

Transcription ICANN Durban Meeting

GNSO Wrap Up Session

Thursday 18 July 2013 at 10:30 local time

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

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

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

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

Jonathan Robinson: All right everyone let's kick off the meeting then. Everyone we've got - this is the - are we ready to start the recording? Yes great.

So this is the GNSO wrap-up session of our meeting here in Durban. It's an opportunity to try and synthesize topics that have come out through the weekend sessions and yesterday's meeting.

So welcome counselors, welcome to those of you in the room. Let's get straight on with it.

I have sent around an agenda yes. Okay so before we kick off it would be useful if we could just do a quick roll call. And then should we do that? Can we do a roundtable quickly?

Yes so if counselors around the table just simply announce your name and affiliation and so we'll kick off with that. So we will start with you Volker please.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: My name is Wolfgang Kleinwachter. I'm a counselor from the Commercial Stakeholder Group.

(Margaret Basal): I'm (Margaret Basal). I am CC in the GNSO council. Thank you. Oh I am member of the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group.

(Mahi Maniher): Good morning. My name is (Mahi Maniher). I'm temporary alternate for Wendy Seltzer who is counselor for NCUC Noncommercial Stakeholder Group. Thank you.

(David Cake): (David Cake), NCSG council.

John Berard: John Berard from the Business Constituency.

(Tony Basteer): Good morning. (Tom Basteer), Temporary Alternate for (Maria Ferrel) from the SG - sorry for Noncommercial Stakeholder Group.

Glen Desaintgery: Glen Desaintgery GNSO Secretariat.

Philip Sheppard: (Philip Sheppard) observer from the BRG.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben from the ISPTP.

Jonathan Robinson: Jonathan Robinson, counselor from the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Mason Cole: Mason Cole, counselor for the Registrar Stakeholder Group and Vice Chair of the Council.

(Wendel Aurora): (Wendel Aurora), Counselor for the ISPCP.

Marika Konings: Marika Konings, ICANN staff.

Mary Wong: Mary Wong, ICANN staff.

Brian Winterfeldt: Brian Winterfeldt, Counselor for the Intellectual Property Constituencies.

(Adrian Port): (Adrian Port), Counselor for Intellectual Property Constituency.

Volker Greimann: Volker Greimann, Counselor for the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Jeff Neuman: Jeff Neuman, Counselor for the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Brian Peck: Brian Peck, ICANN staff.

Lars Hoffman: Lars Hoffman, ICANN staff.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks everyone let's kick off. Then Lars if we can move on to the first slide which has the agenda items on it. So yes, so the - these are just in a sequence of individual items yes.

So I sent around to all of you a list. It was relatively short notice. You only had it for a half hour or so on the council mailing list but that list is now represented up in bullet format on the slides in front of you.

So I suggest we just talked through these. We'll go through them, some of them are relatively minor points. We should be able to nail them pretty quickly. Some perhaps require more discussion. We will just see what we can manage to achieve.

Just a time check, I think we've got two hours so 12:30 so we I think I'm reasonably optimistic we should be able to work through these topics.

So the first point is on the weekend sessions. We had a new sort of style or format. For the record we've just been joined by (Yohab). (Yohab) if you could just announce yourself for the record and for the roll call.

(Yohab Kieran): Hi. (Yohab Kieran), registrars.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Yohab) and good morning. So we had in a sense a new style of presentations. We asked for anyone presenting to the council over the weekend to have a reduced primary content and enhanced secondary content if you like.

So first of all in terms of those presentations that were meant to inform the council and those that attended the GNSO working sessions over the weekend feedback good, bad, indifferent?

Satisfactory positive change. David?

David Cake: I mean I had a whinge at the time of about the (data) the digital engagement which wasn't really in that format. But other than that I thought it went pretty well.

Jonathan Robinson: So to respond to that David, challenge that, I mean we haven't heard of both the digital engagement before so I'll give you that correct that it was like that.

David Cake: Yes. I gather that it was sort of a last minute inclusion and I think demonstrated pretty well the - well we generally we seem to be on the right track I mean (unintelligible). And, you know, I think showed that we showed that we're on the right track.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other connected comments or input? Marika and then Wolf.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. And maybe just a question. We received many positive comments about the background briefing that we provided beforehand.

Just maybe to answer does it provide enough detail, you know, still too much, too little just to get a sense of that, you know, if we should continue doing that and again really trying to get it out?

I think we tried to get it out almost a week before the meeting started so with the idea that people could, you know, put it on their laptops well or print it out and while they're (unintelligible) here actually preparing the background so we can really focus on the substance of the issues.

Jonathan Robinson: So I've got Wolf-Ulrich, Mason, and John and no flattering comments for Marika please.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes thank you. Just in particular (unintelligible) on this from - which comes from staff. It's a very, very helpful I have to say.

So to give an overview and then you have to - you can decide for yourselves where to go more into details or not -- very helpful.

My other comment is how are you going to talk about the beginning of the weekend session, the strategic (unintelligible) discussions now because we had this discussion about how to frame that in the future whether this is the right start to start with, you know, I plan to start it or not?

It took us a little bit right to get it moved, to get it running yes. So I just wonder the outcome of all that?

Jonathan Robinson: Two quick comments. I mean the styling of these bulletins, you know, the overall is form and content. I think we should cover those items. These are just two suggested sub bullet areas so happy to cover those in, you know, just endorse that.

I was personally very happy with the background briefing. I think they had value beyond just the council and the GNSO.

So I think I have Mason and then John and then by all means come back to some of those points you made Wolf-Ulrich.

Mason Cole: Actually I just wanted to echo two things that Wolf just said. First yes Marika the background briefing it was extremely helpful.

I - speaking for myself I thought the information was just exactly concise enough and complete enough to prepare for the council meeting.

So if staff is going to continue that it's very, very helpful and I agree with Jonathan that it's even valuable beyond the GNSO.

And when it comes to the strategic session over the weekend I would personally favor moving that to maybe towards the end of the day agenda after we've all had a chance to sort of warm-up on some of the other issues because it felt like we sort of came into the meeting cold and not ready.

And it was - it would be helpful if we had an opportunity to talk about some things that the council was doing and then have ourselves prepared for strategic discussion towards the end of the day.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes so I'd like if anyone could pick up on that I'm hearing that, you know, that suggestion that we clearly weren't in quite in the right shape to deal with that first thing in the morning on Saturday.

So but nevertheless it's a valuable discussion. So John your next in the queue but if others either John or others could pick up on that particular aspect as well.

John Berard: Sure. This is John Berard. Regarding the strategic discussion rather than move it to the end of the first day I would move it to the Sunday morning because so many of the ends of our meetings are cauterized in ways that

don't - wouldn't allow for the thoughtful discussion the strategic session seeks to engender.

So I would be in favor of moving and not to the end of Saturday but the beginning of Sunday.

Jonathan Robinson: So in terms of the sequencing that may be attractive. I'm slightly worried about, you know, where - I mean I know not all of us are not - have favorable things at the beginning or end of the day.

How do you think, do you feel we have warmed up enough at the beginning of the day to have that kind of conversation?

John Berard: Well it would be the beginning of the second day so yes I think we would probably have thought through some of the things that would make that session more useful.

My concern at the end of the day is we're generally rushing to get somewhere else. Just witness the end of the council meeting yesterday in which, you know, we were 90 minutes into the first bus having gone to the gala.

So I mean I'm trying to be practical as well as strategic here with regard to that.

The reason that I had wanted to speak was that I found certainly I have long been looking for an alternative to the policy conference call that the staff runs before the meeting because there's just so much that is not as compelling as the things that I am most interested in. So I found the document that was attributed by staff to be a precise, a look at issues of instant concern or urging concern.

And then I also distributed it to the business constituency so that it could help inform our constituency discussions rolling up to the council meeting. So it

was very useful. And in ICANN's world any asynchronous communication that we can use to inform and educate is always welcome.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes Wolf-Ulrich. I have two points. One is regarding the warm-up of the meeting of the meeting session. I think it doesn't matter whether it's strategic discussion or anything else.

At the beginning of that we have to warm up. So that means I think maybe sitting around if the council chairs they have to discuss how to manage it yes I mean for the next meetings. I don't have a precise suggestion on that.

The other thing is so if we move this particular discussion to Sunday you have to look at this how we can manage this because we have - it's the only time that we have eight blocks. So we have meetings with the board, we have the meeting with the GAC is 90 minutes plus then a discussion plus preparation of that and shortened to Sunday via two hours in the afternoon so it's (unintelligible) point of (that).

Jonathan Robinson: So let me respond to that. My thought is that the feedbacks well taken. We know we sort of stumbled a little bit on Saturday morning although we did warm up into it. Let's just take that feedback and we'll try and manage it into the schedule with that feedback in mind. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. One thing to consider maybe that actually before you have that session maybe either for email already gets some of the topics out.

Alternatively if you decide to move the session to Sunday ,that action Saturday morning you just have 15 minutes to say, you know, what are the topics we want to discuss to lots of people can actually think and hopefully come prepared?

And on the background briefing it was also intended for the broader community is you were more focusing on the substance idea would be that those may be in the room have a chance to catch up.

So we did also distribute it to all the stakeholder groups and constituencies and post it on the agenda so anyone looking at it had access to that as well so...

