

ICANN  
Transcription  
GNSO New gTLDs Subsequent Rounds Discussion Group  
Monday 11 August 2014 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GNSO New gTLDs Subsequent Rounds Discussion Group call on the Monday 11 August 2014 at 14:00 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/gnso/gnso-new-gtld-subsequent-20140811-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug>

Attendees:

Thomas Rickert - NomCom GNSO Council  
Dan Rodgers - RrSG  
Katim Touray - Individual  
Brett Fausett - RySG  
Alan Greenberg - ALAC  
Martin Sutton - BC  
Susan Payne - IPC  
Craig Schwartz - Applicant  
Jennifer Wolfe - Non Commerical  
Dietmar Lenden - RySG  
Ron Andruff - BC  
Ching Chiao - RySG  
Stuart Fuller -RrSG  
Rubens Kuhl - RySG  
Markus Germann - RrSG  
Stephanie Duchesneau - RySG  
Iliya Bazlyankov - RrSG  
Avri Doria - NCSG  
Jon Nevett - RySG  
JC Vignes - NTAG  
Stephane van Gelder - BC  
Lucie Loos - Individual  
Tom Lowenhaupt - ALAC  
Sam Lanfranco - NPOC  
Tobias Sattler - RrSG  
Michelle Sara King - SOI  
Mavis Hsieh – SOI  
Trang Nguyen – SOI  
Michael Berkens -SOI  
Michael Palage -SOI

Apologies:

Oli Hope - RrSG  
Mason Cole - RySG  
Philip Corwin - BC  
Michele Neylon - RrSG

ICANN staff:

Amy Bivins  
Mary Wong  
Christine Willett  
Steve Chan  
Lars Hoffmann  
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Excuse me. The recording has started. Thank you.

Terry Agnew: Thank you.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the GNSO New gTLDs Subsequent Rounds Discussion Group on the 11th of August, 2014.

On the call today we have Thomas Rickert, Dan Rodgers, Katim Touray, Bret Fausett, Alan Greenburg, Martin Sutton, Susan Payne, Craig Schwartz, Jennifer Wolfe, Michelle King, Mavis Hsieh, Dietmer Lenden, Ching Chiao, Stuart Fuller, Ruben Kuhl, Markus Germann, Stephanie Duchesneau, Iliya Bazlyankov, Avri Doria, Trang Nguyen, Jon Nevett, and J. C. Vignes.

We have apologies from Ron Andruff, Oli Hope, Mason Cole, Philip Corwin, and Michele Neylon.

From staff we have Steve Chan, Amy Bivens, Lars Hoffman, Mary Wong, and myself, Terry Agnew.

I would also like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes.

Thank you very much, and back over to you, Bret Fausett, for the beginning.

Man: (Unintelligible), I'm back.

Bret Fausett: Oh, thank you very much.

You're just in time. I was going to give a brief introduction and then we'll - I'll pass it over to Steve to go through the Statement of Interest process and a little bit about our transparency and openness processes.

Again, my name is Bret Fausett. I'm a member of the registry stakeholder constituency of the GNSO. I'm the General Counsel of the inner registry, which is previously a gTLD applicant and now an operator for several new top level domains. And, I'm also a GNSO Councilor appointed by the registry stakeholder group and I was the one who put forward the motion to create the process to start off talking about subsequent rounds of new top level domains, and the Council appointed me to be the interim Chair of the group to get us started.

Every working group and discussion group, as this one is, has a GNSO Council member appointed to get it started, and I'm filling that role right now, and will fill it until it we elect a permanent Council Chair or co-Chairs.

So let me tell you a little bit about this group. We are trying to do something that to the best of my knowledge the GNSO Council has never done before, and to understand why we're doing it, it's important to understand how a policy is created inside the GNSO.

The bylaws provide a process for creating policy. It all starts with an issue report. An issue report can be created - requested by the Board, any advisory committee, but typically they are requested by the GNSO Council itself.

It's easy to request an issue report when you have a clearly defined issue. Here, talking about new top level domains, and especially a review of the last round and what we might want to do for subsequent rounds, asking staff to prepare an issue report on what should we do about new top level domains in Round 2 seemed like too big of a question.

So we decided to see if we could break that up into smaller questions. Perhaps aggregate those smaller questions into logical subject sets and create issue reports that way.

