Are we all here? Hands up who’s not here, okay. I think we’re all present, and it’s- Just going forward. So welcome, everybody, to the- Hang on, Beau, you’re on my-

Welcome everybody to the ccNSO Council meeting here in Cartagena in Colombia. We have a reasonably full agenda. The first item is as usual, the confirmation of the approval of the minutes and action items from our last Council call, which was the 16th of November. The minutes have been sent out, amended where necessary, and so unless there are any objections will be deemed approved.

Gabby, would you care to tell us the action items please?

Should I read all of them or just the ones-

Well, you can- How many of them are there?

Five.

Yeah, just tell us what they were.

Okay. Action 5701, Byron Holland to update the GAC analysis on strategic items and share it with the Council in order to use it as a base at the meeting with the ICANN Board in Cartagena, and that’s done.

Yes.
Gabriella Schittek: Action 5702, Gabriella Shittek to inform the Finance Working Group members of their appointment and to set up an email list for the group. That’s done.

Action 5703, Bart Boswinkel to add an explanation to the Finance Working Group charter as to why regional organization representatives only can participate as observers. Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Excuse me, it’s not included but the definition of observers and liaisons is included in the Article 9 of the ICANN bylaws. That’s why they observe us.

Gabriella Schittek: Action 5704, Gabriella Schittek to send a note to the ccNSO community asking for topics for the meeting with the ICANN Board in Cartagena, and that’s done. And then action 5705, the Chair to look into ccNSO involvement in the Cross-Community Working Group on Recommendation 6 and report back to the Council.

Chris Disspain: Yes, or rather no. Sorry. Been a bit busy, I haven’t done that yet but I shall. Okay.

[background conversation]

Chris Disspain: Yes, don’t want to be involved in that one. So item two on the agenda is the ccNSO independent review draft recommendations. Now, so that was the session we had with Jean-Jacques: the
question of whether we need to respond. He has obviously asked for input during the comment period and he asked for positive, “Thank you, well done” input just as much as anything else.

I think at some point but not today we will obviously pass a resolution thanking the committee for their work, etc., etc., but it’s not finished yet because the final report hasn’t been produced. The question for us I suppose is should the ccNSO itself, as opposed to individuals, put in a response to the report? And I think it probably would be a polite, if nothing else a polite thing to do.

Does anyone know when it closes? Bart, can you remember when it closes?

Bart Boswinkel: Mid-January.

Chris Disspain: Mid-January, the 15th of January, okay. So I will take, if it’s alright with everyone, I will take as an action item— Paul, I hope you’re paying attention. An action item to draft a response. I don’t think there’s a need for it to be anything other than just thank you, and I don’t have anything specific we want to say, Lesley.

Lesley Cowley: It might be appropriate for the Council to comment on the recommendations concerning the Council.

Chris Disspain: Yes, what I meant was their comments would be things like “Yes, we’re doing that. We’re halfway through this,” whatever it may
be. So for example, the work plan and all—Oh, Dottie. Sorry, Dottie.

“We’re halfway through the work plan, we’re going the roles and responsibilities,” that sort of thing. But I don’t think we’re pushing back on anything because I think the new report, the draft report from the Board Committee is basically fine. But we’ll go through it and we’ll send it out to people and see if we can manage to get an agreed text.

Item three is the review of rules of the ccNSO and the IDN/ccTLD PDP—God. Basically if you remember, yesterday Hiro presented to us on Working Group 2 and said that it’s clear from the work that they are doing that perhaps they should also look at any consequently required amendments to our internal rules and procedures, but that currently that is not within the scope of the charter and therefore asked us if we would like them to do that. Can I have any discussion on that point please? Anybody agree, disagree, don’t care?

Can I take it that there’s no discussion and we think we should resolve that? Okay, so, and thank you, Hiro, for A) your work and B) for bringing that to our attention. I note that you don’t have any microphones down at that end of the table, or down at that end of the table. Excellent.