Jonathan Robinson: So what about the moving then onto the impact of the two-hour carve out? I mean there are other - there are potentially other options for that to take place perhaps like on a Friday beforehand rather than during the weekend sessions.

Although we did get a lot of positive feedback from CSG particularly. Any strong feelings in either direction on that in quote, loss of the two hours from the weekend session for the council and the GNSO as a whole? Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. If I may I think from a staff perspective we did get the feeling that things were squeezed.

And I think we had a lot of valuable discussion that either needs to be cut short because we're running out of time or items that needed to be removed.

Where I think from some of the substantive discussion the weekend session is really that moment where we can have that.

And I think there were quite a number of other topics we could have added to the agenda that would have benefited from such a discussion.

So I do feel I understand as well that for other groups it's really beneficial to have additional time. In looking at the GNSO agenda it did feel very squeezed in certain cases when we really had to rush while I think we could have gotten more out of it if we would've had a little bit more time.

So any one of the questions you may want to consider is there a way of for example, you know, splitting that time that groups have so that you, you know, get for example a slot Sunday morning breakfast slot and then at the end of the day an hour so it's we have more time over the weekend or is there a way to do it on the Monday or indeed as you said on the Friday?

Or if people feel that indeed they didn't feel that, you know, feel that wasn't enough time for discussion because maybe I it'd just a sense I got from my side so maybe that's not a shared feeling. But I just wanted to share that from a staff perspective at least.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments or input on that on the effect or not impact on that session? John.

John Berard: I cannot overstate the value that we got as a constituency for that time period on Sunday.

And I wouldn't want the council to be responsible for adding another day to our trip by suggesting that it be done on Friday. So I would heartily endorse the continuation of this two hour carve out as you describe it.

Jonathan Robinson: So it's quite clear that that sort of - that endorsement that you made John that was all this about is what is scheduled is the this logistics of scheduling the value is not being questioned in any sense just to be clear as well.

Man: Yes I just wanted to support John's position. I think it's very valuable for - the experiences we have in our stakeholder group was that there - it's very important to have a meeting at the beginning of the ICANN meetings so we can coordinate and have our conversation and a lot of things going forward. So I think it's very valuable.

Jonathan Robinson: So here's my suggestion. I think it's absolutely loud and clear the value as I say. That's not being questioned at all.

The only issue is one of architecture, when these - when is the best time from, you know, when - where the council had from a council's perspective when is the best time to over the weekend to potentially lose that slot and what - is that acceptable or doable to the beneficiaries of that slot if you like? So that - John?

John Berard: Well perhaps we could apply a finer screen to the subjects that we actually put on the agenda. I mean I have not participated in building our weekend agenda so I have absolutely no idea except - and I believe that it's very difficult to do.

You know, but in fact if we perhaps should focus only on those things that will be first up for consideration at the council then maybe second new matters that are being brought to the attention of the GNSO broadly.

So and then to maybe throttle back on those subjects that are going to be covered in separate sessions during the course of the week.

I - you know, I was struck by the fact that we - the week was very busy but this morning. Until now there really hasn't been a whole lot going on.

So I mean in terms of the schedule maybe we should think more broadly not just about scheduling within the context of those two days but also if there's something that somebody wants on that schedule that could be put elsewhere in the week maybe we should look at that.

But again I've not participated in building a weekend agenda so I as is often the case may not know what the heck I'm talking about.

Jonathan Robinson: John quick clarification point before we go to Volker and then I think we should touch a little bit more on that weekend issue.

But just on the scheduling I think I understood from you guys that to your point that there's perhaps this two hour slot this morning for example. But that is not what the CSG is looking for so just to be clear on that.

John Berard: Yes just to be clear what I'm looking at say for example, you know, did we in thinking about putting the registrar accreditation agreement session on our weekend schedule.

With the amount of attention that's gotten with the awareness that we have perhaps that's something we could have sacrificed so as to make life a little easier for the constituents.

Jonathan Robinson: No I understood that point.

John Berard: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: I just think did - from a CSG's point of view is it critically important that those meetings that you had were held on the weekend rather than say for example this morning?

John Berard: Yes. Yes it was.

Jonathan Robinson: There are times...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: It was in advance of activities...

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

John Berard: ...rather than...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: That's right.

So this slot, this morning's slot whilst it may be relevant for the council it's not relevant for the purpose of this CSG. That's what I want to be sure. Volker?

Volker Greimann: Well the Registrar Stakeholder Group this time did not make use of - they (start) but there has been times when needed some time in advance of our stakeholder team meetings to get some things discussed.

So I would support having at certain times allotted for Stakeholder Group discussions prior to the council meetings.

However I think as a council we should be careful not to operate against a hard stop on our weekend sessions so it might be beneficial to schedule the stakeholders carve out at the beginning of the session. i.e., in the morning and have (give you) have the time in the afternoon to the GNSO so we would be able to extend if we had to buy an hour or half an hour.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Volker. I think I've got Wolf-Ulrich. You - Wolf are you in the queue? Okay.

So just a brief response John to one point you made on the scheduling -- and I don't have anyone else waiting to talk -- but one point there you talked about recognizing what might be on the council's agenda in order to help formulate the weekend sessions.

There is a logistical challenge there in that the weekend sessions tend to be planned out in advance because of the scheduling and the requirements although slightly less so on a Saturday but certainly on a Sunday and so

whereas the agenda tends to come together at a much more later point depending on what is then is relevant and current.

So there's a slight practical issue with that but I take your point just letting you know that that's the one issue.

John Berard: I'm not suggesting that it - that there is a specific plan but merely a hierarchy in which we approach things with the goal being to get our work done but also provide for the time for the strategic discussion that we want to have and also providing time for the constituencies to meet in advance of the week so that they can be smarter and better prepared.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I truly like Volker's suggestion. I think that maybe compromise between the two positions are saying are we squeezed or not?

Because if for example you start on Sunday morning from 8:00 to 10:00 and give that slot to the constituencies, you know, it is a bit of an earlier start than the council would otherwise start but indeed it does allow you then in the afternoon if you see that there are more discussions that are needed to have more flexibility there.

So effectively it would only take up one hour from the existing GNSO weekend slot while at the same time giving stakeholder groups and constituencies that opportunity to meet and maybe even allow them as well to go through some of the points that are on the agenda for later in that day because technically we do meet with the board and with the GACs on the afternoons.

So it may be even be an effective way of preparing for those discussions as it allows stakeholder groups and constituencies to prepare their points and bring that back to the council preparation (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks we - (Peta)?

(Peta): Well first of all I would just thank you around the table for the formal presentations and discussions are leading to good decisions.

And also may I suggest that we have that we put our dinner on Sunday because I mean it's good to have the possibility to meet and discuss and maybe to that way it also solves some smaller practical issues and but that after we have the constituency meetings?

Jonathan Robinson: Just to make sure I understand you. I think - I mean I understand that one is just simply suggesting that it's on Sunday. But do you think that maybe actually - I mean I guess it depends on in quotes, the purpose of the dinner.

To some extent that purpose has been simply about relationship building, a bit of informal time together.

But what I think I'm hearing you say is that there is actually a real value in us getting together to perhaps tease out some of the more challenging points that are - that have come up out of the weekend and maybe coming down the tracks for the Wednesday meeting.

If so it may or may not be that the dinner's the right way to do that. For example we could have some other way of just perhaps engineering that those people with any concerns or who need smaller discussion groups get together on the Sunday which is another variation on the same theme.

So any comments, thoughts or input on that?

Quite good. Just before we kill - before we close this topic I've got - I mean in a more general sense are there any - is there's anyone want to throw a grenade into the way we do things?

I mean we're talking about tinkering with things, managing a slightly differently but in essence we are running things in the same way.

And I just wouldn't mind seeing if there's any radical thoughts with that? Can't see any hands up so okay. So Jeff, sorry.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I've been listening. I mean I don't know if it's a (unintelligible) meeting. But I just think that there would be the most beneficial session would be after the constituencies actually meet before our GNSO council meeting.

I don't know how we do that but I've got to tell you what I thought were sort of agreed to during our weekend sessions just sort of went (caplooey) after the constituency.

After everyone went into their silos it just seemed like there was a complete breakdown. And it would have been helpful - I had a discussion for example with one constituency maybe five minutes before the GNSO council meeting.

And what actually came out of that was sort of a oh I didn't know that that was what you meant. And, you know, maybe if we had more time they could have had more constructive dialogue on this. Maybe things would have been a little bit different.

I just think that something after constituency day - and I don't know if we can move constituency day earlier. I'm not going to radically suggest move constituency day to the weekend, but possibly constituency day to Monday. I don't know how we do it actually because then this problem with the welcome ceremony.

But the point is that constructive dialogue after constituency day is so much more effective than any of our weekend sessions.

Jonathan Robinson: So Jeff that's the point and it's a good point. and I happen to have a lot of sympathy for that point.

The question is is that in part because we weren't as effective as we could be on our weekend sessions or and/or do we need - my other second question I suppose is would it be beneficial to meet as a whole counsel in order to do those things?

And my thought is that perhaps wouldn't be but question. Because I'm not sure that those conversations are better served by those with - so we may be can facilitate interaction but not necessarily get together as a whole counsel. Your thoughts?

