

Transcript GNSO Council Teleconference 10 May 2012 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Council Teleconference on 10 May 2012 at 15:00 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/gnsocouncil/gnsocouncil-20120510-en.mp3>

on page

<http://gnsocouncil.icann.org/calendar/#may>

Adobe Chat transcript :

<https://gnsocouncil.icann.org/meetings/chat-transcript-council-10may12-en.pdf>

List of attendees:

<https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/GNSO+Council+Meeting+10+May+2012>

NCA – Non Voting - Carlos Dionisio Aguirre

Contracted Parties House Registrar Stakeholder Group: Stéphane van Gelder, Mason Cole, Yoav Keren

gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group: Jeff Neuman, Jonathan Robinson, Ching Chiao, Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Thomas Rickert

Non-Contracted Parties House Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG): Zahid Jamil, John Berard, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, David Taylor, Brian Winterfeldt, Osvaldo Novoa – absent apologies

Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG): Rafik Dammak, Wolfgang Kleinwächter, Mary Wong, Bill Drake, Wendy Seltzer, Joy Liddicoat – absent, proxy to Bill Drake, Nominating Committee Appointee (NCA): Lanre Ajayi

GNSO Council Liaisons/Observers Alan Greenberg – ALAC Liaison

Han Chuan Lee – ccNSO Observer

ICANN Staff David Olive- VP Policy Development,

Rob Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director,

Julie Hedlund - Policy Director

Margie Milam - Senior Policy Counselor,

Marika Konings - Senior Policy Director,

Brian Peck - Senior Policy Director,

Berry Cobb – Policy consultant

Alexander Kulik – Systems Engineer

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Liz Gasster - Senior Policy Counselor – absent- apologies

Coordinator: I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you very much (Kelly). Will you just check that the Webcast is up (Kelly)?

Coordinator: Yes it is.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you very much indeed.

Coordinator: You're welcome.

Glen DeSaintgery: Stéphane, would you like me to do a roll call?

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yes, please Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Council call on the 10th of May. And on the call we have Jeff Neuman, Ching Chiao, Jonathan Robinson, Mason Cole, Yoav Keren, Stéphane Van Gelder and Thomas Rickert.

For the non-contracted party house we have Zahid Jamil, John Berard, David Taylor and (Wolf) and Brian Winterfeldt have not yet joined. We - Osvaldo Novoa will be late joining. We have Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, Bill Drake, Wendy Seltzer, Rafik Dammak. Joy Liddicoat is absent and has given her proxy to Bill Drake. Wolfgang Kleinwächter, Carlos Aguirre and Alan Greenberg.

For staff we have David Olive, Margie Milam, Marika Konings, Julie Hedlund, Berry Cobb, Brian Peck, Steve Sheng and myself Glen DeSaintgery and Rob Hoggarth I see, I'm sorry. Have I left off anybody? Wendy Seltzer has just joined the call now.

Wendy Seltzer: Yes, thank you.

Lanre Ajayi: Lanre Ajayi is here.

Glen DeSaintgery: And - sorry Lanre. I saw that I'd left you off. And Lanre Ajayi. Thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you very much Glen. Welcome everyone. Now I'm unable to access the Adobe room for the moment. So apologies for that. It does mean I won't be able to see the chat during the call or going on there or see people have they raised their hands if they wish to speak. So we'll try and work through that as best we can. And I'll ask you to bear with me on that.

Can I ask if there are any statements of interest updates at this time please? Hearing none, can I ask if there is a call request to review or amend the agenda at this time please? Hearing none, I'll draw your attention go the previous meeting's minutes and the link highlighting those on the agenda for today's meeting.

And I will also as I usually do draw your attention to the ending projects list which is - you have a link provided on the agenda for that. And that, as you know, is our list of ongoing projects. Are there any questions about the list at this time? Hearing - I will just note that there are no consent agenda items on our agenda for today and move straight into

Item 3, which is an item coming out of the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group recommendations.

And we have a motion on the table. It is the only motion that we will be considering in today's meeting. The motion was made by Zahid and has not been seconded yet. So before moving on I will ask if there is a second for this motion. There is no second. I will move on to the next item on the agenda.

So can I just make sure there...

Alan Greenberg: Carlos' hand is up.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Sorry.

Alan Greenberg: Carlos' hand is up.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yeah. I'm unable to see the Adobe once again. So if you do want to speak, second or do something, please speak up. Otherwise I'm not aware that you are manifesting yourself. So Carlos, are you seconding this?

Carlos Aguirre: Yes Stéphane. I want to second the motion by Zahid.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you very much Carlos. And in that case, Zahid, can I ask you to read the motion for us please?

Zahid Jamil: Thank you Stéphane. I thought I was in trouble for a while. Let me read it out. It's a motion to create a drafting team to develop the charters for two working groups on the creation of a non-binding best practice to

help registrars and registries address the abuse of registrations of domain names.

Whereas the following recommendation of the Registrar Abuse Policy Working Group, the GNSO Council requested a discussion paper on the creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the abuse of registrations of domain names in accordance with the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group final report.

Whereas ICANN staff submitted the discussion paper to the GNSO Council on 28 September 2011, the link is there. Whereas the GNSO Council discussed the discussion paper at a working session at the ICANN meeting in Dakar and a public workshop was organized.

Whereas the GNSO Council identified the issue as a priority topic at its wrap up session at the ICANN meeting in Dakar. Whereas the discussion paper recommended the creation of two working groups, namely one GNSO working group to establish the framework for best practices and one cross community technical group to propose candidate best practices to address the abusive registration of domain names.

Now therefore be it resolved that the GNSO Council hereby approves the formation of the GNSO drafting team, which will be responsible for developing the charters for the two working groups to address the creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the abuse of registration's domain names as identified above.

Resolved. The drafting team will consider the discussion paper prepared by ICANN staff as well as the discussions of the GNSO Council on the discussion paper and the public workshops on this topic as part of its deliberations and developments of the charters.

Resolved further that (unintelligible) shall serve as a GNSO Council liaison for this drafting team. Thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you Zahid. And let me at this point open it up for discussion and once again ask people to speak up if they want to be in the queue. (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Jeff, please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, thanks. Okay. So I've been actually doing some research into this and reread some of the reports, which are now fairly old at this point. I think this is a little bit premature given the new stage that we're heading into.

I will also not that there are a number of other initiatives that are currently underway, which all touch these quote best practices. And I have no idea where this - where these groups will fit it.

Well I know one of the groups is to define what our best practice is and perhaps maybe we can do that. The second group of working on substance, I'll not that the following ten items are currently undergoing - underway, which I think in part overlap with this work.

You have the synthesis of Whois service requirements, the IRTP Part C including finishing IRTP Part B, the implementation of that.

(Unintelligible) in queue, locking of a domain name subject to the UDRP, the RAA renegotiation as well as the RAA PDP, thick Whois, uniformity of reporting, uniformity of contracts, IRD working group - sorry, the IRD working group and the (pender) implementation.

All of these things are underway at this point that the GNSO Council has on its plate in different stages. And I think - and we also agreed to push off the UDRP review, which kind of touches on some (unintelligible) as well.

So, you know, I just want to make sure also that - and I know Zahid has this in the motion. But I really think that if we do end up creating this, we need to consider as he said all the comments that were raised to the staff report.

As I recall the staff had kind of a unique interpretation of what they call non-binding best practices, which included things like let's put in the code of conduct and then we can mandate the code of conduct in the agreements, which to me is not really non-binding at all.

So I have a bunch of concerns. One is time. All the time that needs to go into this. Two is the complete overlap with everything else that's going on. Three is the introduction of the new gTLD process, which, you know, we're only a year away from a lot of new registries coming into existence. So develop best practices now without kind of the - what's the - the experience of a new registry is looking at their new registry agreements I think is a little premature.

So kind of all that combined the registries discussed and the registries are not in favor of moving forward with this.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Jeff. I'm happy to say I'm now in the Adobe so it's business as usual. Anyone wants to raise their hand, please do so and I see that Yoav wants to speak next.

Yoav Keren: Yes. Stéphane, I want to (provide) some background. I'm in a car on my way to the airport. We - I just wanted to request a deferral of this motion based on what Jeff said and we feel that there's - we need to discuss this further with our stakeholder group and get more understanding whether we need this motion or not. So would like to ask for a deferral.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Yoav. As you know, we have a practice of accepting requests for referral for motions that have not been presented before. So we will on your request on behalf of the registrar group and defer this motion until the next Council meeting.

However, if there is more discussion to be had, we will of course allow that discussion to continue. Zahid, I see you have your hand up. So please go ahead.

Zahid Jamil: Thank you very much Stéphane. I just wanted to say that's fine. Absolutely. We are going to do - abide by this custom. And it may just give us time to sort of reach out between those who have concerns and those who would like to see this go through. And maybe we can work out and work on some of the issues that Jeff just raised and see if we can come up with something that'll work.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you Zahid. Anyone else want to speak on this? Okay.
Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you Stéphane. While I also agree that the deferral certainly should be granted or just has been granted, I'm wondering whether our consideration of this motion should be deferred if possible to a meeting when we have seen the published new gTLD proposal.

