ICANN Prague Meeting
Outreach - TRANSCRIPTION
Sunday 24th June 2012 at 16:30:00 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.

Coordinator: The recordings are started.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you very much. Welcome back everyone. This is the last session of the day for the GNSO Council. As a reminder the session that had been planned from 5:30 until 6:00 today has been cancelled, so this will be our last session of the day.

We will be discussing Outreach. And to do that we have Wolf-Ulrich Knoben who is leading this asset on behalf of the Council and who is - we'll just give Wolf a bit of time to settle in. But Wolf will be leading this conversation today on Outreach.

And just before I tune out and listen to Wolf, let me just once again remind you that our next scheduled meeting for the GNSO Council is tomorrow from 12:30, and that's the joint meeting with the CCNSO Council for which I sent questions and discussion topics earlier on the list.

So with that Wolf if you're ready, we'll begin on Outreach. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you Stephane. To make up certain things we are asking Luis -- and I'm not talking about Luis here -- I'm the one talking about here, we're asking what was (unintelligible) and who is whatever. I'm sorry, our session about Outreach here.

Well you gave me to do that change in the schedule you've left one hour for that discussion. It was supposed to last half an hour. We'll see how time we need really to discuss this topic.

What I'd like to do is just briefly to explain what we did since the last meeting in Costa Rica, that's where we had a session on the Outreach item as well, and then discuss further steps. Let me say it that way.

You may recall that in the last years there was made an effort to come up with suggestions on GNSO Outreach. And there was a working group dealing with that; it was chaired by Olga Cavalli at that time.

They came up with a proposal. It was an extended proposal on that. The Council in last year; I think beginning early last year, decided to put that proposal forward for public comment, and then decided to install a chartering team to come up with a charter on the so called OTS Outreach Taskforce.

This charter came back and came up to the Council for - to vote about, and it was not approved. So in I think maybe May last year or September last year -- it was sometime (unintelligible), it was one of those motions which has been served at least two times.

And so then - this motion was not approved. And instead of that there was then afterwards, a different motion coming out from the BC here, and this motion was even not - could not even be discussed since there was no second to that motion.

So to make a long story short, seeing what is happening then we all had a feeling okay that couldn't be the end of that story just now, because there was (unintelligible) to work with them on that at once. And the question was really what could be the outcome of that and what could be done with it.

So then it was decided last time in Costa Rica that a small discussion group should exchange views and try to come up with just somehow we could deal with the issue or could we find any compromise or whatever.

So we had some exchange of views on the list about that and we also talked about I think in one of our conference calls, about that, so what is the outcome of that story of the discussion we had in the small group is we don't have a consensus.

So we have still different positions on that - how we should deal with that matter should be put forward (unintelligible) or should we do it in a different way so that it's no consensus on that. So it's still the question of how to deal with it.

Now, in-between - okay, let me just add to that, we have some questions put to the table, a small discussion called (unintelligible) for example. There was a request to have more transparency on what's going on, not only within the GNSO with regards to Outreach, but also in the other ICANN environments regarding our source of ICANN institutions, how they are dealing with this.

One (unintelligible) of that was for example the idea of ICANN Academy, how that could influence (unintelligible) and these things. So we would like to see a more transparent view of what is going on. There is some rumor behind that there may be something (unintelligible) by staff so we are asking. I wonder whether this was a trigger that staff up right now with the idea to have a specific session on Outreach here in part which is going to take place on next Thursday I guess. And Kurt Pritz is leading that so then was inviting us to take part in that.

So this seems to be a new situation for me and we should discount that. And therefore I would like to see if possible, not only to discuss right now the existing options we had discussed in the past with regards to the OTF rather than to think about it and to discuss how should we deal with that with that session on next Thursday.

How could we as GNSO contribute to that? How do we see that in the overall context of the discussion we already had? Do we see that as an activity in parallel or are willing to contribute - or how should we do it all?

For that I would agree that it would be necessary to get more information on what is planned next Thursday. However I agree - I would agree - I have seen some documents which have been sent out in advance, if staff prepared for that, but I would agree not to disclose those documents right now because these are documents which are for the public.

And on next Thursday and we would also need somebody who has worked on that - on those documents of explaining what is behind.

I would like if possible, to get more information on the background information what was triggering - what is the idea behind not the details but just to understand what is going on. What could we expect on the - on Thursday and then discuss how could we deal with that and its effect.

So if you agree to continue the discussion this way, maybe one of staff; maybe Julie could just briefly explain what was behind that. But otherwise if you like also to discuss something more about the other two situations with regards to the OTF, so I'm open also to discuss those points.