Jeff Neuman: No I don't actually think that that would help. I don't think it's a question of making our Saturday and Sunday more beneficial.

I think once people get into their silos there is a whole new dynamic in each of the constituencies and stakeholder groups things that we as a council or getting together may not think of and so the answer is no.

I mean the people that I heard from after constituency day are not the same people sitting at this table or the same people that are out here at all. So I would say no.

Jonathan Robinson: So the answer may not be available to us now but it seems like they question is how to facilitate interaction between the various groups not necessarily only the counselors between constituency day and the formal council meeting. Is there anything we can do to facilitate or improve or enhance that engagement?

Jeff Neuman: I mean I'd really like to see somehow trying to get the chairs of each of the constituencies and stakeholder groups to actively participate in weekend sessions to - I think that's something that we should have done at the table.

You know, I'd like to hear from Christina and (Keith) and (Elisa) and Michele and others and just have them actually at the table on the weekend sessions because they're the ones shaping the discussions on constituency day as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Good practical suggestion. Can anyone think of any reason why that's problematic?

So here's my response. Let me write and invite to them to the weekend sessions on the basis on the back of what we've, you know, discussed and recognized. any support for that is an outcome?

(Go ahead).

Man: And the truth would resolve it so there were sometimes on the table. And as you know (unintelligible) had Christina literally saying that it's no she doesn't - she can't change the, you know, that she - it was decided by all the other members of the IPC so the discussion was done.

I'm not saying that we should do it. We should invite them and asked them to be more but it won't be something that they can probably 100% commit to.

So I do think we need to try something (unintelligible). But I totally agree with you. I (unintelligible) the same feeling. But many times internally so we sit here in the table and there's a discussion going on here formally in the GNSO but there's no interaction between groups, not now. There's not enough interaction.

So I have an idea. I don't know if it will work but just add in well maybe instead of a GNSO council dinner have a Tuesday cocktail of the GNSO.

And there and usually in that atmosphere people can just still talk in a more free way and not only have the council but then you would have the chairs and other people interactive in the constituencies coming to that. Maybe that will help the discussion go better. I don't know I'm just throwing it out.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks for the suggestion. I think it's very helpful to have that kind of suggestion thrown in. And I'm not we necessarily need to resolve it now.

We can take this into the planning cycle of the next meeting. I've got Alan and then Wolfgang.

Alan Greenberg: Just a small comment as the perhaps unofficial council historian or at least one of the people with long history I've sat in discussions where the pendulum goes back and forth about should weekends be exclusively council, should they be focused on other people, should we allow other people to talk? It's time for the pendulum to move and try something else if this isn't working.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm not sure I understand that so because I understand the weekend sessions that GNSO sessions that it really facilitated by the council. Primarily the council are at the table having - but the GNSO is - the entire GNSO is welcome to attend, participate and what is what my reason for the letter is almost to remind that that is the purpose and function. So...

Alan Greenberg: My only comment that is today's pendulum. It has varyingly over the years been in different positions.

And what I'm hearing is not only is it for council that we should actively invite some of the people such as the chairs of this constituencies and such.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: And, you know, I think that's a superb idea but...

Jonathan Robinson: Great, thank you. That's clear then. Volker and then John.

Volker Greimann: This is Volker. It's just an idea, you know, how to stimulate, promoted and also provoke more interaction among constituencies.

I think we had a really very excellent preparation for this meeting by the staff because we had these tables, you know, which outline the issues and what is the ratio of the issue and, you know, what are the problems.

But, you know, this is a very diverse group and, you know, different constituencies have a different approach to these issues.

Probably we could add a column that we just, you know, outline in advance the position of the various constituencies to this very specific issue. And you could ask in advance the care of the various constituencies just with one sentence or two sentence.

You know, we are in favor of that of our Table 29 working party or we are against it or, you know, we are for Thick or for Thin or whatever Whois or something like that.

So this would, you know, produce a little bit, you know, controversial debates because it would - then we see where we have differences and then we can, you know, interact and can ask questions why you are in favor of this and why you are against it.

So that means just and it's an additional instrument. And this would bring also more transparency in the positions of the various constituencies. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Volker, another very practical suggestion. I'm key to start to wrap this. We've got a lot to get through so if there are other sort of new - sorry John did I forget you? Yes.

John Berard: That's fine. But and just quickly two points. The first one is having the heads of the constituencies at our session on the weekend just as it doesn't, you know, they are as - they would be as constrained as perhaps as even a counselor is constrained by not having had the discussion with the full constituency.

Looking at the schedule here in Durban on Tuesday the last constituency get together was the board with the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group which ended at 4:30.

I could easily be willing to be convene the council for 90 minutes for two hours at the end of Tuesday which would give us the organic benefit of having had the conversations within the constituencies and still get us, you know, and still not impose too much on whatever evening schedule we might have.

Jonathan Robinson: Setting aside for a moment whether it happens on Tuesday or Wednesday morning I think we - the principle is clear it's post constituency pre-council meeting.

My question is is that - did we create some kind of informal networking type structure or do we seek the council to discuss this? I mean which is most productive?

And my sense is that it's about as Jeff said it's going deeper than just the council. It's somehow engaging.

I don't know if you'd like to respond...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: I think that it needs to be a working session rather than a informal get-together. And I do think that it should be the responsibility of the counselors to bring to that meeting the output of the constituencies so that we can have among ourselves a conversation informed by what the constituencies decided.

Jonathan Robinson: Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: I think kind of tangentially related to that it's not that we just have a meeting after constituency day but people need to have the ability or counselors need to have the ability to have authority in that meeting, the authority to be flexible.

Because as Kristina pointed out rightfully so at the council meeting when we asked her a question she said look this is what the IPC decided. I can't do anything about that.

If the meeting after constituency day turns out to be just everyone stating their position and nobody's got any authority or any flexibility to do anything it's just a waste of time. It's just that - so I don't know how you work that out within your individual stakeholder groups.

I know within the registry stakeholder group we lay out some guidelines and we ask within certain parameters for the ability to be flexible on certain issues.

I don't know if every constituency Stakeholder Group has that - a tool available to them. But I just don't want a meeting for a meeting's sake.

It's got to be like I always say try to come to consensus. There's two things that are required. There's a need for incentive to come to consensus of each group that are there and the authority to have or to be able to have to make changes or to be flexible on that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Jeff. Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. Just quick answer. Well we have that (unintelligible) to do so.

And the IPC (is no) I think so.

But so in this respect and I would say I - would we such a kind of intermediate session counselor stakeholder group after the constituency day and before the council? And I think it helps really, could help really also to facilitate the understanding in this one.

And that would - that would put a lot more flexibility then and I'm sure to do so. Because on the shorthand also, you know, people at the table or from the constituencies they can - they could be in the position after the constituency day also to move on with their decisions.

Jonathan Robinson: Jeff yes, respond. But I'd encourage people to also respond a little to Jeff's question about whether or not it's currently or whether you think you could bring that into your groups to have a bit of flexibility as to how you come into those meetings. Jeff?

John Berard: I mean that's a note. Let's just play this out and let's - and not to put anyone on the spot but let's assume that there was a motion and Wolf let's just use your constituency because you said there's not flexibility.

Let's assume that your constituency voted on constituency day not to support a motion. And let's say we have this exchange where you can to me and said hey we can't support this says is.

What flexibility is there to change that to such a manner where your constituency may support something if you have that flexibility or is that - because I heard your earlier comments saying we have no flexibility in our charter.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well I would like to explain. In principle we do not have the flexibility after we're deciding on that. But a decision could be if you say so over until the motion is at the table and to be discussed.

Not what I mean. It means if there's something in-between because of with regarding and that means whatever is going to happen that could be done. I am sure now that we have a list in our consistency around that to share views on that and we have the ability now to get together. So I'm sure that we are flexible in that sense.

Jeff Neuman: So that would just weigh in favor of making it as - on Tuesday after constituency day as opposed to Wednesday morning because if we do Wednesday morning just note there's no time to get back on a (buy in).

Jonathan Robinson: Just to Jeff but there are clearly two forms. You can be instructed and committed to by your group to operate within a range as well. It doesn't necessarily - I mean so that for me is the subtlety there.

Because it's all very well if you've taken instructions of your group. But your group could say you can concede on A, B, and C because or you can move in X. Y Zed access. It's not that the two are necessarily, you know, that one has to come to this proposed Tuesday evening session with a fixed position.

Because I think as you brightly pointed out that potentially reduces the value of that session.

So I think what we're really saying is we're encouraging constituencies and groups if we go down this route to come to that Tuesday session with this - with a bit of leeway within which they can work to the sense that that's relevant. Am I summing that accurately? Am I - John?

John Berard: Don't under estimate Wolf's point that if on Tuesday night there is a conflict between a motion and a constituency's point of view but in discussion it seems that a solution can be brought to the table, that then gives the other constituency as well as the ISPs the opportunity to socialize that before the board meeting, before the council meeting and reach a conclusion.

I mean do we have flexibility? I don't really - it would be painful for me to sit in the business constituency meeting and say I'd like to get permission to move on a range of decisions with regard to a single mat because it would just be too speculative for me to even ask and for us to consider well how wide is that range.

And so I'd much rather have a specific proposal that I could then bring back and say hey this doesn't sound so bad to me. I think this solves the problem. What do you say?