The reason why I'm making this proposal is because the answer to Question 28, which deals with abuse prevention and litigation is going to be published. So I think that it might be worthwhile or at least I would find very (unintelligible) for me education to see whether and what if any proposals to mitigate abuse are made by applicants for new gTLDs.

And maybe this is something that other Councilors would also like to take (into) consideration when making their decision on this resolution - on this motion.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Thomas. Just to be clear, you made a suggestion that the motion - the person making the motion is free to take onboard or not but the practice is to defer to the next meeting unless we have a request to withdraw the motion from the person making it. That is what we'll do. As Zahid just suggested, this deferral does give time for people to get together, discuss if there is a different way forward that we might find.

Then may I suggest that the time between now and our next meeting in June is put to that use and discussions take place on your suggestion maybe Thomas or in other directions if there is interest in doing that.

So thanks for that suggestion Thomas. Yoav you still have your hands up or is that - were they just left up? Thank you.

Yoav Keren: It was left up. Should have taken it down.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you very much. Any further discussion on this? In which case we'll move onto Item 4 and this item has been pushed back a few times. Apologies - sincere apologies to Marika who's been very patient with us and has been ready to give this update for the last three meetings I think.

So as promised at the previous meeting, I pushed this up towards the top of the agenda to make sure that this would happen without fail at this meeting. So Marika, over to you. In fact thanks again for your patience.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much Stéphane. And so the slides that are up on the screen are the same as the ones I circulated after the Costa Rica meeting and they have also been posted on the GNSO Web site.

And basically I'll take you through the different steps of the new PDP process. And what you see in these presentations were the graphics that were developed on the request of the PDP work team to provide an illustration of the different steps of the PDP, which will hopefully make it easier for newcomers but also for any involved in the process to see the different steps and also the new enhancements that were introduced.

So, you know, many of you are familiar with the GNSO improvements project which started in 2008 and this is actually as far as I'm aware

the last remaining item that has to be addressed. An objective of the new PDP was to move from the task force model to a working group approach in order to make it more responsive to policy development needs of the community.

And, you know, this PDP has been developed as a result of a lot of hard work by the community and several Council members here as well. And the rules itself are captured in two different places. First of all the Annex A of the ICANN bylaws and two, the PDP manuals. So together they form, you know, the completed pictures as such.

So basically, you know, the - you all adopted this some time ago was adopted by the board in December 2011. And following that these new rules are now applicable to all ongoing and the new PDP.

So this is just the broad line and stats. And for those of you familiar with the old PDP, I think, you know, these might look very familiar. But, you know, as often the case, you know, the devil is in the details and I think there's some significant improvements that were made in the new PDP model.

So here you see that the first step of the process is for Council members, stakeholder, constituency or advisory committee to actually ask the question whether a PDP is required to address the issue that they want to raise.

If the desired outcome is a consensus policy, then a PDP is a required process. However, if a consensus policy is not the objective and it's clear from the outset, a different process may be considered. And as many of you know, the Council has used drafting teams, work teams

and communities as a whole to address a whole range of issues in the past without needing a PDP.

But however, it's clear that a PDP is a desired process. You know, we're moving to the next phase, which is the issue, scope and process. And that stage is really about defining the issue. What is it exactly and why should it be addressed?

So one of the new elements of the PDP is enhanced focus on the scope and process and encouraging sufficient discussion and information gathering prior to the actual request for an issue report.

And some suggestions here are, you know, organizing workshops or identifying certain areas for which additional information or data should be gather first before moving forward.

Once this has been done and requested of an issue report, I encourage to complete the template that is included in the PDP manual to provide as much information as possible on the issue to help inform the Council deliberations as well as the staff experts on (qualification) report.

And we'll get that template posted as well on the Council Web site and circulate it to the mailing list or ones familiar with that. And what it basically does is just outline the different questions that a requestor is hopefully able to complete and especially looking as well a additional supporting information that help inform the discussion as well as development of the issue report.

So the three entities that can request an issue report has remained the same. The Board and advisory committee and the GNSO Council with, you know, the GNSO Council a specific voting threshold associated.

Requests from the Board or an advisory committee do not require an intermediate vote by the GNSO Council. And a novelty is that a mechanism has been introduced to allow for communications between the Board and the GNSO Council on requests for issues report by the Board should there be any additional questions or things that are unclear.

Following that, staff is then expected to produce a preliminary issue report for public comment within 45 days. And this is also a new feature where before it was immediately a final issue report that was produced.

And this public comment period is really intended to ensure that all the information included in the issue report is relevant and correct and to give the community an opportunity to express their views on whether or not a PDP should be initiated so the information can be provided to the GNSO Council as they deliberate the issue report.

And following the closing of the public comment forum, I can then produce the final issue report for GNSO Council consideration.

So this moves us then to the next stage of the PDP, which - during which it is to be decided whether or not to move forward with the policy development process. In the case of a PDP that's initiated by the Board, there's actually no intermediate vote and the PDP automatically proceeds to the next step.

In the case of an issue raised by the GNSO Council or an advisory committee, a vote of the GNSO Council is required. Again here a new mechanism has been introduced to allow for dialog between the Council and advisory committee should a PDP not be initiated on an issue that was raised by an advisory committee.

If the PDP is initiated, the next step is then to form a drafting team to develop a charter. And this is another new requirement in a revised PDP. A charter is required for a PDP working group and is to be adopted by the GNSO Council with the same voting threshold as the PDP was initiated with.

And once that has happened, the PDP moves into the next phase, which is the working group phase. So in the working group phase additional emphasis has been placed on ensuring broad input early on in the process. Not only from GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies but also from other ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees.

The other steps are in broad line the same as before with working groups required to publish initial report for public comment and producing a final report.

One important addition here is that working groups are expected to also provide their views at the impact of the proposed recommendation as well as how these policy recommendations should be reviewed and assessed once implemented.

So following the submission of the final report, the GNSO Council is then expected to review the report and deliberate. The GNSO Council is strongly discouraged from itemizing or modifying the recommendation. And there is a recommendation there as well that there are concerns or proposed modifications that these are actually sent back to the PDP working group.

If the - or once the recommendations are adopted - their applicable holding thresholds that can be found in Article 10 Section 3.9 of the ICANN bylaws. And then it comes with recommendations report is the ballot that is sent to the Board. Another new element here is that the Council recommendations report is to be approved by the GNSO Council before it is submitted to the Board.

From the final approval part is when the Board looks at these recommendations. Here nothing really has changed or anything with the - what we actually did is to clarify some of the language in case the Board has concerns about the recommendations and determines that these are not in the best interest of the ICANN community or ICANN.

And then there's several steps in place by which the Board can reject the recommendations and a consultation then takes place between the GNSO Council and the Board to come to a resolution.

But once the recommendations are adopted, then we move into implementation. And there another new innovation is that there's the option for the GNSO Council possibly on the recommendation of the working group to create an implementation review team, which has been tasked to assist ICANN staff in developing the implementation details of the policy.

The idea behind it is to allow a channel of communication for staff to get clarification - certain issues that, you know, might not be clear or if there's some concerns about how certain recommendations can be implemented.

And this allows also for a way to, you know, go back to the GNSO Council should there be any kind of reasons for modifications or issues where it's seen that, you know, they cannot be addressed through the implementation of the policy but further consideration needs to be given to those.

And this is for example already being tested with the post expiration domain name recovery working group, (right), implementation review team is in place and will be working with ICANN staff on the implementation - development of the implementation plan.

And this process ICANN staff is also required to inform the GNSO of the proposed implementation plan and then also of course (the conform) the GNSO recommendations.

So I think this is in broad lines the new PDP and I've tried to, you know, highlight in this short time some of the main innovations. As said, you know, for the real details you'll need to review the Annex A and the PDP manual. There are several as well summary documents of that and I'm happy if anyone wants a more detailed presentation or, you know, or answer any questions you might have either at this stage or at a later time.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Marika. Very nice (flags) indeed. Very useful, very clear presentation. Several questions or comments I think are - do follow on from that presentation. And some recent discussions that we've had at Council level, you know, (unintelligible) things like the discussions we've had recently on the laying of PDP.

And as you know, we've asked the SCI to possibly have a look at that. The implementation review team is another interesting topic in light of some of the comments that's been made recently for example on the JAS Working Group.

So there's a lot there. I encourage everyone to - I take it these slides are available Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Yes. Yes, these are posted on the Web site and I can post you the link again in the chat and they've also circulated in the Council list. And, you know, I think Glen has already posted it.

But I think as well when the - with the new Web site we'll have a specific section dedicated where these graphics will be available and all the supporting materials so people have everything in one place.

Stéphane Van Gelder: That's great. Thanks. I'd encourage everyone to send those to your respective groups. I think they make great educational material. And with that, let's open it up. Yoav, you have a question.

Yoav Keren: Yeah. My question is coming from the point that I think one of the main problems that we've seen in the past or I would say a criticism of the GNSO is that everything takes too long. If the community wants to get something done, the GNSO process takes sometimes for years.