So the suggestion—
Hirofumi Hotta: Oh, Gabby.

Chris Disspain: So the suggested resolution is that the Council resolves to request the IDN/ccTLD PDP Working Group 2 to review the rules and guidelines and propose changes to align the rules and guidelines pending the implementation of the recommendations to adjust Article 9 of the ICANN bylaws to include IDN/ccTLD managers in the ccNSO, which is a somewhat convoluted way of saying what we want them to do. Bart, the question is do we need to amend the charter?

Bart Boswinkel: No. I think you should, but if you direct it I would say the Working Group can do it.

Chris Disspain: They can do it under the charter as long as we say it’s okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: Okay, well then in that case I’m comfortable with the resolution. We know what we need. Can I have a proposer, Hiro? Thank you. A seconder? Young Eum, thank you very much. Does anybody wish to abstain or vote against the resolution? Then it is passed unanimously.

Item four is the establishment of a study group regarding the use of country and territory names as TLD strings. Later on in the papers, after the end of the agenda is a document that says “Agenda point 4: Create working group to review and recommend action if any
regarding the use of country and territory names as a TLD string.”

Now Bart, can you just briefly, very briefly just tell us, give us the background?

Bart Boswinkel: The background is again in the IDN PDP came up that country names could be used, but that is beyond the scope of the IDN PDP – it’s only focused, excuse me, on IDN/ccTLDs in order- And this has been a problem already since we started discussing IDNs, since 2007, when the Council passed its first resolution regarding this topic in November, 2007, in Los Angeles.

In order to have a broader and full understanding of the issues involved the idea is to set up a study group to understand and yeah, just to identify the issues and maybe come up if appropriate with a course of action, which is outside the scope of the- So we can pack it outside the scope of the-

Chris Disspain: We’re talking about country and territory names as TLD strings, both in ASCII and in IDNs?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: And we’re talking about country names obviously in the gTLD space.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.
Chris Disspain: Yeah. Okay. So we don’t necessarily, we don’t need to do any of the sort of- If we say yes to set up a study group then presumably you will go away and draft a document that explains what that study group is going to do in detail? Yes, Lesley.

Lesley Cowley: I’m being very thick. What’s the difference between a study group and a working group.

Chris Disspain: Excellent question and no, you’re not.

Bart Boswinkel: The study groups and working groups, in this case, are proposed in a model as we use with the wildcarding. So it’s very lightweight and that’s why that one was called a study group. It is for a short time, just to do yeah, understand the issues and with a limited purpose and scope.

Lesley Cowley: It doesn’t need a charter.

Bart Boswinkel: No.

Chris Disspain: No, it doesn’t need a charter but it needs a “This is what we want you to look at” type of thing, like we did with the wildcards, and basically, I guess what it really is a precursor to a possible working group. Because the thing with a working group is generally speaking it comes back to us with recommendations.

So we would as I say get a sort of explanatory document that explains what the study group needs to do. That would then
inform a call for volunteers, because you can’t ask for volunteers until you’re clear what it is you’re going to do. And then we would call for volunteers and start doing some work, and I know Annabeth’s very keen to be involved in that, aren’t you, Annabeth? Good, excellent.

Bart Boswinkel: And possibly that’s an addition, but that’s just to highlight if possible, and that’s a proposal to include members of the GAC as well, people like Manal.

Chris Disspain: Well, I think you’d certainly ask Manal because she’s on our IDN Working Group and so therefore- Okay. So do we need a formal resolution, Bart, or do we just agree to do it?

Bart Boswinkel: I think we agree to do it, but Gabby is more of the formal staff.

Gabriella Schittek: There should be a resolution, certainly.