Okay, good. So Julie, if you like or if you are prepared for that to just to bring us up to the level of understanding that you can prepare for the meeting. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very Wolf-Ulrich. This is Julie Hedlund. So I'm not actually in charge of the meeting next Thursday, but I can give you some brief information and then encourage you very much to participate in that particular meeting.

It is for reference, the ICANN Outreach Community working session is scheduled for Thursday the 28th from eight o'clock until nine o'clock am in the morning.

And I believe that Kurt Pritz sent an invite to the SO and AC Chair's list for those organizations and Advisory Committees to be encouraged to send a representative or representatives to participate in that public session.

And this is not anything new. Actually it's not a new idea. Actually there were public sessions on Outreach and the development of an ICANN Outreach framework at the last two ICANN meetings.

There was one - a public session in Costa Rica and there was one in Dakar. And so there's been some work in the ICANN with - you know, with the desire for community input to develop an ICANN framework for Outreach that is inclusive of Outreach efforts being developed within the SOs and ACs.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Just please a question Julie. Was that on public participation; you mean that? You know several times I've seen these sessions on public participation. Or what - have there been specific Outreach related sessions?

Julie Hedlund: There were specific Outreach related sessions. I'll be happy to send links. I think I did send early on to the Outreach discussion list some links of the previous sessions but that was a while back. But they were specific sessions on Outreach.

So the session that is scheduled for Thursday is as I noted, an hour and it's meant to be among the SO and AC leadership and the ICANN staff with a goal to build on the presentation discussions from the Dakar and Costa Rica meetings and provide a venue where the community can present their ideas on what Outreach community building - Outreach for Community Building means to them.

And there are - I will point you to and be happy to send to the Council list, several documents related to that session. A document on community building through Outreach, one on ICANN Outreach Initiative, and some discussion points - start a discussion. And also an updated on ICANN staff Outreach activities; current and planned.

And so to answer your question, it's not a new initiative it is a follow-on of a - continuation of an initiative that was started back a couple of meetings ago. And the GNSO is very much encouraged to participate.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So thank you very much Julie for that overview. And well, just I would like to open along to a maybe to press them for understanding before we go into a little discussion on that just for understanding what is going on at the (unintelligible) wide level. Carlos?

Carlos: Thank you both. Many times I am put on the table in my position in favor of the Outreach of GNSO. Because I consider GNSO needs more Outreach because the people don't know what about GNSO.

I think the Outreach on Thursday is a general Outreach, not a specific Outreach of GNSO. But the question is - I have two questions for the counselors.

After (unintelligible) the project is possible to make (unintelligible) or give it new life because I saw not much interest to talk about. I insist I will get my position in favor to have Outreach for GNSO.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you Carlos. I can't answer that question so we have within the counsel at GNSO, so we are dealing these motions and that's the way how we are doing everybody. And the Council can come up with motions can also bring up motions again or a little bit amended so it's open to all Councils to deal with in that way.

The question is for what could be the best way, and then that's why we are talking then in the whole Council about motions. So whether there is a chance or not and what are the polls (unintelligible).

So the way is open to do so in whatever way you are thinking of or anybody else is thinking. Any comments further and I see Chuck is first, please.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Wolf; Chuck Gomes from VeriSign. In Costa Rica I said I'd join this group and see if I could contribute anything. I don't think I was very successful.

But as I'm evaluating the situation now, it seems to me okay, we have a working team that made some recommendations after a lot of work. So we do have to be cautious about undermining such a big commitment of time on those people.

Now that doesn't that we approve something that we don't think is wise at this point in time, but I think it's important that we keep that in context when we're looking at this issue and that we show good respect for all the time that was put into that work.

The Registries were supportive of the recommendations, okay. And we haven't talked about it further since then. But the BC raised some questions and some things together; a little more information. I don't think we ever came to agreement on what we should do with that.

We now have some activities by ICANN staff -- I think it's a staff effort -- in response to the need for Outreach that we're going to learn more about on Thursday and hopefully in the future.

It seems to me that maybe what we need to do at this point in time is try and get -- similar to what you've asked for Wolf from Julie -- to get a good understanding of what the ICANN bigger Outreach - bigger maybe the wrong word, the ones that are being offered by the ICANN staff and Kurt and his team to make sure we understand that.

Because one of the things we don't want to do I don't think is create duplicate efforts, and they may not be duplicative. I'm not suggesting that they are, but we need to clearly understand those.