We've seen the Board doing something that they didn't like, kind of a top down on the IOC. And we've talked about it. And what I want to understand whether this process is going to shorten the timetables in any way or there are mechanisms in it to have a (unintelligible) process in some cases.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. If I can respond to that. Actually what the new PDP does is bring in more flexibility. So basically it can go as fast or as slow as people want.

If you look at the different stages, there's certain maximum times for example for the preliminary issue report. There's a, you know, within 45 days it should be produced unless, you know, staff requires more time. And you see a few minimums or - for example, on the public comment period for the initial report there's a minimum I think of 30 days in the bylaws.

But for all the other elements, there's a lot of flexibility. The idea really being that it's, you know, up to the Council for example and the work on the charter to set sort of milestones and define certain work. And as well allow working groups to, you know, go as fast or as slow as they need to.

So I think while in the other - in old PDP there were some timelines in there although they were, you know, impossible to meet. I think this one allows for flexibility, you know, to go as fast or as slow. But, you know, the answer being that some things do take time, you know, doing outreach to constituencies and stakeholder groups and other parts of the community, you know, require time.

Maybe just to (ask) because the PDP working did discuss extensively whether there should be a fast track PDP attached to this. And they discussed it in detail but, you know, weren't able to come up with a process that, you know, would meet the sufficient, you know, accountability and transparency. At the same time, you know, move pretty fast.

I think, you know, as someone worded it there, if it's, you know, if there is consensus and it's, you know, if there would be able to do fast track, why don't we do it for all PDPs?

So I think ultimately it is like if there's a desire and a will in the community to move fast and there is consensus, you can move relatively fast but of course you still need to, you know, check some of the milestones that are required elements in the PDP.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Marika.

Yoav Keren: One follow up question. Did you do any assessment of what would be the fastest way to, you know, decide on a policy? Well how long will it take? What would be - what would be the timetable?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I haven't done that but it shouldn't be too difficult because basically if you reduce everything that's a maximum to a minimum like, you know, staff produces an issue report, you know, in one or two days. Working groups turn around very quickly.

But there's certain, you know, minimum timeframes. So I can try to make a calculation. But of course I think it will give a bit of a distorted

image because, you know, on issues very unlikely that staff can produce an issue report in one day.

And you need a public comment period on the preliminary issue report. And those are very dependent of course on the community work because a large part of the work is in the hands of community working groups.

I think we've seen there in the past that, you know, sometimes things can go really fast if there are a lot of resources and there's really a common mindset on what is the outcome. But we've also seen instances where they're really complicated and a controversial topic.

You know, even having, you know, two weekly meetings of two hours didn't resolve in consensus and, you know, agreement at the end of the day. So it's, you know, I can put those numbers together but to a large extent in my personal view, it also depends on the topic and really the will of the community to, you know, come to consensus and, you know, do something really quickly.

Yoav Keren: Okay. It would helpful just to get that.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yoav, can we just - I'm not sure that it is helpful to us Marika, to work on this. Let's just put this back in focus as well. I don't think that the Council should yield to some outside pressure to do PDPs as quickly as possible. I think the process outlined here, and this is my personal opinion, is a process that is extremely clear that has been refined that is the result of work that's been going on in the community for a good number of years.

And the truth is, as Marika says, it's important to be able to go fast and it's also important to be able to go slow. And if there is time needed to do things, then that time should be taken.

I think what we've seen are some instances recently is the tendency to try and short cut processes, which in the end does tend to short cut the bottom up policy development process, which is the mainstay of what we do here.

So, you know, whilst it may be informative to have an idea of generic timelines, I think we do have that idea. There were timelines in the previous process and those were never kept to.

I would much rather see a process that is streamlined, clear and, you know, easier for people outside of this group to understand as well. I think that's been one issue we've had in the past in communicating with the outside world is that not everyone's found the PDP easy to understand.

And I think the slides that we've just seen are extremely good to - in that light that they make the PDP process extremely clear. So, you know, maybe some numbers can be put together but I'm not sure that is the priority here.

If Marika you're able to do it and you can answer Yoav's question better that way, then fine but if it's going to take you several weeks of work, then perhaps...

Yoav Keren: No, no, no. Just a (unintelligible) on what you said. I totally agree with what you said. That's exactly where I'm coming from. I don't want to

see shortcuts of the - that will do a top down instead of a bottom up. And just exactly what I meant is in cases where we have consensus in the community we want to do it faster.

Are there - you know, what would be the reasonable data? That's what I want to understand a lot more than that. And if it takes a lot of work, don't do that.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Well that's a useful clarification. Thanks very much for making it Yoav. I leave that in your hands Marika if there's a - if there's an answer that can be provided to that point and move on to Alan who's been patiently waiting in the queue.

Alan Greenberg: Well a lot of my subjects have already been discussed. Two points. Number one, I participated in this process and reviewed an awful lot of very complex charts. And I really want to give credit to Marika and/or whoever created these charts. They take a very, very complex process and make it actually understandable. So my hat's off. I think it's a marvelous presentation.

Regarding the issue of cutting short. Marika did do a - maybe she forgets but she did do a very quick back of the envelope summary not of the final process but when we were almost done. And the answer was about nine months is the shortest a process - a PDP could take assuming all the steps were covered reasonably. And that's been lengthened because the comment periods are now longer than they were before by about ten days.

So we're talking close to a year. I was one of the people who strongly suggested that we have a fast path process. And as Stéphane has said, it basically was voted down and the group did not agree.

At Large again in its final comment on the very final recommendations said we believe that the GNSO must work on a fast path. And if for just the kind of things that we're - that Yoav suggested. That is one's where there is consensus. There is not a controversial issue. The fake renewal notices may be one of those. We'll see.

The other one that came up a number of times is we are now putting into every PDP the requirement to look at the outcomes to see if the recommendations were appropriate.

Should we come to a point where we feel they weren't quite appropriate and need to be adjusted, we have absolutely no way of adjusting them other than to launch a completely new PDP.

And I don't thin the GNSO or the community has the stomach to do that to make a minor change. And yet there's no formal way or other way of doing it. So we believe the GNSO must look at a fast path for the situations where it's applicable and certainly not for all - for the ones where there's controversy and complications. Thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Alan. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I have a - I guess it's a question to - this (unintelligible) of the Chair of PDP work team group and I think I want to thank Marika too for the excellent graphics and would love to actually request a copy so we can send to our stakeholder groups, constituencies, et cetera.

The question I have though is since this came out, the Board has decided to add a reply period to every single public comment period that's ever done. I believe they intend that to be applicable to the GNSO activities but I'm not 100% sure. So that's more of a question.

But if it is applicable to all of the GNSO activities, we now have added at least two months if not more to the shortest PDP that we could do simply because there's at least three opportunities for public comment periods.

That's the very minimum, which is one between the preliminary and final issue report; two, there's got to be a public comment period when the PDP is launched or at some point for a preliminary report of the group and then a final report.

So the question is we've now taken what - Alan said we estimated the shortest is nine months to at least 11 months if not more. So, you know, everyone keep that in mind and it'd be great Marika if we can figure that into the whole schedule as well.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Next up Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. Actually it's another thing there are only two mandatory public comment periods. There's a first one a preliminary report and then the one initial report. There's no requirement for a public comment period on the final report; only, you know, one they may decide. So they might hold more public comment periods if needed.

And on the additional time, yes, the new reply period also applies to the GNSO Council. So it's a 21 plus 21. So if you look at the, you know, I think for both the preliminary issue report as well as the initial report, it says should be a 30 day minimum. I guess it only adds in reality then ten days more.

So two times ten days is 20 days provided if the working group of course goes to a minimum and most of the times they actually add more time. So there might be less impact than initially thought. Just need to clarify that.

Jeff Neuman: Well yeah. And then I think - thanks Marika. But I was also assuming that there's usually when the final report comes out the Council usually calls for a comment period before it takes any kind of action. So there's usually at least three.

And usually while the group's doing its work oftentimes on many subjects there's other public comment periods. So it's - you're right. The minimum mandatory two public comment periods plus the Council generally does one. But as we know, there's usually more of them that are done.

And so are you saying then Marika with the 30 days that if the - that a working group has the option of only give 21 days followed by 21 days and that counts. It doesn't have to a 30 followed by 21. It can be 21 followed by 21.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I mean that's open to interpretation. What this says I think it's a minimum of 30 days because that's the time we develop a report that wasn't yet, you know, initial reply period and - or the initial

period and a reply period. So, you know, presumably that's (unintelligible) interpretation whether that's a 30-day as a whole or whether 30 days should be the initial part.

Jeff Neuman: All right. I'm sorry Stéphane. Final question. Why - since what the Board - did the Board do a bylaw change for the 21 followed by 21 or it's just a regular resolution?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think it was a regular resolution but what did happen following the, you know, as we had already adopted a new PDP, if you might have seen, you know, we may - there were some further changes to the - to update the voting threshold that are in the bylaws.

And linked to that there was a small modification to the Annex A, which basically just says, you know, public comment period should be in line with whatever is the ICANN standards to, you know, accommodate for the 21 plus 21 days or, you know, whatever it might look in the future if there would be changes. So I think that's - that was a change that was made.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Shame on me for missing that then because anyway just to get the Board (changes) for itself shouldn't necessarily mean that we have to adopt it but we made that change so it is what it is. Thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks to you both. Alan, you have another comment.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Just a quick follow on that my recollection is in addition to those public comment periods the Board always does one after the GNSO approves and before they vote. I don't - can't recall a case where they didn't do one first. So there's yet another one.