Chris Disspain: Everybody wants a resolution. Okay, so why don’t we resolve to- Can you make a note, Gabby, please? Resolve to establish a study group to look at the issue of, oh, you’ve got- There is actually a resolution, thank you, Bart, it’s just not on the agenda,” To create an ad hoc study group on the use of country and territory names and invite the GAC to participate in a manner it finds most appropriate, with the purpose to provide a comprehensive overview to the ccTLD community and the Council; and if the study group…” This is, just take that out,”… to the community and
to the Council. And once the volunteers have been appointed their first task is to draft the- “

Well no, I don’t think that’s right. I think you have to draft the purpose of the working group and we have to approve it. Okay? So you just stop.

So the resolution reads: “The Council resolves to create an ad hoc study group on the use of country and territory names and invite the GAC to participate in a manner that it finds most appropriate for the purpose to provide a comprehensive overview to the ccTLD community and the Council.” And that’s the resolution. Would-Young Eum?

Young Eum Lee: I think we should not just create the study group but ask someone to be in charge of the management of the study group, like Annabeth.

Chris Disspain: Someone like Annabeth.

Young Eum Lee: Yes.

Becky Burr: I nominate Annabeth.

Chris Disspain: And yes, that’s fine. And request Annabeth to Chair the study group if that’s okay. And there should also be a request for Bart in conjunction with Annabeth to draft a purpose paper. So can I have a proposer for that resolution please? Yes, Young Eum, thank you.
A seconder? Yes Becky, thank you. Anyone object? Anyone abstaining or voting against? Okay, good, thank you.

The next one is number five which is the ccNSO response to the Fast Track review. You’ll remember yesterday we didn’t look at it in any detail, but we did put up the one particular section which appeared to be suggesting that ICANN should have some sort of approval mechanism for language tables. So I think my view is that we certainly need to respond to that but we haven’t really done any work on it, so I would suggest that we ask Bart to draft a suggested response for the Council to consider on list. I’m unsure when the deadline is.

Bart Boswinkel: The 17th of December.

Chris Disspain: The 17th of December.

Bart Boswinkel: Yep.

Chris Disspain: Okay. Can I suggest that we immediately ask that that deadline be extended? Paul, could you do a note, a ccNSO note asking that that deadline be extended to allow us enough time to respond comprehensively to the document on behalf of the- And I’ll send that out later on? Thank you. And Bart, you draft a response document. We don’t need to resolve anything on that.

The next one is a resolution, and that is the Joint Security, Stability & Analysis Charter Drafting Working Group has produced its
charter. I can tell you that the ALAC unanimously approved the charter yesterday. The GNSO has not got to it yet but is doing its best to do so. And everyone has seen it and I went through it briefly, the key points this morning. Are there any questions on the charter or anything regarding this?

Paulos Nyirenda: May I ask-

Chris Disspain: Yes, of course you may, Paulos.

Paulos Nyirenda: Section 2, last sentence. I wanted to know why it was necessary to specifically “Each of the participating SO’s and ACs has adopted this charter according to its own rules and procedures.”

Chris Disspain: Just, is that- Sorry, I don’t have it in front of me. That’s the bit that says that each SO and AC will adopt the charter according to its own rules. Well, that’s because in the GNSO unlike here or the ALAC, where it’s a simple vote, in the GNSO they have to go through a whole series of voting procedures with their two houses before they can actually approve something like this.

So each of the ACs and the SO’s has their own mechanisms for approval of these things, and so it was necessary to say that what- Well, you probably didn’t need to say it but anyway, we said it, that it will be approved using their own mechanism, whatever that is. Okay?
Anything else? Alright. So I wonder if somebody would like to propose the resolution that we adopt the draft charter. Ondrej, thank you. Do I have a seconder? Lesley, thank you. Do we have anyone who wishes to vote against or to abstain? Excellent. So that is passed unanimously, thank you.