So a first step might be to let's first of all do that; getting an understanding of that. I think John, if you can maybe resubmit to the Council or to the Drafting Team, whichever way we want to do it, what the business constituency has suggested before we move forward with this so that we're all on the same page there. Others can respond to that then.

And then I think at some point we need to, you know, examine whether we consider that motion again or modify it a little bit or something, but I do think we need to take action on the recommendations that were put forth by the Drafting Team.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Chuck. Before I come to you John, because Bill also had a comment, please Bill.

Bill: Thank you. We did take action in a way because the Board - I mean the Council voted not to do the OTF; that's kind of taking action.

Chuck Gomes: If I can follow it, so - and I'm hazy on this so by - now what happened on it was a motion was made, right on approving the...

Bill: Mm-hmm.

Chuck Gomes: ...recommendations. And what happened on that motion?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It was rejected.

Chuck Gomes: So it was voted no.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay. And that's my understanding.

Bill: If I remember correctly, I think just NCSG voted for it. I don't think anybody else voted for it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh, so maybe there's some big understanding, Julie please (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: Yes, actually there were two sets of motions. I mean it goes back quite a while. And so it was last year that the recommendations were presented to the Council. I don't have the exact date in front of me.

                   But when the recommendations were presented they were accepted. And the next step that the Council directed in that motion was the creation of a Charter Drafting Team - an OTF Charter Drafting Team.

                   That then created the team that Olga then led that produced the draft charter. That then resulted in another motion late last year eventually - late last year after it had been deferred a couple of times. And that motion did not pass in its first form.

And then in its second form it did not get a second, so it never came up for a vote.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so now that clicks -- excuse me, if that's okay. If you'd like to go first you can Bill.

Bill: That's all right.

Chuck Gomes: That clicks more with my memory. Thanks Julie, because I'm quite confident that the Registered Stakeholder Group counselors voted in favor of approval of the recommendations. Is that correct?

Julie Hedlund: I don't recall that there were any objections to the recommendations themselves, but I would have to look back at the record.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It's great. It's exactly that. In May - in February last year it was sent as a Council recommendation. The Council put it forward on public comment. It came back in May. It was accepted; the recommendations - have been accepted.

And then the Council put it forward for the team to draft a charter to be approved by the Council and that has not been approved. The first defeat is at motion.

Chuck Gomes: That checks, yes. That sounds right. Thanks, that's helpful. That makes sense to me now.

Probably -- I don't know if there's anybody else that hasn't been as clear on this as I have because it has been stretched over such a long period of time, but it would probably be good to do a quick little outline of what the history is on it.

Not a long document, but to point out okay, just like was done, so that we've got that documented and know where we're at. Because that's where I'm suggesting that - it's the implementation of the recommendations then is where we're stuck. Is that right?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, it is.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Maybe Marika, you can find that, you know, from (unintelligible) you have that. We can't put it on the screen yet because there is one slide here that we have all this data available. So, still Bill?

Bill: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes please, I'm sorry.

Bill: If people wanted to revisit the charter concept and go through another cycle of this that would be fine. But if there are a constituency or stakeholder groups that don't feel that this is the way they want to do things.

I don't really see that it's a terribly - I mean this is the kind of completely additional activity to build the things we do that if people are not enthused and looking to do it together, then there's really no point in pushing it.

On the other hand one could, since it is an entirely - it can be an entirely voluntary effort since people - since the argument has been it's something that should be done at the stakeholder group level and not at the Council level or not at the collective level, I suppose that you could have an informal situation where those parties that do want to talk to each other about how they are pursuing Outreach efforts could do so through another vehicle.

So we don't necessarily have to pass the charter as it is completely conceptualized. We can think of another more decentralized and (unintelligible) any kind of way of doing things. Relevant parties could get engaged.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: May I just refer to John and I'll complete our picture of what's going on and then, please Chuck.

John: What I wanted to say had been said so I'll pass.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear that John.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: He passed.

John: What I wanted to say had been said so I'll pass.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks. And now I lost my thought.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No problem. Maybe Rafik could in-between, comment.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. This is Rafik for the recording. Just to go back to the comments from Chuck, I wasn't at first working for the (unintelligible). I was not busy with that to make compromise with different participants from all stakeholder groups and constituency, especially those many comments from the business constituency as we tried to find a common group.

And why I'm talking about that is because when we are doing the Outreach, to bring people to participate in ICANN and one of the basis of the work in GNSO is the working group.