My interpretation of the period length is the GNSO working team that came up with the new PDP rules thought that 30 days was really necessary to solicit comments on such an important issue as a PDP. And therefore my interpretation is that the new period is 30 plus 21. Because otherwise we're short circuiting the amount of time (unintelligible) will have to produce initial comments into the process. Thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you. Mary.

(Mary): Thanks Stéphane. And I can't recall this point was covered during this discussion. But couldn't the Council in initiating the PDP specify a time process or a number of periods (unintelligible) on the norm. And when that happens it's obviously always open for a group or the Council to refer that to the SCI. Would that be flexibility that we have that would to some extent take care of the issue?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yeah. (This is Marika). What is required for a PDP is the part that's in the bylaws. There's like - yeah, there are certain requirements that need to be met. And I think actually the manual provides more detail on how those different steps need to be done.

There is, you know, certainly flexibility for example on, you know, the time you give to working groups to deliver its product. I mean there are, you know, in the charter there the Council would say we expect you to deliver X, Y and Z by this date. But it would need to, you know, reflect those mandatory elements that are required.

I mean of course it is - and I think that's something that the PDP work can discuss as well and say well, you know, we cannot come to agreement or we don't now how, you know, we could come to a fast track model that would, you know, accommodate the difference concerns and issues that were raised in the context of those conversations.

But that shouldn't prevent the Council if there is a need or desire to have a fast track to either, you know, ask the SCI or a separate group to look at that issue again.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay. Thank you very much. I see no further hands up. So if there's no further discussion on this, we'll move on to Item 5. Thank you once again Marika for that - the quality of that presentation and perhaps we should mention the person that you named in the chat, (Tom Hudson) as the creator of that presentation. Well done and thank you (Tom) for doing that.

So Item 5 is on the International Olympics Committee and Red Cross Drafting Team. Just as way of background, we all know this but the GAC sent us a request to look at protection on the IOC and RC marks at both top and second level for all new gTLDs.

A drafting team was put together chaired by Jeff and came up with a set of recommendations that were passed by the Council. They were therefore pushed up to the Board and the Board chose - the Board has a committee on the new gTLD program and that committee chose not to update the applicant guidebook in spite of the recommendations made by the drafting team.

And following that decision, the GNSO (unintelligible) approved another motion to request an issues report on protection of those - well protection of names of IGOs as we had in between being sent a letter by some IGOs requesting protection of their marks as well.

So that's where we have got to on this. And the discussion for today is for us to determine what options we'd like to pursue with the IOC RC Drafting Team and some of the proposals that we've included in the agenda. One would be to continue and make a recommendation to the team to provide a complete response to the GAC for second level protection.

Another would be to respond to the GAC but at the same time disband the drafting team so the Council would be responding to the GAC or disband the team and wait until we have made some headway on the issue report itself or give new instructions to the drafting team.

So a few options there. There may be some others. Let's open it up for discussion and perhaps I can ask Jeff as Chair of this drafting team to introduce as to that - introduce that discussion for us and maybe Jeff there are some points that I have omitted to mention that you'd like to add.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Thanks Stéphane. I think you covered some of them. I think I'm going to go back and maybe sort of repeat some of them but in maybe a little bit more detail. And, you know, I have taken this issue back to the drafting team as well. So I just wanted to present what some of the members felt on the drafting team that responded to this topic.

So as everyone recalls, this actually began at a motion by the ICANN Board of Directors in June where they decided to kind of protect certain Olympic and certain Red Cross marks at the top level in a certain way. And then they also decided to include in the - or decided not to include the guidebook any second level protections but basically punted that issue to the GAC and the GNSO to figure out.

We received a GAC proposal on September 11, 2011. So that's nearly eight months ago. And that GAC proposal, as Stéphane said, it's had recommendations at both the top and second level.

In Dakar we created - the GNSO Council created very informally a drafting team during our wrap up session. And that drafting team's mission was to provide advice to the GNSO on these issues in its dealings with the GAC.

The drafting team got together shortly after the meeting in Dakar and worked through the beginning of this year and made some recommendations, which went through a public comment period, and then ultimately, as you know, the GNSO Council approved those recommendations at the top level.

The drafting team specifically only address the top level recommendations because there was an immediate urgency for those - if we were going to make recommendations or we're going to respond to the GAC proposal, we had to do so at the top level much faster than we did at the second level because the second level protections if we were to adopt the GAC recommendations or even a part of those or some variant of those, those in theory could be incorporated into the registry agreement.

And no registries - new gTLD registries were assigned agreements until at least thought that that time the end of this year. Now it's clearly at least to next year and slipping every day. So the - so again, the drafting team specifically decided not to address any of the second level protections until after we dealt with the top level.

The Council submitted a recommendation to the top level of the Board. As Stéphane said, the Board chose not to adopt those recommendations. So I want to stop there for a second because I've seen a couple posts saying - not only on the Council list but on some other constituency and stakeholder lists basically saying that the Board rejected the drafting team's recommendations.

And, you know, the whole basis for the drafting team the Board - the Board's rejection shows that it doesn't want any recommendations on anything top or second level. So there's a lot that's going around, you know, even from people we know and trust.

There's a lot of - I don't want to say rumors. But there's a lot going around that's actually not necessarily what was decided. So I think it's clear to kind of just clarify that.

So what's also clear is that, you know, the draft - neither the drafting team nor the Council has responded to the GAC proposals at the second level. By responded it doesn't mean approved or rejected. It can respond by saying we're not dealing with it now. There's plenty of different responses we could do. But that response hasn't come.

As Stéphane said, there was a resolution that was approved by the Council at the last meeting, which is to approve an issue report not only on IGAs while that was the title of the resolution. It actually if you read the resolution it's basically an issue report on defining the types of organizations that they should consider these special protection up in second level if any.

And policy is required to protect those organizations at the top and second level. So it's not just IGAs. In theory it could include the Red Cross and it could include the Olympic Committee. So I just want to clarify that.

So we're kind of in this area. We have met as a drafting team a couple of times since the Costa Rica meeting. And we had some excellent presentations by the Olympic Committee and by the Red Cross, two papers that were written that addressed some questions that the drafting team had.

Some very important questions that the drafting team had as to things like why do they think they deserve this extra protection. What is it specifically about the protections in the new round that aren't sufficient and why? And why do we think that the GAC proposal of only protecting exact matches would actually go and make a dent in helping them achieve what their goals were?

In other words, we didn't - what makes them think that this is going to solve their problem or at least make things a lot better. And I - and the Red Cross and Olympic Committee actually responded with some - with a - each with a paper that explains the answers to these

questions. And we followed that up with a very constructive dialog on the drafting team.

So whatever we do, it's clear that we're going to need to preserve that and make sure it's documented well and make sure that it's passed on to whoever and whenever it's addressed.

So I presented these to the drafting team. We had some different reactions in the drafting team. The members of the non-commercial stakeholder group pretty much uniformly said it's time to close this drafting team down.

You know, none of them feel that it was a waste of time. They all believe that, you know, we should document - finish - wrap it up, finish documenting what we have and then move on. And wait - ultimately wait until the PDP if there is a PDP towards the end of the year ultimately wait for that and, you know, reconstruct a new group, whatever, under the PDP.

The other members of the drafting...

Stéphane Van Gelder: Can I just - can I just clarify that. So the recommendation from the drafting team itself is to close it down. Is that what you said?

Jeff Neuman: No, no, sorry. That was - I'm going over feedback of what members of the drafting team said. So the...

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: ...non-commercial - the non-commercial stakeholder group members of the drafting team made that recommendation. Others of...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: ...yeah, I'm - I want to present all the views. So other members of the drafting team included a registry representative, the ALAC representative, the IPC representative and there may be - and Thomas; so the Nominating Committee representative all said that they believe the work has been valuable and the work of the drafting team should continue because, you know, the Council still does need to respond to second level.

And while we have this momentum we should continue. So really there's different views on the drafting team. My personal view as the Chair is whether this work happens as a drafting team or as the Council of the whole it has to happen. And we do need to respond to the GAC proposal in one way or another but we do need to respond in a thoughtful manner that addresses their points.

Again, whichever way that turns out to be the GAC has requested it. We've already indicated we would deliver it in a past meeting. So that's my own recommendation. And I really throw this out to the Council to provide some guidance.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you Jeff. So let me open up this discussion there and preface it with a reminder that we are trying to find a way forward. So I'm sure there's a lot of passion on this topic. But what we're trying to do here is to determine the way forward that the Council would like to take on this and perhaps get to a point where for the next meeting we

can add a suggested way forward for the consent agenda if we're not able to determine a way forward here. But that would be the end.

Thomas please.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Stéphane. I'd just like to add to what Jeff said that I do not think that there's an awful lot of duplication with the work of the drafting team and this initiation of the PDP or request for initial report to work in parallel.