Bart you will, Gabby will organize a call for volunteers. In the call can we highlight please the bit in the charter that talks about what qualifications are expected of the people who volunteer? And we can’t really resolve to close the Charter Drafting Working Group because it’s not just our working group, but we can resolve that there’s no more work for that working group to do. And I think we can terminate our involvement therein, so I think we can just take that as read. I very much doubt if in a year’s time someone’s going to come running back and claim that that working group is still in existence.

Bart Boswinkel: No, but we can move it.

Chris Disspain: Yes, we can move it off our plate of reports. Okay. Now we have the item seven, which is the Incidence Response Working Group. There is a final report from that working group and it’s been submitted to us. And so our first task is to accept the submission of the final report, and the, hold on. Actually, I’ll read what Bart’s written here.

“The Chair of the Incidence Response Working Group has submitted the final report with the details for an incident response
repository with contact details, use cases, and associated material. The Incidence Response Working Group has also identified next steps in order to implement such a system. These next steps are considered to be out of scope of the working group and need to be discussed by the Council. The working group is therefore of the opinion that it’s completed its task, however it remains available to advise the Council.”

So the first thing would be to accept the submission of the report. That doesn’t mean to accept the contents of the report; it means to accept the report has been submitted to us by the working group. The second would be to resolve to discuss the recommendations and suggestions of the working group at the next available, sensible meeting time; and the third is to resolve to close the working group and to request the Chair of the working group to remain available to provide explanation and advice on next steps.

And what I think we should do is probably, I’ll certainly allow on the next available call if we have some time is ask you to, when we’ve had time to think about this report ask you to offer a session and talk about the report. So can we propose those three resolutions: that we accept the submission of the report, that we’re going to discuss it, and that we’re closing the working group? Can I have a-

[background conversation]
Chris Disspain: I’m going to take Dotty and then Byron. Thank you very much. Does anybody want to abstain or vote against the resolution? Good, excellent.

Ah yes, ICANN’s Strategic Planning non-process. “The SOP Working Group has concluded that ICANN’s planning process is dysfunctional and compromised, and contradicts previous comments made by ICANN’s Chair and CEO on the desirability of community participation in the Strategic Planning process. The SOP Working Group has indicated that it will submit a letter into the Strat Plan process to highlight its concern.” Has that been done yet?

Byron Holland: It has not been done yet but it will be before-

Chris Disspain: So this is a letter from the SOP itself.

Byron Holland: Yeah, and I think that there’s an important distinction here because there’s two activities: one is submitting the letter on behalf of the SOP into the process itself, and then there’s also the proposed action for the Council.

Chris Disspain: Right, which is to write a similar letter but formally to the Chair and the CEO, and not part of the comment process but as a separate outside letter. Now, Bart has, do we have that or not?

Bart Boswinkel: We should. It’s the final page on the back.
Okay. So given that we haven’t read this yet I know that we want to do it quickly. Could I suggest that we resolve that subject to agreeing the terms of the letter over the next day on email that we, that the principle of sending the letter is agreed and we simply need to- Yes, Lesley?

Apart from resolving to send a letter, could we resolve something along the lines that we’re deeply dissatisfied with the current situation?

Well, yes we can and I have absolutely no problem with that at all. And why don’t we resolve something along the lines of “The Council…”

“Yes, thank you. It’s not, I’m trying to think about how to make it a resolution. Yes, Dotty?”

Could we make a resolution that someone just highlight a few points that are in each of the letters?

Sure. Just so everybody has a little additional comfort to it, the letter that was in here is something that the SOP itself has seen and agreed upon in the meetings on Sunday. So that group is comfortable with this letter as it is, but fundamentally what it does is articulate the fact that ICANN made commitments in terms of the timelines and process to put out the Strategic Plan so there
would be time for comment, so that it could get to Cartagena and there would be a Board vote to approve it.