So what we are tasked to do is come up with the issues that we want to think about pushing back to staff to create an issue report. Once those issue reports are created, Steve and other people on the call will take them - they'll prepare the issue report.

The issue report is a little bit like an impact statement that talks about who are the impacted parties? What are the consequences of various policies? What should working groups consider when they're moving forward? And then those issue reports go back to the GNSO Council. The Council votes to create policy development groups, and working groups then start to resolve those issues.

Though our task is actually fairly easy, and I'm hoping that it makes this a quick and collegial process, we simply have to identify the issues. We don't have to solve them. We're going to leave the harder problems to subsequent groups which may and probably will comprise many of the same people who are on this call.

But our task I think is quickly to identify the issues, organize them, maybe tag some as clearly policy, maybe others as implementation, and then you know wrap up our work and pass things on to staff.

We can talk a little bit about more of that in the discussion plan, but I wanted to say that at the outset so you knew what the special group was and how we might think about our work.

So rather - I think maybe - people may have some questions about that. I think maybe we'll put those into discussion of the work plan. That's our fourth bullet point. And after that brief introduction, I'll turn things over now to Steve Chan from ICANN staff, who will talk a little bit about - go through the Statement of Interest process and the second bullet point, the transparency and openness.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Bret. This is Steve Chan.

The SOIs, as you may know, are a requirement for participating in the group. I've noticed that a few of you have not completed yet, so I just encourage all of you who have not done so to this point, please be sure to do that as soon as you can.

And for those that do have an existing one, just make sure that what you do have there is current.

So like I said, it's a requirement, so please be sure to make sure you take care of that as soon as you can.

Openness and transparency. While this is a discussion group rather than a working group, we will still be operating under the principles of openness and transparency, which means that calls are recorded and transcribed. The emails on the list are archived and essentially everything that is happening on this call and on the list is public information.

And I think that's actually it for SOIs and openness and transparency.

Bret Fausett: Thanks, Steve.

And for those of you who haven't - this is Bret again. For those of you who haven't created a Statement of Interest or need to update one, Mary Wong has posted a link to that in the Adobe Chat, so that ought to be available to most people on the call.

Now we'll head to the next bullet point, which is the items for initial review. This is really just talking about the resolution that was passed. You can see some of the resources - some of that in the - now it's - okay. Now it's up on the (light board). You can see it there.

You'll - let me talk you through the resolution that the GNSO passed and how it feeds into what we're doing.

You'll see pretty much here a history of the GNSO process to date. It started in 2005 and obviously brought us up to today, so it is a very long process. I don't know how long the process is we're starting now, but you know it may be a multi-year process. It will probably at least be a two year process. I don't know if it'll be quite 2007 to - 2005 to 2012, seven years. Hopefully, we can do it in at least half that time.

But it was a long process and we are just now at the very starting point.

You'll see that in the resolved section -- yes, if you can scroll down to that -- it is Item 1 that created this group and put us into creating future issue reports.

So I talked about what those issue reports are and why we're having a discussion group. It might - if you have any questions, let me know. I'll look for hands in the Adobe Chat, or you can just ask them now.

All right, well seeing no hands and no questions on the call, let me tell you a little bit on the work plan how - go ahead.

Steve Chan: Actually - sorry. This is Steve.

I just wanted to mention a couple other things. While this is a discussion group rather than a working group, we're still going to be operating under the GNSO working group guidelines. And if you look in the right hand bar for notes, you'll see links for the guidelines, and there's also a link for the PDP process which I don't think we'll exactly follow, but we may take some inspiration for the work that we do.

So - and there's also a link to the Wiki as well.

Thanks.

Bret Fausett: So let's move on a little bit to the work plan. I think this is the kind of thing - and I put some things - some initial comments to the list earlier. I think this is the kind of thing where we ought to be able to use online tools to accomplish virtually all of our work. And whether that is posting notes to the list or working inside a Wiki, or if you just want to, you know, send reports to Steve and/or me, or the entire list, we can all put them up in a Wiki some place that they can be reviewed and edited.

Where I think what we want to do is simply identify the issue and maybe state a little bit of why we've identified that as an issue.

The example I used in my email was, you know, the new TLDs are launching on random days of the week. The registry operator gets to pick it. Maybe you or your constituency thinks that's confusing. That maybe there ought to be a uniform day of the week? A Tuesday? A Thursday? A Wednesday where all registries have to launch?

You could raise that as an issue and that will go on the list, and that will eventually feed into some process either at the policy or at the implementation level.