I also think that we really do need to provide the GAC with a response and not only half a response but a response for the top level as well as the second level. And I think that this is not only a matter of courtesy but just to remind you that this collaboration between the GAC and the GNSO would cause a new type of relationship or collaborative effort (and was caused) by the GAC.

And I think that we should not make this model fail which have been commented very favorably by GAC members that we spoke to. So I think that this should be used or which in other words we should not miss this opportunity to enter into this new type of collaboration successfully with the GAC, which could help us in other scenarios as well later on. Thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you Thomas. So far we've heard from two members of the drafting team and they are clearly in favor of pursuing. And there may be some other views coming. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. My comment that Jeff relayed was made on purely on my own behalf at that time, not representing the ALAC. I have since

however discussed it with the ALAC Executive Committee and there is a strong feeling that as Thomas said, the GNSO must respond with a thoughtful response to the GAC on the second level protections.

That could be no protections are going to be given or here's this waiver that the GNSO is recommending addressing the issue but it must be a thoughtful one not just saying we're not going to look at it right now. The drafting team so far has started some preliminary work but has not come out with any recommendations.

So we believe the GNSO must take some formal action to come up with thought out recommendations on how to respond - how the issue should be treated.

If a drafting team is not the right thing, some people have indicated some level of offense that the drafting team is not appropriate, then the GNSO can charter a new group. But it's got to be done before the first gTLD goes live, before the contracts are signed and under no conditions can this be basically tossed off and ignored.

And putting it into the PDP and saying the PDP will address it, given the discussion we just had on PDPs, that as a minimum time as close to a year and that's assuming no controversy, this is not going to be a no controversy PDP. This is going to be one with substantially different view and very, very difficult to come to closure on.

So we feel strongly that there has to be some continued action to look at the second level. And it has to be something which is going to bear up under examination of whether the GNSO, you know, took reasonable efforts to look at (the issue). Thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Alan, when you say we, just to clarify you are talking about the ALAC.

Alan Greenberg: I'm talking about the Executive Committee of the ALAC, not necessarily the full ALAC. It may come up at the next ALAC meeting, be ratified. All I'm saying is the leaders - some of the leaders in the ALAC agree that for the reasons that Thomas indicated, that is, this is one of the instances of a level of collaboration we haven't seen before and a level of interaction.

The request did come exclusively from the Board in addition to the GNSO and the GNSO has to respond - not necessarily giving the GAC what they ask for, but with a thoughtful response as to what the GNSO is recommending to be done and be done in a timely manner, given the delegation of gTLD prediction that we have, thank you.

Wolfgang Kleinwächter: This is Wolfgang, I wish to...

Stéphane Van Gelder: It seems that the issue of whether the drafting team should continue to continue working and the issue of responding to the GAC which are really two separate issues and need not be mutually exclusive but they could be. And as Alan I think suggested, the drafting team is one solution but there could be other solutions as well. But it's clear that from this discussion the - that there are two issues coming to the floor, one to continue work, the other the response to the GAC which once again the Council could give. Mary, what are your thoughts?

Mary Wong: Thanks Stéphane and I think that first I'd like to clarify that the NCSG is definitely not opposed to the Council responding to the GAC, so that was the first issue outlined. And we and I particularly too believe that it is policy and appropriate and necessary for the Council to respond to the GAC by way of a letter or thought or some response like that. The response itself with respect to content, you know, doesn't have to be - and I think should not be and we're not in a position to give basically, "Here's the solution and we all agreed on it, let's go with it."

The response could outline the process that we're going through and the option, whether it's a TDT or the formation of a working group. We also do think that presenting the work of the drafting team to date would be very, very useful, there's been a lot of good work done. Then with respect to the second issue as to how and who continues this work going forward - the fact that, you know, we have this TDT issue and that the Board in its recent resolutions has essentially thrown back the second level of question to us the GNSO, it would be more appropriate for us to form a formal group, whereas the drafting team was a informal group.

And it may well be that the same people will volunteer for it, but I just think that in terms of having the structure done correctly, that that would be the way to go.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Mary, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Stéphane, if I think it's - my impression is that to date the drafting team did some good, thorough and effective work and so to the extent that we need to (give) a response in relatively short order, they seem - the drafting team seems very well qualified to assist us in

doing that. There's nothing to stop others joining that or contributing to the drafting team, so that doesn't strike me as any sort of exclusivity there. I suppose Mary's recent point is prior to mine about making something more formal.

If there is further ongoing work to be done then perhaps that makes sense, but in terms of dealing with the short term issue, it strikes me that the drafting team is well qualified and equipped to help us with that - that's my two cents worth, thanks.

Wolfgang Kleinwacher: Yes, Wolfgang.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Sorry Wolfgang are you not able to put your hand up?

Wolfgang Kleinwacher: Yes I can do it here but, you know, it probably doesn't work. I do it (unintelligible) but if you go to...

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay, please jump in because I think you try to speak earlier on and I kind of jumped over you, so please go ahead.

Wolfgang Kleinwacher: Okay, yes my - I was on the drafting team and in the last meeting, you know, I asked if the representative from the IOC and the Red Cross to give us more facts about the problems because sometimes it's difficult to understand given why there are special problems for the IOC and the Red Cross which cannot be settled, you know, within the existing mechanisms which protect them. And, you know, they promised to give us some additional facts where misuse of the name has taken place, so that we can make any recommendations based on facts.

So at the moment, you know, we are living more or less, you know, in a situation where we just refer to estimates or some rumor or things like that. So I would prefer really, you know, to get first the facts before we continue, so it means I do not see any urgent need. In the meantime we could send a letter to the GAC, you know, to explain the procedure that we're dealing with the issue, I think this would be okay.

But, you know, if it comes to the substance I think, you know, we - first we have really to get all the facts on the table before we can continue, you know, with any concrete recommendation which goes to the substance.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you, Zahid back to you.

Zahid Jamil: Yes, I just wanted to say that I got very clear messages from members of the GAC that if we close the drafting team, the GAC would see it as a sense - because they are expecting a response. So I think we should have the drafting team prepare that response and then stop the, you know, the (gulf).

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Zahid, (David).

(David): Thanks Stéphane, yes I can be very quick, so I agree completely with Jonathan and those previous comments, I think forge ahead - keep the drafting team together, there's no point in dismembering it. And definitely get a response to the GAC, so that's just the IPC view.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks just to ask for another clarification, in that general view that the drafting team should respond - or the drafting team should project that the Council - suggest a response from the Council

to send to the GAC which I think would be if I might suggest the proper way of doing it. But what's the view there with the IPC?

(David): Yes, I think the drafting team should respond, I think they're well positioned to do so.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay, (Jeff).

Jeff Neuman: Yes I actually - I do think a little bit different then (David), I do think that the Council needs to respond, you know, the Council could adopt the drafting team recommendations like it did before, but it should come from the Council because that's really who it's directed at. And I will note that most of our - or a lot of the members of the drafting team happen to be counselors, so it's not like we're talking about two completely separate groups. And the drafting team is always open, so anyone new can join.

But I do want to clarify something though that Wolfgang said because it kind of left a little bit of a misperception, at least in my mind. We were in the process of collecting facts - the drafting team's in the process of collecting facts. And there was probably - I think it's over 100 pages I think that the Olympic Committee sent us - well over 100, a couple hundred pages of facts supporting their position or at least, you know, facts that they believe support their position.

So we've been getting lots of facts and Wolfgang just - I just want to leave the Council - or don't want to leave the Council the impression that the drafting team was anywhere near making any decisions or recommendations without any facts. They're coming in, the Red Cross does owe us an update, but they still provided facts. So again they're

all in the process of doing that and so I think the drafting team will continue to evaluate those facts and are not going to make any recommendations at the second level without some factual basis behind it.

I think that's clear, so I just want to clear that up - if the drafting team continues, it will certainly base it's recommendations on the facts that are presented to it, thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, Mason.

Mason Cole: I just wanted to agree with - first I'd like to thank (Jeff) for that clarification because I agree with Wolfgang, I do think fact-based decisions are better than suspicion based decisions. And I just - I also wanted to agree that the drafting team I think should stay in place for the purpose of creating a response that would be sent on behalf of the Council.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay thanks Mason, so it does sound like we have close to consensus on asking the drafting team to continue and draft a response that the Council would then ask me to send as Chair to the GAC Chair. Is there any violent opposition to doing that? I'm trying to push this forward in a rather informal way but perhaps that can work - is there a violent opposition to asking the drafting team to continue with a mandate to drop a response within the - obviously approved by the council and to the GAC Chair?

I'll skip over you (Jeff) and go to Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks Stéphane and maybe it's not possible to answer this question fully today, but I just wanted to clarify it. First we are trying to set a timeline because we've talked about timely response to the GAC and if so, I think appropriately then other people on the drafting team would be working on a response as to what has been done to date and what could be done going forward as opposed to taking a few months to work through a second level of protection, right.

