

Transcription ICANN Toronto Meeting

GNSO Wrap-Up Session Meeting

Thursday 18 October 2012 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.

Coordinator: Time is 10:40 am. Recording has started for the GSNO wrap-up.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks everyone. So welcome to the session. I must say I'm caught slightly unaware that I thought our outgoing chair was going to finish the meeting with (Jerry) in the last session so I'm straight into a baptism by fire.

The first item we'd like to cover is getting an update of the progress with the URS and ready the next steps as far as the council is concerned. And I believe Olaf is here to talk to us about that so, Olaf, we'll go straight on with that and hear from you. That would be great.

Olof Nordling: Thank you very much, (Jonathan). The URS, Uniform Records Suspension System was conceived by (unintelligible), I mean, two community groups, IRT first and then refined by the STI as they were called in order to find a cost and light (weight) and low cost compliment of the URP to address clear cut infringements of trademark rights by suspension of the main names. That's in short discreet.

And we're very very grateful for all the work that went into that. And it's been included as you know in the applicant guidebook for quite some time and it's going to be compulsory for all the new (DTMB)s.

Now since some time engaging with potential providers as it turned out that it may not be as (lost) light weight and low cost as desirable. And so we had a session on the URS in Prague in order to find ways and to address that.

And a number of change proposals came up which we have since (unintelligible) and we have a Webinar on the 3rd of October to get the (unintelligible) the community centers about what they do, what they decide at (unintelligible) And so there was a preference.

We also in order to assess the market get some kind of a market check (unintelligible) request for information notably the 24th of September you see what kind of responses you would get and the deadline for that is late in November.

But time is pressing and in particular since the time schedule for the launch it will be has been well happily advanced but that adds to the pressure on what should be done with the URS. So we have a two-prong approach here.

We have the (RF5), we're expecting we have positive (unintelligible) saying that this - we will and that's (unintelligible) that happens so the idea is to develop more thoughts about the - well, the (unintelligible) that received and presumably and here comes the proposal a job with participation from the potential providers and in a sense making a (microcosum) of the STI in order to make it small enough, the drafting team to be efficient but yet big enough to be effective.

So that's first which I put in front of you and I don't know if I'm asking for a blessing to go ahead with that or absolution for going. So I (unintelligible) for at least to have your feedback on what you think we should do. Maybe you have much better ideas.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olaf. Does anyone got any feedback for this suggestion for a drafting team to - yes, (Alan).

Alan Greenberg: I'm not making a formal statement on behalf of ALAC or you'll see but ALAC and NCSG had a meeting yesterday about this and there is a strong preference that we not have to make any changes and that we get (response).

If that may or may not happen there is some willingness to working parallel on the chance that we may have to make some changes. There is a very strong preference not to make changes in the substance of the policy but in the process (of the) steps.

So what can we do to streamline the process to reduce the steps without changing the actual specifics of it? So electronic filing is fine. Judgment on no response, no. So in other words we should first address in the drafting group things that may be applicable even if we can find someone who could do it for \$500 to changes may lower to \$350.

And certainly those we should focus on because in the three years or two years that propensity SGI met, you know, things may have changed slightly and certainly there are opportunities that we can change the process to streamlines. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, (Alan). (Jeff).

Jeff Neuman: I remember making the same comment in Prague. Part of our problem is we're working on streamlining a process that we still don't know the difficulties. In other words, we don't have the comments that were initially received from the National Arbitration Forum and World (unintelligible) Property Organization as to what made it so expensive other than some suggestions of well, we think that default situation should do X, Y and Z.

So I'm hoping that those entities respond to the RFI. I'm hoping that the RFI becomes completely public. I was a little bit concerned. I still am, but there

was nothing in the RFI that asks them what they would charge or what they believe the costs are because I think that's really the relevant information and I think that was missed.

And maybe it was because you used past templates. But my problem is we're putting the cart before the horse. We're saying we need to change the process because two vendors said they couldn't do it for a certain price.

I'm a little skeptical of doing that until we actually see those vendors comments on the record and otherwise it seems we're doing this backwards. So I'd like to know - so that's my first comment.