And I think that's Wolf was saying as well with the ISPs.

Jonathan Robinson: So I've heard you both and I think I understand it clearly. And I'm not sure they're entirely mutually exclusive but I understand your point.

Okay let's cool that down. I think that's been a very productive session.
Kristina?

Christina Rosette: Christina Rosette for the IPC. You know, kind of having the Option A, Option B is something that we often try to do in fact with regard to one of the motions that was ultimately that John did have.

I guess one thing that I'm - I want to suggest that the council think about is that it may be the case that notwithstanding this Tuesday session that there simply isn't enough time depending upon the location of the meeting, the number of members present the, you know, the ability to kind of communicate

this the breadth of the constituency between that Tuesday night session and the Wednesday council meeting.

But there may in fact be instances in which it's not possible to perhaps get approval for another option in that time and that the council then faces the decision of do we vote on the motion as it is knowing that this group or that group is not going to support it?

Or do you maybe want to think about having kind of a conditional council meeting preset for two weeks from the date of the council meeting at the ICANN meeting so that in the event that you do have situation where there is motion that if there are tweaks to it it could have the entire support of the council that additional two weeks would give you the opportunity not only to consult within the constituencies and the stakeholder groups to have the group signoff and it would also account for the 14 day notice that Marika referenced yesterday.

And in - and then it would be up to council to decide do we want to table this motion for that meeting that's been conditionally called or do we want to go ahead and vote on it?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Christina. And you don't think the existing mechanisms for example, deferral cover that adequately?

Christina Rosette: I mean I do but I also think that depending upon the time span between council meeting at the ICANN meeting and at the next scheduled council meeting that - there could be situations which that time span is too big.

And I'm trying to come up with maybe another path that could get buy in from all of the stakeholder groups, end up with motion that can be supported by the entire council.

I realize that's obviously not always going to be the case and minimize the delay.

Jonathan Robinson: Great, thanks. Now I think in effect that's what we did yesterday. So, you know, it is available to us and I'm sure we can - and that kind of willingness to flex within the processes and to modify our procedures when and if it's appropriate seems to be the spirit of things.

I'm just going to capture very briefly done work we've discussed here.

We focused in on the weekend session and best use of that.

One of the things - one of the key themes that I picked up was the opportunity to encourage as full as possible participation including that of the stakeholder group and constituency chairs as many GNSO so participants in those weekend sessions as possible and second that there is a critical window between when we close our weekend sessions and we commence our Wednesday council meeting in which we should seek to find ways and we haven't prescribed yet the exact way. We've got some pretty clear ideas of how we best use that window of time.

So I think that's a very proactive discussion, exactly what we would hope to have in this current session.

So let's pick up on some of the other items as we go through. Just a note Zahid not to single you out but to note for the record that you've joined the meeting so that you are reported as present from this point.

All right could we flip to the next slide please Lars?

I guess this echoes a thing that came up yesterday in the public meeting. Now this is the Wednesday meeting. And really the main point or formal content of that was whether it was continued to be relevant to have the

stakeholder group and constituency and the format in which they were produced any - and that the other thing that I picked up on is clearly this one, the fact that it's arguably in a graveyard type slot at 3 clock in the afternoon and particular also in conflict with other key items whether that's the (unintelligible), you know, of the GAC meeting or anything else.

So comments, questions or input on those points please. And if we could keep it focused because we spent a long time with good reason on the first point.

Well maybe it's pretty conclusive what came out yesterday. I mean my take away was way want to meet earlier. We want to do our best to avoid scheduling conflict. I tend to take that up with staff and (CNS) responsible for scheduling. I make that point as clear as possible and to the extent that it is possible to remove the conflict and pull us in.

Does anyone have a strong view of what the most attractive spot for the GNSO to be in from a timing point would be?

I mean we were - we used to be at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. At Costa Rica we got shifted to 3:00 and we've kind of stuck with that in spite of minor process.

Should we be at 11 o'clock in the morning? I mean is there a better time especially in the context of what we've just talked about creating a window between the Tuesday Stakeholder Group and constituency meetings on Wednesday.

It sounds to me I mean I'll put on the table that the 2 o'clock meeting is probably good for us. Any thoughts to support or contradict that?

Zahid?

Zahid Jamil: I think I could help some others on the council. And I can tell you that having that window is extremely useful or when negotiating for motions as you saw for what happened yesterday.

So I think that keeping that window of that option in the morning gives people time for (unintelligible). So let's keep it at 2:00 or 3:00 or whatever it is, keep it in the second half of that day.

Jonathan Robinson: Well I mean I'm going to advocate for to 2:00 I'll make it clear unless I hear otherwise. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes it is Marika. One of the things and I think we'll only see how that works going forward. But if we would have such a Tuesday afternoon session I'm assuming that some substantive discussion around the council motions may already take place there.

So you may actually have a much more streamlined session on Wednesday afternoon where you can indeed have it between, you know, 2:00 and 4:00 enough to go into, you know, (unintelligible) time and then things like that.

But I guess that's something to, you know, experiment with or that may allow - and if you move through the motions very quickly actually allow for some more - putting some topics on the agenda give - invite some more community engagement which means some people make comments as well. Is there a way to actually have some topics made there that would get the community more involved in discussing?

So maybe, you know, for next meetings experimenting with that approach and seeing if you have that today session doesn't mean that they have less need for a long discussions on some of the items on Wednesday and actually move quicker through those?

Jonathan Robinson: Just to respond to that before picking up to Jeff, one way in which we could do that is do that but in effect streamline formal business and open up the open mic with like three or four public form type topics that are of particular interest to the GNSO. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Okay I don't know if you want to go to other people because I have another idea on the council.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm not seeing on the other hand so fire - or (Jorge) were you - sorry.

(Jorge): Yes I don't see just about the 2:00 or 3:00, you know, I don't see the difference, big different between 2:00 or 3:00.

The only thing is if you started at 2:00 you usually end at 5:00 then you've kind of lost an hour.

Usually that's how we can really do anything with other people in other session or meet (unintelligible) at the end.

So, you know, it's a long session but it will be our last session of the day so we don't - we'll actually lose two to three hours that's not only (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Jeff speak now or lose your slot.

Jeff Neuman: One of the things that used to happen more often is that our board rep on the GNSO used to come to those council meetings.

I'd like to see that practice reinstated to the extent that's possible. So to the extent that (Bruce) and (Bill Graham) could come to our council meetings I think it would be highly instructive for them to see how we operate.

I don't know if that'll bring more people or not but certainly board attention. I seem to find the GNSO is marginalized in a lot of ICANN strategic initiatives

in this whole new era of lateral whatever he calls it instead of bottom-up now it's lateral and that scares me.

So to kind of emphasize a point we need - we should have our board members present or at least invited.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Jeff. And in response to that I'll not - I don't want to do a disservice to any board members but I certainly know it's better on the weekend session. I actually commented to him and thanked him for his attendance and recognized that that was something that I saw as positive.

I also intend to and in part have already raised this with the chair of the board. I - that with the chief executive I will raise this issue and continue to raise an advocate for, you know, recognition and symbolic recognition of the role of the GNSO through those kinds of things.

But nevertheless yours is a very practical suggestion of attendance of the GNSO council board reps at the Wednesday session. It's symbolic (unintelligible) board.

Jeff Neuman: Historical I believe when it was the DNSO (obviously) the board members from the DNSO actually sat at the table and sat at the - during the council meeting. They were actually...

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: ...sitting at the table.

Jonathan Robinson: John.

John Berard: I don't - there was a fair bit of discussion during the council meeting about the nature of the presentation by stakeholder groups and constituency leaders.

I mean I don't want to miss - I don't want to lose that. As I recall well Jeff you talked a little bit about the origin of why we had them in terms of it being more policy oriented than a recitation of facts?

Jeff Neuman: It was the intent which I guess never really came to fruition was that if there were some issues it was basically the same thing we talked about the whole first hour which is to get input from the constituencies the stakeholder groups on the issues that were coming up at that council meeting to see whether there was some flexibility and to see, you know, maybe it would inform our discussions and maybe it would change the way that we thought about certain issues that could be solved if we had this other - not solved but it would be helped if we had this other session Tuesday evening or early Wednesday morning.

But the intent was to put a couple issues out. It wasn't for a, you know, this is what we did. We had this for lunch and, you know, it was hopefully to hey, this is an issue that's before you. And our constituencies decide - have these great discussions.

And what we were worried about was that, you know, for example and (Greg) came up afterwards and said, you know, our constituency was worried about that this was really an attempt from the GNSO council to power grab -- whatever it was or whatever it is.

That would be helpful to know during those statements not, you know, we had a discussion about asking for not to put - you know, I'm not going to put anyone on the spot just not a rundown of their agenda.

Jonathan Robinson: Jeff a question though for you and the other counselors. Isn't that - I mean from what we - reflecting on the prior discussion isn't it - haven't we kind of dealt with that already and isn't that in a sense too late to hear that, you know, the die is cast by then. And I just think that the - that objective of those sessions is perhaps...

Jeff Neuman: So again historically again this is many years ago when there was a DNSO, Domain Name Supporting Organization the day before the DNSO council meeting there was a GA, the General Assembly meeting. So it was a day before and that's when all these issues came to light.