Stéphane Van Gelder: I think that's a very useful comment. Yes in my mind the response would be for what's being done to date and it - what we've heard today and what we've heard in the past weeks both on the group list and in chatter in general is that there's an expectation that at least the current expectation that we would respond to the GAC. I do think that that response has to be in the present and not the possibility of future work, but perhaps (Jeff) you have a opinion on that.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I do, I have a pretty strong opinion. The drafting team is not in a position at this point in time to make any recommendations out of response to the second level. It's going as - and I think even Mary said it, it's going to take several months. We were just in the process of starting the fact collection, again these are facts that are clinging by their groups, I'm not making any judgment in telling you that they are facts, I'm just saying that these are what the groups have submitted to us and everyone's free to interpret.

But no we will not have a response by Prague, it will take some time to gather the facts and to have people question the facts, get more facts and, you know, so it's going to be a process. It's - unfortunately we've been set back due to this controversy and, you know, due to careful consideration by the group, so it's going to take some time.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Perhaps I should clarify, my intent was perhaps more of a status update. I was mindful of the character of the argument that (Thomas) developed earlier on and I do think that - I do agree that if this group's firmly have been borne out of the spirit of collaboration between the GAC and the GNSO, that we probably don't want to lose. And my thoughts were that we might be able to just provide a status update.

So say if we decide as the Council that we'd like to have the drafting team continue working, we could ask the drafting team to just provide us with a status update and that would be the nature of our response to the GAC.

Jeff Neuman: Well so I think we - I followed you up until the last sentence - I think yes absolutely we could provide a status report and that was the plan to provide it to the GAC at the Prague meeting anyway. But it almost seemed like you implied that that would be the nature of the response to the GAC - no that would be a status report. The response to the GAC should be an actual response to their proposal which is much more detailed - either it's a yes we agree, no we don't agree, we agree partially and here's why.

Or it could be that we still have participation at this time and we're going to wait until the PDP, that's a response because a status report's not really a response.

Stéphane Van Gelder: I wasn't talking about a report, but an update so it would be a one page letter maybe saying we - the Council has asked the (BP) to do this, that and the other and to continue working on this. It's - I was

going into this discussion mindful that there was no readiness on behalf of the (BP) to provide explicit responses to the issue of second level domain named protection. So it was not my intent or meaning to suggest that that was a ready-made response that could be packaged and sent off in the next week.

However I think it would be useful for the GAC if that's the intent of the GNSO to know what we're doing next. I'm just not ready to assume that they will read the minutes of our meetings and take it, you know, take their information from that, that's what I meant. So I don't see anymore hands up, but I don't want to pursue this discussion as a monolog. But I would like to get an idea - Alan saved me putting his hand up, so go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I - sorry, I'm hearing different things from different people and I'd just like some clarity. I think what (Jeff) is saying is yes a status report is reasonable and if Council wants to send one prior to Prague or at Prague, that is something which is a courteous thing to do, but the drafting team should continue working until it comes to closure on what the formal recommendation are with respect to second level protections for the Red Cross and IOC, be they none exhaustive protections which will make them delighted or whatever.

And - so when we say the drafting team continues, I think we're meaning yes maybe we issue a status report, but we then continue to have a definitive answer on the particular request. But I'm hearing some words which imply, no the only continued work of the drafting team is to come up with a status report, so I'd like clarification.

Stéphane Van Gelder: I think once again we're kind of brainstorming so to stop this from going on endlessly, why don't we do this, why don't we - I mean the drafting team is a body where we've kind of put the expertise. Where, you know, the GNSO Council has asked the drafting team to do something, we are relying on the drafting team to provide us with recommendations, information and so on. So perhaps we could ask the drafting team - which I've not, I've certainly not seen this from the drafting team yet, it may exist but for a recommendation on how they would recommend the Council proceed.

And I'm not sure there's consensus in the drafting team on that point from (Jeff)'s explanation earlier on. But I do, you know, may I suggest that if there's no consensus in the drafting team then it may be difficult to explain at the Council to have consensus on the way forward. (Jeff) is that something that you feel is possible, because obviously you and I have been discussing options that perhaps we don't feel we are in a position here to determine options on the (fly) as it were.

Jeff Neuman: Well I think it's - it's going to be on how you define consensus and I got in trouble last time I tried to define consensus. Because it seems like - and maybe I'm wrong and maybe someone will correct me on this call, but it seems like the desire to continue the drafting team is split along the same lines as those that desire increased or - (let me see) that's not fair - it seems like those that oppose the recommendations at the top level are the same people that oppose the continuation of the drafting team.

So it's almost like the fear of the outcome is driving the desire to continue or not continue the drafting team, which is why I presented to you who said what. I'm not sure it's going to be - unless someone

corrects me on this call, I'm not sure it's going to be - we're going to be able to get a full consensus as some would like it defined. You know, the last time I did it I was accused by - to put it on the table, the non-commercial stakeholder group had opposed the recommendations.

And because they opposed the recommendations, they said that that couldn't by definition be a consensus and so there's a whole dispute as to what consensus is.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay, so I thought we got closer to some kind of resolution, it feels like we're moving away from it now so let me suggest something. Can we recommend - can we leave the drafting team as is, so that's the overall majority recommendation that I got from our discussions here. Can we task me with just sending a couple of words to (Heather) saying that's what we're doing and that will be cleared by me with the Council before I do so and leave the rest of the debate for another time.

So the debate on an actual progress report, the second level protection, etc., that is something that I don't think we are in a position to solve today. But I do think today we do have to come up as a Council, with some response to the drafting team on whether they should continue or not. That basic response I think is needed from us, so can we at least agree on that? I mean I'll ask that the other way around, is there any opposition to doing that?

Okay, hearing no opposition I suggest then that we instruct (Jeff) to tell the drafting team to continue work and that I ask (Jeff)'s help in drafting a couple of sentences to (Heather) just to update her on what we've decided to do. Alan I see your hand up.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, just adding to what you said and I think that your proposal is great - I wouldn't say anything of substance or in terms of the subject here that we're dealing with in the status report apart from reporting about today at the Council's meeting, meaning that the Council has asked the drafting team to keep up its work. And I think no more is needed and I think the GAC will know that we're having this discussion in the light of - or to reaction to the notion that - to the resolution that has been made.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yes agreed - any further comments? Okay thank you very much for that discussion and we now have an item on the joint - well JAS is quicker that way, the JAS working group. We did aim to have Kurt Pritz on board with us for this call, unfortunately Kurt is on a plane so he's not able to join us today. He did though issue - or send us a statement to the Council earlier on. I've not actually had time to read that statement, so it's difficult for me to comment on that statement initially, but perhaps we could launch straight into any discussion that want to have on the JAS, the idea there once again being that we decide on any next steps from this group if next steps are needed.

I will just read out Kurt's comment, it's quite short - for the benefit of those people listening in on audio, "The GNSO Council approved an extension of the JAS charter on the 22 of September, 2011 in order to complete other reports [Milestone 2 Report] that have sense been completed and to request that the joint SOAC working group remain on call to review the outcome of the ICANN implementation of the JAS recommendations and a link is provided to that resolution.

We continue to review implementation details with the JAS, either the entire JAS or a sub-group selected by the JAS. Most notably, JAS members have recommended that the community play a role in the planning for the recruitment, training and operation of the (SAB). The review panel that will review evaluate financial systems application - so that's what the (SAB) is, the planning includes the idea that the (SAB) include a community member representative or CMR.

Additional information can be provided to the GNSO to augment information provided by the JAS. A report on the details can be made directly to the GNSO Council in (Maylak) if the Council indicates such a preference." So that is Kurt's statement and let me open this up for discussion then and see if we want to decide any next steps on it, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: So I'm not sure how we could have this discussion because it was (short of date) from Kurt so maybe we should postpone this discussion until he is available. As when you put this on the agenda, I saw that you asked a update from the staff, so I guess maybe we should postpone it.

Stéphane Van Gelder: I'm happy to do that, but there does seem to be other people that want to talk about it, so...

Rafik Dammak: Yes we understand, but who will answer the - if there is any question, who will answer about the update if the person that's supposed to do it is not here? So and the kind of details we can get so maybe just avoid any misunderstanding or misinterpretation, so that's why I'm asking for postponing.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yes, I still think we should give people a chance to speak if they want to speak and questions can be written down and answered by Kurt at a later date. But I don't think we should block people from speaking, we have two hands up in the queue - (Jeff) you're next.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks Stéphane, and I also think Stéphane while we're discussing it, you may want to read the chat, because there's completely different understandings on the last topic, so you may want to read the chat and you may have to come back to that last topic. But on this topic in particular, Rafik I don't think in my mind, it didn't matter whether Kurt was on or anyone from the staff was on. I think there are some things that we need to discuss regardless of the activity that's going on with staff.

So while it is disappointing that he's not able to make it, nor Karla is able to make it - she's the one that's directly working on all the emails that I saw going back and forth, we do need to discuss this topic, because I think that there's the (mystique) that we have. I first want to state like I always have to because things get taken out of proportion or out of content, the registry absolutely do support the program to provide financial aid to applicants.

They do support competition so this is in no way has any bearing on that, it's a procedural discussion. But it was my impression that when we approved the revised JAS charter and then later discussed the final report, that really the role of the JAS group was to produce the final report and then to monitor after the final report was finished, basically to monitor the process and provide reports - or report back to the GNSO if there was anything that we as the GNSO committee needed to address.