So you know with a group this big, and this is a fairly large group for a GNSO working group, it seems to me the kind of thing where you know if we had a Wiki, people were uploading to it, we could get all the issues out in fairly short order. You know, there's no reason that we couldn't have, I think, an initial draft of the issues by the Los Angeles meeting. Maybe use some live time in Los Angeles to refine that and then hopefully finish our work by the end of the year.

That seems like a lot of time, but by GNSO standards, that's absolutely a lightening pace.

So you know, I would hope that either - you know, if you're a representative of a constituency, you could work with your constituency to get their issues and maybe be a conduit for those issues to the group. If you're from the ALAC or from some other you know organized group, you know please do the same. And I think that we'll find that we have a lot of common issues, even if we might solve them differently.

You know for example, we may have different views on rights protection mechanisms, but the fact that rights protection mechanisms are an issue should be fairly non-controversial.

Now how we solve that, we may you know have a fork in the road in the policy development process, but you know I think identifying it as an issue is fairly noncontroversial.

So that's my hope. And then we can - you know, we can look at them after we've got them. Maybe we can use the Los Angeles live meeting to start thinking about how we might aggregate these into issue reports.

If we identify something and we feel like it's fairly complete early, I might suggest to the group that we go ahead and forward that to staff early because

the issue reports start a clock ticking for staff. And I think if we give Steve and his team five or six issue reports to do all with a - what is it Steve? A 30-day timeline?

Steve Chan: I think 45 days.

Bret Fausett: Oh...

Steve Chan: Whatever the time is.

Bret Fausett: Whatever the time is.

If we dump them all on him at one time, that's going to be problematic from a resources perspective. So, we may decide that we want to take these issue reports and provide them to staff in an ordered way.

You know, it's also possible that at the end of all this we decide that we want to create, you know, one issue report. I don't know. I think the organization of it will make itself clear after we've put all of the issues up on a (light board) and taken a look at it. But we really won't know that I think until we start identifying the issues.

And, I think that work can start immediately.

One of the things I heard on the list was that we wanted to defer the election of the discussion group leaders until the next meeting. Many people are on vacation. I think don't really have a sense of the group yet, and that's fine. We can put that over to the next live meeting which'll probably be in early September.

And then there's no reason we can't start to work on these issues immediately. I know that I talked to Steve already about making sure that we

have the tools we need. We can work inside a Wiki. We can work on the list. I don't think it matters.

And if you're more comfortable working inside a Word document or working on the list, you know Steve and I and the rest of the staff will make sure that those find their way to a Wiki so that you know we're aggregating them in some common place.

So that's really the way I thought we would work, and I think we can you know get to work immediately. I assume that everyone on the call has an issue or two, or maybe ten, that they know off the top of their head that would be appropriate to put up on the board, so you know there's no reason you can't start immediately putting issues together, and we'll start thinking about them together and writing them up.

I think the wording won't always be perfect, and maybe that's something that we can help each other out with and try to find wording that I think is acceptable to everybody. But you know again, I think we can start now and I think we can make this a very collaborative process.

So having talked through the work plan a little bit, at least my vision of it, again let me throw it out now for questions or comments from the group.

Steve Chan: Sorry, this is Steve. (Unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible)...

Steve Chan: I see that Avri's hand's up.

Bret Fausett: Oh, good.

Steve Chan: I see that Avri has her hand up. Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. This is Avri speaking.

I've got two points. One from before all the discussion on the work plan, and I just wanted to mention it because it does effect the work plan. Number two, in the - now therefore it is resolved but still in front of us thankfully, says that we're talking about possible adjustments for subsequent applicant procedures, yet we've named the group subsequent rounds.

And so, I basically want to make sure that we don't limit ourselves to just the notion of rounds, because I know various of us have been discussing different sort of approaches, and that's why within the GNSO we changed it to subsequent applicant procedures so that the subject field would be more open.

So I wanted to get that point made, and I'd even like us to change the name of the group, but because that might confuse us. But if not, I'll make this point again and again as we go on.

And by the way, I haven't managed to get myself added to the - I didn't volunteer in time to get myself added to the list so I haven't been following the conversations, so forgive me if I've repeated something that's been said ad infinitum already.