That was after consistency day. So I believe what it was -- and Glen maybe remembers -- but I believe on Tuesday it was constituency day, Wednesday was this notion of a GA and Thursday was a council meeting.

And in afternoon was the public forum and then Friday was a board meeting. I think this is the way we used to do it.

The GA which was a day before the council meeting gave very good instruction.

It was - that was where the constituencies came and presented what their thoughts were. And it was a full day between that and the council meeting. And it was a valuable exchange because anybody could come up to the mic. It was in essence a council or sorry not council, it was a GNSO public forum which is totally different than the ICANN public forum because they were very different agendas.

That's the way we did it from like 2000 - or 1998 to 2003 before we became a GNSO.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So that historical perspective is helpful to understand how it was done but I think we've got the principles haven't we?

Glen Desaintgery: Just to say that's correct Jeff yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Glen. And I think we've established the principle of some form of desire for effective interaction post-constituency day and pre-council meeting.

Can I just ask one more question and notwithstanding that so we've established that so is there a value -- and I would play devil's advocate and say it is a value to have the two to three minute briefings from the stakeholder groups and constituencies for the benefit of that forum.

So question are we going to take this off the agenda in Argentina or not really? That's what we're saying given everything else we've discussed and where we seem to be headed which is trying to facilitate effective interaction within the GNSO and between constituency day and council meeting?

So we're going to do that. That's our objective. I'm not quite sure how are going to do that. But given that we're going to do that is there any retained or remaining purpose to those stakeholder group and constituency presentations?

Yes?

Jeff Neuman: Not in its current form. In its current form it's not proven to be useful. And I'm the one who suggested it initially and I'm going to say it hasn't served its purpose.

And if we decide to do something different but in its current form just the reading of the what we did was not too helpful.

Jonathan Robinson: Right. So here's what I propose we do. I have already committed to a right to the stakeholder group and constituency leadership in order to re-invite, formally invite and/or encourage them to be as active as possible in the weekend sessions.

I think I'll probably brief them on our thinking about the window between constituency day and our Wednesday meeting.

And then third I will indicate to them that we propose to remove this item off the Wednesday agenda. So if those three could be captured yes I'll come to you Jeff now...

Jeff Neuman: And there's a fourth.

Jonathan Robinson: And there's a fourth please Jeff yes.

Jeff Neuman: Yes and the fourth would be to take (Connie Lee)'s suggestion which is perhaps a written, some sort of written summary of what Stakeholder Group constituency did that was not necessarily a council item.

Because I found it helpful from Christina for example that she talked about the sunrise dispute resolution.

I found it helpful from David when he talked about the, you know, that they're looking at the issue of the nominating committee and additional reps.

So there were nuggets from each thing I actually found pretty interesting. But I can read that in the report if it's not too much of a 0 I don't want to put more work or burden on them.

Jonathan Robinson: In the form of perhaps bulleted lists. So in essence that's I would say that Part B of the removing of, you know, it's part of the same thing.

So then did you manage to capture those three items if...

So what we - what I - there is a communication that's going to go from me to the Stakeholder Group and constituency leadership to our - to indicate - to encourage and invite and - attendance at the weekend sessions to indicate our thinking that we need to better facilitate interaction between Tuesday evening and Wednesday afternoon in the form and format to be finally agreed and then third that we will remove off the agenda the reporting function of the

stakeholder groups and the constituencies and we would seek to have that captured in the bullet point digest which would have been the memo that they would have written to themselves I suspect in order to (unintelligible) speak in any event.

So hopefully to your point Jeff it's not significantly more work. John?

John Berard: And can we also add in that we're going to be creating what we are now calling a GNSO council public forum so that if there were something that they wanted to bring to the body's attention that there is an opportunity for that?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. There's no reason not to emphasize that. I think that - so the question just to are we decided or undecided yet as to whether we will put topics into that or are we just going to leave it freeform?

That's just a final question that GNSO public forum> Any thoughts on that? Does it have - could it potentially have council suggested topics for discussion in there? John?

John Berard: I think that we probably should hope that it would be community instigated but be prepared to see the discussion from a perspective of things we see on the horizon.

So if we wanted to simulate some discussion about the - how the questions from Expert Working Group for example might be answered perhaps we could have a, you know so we should be - if you think about seating it but I think we should be - we should hope that it would be community generated.

Jonathan Robinson: Got it. Okay. Thanks everyone. Let's Lars please if we can move on to the next item then. This is the GNSO review. So what I, you know, it's clearly we've seen the announcement. It's going to be, is proposed to be delayed. And so the question is does the council respond to that call for input on the delay?

In addition what is our own work, what does the council do on this? And there's an action item related to this to circulate the links to the prior work.

And hopefully that Glen will be on the (unintelligible). Glen, sorry just circulate a link to the prior work should hopefully be on the action items...

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: ...list.

So we if we could - so if counselors could respond to that the delay, do we respond as a council? I don't think we need to discuss necessarily how we feel or is this something that the GNSO groups constituency should respond to?

So that's a specific question that I wouldn't mind some guidance on so it doesn't appear unnecessarily on our agenda.

And also I think there's quite a tight deadline for this. From memory this is end of August or something and so it kind of catches us. So that's a practical point as well. John?

John Berard: This is rightly the responsibility of the individual constituency the stakeholder groups.

Jonathan Robinson: Support for that position?

(Oswaldo): I agree. I don't think there's any doubt you're trying to get a council position.

Jonathan Robinson: I've got (Oswaldo) and Marika. So (Oswaldo) just for the record is in support of this being delegated to the extent that that's the councils position

to do it but recognize that the responsibility of the groups and constituencies.
Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It triggers the thought I had yesterday because I remember as well we had a - I don't know if it was on this item or someone as well so while this is the responsibility of the stakeholder constituency.

But isn't there any value in coming back to the council and saying hey our constituency thinks, you know, it should be delayed?

And if everyone else says we all agree to then say hey why don't we also submit a statement in addition to what individual groups say as GNSO council because at the end of the day, you know, the GNSO counsel is part of the review right? I mean it's just a thought.

I mean it doesn't take away of course the positions and in this case there may be very different views or indeed is not possible to have a common position. But just wondering if there's, you know, in the interest of saying well a quick check of our group's stand if there is a chance of having a common position that may send a stronger message in addition to the individual contributions?

Jonathan Robinson: John and then Rob Hogarth.

John Berard: So Marika you tweaked me when you say what you just said because I worry that the board in particular, perhaps staff as well sees the council as somehow a way to put the community into a bit of a funnel to sort of a narrow where they have to look and reduce the number of voices that they have to hear.

If each of the constituencies and stakeholder groups were in agreement on a particular matter that would speak far more loudly than the letter that we might then write because there is consensus among the GNSO.

So I don't, you know, I think that the recurring requests for input for letters, for advice from the council is a workaround by those who are asking those questions, workaround the wider set of voices that might be coming from the GNSO specifically.

I mean the council is a creature of the GNSO, you know, not the other way around. We're not, you know, we don't sit on top of it. We are a part of it. And so that would be my bias.

Jonathan Robinson: Anyone want to respond specifically to John's point before we go to Rob talking about the review itself? Rob.

Rob Hogarth: Thanks. I do have a response to John's point as well. Recall that the review contemplates not only a review of the community structures but their councils as well.

So it would be valid for you all as a group to have a point about potential future review and the timing for the council.

The second point I wanted to make is simply that the time is not only tight but very tight Jonathan. The comment period expires on August 8. So if folks want to have until the 29th I presume that it would behoove someone to file something before the eighth so that they can take advantage of the reply time period.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Rob. You're right to remind us of that of the fact that the council part in all of that. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes I don't think we need to impose such tight deadlines on ourselves. I would ask Rob to go back and get that comment period moved.

There is no reason at all I think unless you could tell me otherwise why it just has to be a 21 day, 21 days. This seems to me this is something that should be more flexible.

I don't want to pressure every one of us to say oh we've got to get it in by August 8 unless there's some deadline that you're going to tell me that's external other than that was just a good date to set.

Jonathan Robinson: Well Rob before you respond and I think there is the related point and that is as principal of comment periods beginning or ending during the course of an ICANN meeting.

So even if the 21 days is strictly adhered to I think the spirit of that understanding is that technically that 21 days should commence at the closure of the ICANN meeting rather than during the course of the ICANN meeting. So that would be my thought.

Jeff Neuman: And let me just add sorry. I do want to at some point maybe not here, maybe at subsequent conversation but the whole notion of a reply period was never to file initial comments is was always to reply to an actual comment that was filed.

And I think at some point that needs to be addressed by everyone because it seems like everyone now is just filing initial comments during the reply period.

John Berard: Thank you. We're not staffing that but I will certainly pass on your comments to the SOIC and the staff that are responsible for that public comment period. But I - your points are valid. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes I think maybe should recognize that. Thank you Rob. You've done a good job of being kind of a liaison for us and so we should recognize that. I'm not sure whose hand up. Alan and then Zahid.

Alan Greenberg: Rob said he'll pass on the comments. It's the practice in the ALAC to formally make a request to extend the comment period so I think it would be wholly within your prerogative to request the two week extension or whatever you think is appropriate.

Jonathan Robinson: Glen can we please add that to the action items? So that's a request to extend the comment period to add minimum 21 days been the close of the ICANN meeting.