And if the GNSO Council at the (unintelligible) does not handle it well, the work done for more than two years from people who committed time - for myself I committed time in Friday night.

For maybe it looks funny but its Friday night. People have a social life but I committed time for one hour every week. And at the end I see that we did not do anything now.

So we are trying to bring people to participate in the ICANN activities and we have this working group (unintelligible) undermining it by not taking actions.

So we can discuss with that let's do something as soon as possible. We had the report, the GNSO Council approved it, and then the Drafting Team worked it in charter.

So okay, we can discuss maybe on the charter, but my understanding of what's happening now is undermining of all the recommendations of all this work of the work team.

So we need to be cautious what we are doing. The Outreach is important. We need new people. A lot of activities in ICANN and it's really having an important impact on the people's ability to continue working in a volunteering way. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Rafik. And Chuck, your ideas?

Chuck Gomes: I remembered.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And I wonder if what I'm going to say -- this is Chuck Gomes again -- I wonder if what I'm going to say kind of relates to the enthusiasm that Bill was taking about.

But I think maybe part of our problem -- and I'm talking about the GNSO as a whole -- is that Outreach has very different characteristics for the different constituencies and stakeholder groups.

For example for Registries and Registrars, you know, we're contracted parties. You really begin - you have to have a contract. Now that doesn't mean we can't recruit other people to apply for being Registries or Registrars and so forth, but it's a very different animal -- if I can use that expression -- than it is for non-commercial or even businesses in doing that.

I think whatever we do as a GNSO to the extent that we can, we need to do Outreach to cover the whole unit.

Now I say that but then I recognize that again, especially with contracted parties, it's very - how do you really do that effectively because of the processes that are in place to become contracted parties.

So I think that's part of our problem. But I guess I go back to what I said first earlier in this meeting in that I think, let's get a picture of what's happened. Let's get a picture of what ICANN staff is doing and decide that at that point I think we're going to have to come back and decide do we want a charter on this or not.

And if not do we need a recommendation to reverse the recommendations of the Drafting Team? I'm not recommending that, but to get closure on this I think we need - that those kind of steps might help. No guarantees.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much. I have Bill and then Mary.

Bill: I understand the point you're making Chuck about how different the different stakeholder groups and what Outreach within their respective spheres might mean to them.

Actually to me part of the constant of doing a cooperative information sharing effort at the GNSO level was not really to focus on, you know, the - NCSG focuses on non-commercial and you focus on Registry possibilities and so on.

I kind of thought of it more as we are collectively trying to drum up interest in ICANN generally, in GNSO in particular, wherever it may be found, particularly in the developing world. And that cooperating on that, because we all have a shared interest in growing engagement in the space, didn't have to revolve around whether one stakeholder group is getting more or less new bodies or anything like that. The point was to try to pool energies and kind of advertise we are more.

And, you know, I've talked about this in previous Council meetings probably to the point of boring people, but just I'll say again that there's somebody that lives in Geneva and spends a lot of time around the United Nations and spends a lot of time talking to developing country governments and other contacts and other people.

That's just like a lot of folks out there who have preconceptions about ICANN who find it mysterious, off-putting, whatever else for whatever reasons. And I think that we collectively could tackle those kinds of things more effectively than if we were trying to do it individually.

And I think it's - I've always felt that it's better coming from the community than coming from the staff. I mean I saw this as a cooperative thing. But if it just looks like a staff organizational then that's a very different kind of Outreach in terms of how it's going to be perceived by folks at the other end.

So that was the point to me. And so I don't know. Obviously we're not going to be, you know, NCSG or CSG, we're not going to be, you know, the right people to sit down with potential Registry applicants - that's necessarily.

But I'm talking I think the concept is a broader one. It's the external visage of ICANN and how people perceive it in terms of engaging.

And if you talk to folks like Carlos who's left or others who live in developing countries, they will tell you over and over how little it's really - ICANN is really understood, and how widespread misunderstandings that are, you know, the negative character often are.

And so I think we could do something about that and I think it would be good for the organization.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Bill. And Mary, please.

Mary Wong: Thanks Wolf, I had two points to make. The first point - and they both fall a lot to some extent on things Chuck said.

I think two factors may influence or affect the question whether the GNSO as a whole, or through the Council, engages in Outreach as well as each individual constituency and stakeholder group in parallel or something like that.

And I think these two factors would be -- and these are the two that occur to me right now -- is the questions that we keep being asked; and we've been asked at this meeting, how will the new GTLD program affect the makeup, the scope, the coverage of each (unintelligible) and constituency.