The other point I wanted to make is I very much agree with the notion of Wikis and I think they're a good semi-dynamic place to record work that's being done. But very often the Wiki can serve a greater use by actually either uploading, as you said, documents that people have produced in Word, putting them on there when they get to a certain point of stability as Wiki documents, but also a lot of us have started actually doing group development of pieces of writing either in Etherpads or in things like Google Drive documents.

And so I would recommend that that also be a path we use and that I know ICANN doesn't provide either Etherpad-type of capabilities. The Wiki itself doesn't. So you know those documents could just be linked in with URLs to whatever we do on the Wiki. But you know, I know that on some of the things that I'm thinking of -- and you're right; a lot of us are coming into this with half-baked ideas already -- you know, would be something where I would start a Etherpad or a Google Drive document and see how many people wanted to contribute to it in that sort of live working simultaneously, or asynchronously mode that you can do on those things.

Thanks.

Steve Chan: Thanks, Avri.

Alan?

Alan Greenburg: Thank you.

I guess I'm a little bit confused as to just what we're going to be doing. Part way through the last dialog there was the implication that we are going to be identifying issues. Things for issue reports. And clearly, that's a responsibility of Council.

I would presume that at some point, perhaps checkpoints along the way, we will be forwarding to Council things that we think might merit issue reports.

I'm a little bit worried, however, that if we do it in that way, we may end up with a huge number of issue reports which may map to a huge number of PDPs, and I think we need to defer until our ideas are more gelled exactly what is an issue report and what - and - you know, I just think there are far too many issues that I think that are going to be brought up over the next

while in this group. And, we need to put the ideas on the table and let them sit for awhile and - before we start making decisions on issue reports.

Yes, it's nice to give issue reports lead time, but as you've pointed out, we are likely talking about a multi-year process here. So you know days are not necessarily of essence.

The other thing is I'm getting a little bit of mixed messages in terms of how much we are going to refine the ideas here? And perhaps more importantly, put value judgments on them. I can easily imagine that various people will come to this group with competing issues, or at least issues that would be solved in completely opposite ways from each other.

And I don't think we should be at the stage here where we're trying to assign merit to things or say who's are the more important ones. So, I think we need to - although we want to flesh things out, we want to try not to make value judgments I think.

Thank you.

Bret Fausett: Yes. This is - thank you. This is Bret. I see no more other hands. Let me respond to both of those.

Avri, I do like your idea of using different tools. You know, the Google Drive documents and shared docs that people can do. And also, your comment prompted me to think that you know maybe once everyone has taken a look at the list of participants, they'll see people that have maybe common goals or common values to their own, and we can have some self-organizing groups that could work together and then you know get their issues together, and then we can all compare where we are.

And that gets a little bit to the point you made, Alan, that we may have competing issues.

I think we will, or at least maybe we will have written the same issue in two different ways. I'm hopeful that the commonality of these issues will make themselves apparent as we're looking at them and the groups that proposed them can work together to reconcile them.

I know that maybe this is easier for the lawyers because very often before you go to court, you have to tell the judge what the issues are. And you may phrase those issues in very different ways, but often the judges will ask you to prepare an agreed statement. And so, there's a reconciliation process that happens before it's submitted.

And usually, you know, it works quite well. And when there's not an agreement on what the issue should be, you know, you can have you know - you know, you might have the registry statement of the issue, and then if the registrars had a completely different statement of the same issue, you would have their version. And you can actually put it up there with who proposed it, and maybe that has to be the way we resolve it.

But I think most of these we will be able to resolve, because at least in my experience in the legal process where things are often - or always very contentious, even the lawyers have the ability to reconcile that.

So I think it can be done.

And then on the other point, Alan, as to what the output here is, I think the Council is the place where issue reports are created. I don't see us creating issue reports. I think the output of our group will simply be a recommendation for issue reports.

And, I think there will be many issues. 50. 60. 100. And, I'm hoping that some of those will be big. Some of those will be small. But, they will aggregate into some common subject matters where we can see that maybe there will be

four or five issue reports with - then I think the Council has a difficult task. Does it want to create four or five working groups, or does it want to have one working group that works its way through the four or five sets of issues?

I don't know. I think that will be a Council judgement that will be informed greatly by what we do here. But I don't think we can forecast what the outcome is going to be, nor can we mandate what the outcome is going to be because ultimately that's going to go back to the Council.

Let's see. Two more hands in the air. Stephane?

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes, thanks Bret. Stephane Van Gelder here.