Zahid Jamil: Again as I said yesterday Rob, you know, we don't want to put you in a position where you have to sort of take responsibility for this and we completely understand.

And it sounded like we were shooting (unintelligible) so I apologize.

I think it's vitally important that we don't constrain ourselves by this deadline. We won't know whether this deadline has been extended at least for another week or so. I don't know. To get that message out to constituencies et cetera, will also take its own sort of momentum.

So I would suggest the following. We write a letter or something of that nature to the board if it's that's where we should send it saying...

Jonathan Robinson: That's really...

Zahid Jamil: Oh I'm sorry, I apologize, SIC and say that, you know, we will be - we're exploring this and we probably need more time as the council to come back to you.

That will be a placeholder. And then if the time is extended that's great. If it's not extended we should then reply whenever we are able to because the delay is a delay for an un-known period.

I don't think that's something we're trying to sort of try and catch up to. So I think we should be constrained by the deadline. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. And then on the other point I think I've got that all clear. On the other point which is what work does the council do?

I think that this question in my mind is best informed by looking back at what was done before as a baseline.

So I have committed to circulate I suspect I did previously but I'll certainly stick to the commitment now to circulate references to what was done previously.

For the record I have (Jennifer Wolf) volunteering to potentially lead or at least participate in a group that picks up what the council should do in respect of its own review work.

So we have a volunteer to as I said at least participate if not lead that group. And I'm, you know, I'm grateful to (Jen). In her absence I should say she sent me a note of apology with good reason for not attending this meeting this morning. So we should record her apologies Glen if you haven't already.

And so yes so that's my suggested that I circulated this to you and we picked it up in terms of our own work. And because as Rob rightly directs us a portion of the review work no matter whether delayed or not pertains directly to the functions of the council and the work of the council. So that is something we should at least address ourselves to.

I think John I don't know whether that just to give you a right to reply on that, you know, point in relation to what you said earlier.

John Berard: What aspects of what would we as the council seek to review that would not be the domain of the constituencies and stakeholder groups?

Jonathan Robinson: Two points. One it may be best taken up once we've seen what was done previously. But I don't think there's anything we would seek to review that wouldn't be the domain of the groups and constituencies.

But it may be as well as and in particular the specific way in which the council operates and functions may be the most appropriate.

And let me point you in the direction of what was done previously and see where we get to on that. that's the most constructive. Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. A while back we also discussed or suggested maybe worth forming a small committee of people that are really interested in this topic to start actually, you know, thinking through, you know, should the council respond, you know, what do the constituencies do, what can we already start doing proactively to start engaging on that in a proactive manner so that we do have a group on standby should there be a need to either liaison of the SIC or prepare a statement.

And I think Rob has even done some work on that and called for volunteers for that. So I don't know if it's worth starting that now in light of this all taking place.

Jonathan Robinson: Two things. Did you miss me saying that (Jennifer Wolf) had volunteered for that group and potentially to lead the group a moment ago? So that's where we're at on that. I know there've been others who stuck their hat in the ring previously. John?

John Berard: If there is such a group to be formed I would like to be considered for it.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. So I mean I think we're halfway down the track already. It's really a question of the remit. And the foundation for that is knowing how or this has

been done before. And not that we should necessarily be constrained by that but we should at least be knowledgeable about that.

So with your permission...

Glen Desaintgery: Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: ...I will close - yes?

Glen Desaintgery: Sorry this is Glen. There's already a mailing list up for a group called the GNSO Review Discussion Group Drafting Team. It was started in 2012. So if you like we can just use that mailing list and clean this up and put the new people in.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good suggestion. That's fine. I think that that's practical.

Man: And (unintelligible) are you going to call for (unintelligible)?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. I think we would. What I understand Glen to mean by cleaning up is circulated who's on the list asking if anyone wants to be withdrawn and seeking if anyone else would like to join.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes because some of the counselors have joined the list and they're no longer on the council.

Jonathan Robinson: So let's move on to the next item....

Man: But that's Jonathan. Just because someone is no longer on the council shouldn't bar them from participating in the review of the council.

Jonathan Robinson: It's a very good point and it actually links to a suggestion you made which I hope you got in the back of your mind about the ccNSO.

Yes so yes?

Glen Desaintgery: Would you like me to tell you who's on the list?

Jonathan Robinson: I think we can cover it on email Glen.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: Let's move on. Thanks. Right so Lars if we could have the next slide please?

One of the discussions ongoing and in terms of one of the themes going on here was not only necessarily that the board initiated formal review as required within the bylaws and our response and own its initiative to that that was a theme of continuous improvement.

And in that vein there is the opportunity to look at as we did via Marika's well-received presentation opportunity to improve the PDP process.

And I suppose in the - so maybe we should just stick to that. Let's cover - have feedback if there is any on what we - how we might take the improvements to the PDP process forward.

Any thoughts or comments on that? Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Jonathan. Well not - I'm in line with what we have discussed. But I would like to point to (unintelligible) the GAC engagement with regard to the PDP.

So for me it turned out more or less it is to some extent a problem or communication between GAC and the GNSO about the process and what's going on.

And I heard also in-between talk to some GAC members and that turned out as well. So I was wondering about that. So my proposal would be just one page.

You know, we have just decided to set up this working group on policy implementation which might be also of interest for GAC members to know about what it is.

So one piece could be for example to send to the GAC (unintelligible) council the charter which now has been decided on the first information about what's going on and then to leave it up to the GAC members (unintelligible) to try to get more information to get closure to that that item. That would be the once piece that (unintelligible) to be more in that process of communication.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. On that point the call for volunteers always goes out to all the groups. But I'm guessing you're suggesting that Jonathan formally reaches out to (Heather) to notify that possibility of that.

Well we'll be working on the call for volunteers I think in the next couple of days because I think there was a motion that specified that it should go out within seven days.

And on the latest point on the PDP improvements there were a couple of concrete suggestions that we included in the slides and a question actually is on some of those things are you happy for us to maybe start moving forward on those?

You know, one of the great suggestions was for example for a PDP working group that we would start including charters as part of the preliminary issue report that would allow the council - that would allow for public comment on

that and as well allow the council if it would decide so to adopt the charter immediate at the time of initiation.

That may be a step of streamlining already. And I think there was another concrete suggestion in there.

So one of the questions is are you happy where they're starting to look at those and see how we could implement those or, you know, make some further detailed proposals on those?

Because I will need to check back as well at the PDP manual to see if we do require any change or actually are in the boundaries of what is currently in there so that would be it.

Jonathan Robinson: Can we have some response to that as the direct questions (stroke) suggestions that Marika has made for any other practical suggestions as to how we might demonstrate a willingness or engage in work to improve the throughput of the PDP process? Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Sorry can we defer that discussion? I'm not sure I necessarily want this passed to the right, the charter. I think we just require some discussion or thinking about that.

I note the - I think there was some - I think there was some good ideas but I don't want to just yet move forward with that. I think we need to just kind of think about it.

One thing and we'll get to it, you know, one thing I know we've just had a discussion on deadlines of motions and things.

And I don't want to reopen that. But what happened at this meeting -- and I know it's a separate subject -- I think needs revisiting because I think one of

the things as ways to speed up PDPs is we're all kind of in line to try to speed up PDPs but then we kind of got halted by this procedural snafu.

So I'd like to actually look at ways to actually constructively look at ways to speed up the PDP or make it more timely because that was one of the suggestions. I don't know if that's a separate group or that's the SCI or what.

But what steps could we do to get things moving faster other than having the charter included in a issue of work?

Jonathan Robinson: Marika do you want to respond?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just to clarify I wasn't suggesting that, you know, staff would draft a charter and that's it.

It's really kind of would be included in the preliminary issue report so that it could be community input. It would be submitted together with the motion at the time the council considers initiation. But it's completely up to the council to form - to decide to adopt the charter or to decide to form a drafting team to modify the charter.

It's a kind of like we provide as one of the options and it's completely within the council's remit to completely say well, you, we don't think that's by charter and we need further discussion. Let's form a drafting team or start from scratch.

It's really as a kind of like we'll include that as a possible option and it's really up to you to see if you want to approach it that way.

And maybe to add one thing I can do from my side because of course the slides it was relatively short handed but different options.

I'm happy to write out those in a little bit more detail and that that may prompt some further feedback or additional ideas that maybe we can then just take it from there and see if there any of the ideas we should forward...

Jonathan Robinson: Look I think that's very practical. I - I'm very sympathetic to Jeff's requirements not - or request not to rush into this. We don't have all of our counselors present.

It's, you know, it's - but I think there is to demonstrate the willingness to look and proactively look at the PDP I think your suggestion Marika would be well received so then if we could put that up on the action list.

There is an action area which I think will be live for some time. Now it's PDP improvement. And the first action that you can take on that is from Marika to circulate the suggestions in more longhand that came out of that. And we can take this up as an ongoing theme for the next - for the forthcoming period. So that seems sensible.

In terms of just trying to pick up on a couple other things Wolf with your points on the GAC it's also dynamic.

So whilst I take your point was a very practical (suggestion) I think the GAC engagement is - the discussion of the GAC is essentially more comprehensive of that. And I'd say that's one potential item. So I think that's an item of ongoing discussion how we might engage the GAC in and throughout the PDP process.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. I think if I recall correctly in the meeting with the GAC we did not follow-up with the question of (unintelligible) or any kind of liaison here between the GAC and GNSO.