My second comment is we're asking people to make changes on a default. This was essential element even going back as far as the IRT and I know because I was on that that it wasn't necessarily a full judgment on the merit if you will if there was a default. It was a sanity check. And that's actually the term I used during the IRT discussions and even subsequent to that.

When a plaintiff submits a complaint in the URS, someone and it doesn't need to be a lawyer and it doesn't need to be even be necessarily a paralegal. Someone needs to look at that complaint and needs to say, oh, yeah, so they alleged XYZ.web is doing these bad things. Someone needs to actually go look at XYZ.web and say, you know what, they are doing the things not whether it's bad or not but they are doing the things that are being complained about. And if they are doing the things that are being complained about and they don't respond, then that's very appropriate for a default and then in those cases it shouldn't go to a panel.

So you know, for me, I'm a little baffled because we have not seen what discussions took place between ICANN and those two organizations. I'm really hoping we get a third or a fourth or a fifth response to the RFI that gives us that better information and seriously consider other vendors. If WIPO can't do it, if National Arbitration Forum can't do it, then pick someone else.

Olof Nordling: Thanks. First of all I think I understand (Alan)'s comments on what changes would be except (unintelligible) meaning that process improvement suggestions would be good and let (unintelligible) things that like the 24-hour requirement (unintelligible) operate and then 24 by 7 so change that to one business day.

For example the reasonable things but if I may proceed to first of all this in parallel put in the cockpit for the horses. We all (unintelligible) situation and we want to make every effort to be able to make the timeline so - and I don't know if we wasted the effort because this may be useful if not immediately then at least at a time that we have the full scene review of the URS.

So (unintelligible) effort you have the comments provided by not only WIPO and (NAS) but also the (CAC) and they're up on the little (unintelligible) launched since some time. (NAS) (unintelligible) comments on the session events coming round about and now on the URS.

So please go ahead and have a look at them. They're actually on the set sessions locked available for downloading. So there are - you mentioned also why didn't we put the (unintelligible) as it should be below 500.

We won't have the price information indeed and we have for the potential applicants and we have a particular session for questions and answers on Tuesday and (unintelligible) certainly bring this up and I think they've done this in the end to what we're saying right now. So I trust information will be forthcoming as a basis for the decision on the further steps we take.

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, (Alan), I'll come back to you in one moment. What I feel like I'm hearing is we've got a session eminent as you say, we've got an RFI running, we've got a call which is a precursor to that RFI on Tuesday next week or eminent.

So it strikes me that there's a lot of moving parts and I just wonder whether we wouldn't be going off on a tangent and I wouldn't mind some feedback on that element of it to try and deal with any questions or issues that a drafting team might deal with and whether we shouldn't let this process run a little further notwithstanding the urgency of the whole thing.

But, Alan, does your point fit in with that or would you like to make another point in any event?

Alan Greenberg: No, the points are somewhat different. But, you know, let your one run out and I'll take the floor.

Jonathan Robinson: Well, I'm done. That's really in part a question to others to say and to Olaf to say I think I'm following from (Jeff) how much value we can provide until some of those - until it's established that there really is an issue with providing the URS (unintelligible). So I've got Marika who'd like to intervene and then we'll come to you, (Alan).

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think part of the discussion on the council here as all have said that's really urgent and that might be information that you're waiting for but I think what would be really helpful is to have clarification on when that information is available, how you're going to do without.

I think as Olaf specified you may consider bringing together back a subset of the STI to have a group that was already involved and is before making insight on how to tweak or modify or change or to address those questions that are being raised.

Because I think what we're already looking for is how can we make sure that we have something in place and we can quickly work with to look at these issues and even if some information still needs to be developed. So I think that's the kind of direction we're looking for for you four.

Olof Nordling: Thanks, Marika for helping out. And the (code) STI, well, what we're thinking about is to take one of the red lines that we do have and provide it and actually go through and say is this something we can live with or not, does this keep the balance, does this involve the process, is it sufficient, is it proper and so on and other modifications to them as well.