There was next to no discussion or warning or information that that process was basically breaking down and that there was no Strategic Plan put forward in the late-September timeframe as it was supposed to; and in fact didn’t come out as a draft until November 27th, fundamentally rendering any opportunity for the SOP to get involved impossible. So really we’re just commenting about the process. We’re not saying anything about the plan itself, just the fact that the process broke down and prevented anybody, really any constituency group from making meaningful comment. And that’s what we’re dissatisfied with.

Dotty Sparks de Blanc: So that’s letter number one?

Chris Disspain: No, they’re both the same effectively, Dotty. The difference is that the letter from the SOP is a letter from the Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group, it’s a letter that goes in as public comment, in the public comment process; whereas the letter from me on behalf of the Council is a direct letter to the Chair and the CEO of ICANN. It’s got nothing to do with the public comment process; it’s an overarching letter that says “You need to fix this and you need to fix this now,” okay?

So perhaps the way- Yes, Paulos?

Paulos Nyirenda: Can a working group independently send out a letter out of the-
Chris Disspain: Yes, the SOP is specifically chartered to do that. So what I suggest is that if we did it this way, if we resolved that the Chair write to the CEO and Chair in terms as set out in the draft subject to final approval, and then say the- So the resolution starts with that, and then goes on to say “The Council expresses its-“ Did you say deep concern?

Lesley Cowley: I’m trying to- Yeah. I was trying to be strong, some sort of strong feeling.

Dotty Sparks de Blanc: “Serious concerns.”

Chris Disspain: “…expresses serious concerns about ICANN’s planning process for Strat Plan 11-14, which has been dysfunctional and is compromised, and contradicts previous comments made by ICANN’s Chair and CEO on the desirability of community participation in the Strategic Planning process.” Okay? That’ll do it, won’t it? Okay.

Okay, can I have a- Byron, Dotty, did you put your hand up again?

Dotty Sparks de Blanc: I just have one little question.

Chris Disspain: Yes. There’s no such thing as a little question, Dotty.
Dotty Sparks de Blanc: Is the manifest content of the proposal they wrote in line with the same thinking that you were having?

Chris Disspain: You mean, is this about the actual plan itself?

Dotty Sparks de Blanc: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: Okay, which is kind of a separate issue, but go ahead.

Byron Holland: I’ve only looked at it in a cursory way because of the timing. As far as the document goes it looks like an evolutionary document that one might anticipate, which is all the more surprising given that if it’s simply an evolutionary document why were they not able to put it out in time? The letter doesn’t speak to the Strat Plan at all; it strictly states the facts of the process that got us here and highlights that the commitments and promises were broken and breached.

Chris Disspain: So Byron, would you propose the resolution?

Byron Holland: Yes.

Chris Disspain: Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: As suggested.

Byron Holland: As suggested and articulated but a moment ago.
Chris Disspain: Lesley? Okay, Lesley seconds. Does anyone want to abstain or vote against? Okay. So I will, the letter that I’ve got in front of me obviously I will read it; I’d like you guys to read it, too. If anyone has any either editorial, grammatical, spelling changes or any other more important changes please let me have them within 24 hours and I’ll then send it out.

Bart Boswinkel: And you all have the letter in your inbox, so-

[background conversation]

Chris Disspain: Okay. Now we move on to item nine, which is the SOP Working Group. The Chair of the Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group, Byron Holland, has stepped down. Don’t panic, he’ll be back in resolution ten.

Dotty Sparks de Blanc: I was going to say did somebody give him permission?

Chris Disspain: Yeah, that’s right. The Working Group members have unanimously nominated Roelof Meijer, the CEO of SIDN as the Chair of the, the new Chair of the SOP Working Group and the Council needs to resolve to appoint Roelof Meijer as the Chair of the SOP Working Group. I’d be surprised if anyone has a problem with that. Lesley?

Lesley Cowley: I’d like to spell his surname correctly.

Bart Boswinkel: I should know.

Chris Disspain: Yes, Bart of all people should know. You were trying to type a squat on that. So can I have a proposer for that resolution please? Young Eum, thank you. Seconder? Byron, thank you very much. Anyone object? Anyone abstain? Passed.