Rob made a point that they should think about as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Jeff would you like to comment or should I respond to Wolf?

My understanding is that in a sense agreed in principle we have some difficulties with the mechanics because of parallel sessions and so on.

One related area that one key point there I suppose is related to a suggestion that John talked about, about a ccNSO liaison or if I remember correctly that it was - could it be someone who's just stepped off the council could be appointed to that GAC liaison point?

Now that means they're not a counselor but they're intimately familiar with counsel business and therefore wouldn't have the potential clashes. That's one perspective solution.

It's clear we had - while we haven't - there seemed to be quite a high level of support for that I don't - can't really gauge it but not necessarily an understanding of how the mechanics of that would work. John I'm conscious that Jeff did okay.

Jeff Neuman: With regard to the ccNSO my sidebar with Jonathan yesterday was prompted by the fact that the ccNSO liaison to our council is always in attendance.

But because of a conflicting schedule the hour liaison to the ccNSO is never in attendance. I participate on the conference calls but that's pretty much it. I don't have any face time with the crowd except in the hallway.

And so I was wondering if we might ask a counselor who has - who may just rotating off the council to serve in that role.

Now it puts a little pressure of course because it has to be somebody who is likely to attend ICANN meetings because there isn't any specific funding for the - for that function.

But it struck me that it would probably be valuable for us to sort out how to actually have somebody from - have our liaison actually be able to attend the meetings.

Man: You just want (Stephan) back don't you?

Jeff Neuman: No I'm trying against hope to make that not happen.

Jonathan Robinson: Alan you have a response to that.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Just a note that ever since travel funding for council was initiated there was also always slots for liaisons which were never used because in my case I'm funded from - on the ALAC side.

And in fact at one point there was even a conscious decision of council to not use the liaison slots for funding to counsel for the liaison to the council.

And last time I looked those liaisons were still listed in the travel summary even though you weren't using the budget. So there may well be funding available if you push a little bit.

Jeff Neuman: So if that's the case then I -- Glen can you or Marika can you check into that to confirm? But if that's the case Jonathan then I would want to formally suggest that we appoint a liaison in that because the best practices that exist in the CC arena are going to increasingly become important in the G space.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Let's for the moment just put an action item Glen with ccNSO liaison and then the question, the active question is s funding available? And then we can pick this up at a future meeting. Zahid?

Zahid Jamil: We talked about this over the weekend and we talked about this in front of - I think we implemented this in front of the GAC and then discussed it on

previous occasions but we haven't actually closed the loop on the reverse or maybe not so reverse liaison with the GAC.

Jonathan Robinson: I think we covered that a moment ago.

Zahid Jamil: Did we? Oh so sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: No, no, no problem. It's think we have an agreement in principle but we have an active discussion about the mechanics. So that's the issue.

And so I'm - if no one contradicts me I'm going to run with that agreement in principle. And in discussions with the GAC by and/or the board Governance Working Group board governance - what was...

Man: Board GAC.

Jonathan Robinson: Board GAC recommended, recommendations implementation working group. I always struggle with that with BGRI working group to pursue that. So and I'll so yes we can pick that up.

I think we probably in the interest of keeping things ticking over let's move on to the next item then which is the SCI.

And as you know we had a - a presentation from Ron Andruff, Chair of the SCI. And then there is some discussion about what the ongoing and future role of the SCI might be.

Has it completed its purpose? And in any event should it continue to function and exist? Does it perform a useful role notwithstanding that? And if so what is its charter?

So again that may not be something we can answer in full now. But I think the SCI is looking for some guidance from the council on this. Any thoughts or comments for those of you are familiar with the genesis of the SCI?

I must say I'm not fully clear of the scope of the question because I don't know what was envisioned in terms of the ultimate demise of the SCI.

Frankly it's committee that looks that is external to the council to which we can pass over perspective, you know, issues of prospective procedure or process improvements seem attractive as a functioning body but that's just my 2 cents worth.

I don't know what was envisioned about whether this would run in perpetuity and indeed if it does so then to what extent does the charter need tweaking?
Mary?

Mary Wong: I think there are others around this table who were present at the inception as well as others who participated in the TCFC and other groups.

If you look at the (main) standing committee it was standing committee for GNSO improvement. So I believe while the question wasn't specifically discussed as to whether this committee would have a three or five year we admit the understanding was that it would be better to look at GNSO improvement.

And I suppose what seems to have happened looking to Wolf-Ulrich is that the GNSO improvement process has gone from initial implementation to where we are now there has been some additional issues that may be related to the improvements that are not specifically recommended that have been raised which doesn't answer your question. But it may be something for the council to consider.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Mary. It does frame it well though because it's a question is the remit dealing with those improvements that were envisaged by those that worked on improvements or is it an ongoing focus on improvements? Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: So I think the chair of the P - what was it called? PDP what? Oh whatever we were. As the chair of PPSC. I couldn't remember the name there.

I - my recollection was that this was a standing committee not only looking at those particular improvements but it was supposed to be as questions came up at least from the PTFC standpoint that because we knew we weren't going to get it right the first time and we knew improvements should always be needed but it was supposed to be a standing committee.

It was never thought of it as a three to five year term or anything like that. So if we need to do work on the charter, (unintelligible) to work on the charter to make that more clear.

And from my perspective I heard the debate I - on how the steering committee should act.

I think requiring full consensus of that group I think is something that from my personal view needs to be abandoned.

I think that group should be - should operate the same way we have working groups operate now where in essence because they're not making any decisions. They're just making recommendations and the council should have enough information to know and trust the chair of this - of the SCI to make a determination as to what to do with that recommendation.

So my recommendation is to look at the charter to make sure the - make sure the standing committee make any improvements that they think are necessary and keep it ongoing.

Jonathan Robinson: Jeff thanks for that recommendation. I think there's one other point you could add before we go to Wolf-Ulrich. And that's if you are aware of why the committee previously required full consensus if you are recommending that it no longer needs it?

Jeff Neuman: The initially -- and Marika can correct -- I think it was that we didn't continually changing requirements that we were afraid that look this is the process we want - we don't want continual questions of changing that over and over again.

And so I mean I remember the person who suggested that full consensus had happened to be the same person that is still arguing for full consensus.

And I know that the original committee that was set before it was a full consensus and Marika can offer more.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika and then Wolf.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika because we actually dug back into the discussion of the charter. And I actually was the person I think that was involved together with Wolf-Ulrich in developing the charters, the drafting team that was working on that.

And actually I think what we did we just copied and pasted what it was in the OSC and PPSC charters which indeed operated on a full consensus.

And primarily as well because we didn't at the time yet have the standard methodology for making decisions which is currently enshrined in the working group guidelines which were developed by the Working Group Work Team and then adopted by the PPSC.

And I think the reason behind that was indeed at that time as there was a major overhaul and we didn't have any kind of a process set forth, you know, determining what is consensus or how should that work.

I think they operated as full consensus and I think it was just an artifact that was basically then transferred to the SCI at this stage.

And I look back in the transcripts and, you know, maybe I missed something but at least the session where we spoke about it there was really no discussions.

So at least from the transcripts I reviewed I don't think there was really conscious decision at least from the SCI of really needing full consensus but more or less well we use it for the OSC and PPSC. Let's copy and paste and it seems to make sense.

Jeff Neuman: Right and we used it because the Working Group guidelines had been developed right? So that's (unintelligible) but the working group guidelines fleshed it out.

I mean it's my view that we should work on that charter, the SCI and change that requirement as well. And I know there's some that disagree so...

Jonathan Robinson: In effect that's a concrete proposal from you Jeff. Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Definitely will take that to the SCI to work on that. Another point is how Mary may gave us a (charter) (unintelligible) past. And that's quite, you know, the (unintelligible) has to cover or what came from the improvements process on these pieces including the words of counselors (unintelligible) including working group guidelines including even what came out from the PPSC. And that is more the PDP.

So now (unintelligible) the following from the council point of view I think it would be good to have a committee or a group dealing with something which the council thinks there is something wrong with tools or there's some procedures so from a procedural point of view. So there must be something.

But however I personally would say so with regards to the PDP which is very special thing and took very much expertise from our folks here, the SCI might not be the (model) who could deal with that in all these details.

So if it comes up like for example PDP must be something related to some that can be reviewed that it could not be done by the SCI.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Wolf-Ulrich just to let this be the basis for that impression, the fact that the bullet point on PDP improvements and SCI come on the sense that it does not connect them in any way.

I mean we have an overarching - one item for us to look at is how we might improve development streamline the PDP process.

This slide should in no way suggest that that work is the remit of the SCI. With what - however people might feel about whether that's appropriate or not that is not the intention of the slide.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes that was normally the discussion in the SCI. It's not...

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Secondly I think we have - Dave I'll come to you in a moment and I think we've got a pretty concrete proposal here.

Let me just see if David if you have anything to add to that before I try and sum up what I think we should do.

David Cake: No. I just wanted to - I do think there is some value in an ongoing - (ACI) is an ongoing institution. It's useful to have a way to talk about particularly

procedural changes and things to council in a way that is both at or removed from the issue of the moment.

And that's unlikely that sort of be too influenced by a particular (business) decision and also takes what can sometimes be quite, you know, detailed discussion out of council time.