And that question is not just being asked of the registree, but throughout the GNSO community. So I think there is an educational opportunity and timing there.

The second factor I think would be the restructuring; whether it gets postponed out another year or not. Again, I'm not saying that either of these

factors mean we do it now or we do it later, but it does affect - that question does affect the question of whether we do it at all as a body, not just individually.

Then a minor point I suppose on Chuck's point about creating that little timeline or that historical reminder, there is a page I think somewhere on the new GNSO Web site -- and I can't find it again, but I think I saw it once -- that gives each initiative we've done a sort of short little summary.

And there is one for the Outreach Taskforce. I think what's missing from that one might be the fact that two motions that we talked about -- and that's one reason why we're confused -- was the first motion was defeated.

And then people go well why wasn't the second one supported? And the reason is because the second one is a completely different motion. I think that was something that John proposed.

And I think that can easily be changed by just having a little notation as in what the motion was about without repeating the motion. So someone can just look at that page and get a sense of the history.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you Mary. And Bill do you can see (unintelligible) with the motion we were talking about, is that the (unintelligible) motion on the charter, that is on the charter which was defeated and afterwards.

Yes, Julie please?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, actually the motion does contain the history in it's whereas causes of the various times that - that are associated with it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you. Let me come back first off to what Rafik mentioned. So we all know the efforts which have been behind of, you know, producing those documents and behind producing that - those ideas.

And I think though that was also the reason why the recommendations have been accepted. So, you know, that came all from these improvements staff and the history of that. And we were really happy that a working group could deal with that and came up with those ideas.

However then okay, it happens. How it happened that way. And one of the reasons speaking frankly, it was that as a result of the question in our group in our constituency is there was an uncertainty or fear or as Mary just mentioned, how that all fits together.

Whether a part of responsibility with regards to Outreach would be taken away from stakeholder groups or constituencies in a group which we were not sure that they would have the capability to deal with that. In that sense we were looking on that.

So that was one of the major issues on that, saying how it circled around this discussion.

And so - but up to now in our discussion group also, they could not let me say. It didn't come to that point where they clearly could clear that point. So it's still this uncertainty and that's why it is as it is at the time being.

So the question is then what Chuck suggested is that the option we have, just let me say to come up to a new recommendation or whatever is does it make sense in that way knowing that it's still this uncertainty and this discussion needed about that.

Or should we just wait and see and go that way tell the staff initiative are we confident, let me say, to see to look at this initiative as facilitating the way in finding out for ourselves in regards to the GNSO potential Outreach activities.

All these questions should be raised as things at least on Thursday as well. And our internal discussions could continue with regards to the items I just raised. But Rafik, please.

Rafik Dammak: I think we need some clarification. The (unintelligible) was never designed to take the control of the Outreach reports from the stakeholder groups because nothing prevents the stakeholder group's constituencies to do their own Outreach offer.

The (unintelligible) was more designed to help to work together to share best practices, to share knowledge, because there are a lot of people that we don't know about in ICANN, like say the public partnerships and so on.

So just to try to have one space tat we can share information to do more common info for the GNSO community. But nothing even, because the GNSO stakeholder groups, to do their info, I don't understand this kind of (unintelligible).

Sometimes people use nothing to prevent the groups to do their own job. The object is mostly - is not to down, it's mostly to have people represent the firm to different communities - the different groups of the community to work together to share knowledge and to have more maybe coherent and comprehensive Outreach effort.

But really, I don't understand this fear that kind of talk down (unintelligible) efforts or so on.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you. So, (unintelligible) is right now. I see we have (unintelligible) these initiatives taken by staff to understand and we have a chance to put this question to the table on Thursday.

We could afterwards though, think of this (unintelligible) staff, you know. We could have a chance of two ways, our questions how we should - maybe we can see - we could see a role of the GNSO in this overall environment.

It's about organizational questions, it's about ideas, it's about, you know, the - our responsibilities and so on. So that's what - how I see we could deal with that right now to look at what is going to happen on Thursday to bring up (unintelligible).

And then afterwards in our team, I would suggest that we exchange views on that. Also discussing that in our related constituencies. And if we are - if you can see any new idea how do deal with that, you know, (unintelligible) then we should bring it up.

Is that the way to deal with it or is it just so uncertain that nobody is really willing well or in any other way? I'm open to any idea to that. Any comments?

How can I understand that no comment is - or Chuck, please.

Chuck Gomes: I'm not going to answer your question directly. I think we do need to do that, so let's at least say that's next step. But one of the things we need to keep in mind that there five working teams that were formed to implement - to develop plans for implementing the GNSO improvement recommendations that the Board approved.