The second thing that we need to do here is to adjust the charter. In order to foster a close coordination and cooperation between the Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group and our new Finance Working Group, the Chair of the SOP Working Group is an ex-officio member of the Finance Working Group under the charter of the Finance Working Group. But the Chair of the Finance Working Group is not an ex-officio member of the SOP Working Group, and that seems a little unfair.

So the action is, the resolution rather is that we agree to update the charter of the SOP Working Group to include the appointment of the Chair of the Finance Working Group to the SOP Working Group ex-officio. I don’t think we can do that now, can we? Do we need to amend the charter and then adopt it again, or can we just now agree to amend it to that effect?

Bart Boswinkel: No, we can amend it to-
Chris Disspain: Yeah, does anyone, any discussion on that? Okay. Can I have a proposal for the resolution? Thank you, Becky. Seconder? Thank you, Hiro. So anyone wish to abstain or object. Excellent.

That brings us to resolution ten which is the Finance Working Group. Now we need to formally agree to appoint the Chair of the Finance Working Group. Byron Holland, the recently-resigned Chair of the SOP Working Group was unanimously nominated by the Finance Working Group to Chair the Finance Working Group.

So we need to resolve to do that. If there’s no discussion may I have the proposer for that? Lesley, thank you. And a seconder please? Becky, thank you very much. Are there any against or abstentions? Unanimously passed. And Byron, thank you for being prepared and willing to take this task on.

I don’t propose to go through a whole series of other working group reports but I will be happy for any councilor who wants a particular report on a particular working group to say so and we’ll see if we can organize it. Okay.

In respect to the liaison updates, Ron is going to provide us with an update on this meeting in writing at some point in the not-too-distant future while he’s having a Christmas break. And Han Chuan Lee is in the GNSO Council meeting but I can’t, and we will- Gabby if you can ask him to do the same, however I can tell you that in respect to the GNSO that earlier today or possibly
yesterday, Stephane van Gelder was elected as the new Chair of the GNSO Council. I’ll talk about that in a second.

The next item is 13, which is the update on the website. Gabby, do you want to just say something briefly about that? What do you need us to do, anything? Just prepare for a full discussion at the next meeting? In other words, you want us to look at the website, play around, no? You don’t want us to do that? You don’t want us to touch it? Don’t go near it?

Gabriella Schittek: No, it’s about- When we did the interviews for how the new website is going to look like, some people suggested we should have a closed section. So-

Chris Disspain: Concealed.

Gabriella Schittek: Something like that.

[background conversation]

Chris Disspain: Like the back of a magazine, yeah.

Gabriella Schittek: Yeah so, but we were not really clear on what they wanted so we have sent out a new, like some questions to about 20 people saying “What would you like it? Do you like it?” and so on. And judging by the replies that I received some people don’t like it, some people really want it, and some people just, they don’t really know.
Chris Disspain: So we need to talk about it.

Gabriella Schittek: Yeah, we need to talk about it so that’s it. You can think about it.

Chris Disspain: Can we really? We’ll do that so we can put that on the agenda for our next Council call. Thank you, Gabby, and thanks for all the work done on trying to get the website thing organized. I know it’s been a hard job.

Alright, item 14. This is the last meeting at which Nom Com appointee Jian Zhang is a member of this Council. Unfortunately as you all know because you’ve seen her email she can’t be with us; she’s been unwell. So two things: one, I think we should pass a resolution thanking her formally for all the she’s done over the past three years by being on the Council; and that secondly we should wish her well for the future. And unless there’s any discussion I propose that we pass that resolution via (inaudible 0:34:30).