I have certainly had that position (unintelligible) the unanimous (unintelligible) items important part of that because it - that ensures that it's relatively, you know, impartial and unlikely to be used to influence council to the benefit of any particular group or so on.

I understand even though unanimous device can take a long time. So it may just mean that we have to wait a bit longer for something than we might otherwise. But this SCI should be a motivated by urgency generally anyway so...

Jonathan Robinson: Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just to make a little time check because we actually have another group coming in here at 12:30.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So this item I - just to - this item I think we can bring in - bring to a close.

What I was going to ask Jeff to do was really summarize that point with a little mini bit of history to the list.

And prior to David's point I was starting to hear that there was a pretty clear view - while I certainly hear there's a pretty clear view that the SCI should remain and I think rationalizing that briefly to the list mindful of the fact that not everyone is here would be very helpful if you wouldn't mind Jeff essentially writing up the points you made.

Second if you have a view which you do have is to frame why (unanimity) or full consensus is not required that would be helpful. But acknowledge David's representation that that's not the view of everyone around the table but yes.

Man: It's not unanimous.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm sorry it's full consensus.

Man: Sorry full consensus I apologize. Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks so Glen you've got that. Yes thank you. So our time check it's 12:15. We've got to be out of here at 12:30.

I have intentionally allowed us to rather than be absolutely time focused on getting through these items I think it's been very productive to let the conversation flow a little bit.

So to the extent that we haven't covered everything that will be as it is and we'll pick it up elsewhere.

There is a live Doodle poll for that meeting, that next council meeting.

If you haven't responded to it please respond to it now or soon as possible so we know whether you can make that or not. Yes Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: So I wanted - an issue I wanted us to consider maybe giving to the SCI and then to the group or to a committee to look at is I'd like to rethink about whether potentially voting by email or something like that is a possibility?

I know we've looked at it on and off over the years. But I just think that for an issue like UDRP lock, you know, getting everyone together may be impossible for August because of vacation schedules.

And if that would help speed things along it would be great to just look at that issue in just maybe we can't do it first time around obviously but for future...

Jonathan Robinson: I'm receptive to that. Your - Zahid sorry.

Zahid Jamil: In favor of that.

Jonathan Robinson: Right. So that's - I'm certainly (unintelligible) and there's a related point Jeff. And that relates to that discussion yesterday.

And essentially I wasn't empowered as chair by our rulebook to allow that motion to be put on the table even if technically although we have done it by precedent and prior practice, even if no one objected from the council I didn't really - there isn't really device in the rulebook to allow that to take place.

So I personally I think that's an area we should look at is the - when and under what circumstances - formal council procedure can be bypassed in the event that there is no objection from the council?

Or not sure I'm framing that perfectly but it's in essence to allow us to do what we could do because there were two issues yesterday.

One that the IPC objected to. That was in - with good - with their own reasons. But two even if they hadn't I wasn't strictly within procedural we as a council weren't strictly in procedure to have that motion on the table. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: And in that re- all you're asking for which is present in every single charter and bylaws I've ever seen is basically the ability to waive the notice period. That's it.

Jonathan Robinson: Precisely. But happens to be missing from hours it appears. So, you know, too so I think that's something the SCI could reasonably look at. Any comments or input on that?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Maybe a more practical question because as the SCI is now in the process that they need to reconsider their charter is it appropriate to already give them these items or should the charter issue be resolved first to determine whether they are the appropriate body to deal with this?

Jeff Neuman: Sorry there is still in existence, the charter doesn't say that they're not in existence right? So we're just working on improving it. But I think we can work that in parallel.

Marika Konings: Well some - and I think in SCI -- and I don't know if that's a shared view -- in the council actually view it that the SCI should be only for the GNSO improvement and should basically...

Jonathan Robinson: But Marika we've covered that now and we have a provisional decision that the SCI should remain in perpetuity.

All I'm waiting for is for Jeff to put that provisional decision to the list and for the council as a whole given that some council members aren't here to essentially sort of ratify that if you like by whatever the appropriate process is.

And then the second issue is about the revisions and what revisions to the charter. And you're right there's a sequencing issue there but there's no reason why we couldn't let them know that these other items are coming down the track.

So that's the way I'm seeing it play out from a sequencing point of view.

Great. Next is Lars, if you could - we've got eight minutes to go so let's just see if there's anything else we could - what could we prioritize from this list if anything?

Is anything that anyone feels is very urgent? You should have that list in front of you in an email. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. There's an item staff would like feedback on. I think at least on the, you know, the lack of volunteers I think on the translation transliteration during the course of this meeting we had several people sign up.

And again we're a bit low on the numbers or if anyone in your group is interested there please volunteer.

On the other one, the reporting and (metrics) working group we actually like to make a suggestion as a non-PDP working group whether it would be flexibility from in the council to allow staff to take may be a different approach there.

And instead of trying to form a working group I think so far we have two or three volunteers to actually maybe turn it around where staff actually proactively reaches out to different stakeholder groups and constituencies and other groups that may be interested, have a conversation with them around this, you know, based on what was in the - an issue report and maybe come back with a first draft, a proposal which is uncirculated and where groups that could provide input as a bit of a different way of trying to move this forward.

Because I'm just concerned that if two or three people with a topic that's quite complex there's not even a PDP you may really struggle in actually getting anything done in a reasonable timeframe. So just wondering if there's a - any objection to the concept.

And again we can write up that suggested approach and put that first back to you to see if it that's something you feel comfortable with.

So I just want to ask your permission to do that and then maybe at the next meeting or some email we can get a sense of whether that's acceptable or not.

Jonathan Robinson: I have no objection to that approach. Any other thoughts or comments or input on that? Let's go with that. Let's get on.

I mean I know you are rightly anxious Marika to try and do something here because without the participation we don't get the progress. So that's pretty self-evident.

Mr. Peck is there anything you sir would like to add to the discussion given the unique use of facilitation in the IGO and INGO Working Group work over the weekend?

Brian Peck: I think it's definitely something that we can look at in the future. I think the one thing yesterday we unfortunately didn't have a large, you know, audience to participate for various reasons I think.

But I think the model itself I think there was some very constructive discussion and we had a couple of new ideas that we can utilize from the working group.

And it kind of gave us I mean even among those working groups that participated I'd invite some of those who participated yesterday.

I think it kind of brought some fresh perspective to the (unintelligible). So I think we should consider for future working group purposes.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes the comments on that issue I mean it was an innovation that was opportunistic to some extent because the professional facilitators were in town as it were. But any other - anyone else participate and see the benefit are not of that? Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes I'm not at all convinced that that method of facilitation is what we want to use in the future. But the concept of having professional people bridge the gaps and what often appear to be unbridgeable gaps between participants I think is something we're going to have to look at and use.

While I happen to have spent quite some time talking to (John Fran ois Berille). And it was interesting to hear his perspective on dealing with an intractable issue and what - how that was dealt with, you know, professionally.

But yes okay so point taken. I personally have some questions about the mechanics of the facilitation as well but yes it's interesting to hear your support.

All right any other matters that are - I mean I'm going to go back to the system where we'll wash it out and see if there's anything else that we should have, could have, would have covered.

But is there anything else that anyone else would like to urgently table now in the last minute or two before we wrap things up in the wrap up session?
Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Is there any way to confirm the council meeting? I know Glen may have a look at the last results of the Doodle poll and just announce here and that may serve already as the, you know, 14 days in advance notification of that.

Jonathan Robinson: We can do that by email shortly afterwards if - as well. But I mean yes Glen is it looking like it's coalescing? I think it - I think I saw it Tuesday being the runner, lead one.

Glen Desaintgery: Sorry Jonathan. It looks like the Thursday is the day. And I would just look at the just to confirm it's the Thursday first of August 1500 UTC I think is currently the preferred time.

So that's just to give you all an indication. What was the time Marika, I'm sorry?

Marika Konings: 1500 UTC.

Jonathan Robinson: So...

Glen Desaintgery: It looks like Thursday 11:00 UTC.

Jonathan Robinson: Let's not get it - let's have a look properly at the Doodle poll afterwards and make sure we're current...

Glen Desaintgery: (Unintelligible) the Thursday 11:00 UTC yes?

Jonathan Robinson: Well we're not saying that. We're just giving people indication that that's where it's at. We will formally give you notice by email. Okay great.

Thanks everyone for contributing to the wrap-up session. I think it's been very productive discussion, exactly what it's meant to be.

Thanks again to everyone for their participation over the last few days on this. Let's keep up the momentum if we possibly can.

I know we generally go into a bit of a slump immediately after the meeting. But, you know, I'm coming - I'm personally coming out of this meeting with a

pretty good spirit at least in terms of where we've got to and the opportunities to take things further so that's great.

Thanks again to all of you. Thanks for the staff as to the staff of the report both those present in the room technical and otherwise so great.

Let's call it a day here and look forward to take online and moving ahead to Buenos Aires.

Yes Marika rightly reminds me that I should just remind all of you that there is - that we have a day scheduled on the Friday for a, you know, counsel development session on that last Friday.

I believe it's the 22 November I stand to be corrected on that. But it's the last Friday of the meeting where we plan to meet and work on the future development and working output of the council there in Buenos Aires.

So thanks. We will remind you again on list.

END