What's happened since from what I've read and again it's sketchy because I haven't been on the call and I've just been following the archives, is that staff approves the JAS working group to appoint people from that JAS group to assist in - I don't know if it was the selection of the - of valutors or to serve as a community representative on the actual evaluation of financial assistance. It didn't come to the Council, it went straight to the GAC and I think and the registry believe that that is, you know, well beyond the scope of what we chartered the JAS group to do.

That if ICANN staff were seeking these volunteers, they should of come to the GNSO community as a whole. Or once the JAS group got this recommendation, the JAS group should of told staff or could of told staff that it needed advice or needed to go back to the Council and the (interact) representatives to go back to ALAC and discuss that and then put out a call amongst the community for volunteers. Instead it seems like there was an assumption that those individuals that continue to serve and follow the JAS was the same individuals that we qualified - or the only ones that wanted to volunteer for this role.

But still in reading Kurt's email, I still don't understand why they went to the JAS first unless it just seemed like the easiest and fastest thing to do as opposed to going to the community. And I still don't fully understand the continuing role that at least staff believes the JAS group has. And then we at the GNSO Council need to discuss what we believe if any, role that the JAS has going forward. So I think there's a number of issues in there and I still believe we should discuss this pretty thoroughly, thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks (Jeff) and those questions perhaps can be written down by someone from staff and put to Kurt or Kurt can be directed to the transcript. Although I do agree with Rafik that Kurt - with Kurt not being here today, it's difficult to work on any specific answers to those questions today.

Rafik Dammak: If I could just - if I could quickly - the problem is what we are hearing now is interpretation for (Jeff). I understand maybe (Jeff) has some concerns, but the interpretations (Jeff) we don't have the document from the staff so people can have idea what he's talking about. So that's why to avoid misunderstanding that I was really pushing to postpone. I am happy for any kind of discussion about the JAS work, but avoid misunderstand - we have many times made a lot of misunderstandings, interpretation so arises many issues and created some heat about the JAS.

So I want really to avoid that we have the same (problem) again, that's why. I don't have any problem for discussion, but how can we really discuss about update when the person supposed to do the update is not here. So we have only interpretation.

Stéphane Van Gelder: I understand what you're saying Rafik - I'll respond two things to you. First of all what I heard (Jeff) doing was asking questions and not making - generating misunderstandings and I think that's what this session is for. Also you as Co-Chair of the group might be able to answer some of those questions, it's not - the owner doesn't necessarily have to be on staff. You may not be able to and that's fine, but the discussion could also be useful in that regard.

And just a following point from that is that as I said earlier on, people can ask questions, we can write them down, they're in the transcript and Kurt can come back and answer those later. So let's go to Wolf, we have Jonathan next in the queue and then I'll close this off anyway because we'll be - we'll start to run out of time, so Alan you got in there after I said I'd close it off and if you send me a big bunch of money I might allow you to speak, but if not we'll have to see. Anyway, that was all a joke, Wolf go ahead.

Wolfgang Kleinwacher: Thank you Stéphane, so when we started discussing the list and about the - let me say the question of justification that (Jeff) (unintelligible) existing or not and working on that, so I was also of the opinion that maybe we have finished the term basically providing the report. But I learned that we have this motion with which I came - could come up again with what we were saying that JAS would remain on call to review the outcome of the ICANN implementation and that shows me that there is a justification still that JAS is existing and working on that.

However, what I'm missing is strong line - a more stronger line in communication between the JAS and us with regards to the topics they are dealing with and they are really circling this. So I wonder whether we could improve that and the future for me is clear that there is justification in doing that but I wonder how we can improve that. And that could be improved only I understand to members of the JAS like Rafik and others - if there are others on the Council and it's their job to do so, thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Wolf, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Stéphane my comment was actually in relation to the URS, so if you happen to take it now I'll make it.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Can we hold on because we've got an item on - can we hold off because we've got an item on that later on. We should close on this if we can and Alan, can you close.

Alan Greenberg: Yes surely, (truly) I am a member and my understanding was the group was kept in place to interact with staff during the implementation, I don't there was - I don't think it was defined clearer then that. In this particular case, staff made a suggestion that certain functions be done and they thought it would be useful to be done by people who had been involved in the JAS pro- in the project from the beginning, which is why they suggested that there be JAS members who take on a certain role.

I do agree that that recommendation should not have been implemented as such, but should of gone back to the chartering groups to pass on to staff or not, as they chose. But I don't think the JAS group has done anything unreasonable other than the path the answer has taken to get back to staff which, you know, that's a process we went through a number of times. We all have scars because of it and that one we in staff shouldn't of blown and it was. But the rest of the process I think was done according to how it was foreseen by at least some of us early on, thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks, okay so let's close off there. We will ask staff to relay some of those questions that we've had on this item to Kurt and I think we will put the item on our agenda for the next meeting. Let's move on to - at this time perhaps I can ask if we can move on to Item 9

because the - and the other business item. We have three items of discussion there that I really would like to get to because they have generated discussion on the list and so can I ask if there's any opposition to me jumping to Item 9 and then coming back if there's time to Item 7 and 8? Hearing none, let's do that.

So the first item on our (AOB) agenda for today was the recent announcement by (Steve Crocker) and the (bull) that Friday's ICANN meeting were canceled basically. And we've see a lot of discussion on the Council list and elsewhere on this - just to provide some contact, I did send this to the list but perhaps it's worth repeating. In Costa Rica I was asked my opinion on this by (Steve) in a private conversation, there was no indication that I should feel free to share it with anyone else, so I didn't.

And since then as you've seen - and of course this was mentioned to me as an idea, there were no implementation details, no planned dates - at no point was I given any information that this would be implemented in Prague. So since then you've seen the announcement from (Steve) saying that what happens on a Friday morning which is basically the SOAC Chair's report, the Board Meeting and a few other reports, those would be canceled. The ICANN meeting would close on a Thursday and there would be Board sessions on the Thursday.

And the idea as you've seen in subsequent responses from (Steve) and (Bruce Tonka) and (the Board wide chair) is that there would be a lot of care taken to make sure that there would be no loss of transparency but that the way the current schedule is constructed is proving very difficult for the Board and the Friday Board Meeting often means very late night for the Board on Thursday to draw resolutions

that they often feel are incomplete or not sufficiently well drafted, so that's the situation.

Why are we discussing this? Well because there was an idea floated that as a Council we might want to provide a response to the Board to this idea. Once again, that was just an idea that was floated and I'm hoping rather than just have a discussion on, yes it's a good idea, no it's a bad idea, I'd rather we focus on do we want to send the responses - is one needed or not. So let's open it up and (Jeff) you're first.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I think I'm going to make a recommendation that we not hold our Council meeting (unintelligible) - that's a joke by the way. I think the problem with - (despite) the obvious problem that this was never discussed with the community to get the community feedback, I think it's really kind of ignoring the actual problem. Yes, I think there were a number of members of community that thought that the Friday meeting was a charade and there - and didn't have much utility although, you know, as (is common) to point out, there is some utility in transcripts and they come out and things like that.

So rather than addressing the real problem of the lack of transparency of how the Board actually makes their decisions and the discussion that they have, they just said, "Well if people think Friday's a waste, we'll just get rid of it." I think that really completely ignores the underlying fundamental problem that the Board has a lack of transparency issue and that staff written minutes after the fact or staff written papers for the Board just doesn't give the community a good flavor of the Board members.

And then after all, how are we to judge the performance of the Board members if we can't even get actual transcripts or other things? And how can the nominating committee, who's put in a position of reappointing Board members, understand whether or not Board member - or those Board members did the job that they were supposed to do? I think this is just indicative of the movement away from transparency and I think that we should send a strong message - not that we want Friday back, but more that we want more transparency of the Board while they're making these decisions and what goes into it and transcripts.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you (Jeff), Wolf.

Wolfgang Kleinwacher: Yes thank you Stéphane, now I can join Stéphane in suspecting the (unintelligible) so for me, you know, no ICANN was starting a survey in - I think in April or March, you know, we got in participation lower participation. And the ICANN meetings is for me is the event, you know, relative to any kind of (unintelligible). And all that needs to be done to improve that participation and one is, you know, all these kinds of projects we have at the ICANN meeting, including the Board Meeting and including a serious Board Meeting.

Which means that it's (constant) on Board level and transparent and on the other hand, to be seen they are seriously not - in my (tier) is now if you go the other way, you know, (Steve) and others are suggesting, then the Board might - some of the Board members might not take it that seriously as if they had to take decisions immediately. So that makes a difference for me and that's what I would like to say and I would agree with (Jeff) to send a strong message to the Board, thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you Wolf, (Thomas).

(Thomas): Thank you for the time, first of all I have no reason to believe that the change to the agenda wasn't done with the best intentions by the Board. However, adding to what I've (seen early on) I think that the Board failed to properly carry the change out. And, you know, as (Jeff) said I don't want to necessarily want the Friday's back, but I didn't hear anything from the Board in terms of alternatives to keep up or even increase the level of transparency with - on what the Board does.