The second item is to welcome our new Councilor from the Nominating Committee who will join just in time to be too late for this meeting; i.e., at the end of it. And that’s Sokol over there. Sokol can you stand up and come and stand where we can throw things at you? Would you mind just doing a brief “Hello and this is who I am” for us? That would be really, really helpful, and also tell me how to pronounce your surname.
Sokol Haxhiu: Okay. My name is Sokol, my last name is Haxhiu like when you sneeze you say “ah-choo,” bless you. I’m from Tirana, Albania. I’ve worked for a long time with international organizations like United Nations Development Program, European Commission, World Bank a little bit; with Albanian government in promoting Information Society, ICT, etc. Currently I’m leading NGO called Center for Development and Technology in Albania. So that is a nutshell of who I am. For more information you can check the website I guess.

Bart Boswinkel: Family?

Chris Disspain: Yes, how many children do you have?

Sokol Haxhiu: I’ve got-

Chris Disspain: Pets?

Sokol Haxhiu: I’ve got a little daughter, no pets.

Chris Disspain: Thank you. Well welcome-

Sokol Haxhiu: Thank you.

Chris Disspain: And it’s great to have you around, and if you haven’t been added to the lists already then you will be added to the lists very shortly. Welcome.
Sokol Haxhiu: Okay, thank you everybody. Thank you.

Young Eum Lee: May I say something?

Chris Disspain: Yeah, sure.

Young Eum Lee: I’d just like to mention that basically all of the candidates that had been and are being given to us or provided to us by the Nom Com have been very helpful and have contributed a lot to the CC process. And this actually makes me have a lot more faith in the Nominating Committee system.

Chris Disspain: Thank you, Young Eum. I remember a very long battle to get this sorted out because the CC community at the time couldn’t understand why we would want to have anybody on our Council that wasn’t a ccTLD manager. But I think it’s proved to be an excellent exercise.

I’ve got a couple of other things that I would like to do with your permission. The first is I would like to suggest that the Council passes a resolution acknowledging the contribution and work that Chuck Gomes has made as Chair of the GNSO Council and wishing him well in his whatever he decides to do next, which will probably be something else to do with the GNSO.

I’d also like to suggest a similar resolution with respect to Cheryl Langdon-Orr who’s standing down as Chair of the ALAC, and I would like to ask to resolve to welcome Stephane van Gelder as
the new Chair of the GNSO Council and Olivier Crepin-Leblond as the new Chair of ALAC. And if everyone’s okay with all of that then I think we can pass that as one resolution, via (inaudible 0:37:56).

Do we have any other business? Lesley?

Lesley Cowley: What, is it funny when I put my hand up? To take you back to the session with the Board the other whenever it was, it seems like ages ago now, doesn’t it?

Chris Disspain: Yes, yesterday morning.

Lesley Cowley: You’ll recall not about staff retention but some questions about the new gTLD handbook and the post-delegation issues. And I think I’ve heard a number of people saying this week that they would like to suggest the comment period be extended in order that they can properly consider whatever the latest revised text is on those issues. It’s somewhat odd that the timeline for comments seems to finish on the day that the Board apparently will make a decision.

Chris Disspain: Thank you. You’re absolutely right. There are rumors that indeed it has been extended but no one can get any confirmation from anybody as to whether it has actually been extended or not.

Lesley Cowley: Just in case the rumors aren’t true perhaps we could request that.

Chris Disspain: Absolutely, yes.
Lesley Cowley: Thank you.

Chris Disspain: So Paul, would you do another one of those little notes that says “We request that this comment period be extended – we’re outraged”? Well, not really. Lesley is but nobody else is. No, we’re-

Lesley Cowley: I’m outraged at staff retention, not-

Chris Disspain: Yeah, that’s right. On that one she truly is outraged.

Okay, so if you could do that that would be great. Do we have anything else that anybody would like to deal with or say? Okay. So on that basis I will formally close the Council meeting. I thank everybody for their attendance, for their extraordinarily hard work this week. Is it me or does it seem to have been even more busy than normal? And thank you all very much indeed for coming.

[End of Transcript]