Just to further clarify what's just been discussed, if there is a Council liaison to this group, which I suppose there will be once we determine our leadership, et cetera, perhaps it would be useful to get further clarification on precisely the process that you've just described.

To me this is, as you said initially in your introduction to the call, this is a relatively new process of discussion before any Council action. There can be no link, however, between the discussion here and a working Council process which starts, as you rightly said, with an issue report and goes on.

So if there is a liaison between this group and the GNSO Council, at some point it might be useful for the Council to provide this group with clarification on what the Council's expectations are, and you know just to make sure that we're all working for the same goals and on the same wave length, and that we feel that we're discussing issues that will feed into the process - the policy development process that will come later on. And, that's the Council's understanding as well.

Thanks.

Bret Fausett: Thanks, Stephane.

As far as I know, I'm that liaison from the Council, so I will make it my job to report at each Council meeting on what we're doing. I want to make sure that the Council gets - I mean, it's very important to me that the Council get output that it finds useful. So I'll make sure to work this both ways; report to the Council on what we're doing, and report to this group what the Council thinks would be helpful.

And you raised a good point; I don't know if it's on the next Council agenda right now, but given the comments you just made, I'll make sure it is.

Alan, you had a follow-up?

Alan Greenburg: Yes, I do.

By the way, you're liaison until we appoint you Chair, at which point we'll need a new liaison.

Bret Fausett: Oh, okay.

Alan Greenburg: It dawns on me as we're speaking, however, that there are other things that are going to be feeding into our process which will ultimately lead to PDPs. There's an AOC review that's going to have to be - it's going to have to kick off sometime in the next N-months. It will likely take a year in its own right, and then some time to analyze the results on - you know, the one on consumer confidence and things like that, which clearly needs to feed into this process.

I suspect there will be post-mortem -- if you'll excuse the expression -- reviews being done in a number of areas outside of the GNSO. Although everyone is welcome into this discussion group, past experience says not everyone participates. And therefore at the Board level, at the GAC level

perhaps, and other places within ICANN or outside of ICANN, there is going to be input created that it will be expected to feed into any following gTLD processes outside of our domain.

So, I think we need to keep that in mind also. Thank you.

Bret Fausett: Good point, Alan.

You also note the group, it's now up on the (light board there), you'll see in the resolved section, resolved Number 3. The GNSO Council asked for a status report from ICANN staff on the current progress of five different areas, including some of the things that are happening inside other parts of ICANN that are outside the GNSO. Some of the things you just mentioned, including. So I understand from staff that those have been requested.

As soon as those staff reports are available to the Council, I'm going to make sure they're available to this group as well.

Steve, you have an ETA on those? What do you think?

Steve Chan: Yes. I can't speak for (GED) necessarily, but I know that they're working on it now.

Bret Fausett: Okay.

Steve Chan: I'll see when they intend to share that with the Council.

Bret Fausett: I would expect it would be sometime mid-September, but as soon as we get all those status reports, we'll report them back.

Any other questions?

Oh, yes Ching?

Ching Chiao: Thanks, Bret. This is Ching Chiao. I would just like to weigh in my - you know, some thoughts here.

First of all, we talked about - I'm glad you mentioned when you actually opened the call by saying that the timeline could be that we could end the work in four years. Maybe 2016 and 2017. And let's see how this working group - sorry, this discussion group will continue and to have some impact on the new gTLD timeline for the subsequent rounds.

The other way of looking at this is that this group may be to create a certainly - I mean the pressures - this timeline issue we have in the previous AGB is such that - I mean after one year of the first round, there should be a second round - sorry, the subsequent round.

And so I'm just trying to - I'm waiting here and see how - I mean everybody thinking is that this could be a - really a discussion group which is brought up issues, or is it a group that could create some - you know, some level of you know pressures or needs for those who are in the group or who's not in the group, but also interested in the subsequent rounds so they can be benefit by the outcome of this discussion group?

So just weighting my two cents here.

Bret Fausett: Thanks, Ching.

Thomas? Tom? Tom, you have your hand in the air?

You may be on mute. Tom?

Oh, okay. Tom will text his question in. we'll look for that.

So anymore questions?

Let me get Tom's question here. I see he's typing.

Hold on. Tom's typing. I'll come back to it in a second.

I'm looking at our calendar and thinking of how we'll move forward. Today is August 11th. It is hard to believe - I feel like I was just in London, but the ICANN Los Angeles meeting starts two months from today. Many of the GNSO will be gathering in Los Angeles on Saturday, October 11th.