And (unintelligible) or when we do have the replies to the RFI and to put (handful) proposals for modifications to recount the various providers that respond to it. And I'm hopeful that we'll most certainly not only get replies from the two that have been mentioned but there are others which have (unintelligible) mentioned at least provide responses to it.

So, well, my suggestion would be volunteers (type) one from each interested stakeholder group and constituency that would be (unintelligible) at least I myself looking into (unintelligible) looking into and try to see well, in the (last) comments we received in Prague and at our Webinar and later to day you'll see what is perhaps doable and then we...

Jonathan Robinson: I think I've got you there. So I've got Alan and (Jeff) and then (Brian) and then (David). If we can perhaps focus on the specifics of this of the rather practical proposal but let's go ahead, (Alan).

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Several things. First of all, I can (tend) be talking about \$500. Now the SGI said 3 to 500. We would really like to see it at the lower of that range not at the absolute range and then push it up to 550. So I would suspect streamlining the process if going to be something that has to be done and I'm suspecting would be suggested in at least some of the RFI responses.

So I think we need to be ready at the very least we need to be ready to spring the day with the group formed the day the RFI responses are ready. If we choose to meet before then to look at some other documents, fine. I'll point out that in last September the board unilaterally shortened the response time which hurt respondents.

All of the changes are virtually all of the changes that were suggested in the interim have been against the respondent. So the change has been somewhat one-sided and there's a lot of suspicion that there's, you know, a game to be played to try to hurt the respondents or rather direct the respondent issues only and therefore there is some suspicion certainly.

So (I) support forming a group soon. In a few days it's going to be November and November is almost Christmas. Things start (winding down) and things start rushing up on things that are deadlines so I would suggest get a group together soon whether we meet or not, I don't know.

Jonathan Robinson: That's helpful. Let's go to (Jeff) and then (David).

Jeff Neuman: So thanks, this is (Jeff). This is an incredibly frustrating conversation because it's become urgent partly because I can't if not publish the information that we need. I would ask for a commitment by tomorrow.

If I could just write up a document which says this is what the National Arbitration Forum, WIPO and anyone else that they discuss a cost breakdown. This part costs X and this part costs Y and this part costs Z. Then we can go through those and see how we can reduce the cost.

But instead you're asking for a URS reform even before the URS has been implemented. We also had a very serious debate on when we should be talking about the dispute processes and we delayed it for eighteen months after the launch of the first new GTLD.

I just find this completely backwards from a business perspective. And that's the side I am on, right. And my own company, if someone were to tell me you've got to reduce the cost, I would look at them and say, well, tell me what the costs are and which part.

But instead what we're being asked to do is we're going to give you a redline of changes that intellectual property owners want that we think will reduce the cost and we have no indication of that at all.

So I understand your point of maybe 24 hours notice should be changed to a business day. Okay, cool, that's fine. But that's not the big issue there. The big issue that they brought up is default and appointing panels, tell us how much it costs. How much and what percentage for example goes to the administrative overhead fee that WIPO and National Arbitration Forum collects that they don't even pass on to the panelists.

Tell us what do you pay your overhead, what do you pay your panelists and why. Is it because it - and give me the time breakdown. How long would it take a panelist to look at the basic issues in the URS to make a decision and how much does that panelist get paid per hour. Those are the types of things we need.

I think it's completely just backwards to look at revising the policy because we don't even know in the end even after we do all the redlines, we don't even know in the end that the vendors won't come back and say it's still too expensive, go back and do more. We need the benchmarks.

I think it's a complete waste of time to put together a group here to work on any redlines. It's crazy. It's policy being done in isolation without thinking of the business. We are supposed to be - we are supposed to create the policy. It's up to others to work out the business issues. You're asking us to somehow merge the two without having the information. And I'm sorry. I'm kind of passionate about this.

Jonathan Robinson: (Jeff), do you have a response though because (David)'s in the queue but I think they left us probably a sufficiently substantial (unintelligible) response.

(David): Absolutely and the (unintelligible) we have is (unintelligible) in the paper that not only the paper that WIPO has delivered and which you can access but URS Web site and on the set. They indicate a panelist or (unintelligible) to be in the order of 8, 900 dollars and that's (unintelligible).