I think that the timing of this was extremely bad, but particularly in the light of the task but I think ICANN could of communicated better and be more transparent and (last) better then it is. And I also think that the communications itself was insufficient because, you know, after a lot of negative comments were made and suspicions were raised that the Board is not going to - or doesn't want to be as transparent as they were. We got the message from (Steve) and (Bruce) and there were good information from there.

But all these were not included in the original communication, so I think that taught the community this was a very bad thing to happen both in terms of concept as well as procedural in terms of timing and how it was communicated and I think that, you know, the Council has put together a very strong message to the Board explaining their thinking, thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you (Thomas) so there's a suggestion in the call that we do send a message as trying to work out if there is consensus for that or not, Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: I support a message - I support calling for transparency. I also support the dropping of the Friday meetings and I appreciate if the Board moves to focus on operating more effectively as a Board and recognizing places where their schedule wasn't doing that for the organization. So real transparency, including I think thanking them for the more detailed summaries and explanations of the votes that they're taking in all of their meetings. We could suggest other mechanisms, including transcripts or even open calls at times, but I think the change in schedule is a good one.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you Wendy, so can I ask for - can I call for a volunteer to lead the drafting effort to send a message to the Board? I'm overwhelmed by the amount of volunteers for this, perhaps okay that's on the list and if someone wants to volunteer then we will be able to draft a message to the Board. So thanks for that discussion, let's move on to 9.2 and once again this is something that's generated discussion on the list.

There is a ALAC proposal to open an ICANN academy, the basic principle of which this is me summarizing it, expensively is that to help people integrate ICANN workers, efficient ICANN community members, understand ICANN more. Existing members of the community might put together a kind of curriculum which would serve as a basis for gaining that understanding. Once again that's a very high level summary of what is a more detailed proposal.

But the reason we have this on the agenda today is that there's been a call from ALAC for us to participate in a working group on drafting the curriculum. You have seen the (fiery) respondent to that call by suggesting that it might be a good idea to first of all decide whether the

ICANN Academy itself should go ahead or not, and if so under what mechanisms, what (unintelligible) etc. Since then you've also seen that I volunteered myself to raise or be on the ICANN Academy working group that ALAC is putting together and called for any opposition to that.

There was no opposition, a few voices of support so a letter is opposition to that today, that's what I'll do. And really beyond this point of information, what I wanted to do is to make sure that the Council was okay with the message that I've just given that I would take to that group which is that the group should perhaps first of all work on whether the ICANN Academy itself should happen and then work on the curriculum itself. So (Jeff).

Jeff Neuman: I'm sorry, I meant to take my hand - I apologize.

Stéphane Van Gelder: No problem, Mason.

Mason Cole: Thanks Stéphane - sorry I stepped away from the phone for a minute, but it might be useful if Alan or someone familiar with what's being proposed could speak about how this is enhancements or in addition to or different from the introduction that ICANN already provides for the community.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Is anyone in a position to do that? Alan do you know...

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan, I can try.

Stéphane Van Gelder: ...more of this than we do?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan speaking, I can try to do that.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yes, please do.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, the issue really was that people new to ICANN in volunteer and former volunteer positions are given very, very little introduction into ICANN. If you look at what is given to new Board members for instance or to ICANN fellows, they are given some pretty intensive primers on what is ICANN, what does ICANN do, what are the bodies within ICANN? You know, the fellows meet at 7:00 o'clock every morning for an hour to two hours every day of the week to get that - the Board members are given full day sessions prior to that.

Other volunteers who are coming into this organization for the very first time, be it in ALAC, the GAC the GNSO, the ccNSO are dropped into it with maybe an hour or so on a Sunday or to talk about what is ICANN and no more than that. And there's a general feeling among the people who are new to ICANN that there is really no idea to figure out what's going on and start participating quickly. And the concept of the Academy was an attempt to try to address that.

And, you know, it turned out that the Academy idea came out of ALAC, staff had been talking about similar things for the rest of the, you know, for the community in general. And these two have (collate) under (rue brick) of the Academy which was a name that someone in ALAC came up with. But there seems to be a need for it expressed by almost all people who are dropped into ICANN for the first time without any real knowledge of either ICANN or the meaning structure and this is an attempt to try and fix that.

And the group that's been put together, my understanding is to try to put together a curriculum to make sure that what comes out of the program will meet the needs not only of the ALAC and of staff, but of the GNSO, the ccNSO and such, so thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Alan, so all right Lanre.

Lanre Ajayi: Yes, I just want to say that the idea of the (unintelligible) if I have asked if I have the opportunity of (unintelligible) academic when I try at the Council my that the Council (unintelligible). I think that the (Academy) should be supported, I think the Council should embrace it and to (unintelligible) so that it's (unintelligible), thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you Lanre, we're running out of time so let me suggest that I draft a few points - a few main points that the Council can agree on before I take those to the working group - that might be a good way forward, Bill.

Bill Drake: Well if we're running out of time, I don't want to go too much in this but there's a long history in Wolfgang and Avri and I (unintelligible) in this. This actually started earlier in the summer schooling that we do every year in Germany and the bottom line was the idea was to sort of take the kind of model that has been found to be extremely useful for (unintelligible) governance issues in other environments to see whether it could be used to try and meet the need that a lot of people do feel, particularly people coming from developing countries to get a more structured overview in a (unintelligible) organized and logical manner to the ICANN experience.

Because people do get lost so easily and I think a lot of folks who are inside the process and have been living here for a long time may not realize how completely alien and incomprehensible it is, particularly for people coming from other backgrounds and so far. So I think it's a very good idea and the material's all in line. If anybody really wants to know more about it can look at the relevant Web pages. There's a proposal for several of the system of curriculum organization, etc., etc.

And I'll be participating in that group as well as a NCUC person Stéphane, so I hope that we can not take a high priority skeptical approach to this, I think from the standpoint of outreach, especially in the post-OTF context, it's a good initiative, thanks.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you Bill and while we're on the subject perhaps I can just direct the Council to Steve Sheng's question in the tab. We won't have time to go to Item 7 or 8 unfortunately today, but on the - on Item 8 I think there is a response that the group there is expecting from the Council, so can I ask Council to have a look at that? Carlos is it very short?

Carlos Aguirre: Yes, thank you (unintelligible) ICANN Academy from the beginning and I was (unintelligible) one of the creators of the (unintelligible) the idea Alan said is to give a basic knowledge about ICANN (that is consistent) (unintelligible) to the NomCom point series difference (unintelligible). The curriculum endured some items like co-topics, specific item training and ICANN issues. So I consider it's a good idea to have somebody of GNSO to show the particular mission or perspective, for that I support your participation in the ICANN Academy, thank you.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you Carlos, let's very quickly move on to 9.3 which was an item on the on the URS which appeared in the drop bucket and it was suggested there that there would be a plan to reconfigure the URS beyond the debate on whether this should have been presented in the budget or somewhere else. And Kurt has provided some - an element of response to that in his email. I suggested on the Council list some wording if we wanted to send a message to Steve Crocker the Co-Chair on this.

There's been no, feedback on that so my intent here was just to get an idea from the Council on whether this was something that we wanted to pursue or not, Bill, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Stéphane, I think the issue here for us must be at least about the operational impact and whether or not whatever process ICANN envisions or is going to take up, you know, how this links to whether or not new gTLDs can go live, because that to me is - it's critical. We need to understand some things between getting an effective URS in place with cost effective operation and at what point that does or doesn't impact us going live. So to some extent for me it's an operational question.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Would - is there support for the message that I suggested we send or do we drop that idea? Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I think the words they used in the budget at convening summit were exceedingling inopportune and someone should have their mouth washed out. The words in Kurt's message that he just sent today saying that he envisions or they envision a bottom-up operation

similar to the - implying similar to the FTI which was a GNSO activity to come up with a current plan, I think is completely reasonable. So...

Alan Greenberg: We really meant a bottom-up, not a summit - excuse what we said and I think that's a good enough apology.

Stéphane Van Gelder: So if no one's out there - if everyone's happy with that, then perhaps we don't need to continue with the idea that we are going to draft a message - would anyone disagree?

Alan Greenberg: The message could be the GNSO is happy to participate in the bottom-up activity.

Wendy Seltzer: Wendy here, I think that - I would say more than we're happy to participate. I think this is an activity that should be led by GNSO, so I was just responding to your email Stéphane. I would still send the message and I would (relay) the last sentence there first. The most important piece to me is that reconfiguration of your asking if it's to happen should come from GNSO.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay it's - Wendy would you be okay with just putting that in an email responding to mine and we'll take up this discussion on the list?

Wendy Seltzer: I'll do that, thanks Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you very much, so I will wrap it up, we're over time - I don't want to keep people from doing other things and go way over time. I just want to thank you for your participation for today. I apologize to Steve Sheng who is on hand to give that update for Item

8, we will carry Item 7 - and I also apologize to Marika and Wolf who were on hand to give an update on Item 7 - we'll carry those updates if necessary to the next meeting. And we will pick up all the rest of the discussion points on the list.

Thank you everybody, have a great rest of the day or evening, whatever the time is where you all and speak to you all very soon.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Bye-bye.

Woman: Thank.

Man: Bye-bye.

END