If we wanted to try to have some time in Los Angeles to go through an initial draft of issues, I think it's important that we have another meeting probably early September, possibly the week of September 8th. And then maybe one additional call the week before the ICANN meeting, the week of October 6th, which I think will you know give us the best opportunity to move forward in the interim.

In the September meeting, we should elect permanent Chairs or Chair, as the group will have it, and then I would also that maybe by the September meeting we would have some initial drafting done either by individuals or these self-organizing groups or constituencies that might want to put something together. Refine that by the October conference call and then maybe we can sit together for an hour or two at the Los Angeles meeting and talk through some common themes.

Maybe start that reconciliation process that I was talking about with Alan on people who have identified the same issues but may have phrased it in a different way.

And then you know from - I don't think we can really plan things out much further than Los Angeles. I think we'll have a very clear idea of where we are by then, and then we can try to figure out what we want to do to complete our work.

Does that sound like a schedule that makes sense to people?

Going back to - it looks like there's maybe some consensus for the timeline that I just mapped out. That's great.

Going back to Tom's point, he wanted to reiterate what Avri said about subsequent application procedures. I think that's right. I think we were very - I was very careful not to talk about the second round, based on Avri's point, and I had - I will try to be more careful now not to talk about rounds but to talk about procedures. And maybe, we'll - Steve, can we name the name of the Wiki and things like that also to get rid of the word rounds?

Steve Chan: Subsequent procedures?

Bret Fausett: Subsequent procedures, yes.

We'll take that and make sure we're not prejudging any outcome with the language we're using.

Okay, well how do we pick - Steve, how do we pick dates? Do we - do you say a Doodle Poll or - Doodle Poll?

Steve Chan: Yes, we can send around a Doodle Poll.

Although if the group is comfortable with the same time, I can send out a Doodle Poll and see if this same time on the dates that Bret mentioned are acceptable to the group?

Bret Fausett: Okay. So look for a Doodle Poll. I think we'll send it out this week asking for some dates and times the week of September 8th. And, we might as well set up the second meeting as well asking for dates and times the week of October 6th.

And then, I don't think we can be - I think we'll probably have to take ICANN meeting time when we can get it. Those slots book up very quickly.

But Steve, can you ask people who are planning the meeting to give us a two hour block in Los Angeles at a time when - that doesn't conflict with other things that people interested in new gTLDs might be doing?

Steve Chan: Will do.

Bret Fausett: Okay, good. All right.

All right, well any more questions before we wrap it up here?

Katim, I see you're in the - you've raised your hand. Go ahead.

Katim Touray: Yes, thanks.

Are you hearing me?

Bret Fausett: Yes, we can hear you.

Katim Touray: No? Are you hearing me?

Bret Fausett: Yes, we can hear you. You're good. Go ahead.

Katim Touray: I guess I'm using my computer's mic and I just wanted to make sure you're hearing me.

Good. Thank you.

Well greetings everyone from down there. My - the point I'd like to make is (unintelligible) why are we so hung up about (unintelligible) subsequent

rounds when that's what (unintelligible) the resolution from (unintelligible).  
That's what at least - this is the term, subsequent rounds.

Bret Fausett: Well, just to give you the history, the initial draft of the resolution -- this is Bret again -- talked about subsequent rounds. It was revised at the Council level, and I see rounds in a couple of places talking about the past. But, the resolution at Section 1 says subsequent application procedures. That was suggested as an amendment to the original motion, and it was quite important to some Councilors that that language be used, so that was the language that was adopted.

And, I just want to make sure that because that was a negotiated point in the passage of the resolution, that we carry that through to the work that we're doing.

Katim Touray: All right.

Bret Fausett: All right.

Katim Touray: Okay. Thank you.

Bret Fausett: Okay.

Well seeing no other questions, we'll send a summary and a link to the MP3 around to the group. If you know of people who may be interested in the work of this group, please tell them of the existence of the group, ask them to join. Or if they don't have the time to do that, ask them to send to you their issues so that you can be the conduit for that information.

I'll wrap it up here and I will talk to everyone again in the next - in a month.  
And again, we'll talk on the list.

We will send links around to the places where people might want to put their initial ideas and - as a participant in the group as well, I'll try to get us started with a few issues of my own.

So thank you everyone for your time and we'll talk to you in a month.

END