Four of the teams - all five of the teams delivered their plans, okay. All five of the sets of recommendations were approved. But there is one set that wasn't - that the implementation has not gone anywhere. So at some point we need to bring closure to that.

So the - I think Wolf, let's do what you suggested. Where that leads, we will see, but at some point we need to try and get closure on this.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Any more comments, objections, support? Bill?

Bill: I support closure. I think that this has dragged on long enough. I don't see that - I don't have any sense that the folks that didn't want to do this are going to change and want to do this.

                And so I think that those who are interested in this issue can talk about other ways of pursuing it, but I don't see the point of continuing - you had the responsibility of trying to stimulate conversations about this repeatedly over the past years.

                So Wolf, and it's just starts to feel like a painful conversation that probably a lot of folks could do without. So I think those who really want to pursue this can find other avenues to do so and, you know.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, let's ask Stephane as a Manager of the Council how (unintelligible), please.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Wolf, this is Stephane. I fully agree with what Bill has just said. I think, you know, whatever the issue, once it's been thrashed out for so long without any possibility of coming to a result, and this session once again has been excellent in reminding us of the history on this work and what a history that is.

                You know, motions that were defeated, other motions that weren't even seconded, work that's been going on for years; it doesn't mean that the issue itself, you know, we have to separate ourselves from process and the issue.

                When the process doesn't necessarily lead to the results that some people want, it doesn't mean the issue itself isn't important. That's not the message that I don't think anyone else outside of this room gets.

It just means that we need to find another way forward. And I think that way forward has been suggested by several people. Bill just echoed that suggestion now which was perhaps the conversation needs to be taken elsewhere, and there have been suggestions in that regard.

So I would, certainly as Chair of the Council, not taking sides or not taking the issue itself, urge you all to bring this to a close as a Council discussion. I think we should take this off the pending projects list and maybe bring this - to continue the discussion in a different forum which might be as has been suggested before, the individual constituencies and stakeholder groups or it might be somewhere else. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Stephane. I just saw that Chuck would like to bring up a new resolution isn't it, before closing?

Chuck Gomes: No. I just wanted to see the resolution.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Not all the whereas as all of that was good history.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, is that our case Joy.

Joy: Sorry, just a question then about the motion - you know, the work that's been done, is there some - in terms of closure what procedurally is required to sort of acknowledge that work that's being done and to close it off other than simply sort of dropping it off the GNSO agenda.

Stephane Van Gelder: One of the things that we've done Joy in the past few months is make it simpler for ourselves to do this sort of thing.

One thing that I might suggest is that we have an item on a consent agenda coming up on one of our upcoming meetings suggesting that following maybe

a report from the Chair of your group. And that doesn't need to be an official report, it can just be, you know, it didn't work to the Council that this is the situation that we're at on this.

Following that there's a suggestion on the consent agenda that we just agreed to stop working on this.

Now we have done this in recent weeks and months on other topics. At times, you know, we've tried to do and people still want to keep the issue open. We haven't done as fine, but we have been successful in doing that and I think that is possibly a good way forward and a simple way forward to try and close this issue.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Julie please.

Julie Hedlund: I just should point out that the impetus for this work was a Board recommendation that came out of the GNSO Improvements process that the GNSO should develop an Outreach strategy.

I don't know then procedurally how the GNSO would like to address the fact that that was originally a task from the Board to the GNSO?

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes, thanks for reminding us of that. I see no problem there. The consent agenda item could include a direction to me from the council direct to the Board and say this is where we're at. This is what we've done. This is the conclusion we've reached, and this is why we've decided to stop working.

And in my view that would be sufficient to meet the Board's request. We don't - when there's a request it means work at it; it doesn't mean come to a result.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you very much. So I view that in this regard, so I see as a leader of this group I'll say that I did prepare something for consent agenda items.

You know that I'm (unintelligible) of the consent agenda items. I know how to extend items on the consent agenda. But I will try that and I will disclose that and we will comment - I will ask for your comments and then we will do that in this way.

So that's this - I think we can come to a closure of that meeting or no - Bill, please.

Bill: I was just going to say, it ought to be pretty simple because there is a record of all of this in the minutes for the relevant meetings, and you can just copy into that, given the motions, here was the vote, boom. You know, straightforward, everybody can look at it and knows what it does and that's it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, that's what I'll do. So thank you very much for that meeting and operator, if you could close the line. Thank you.

END