Don't quote me here but a third of the cost total where (unintelligible) based on the (URP) proceedings. A third of the cost would go to the administration of the (matter) and the bulk or the cost, two-thirds thereabouts would go for the examiner. So it's the examiner costs that...

Jonathan Robinson: Just before we go to (David), I just need to establish a point of character here because as I understand it we're going to a - we're running this RFI process, we're going to a meeting to discuss some of the issues of this but I have heard that at least one provider has emerged and stood up and said I intend to respond to the RFI, I intend to reduce a response within the cost parameters compliant with existing policy. And so what I'm struggling to get into until we've established it can't be done in cost to current policy or am I missing something?

Olof Nordling: That's absolutely correct and I believe and hope that there would be more than (unintelligible) like that. That doesn't say that we have the final solution. So that's the reason for trying something in the meantime and while this isn't perfect we don't have the cost breakdown or the (projected) breaks down but that will be particularly poignant matter to bring up when we look at the suggested modification, what kind of cost would that change and so on. So that is strictly a matter that could come into discussion and (unintelligible) given that we would foresee to do that that would provide it.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Well, this is obviously sufficiently important and you've highlighted the urgency because it's place in the program and we need to have given it some time we've given but I'm keen to try and wrap this up now. So, (David) then (Jeff) and then I think we need to cut things off at that point. (David), let's hear from you.

(David): So as you know I just came from a meeting with (Bonnie) and (Sally) where we're talking about this issue about where implementation of policy, you know, in the future we need to consider the policy process isn't really done until the implementation happens. We've got to keep the policy.

We can't say we've done the policy now let's throw it over to staff to implement and hope that that will actually be done. And clearly this is a problem with URS where there is pressure to change the policy because of the implementation difficulties.

But it really - we are very concerned about the policy changes. We have to follow that of course the whole process was very difficult to get this. All of the concerns that (Alan) mentioned about you know many of the changes into favor, the rights holder, the and many of the changes and some of the changes seem to have suggested in response to get this (permissible) fundamentally changes what we think the URS was even for. So it is - we are very concerned and we are certainly willing to dig in and help but these changes are of great concern to us.

Jonathan Robinson: (Jeff).

Jeff Neuman: So one of the things I would ask is a third of the cost for the administration. You know, if you want people to volunteer I'd like to actually be on the RFI review committee. I would love to see the responses and help critique those.

Right, I would love to actually say okay so if your fee is \$900 you're telling us that \$300 are for admin costs or overhead. Well, how can we reduce that? Why are we looking at the policy to change that? It's like we're hostages of the vendors and I think that happens a lot here in the ICANN world.

We should not be the hostages of the vendors. We should tell the vendors this is what we want and we should look at the vendors' inside policies, say

what can you do to reduce the administrative costs, what can we as an organization do to help you reduce your admin or what can you do for us to help produce your admin.

Because if that's the case, if they're literally saying 300 out of \$900 goes to admin then there's nothing we can do to actually bring the fee into something between 3 and \$500. It's a hopeless cause and then all it becomes is almost an exercise as (David) just said and (Alan) that we're basically engaged in a new policy discussion of how to make things better for the intellectual property constituency. Right.

And I hear some of their concerns but these have all been well debated. I would volunteer to help you out and look at everyone's RFI response. I'm completely independent, registries have nothing at all, no interest in the game other than to have this move forward. I don't care who does it.

I'm not on the IP side, I'm not on the non commercial, I'm not on a side. I want to see it done and I'd be happy to volunteer for that and I'm very good at grilling vendors too. I have some good (unintelligible) experience.

Jonathan Robinson: I think there's been - it seems to me there's a couple of themes here. I mean, I like what (David) said reminding us of the intricate loop and the fact that we can never completely put policy away in a box subject to implementation.

There's certainly a theme emerging of trying to be more effective at linking the policy and implementation as early and as thoroughly in the process going through. But I'm hearing at quite a loud plea from you to have at least try and get together the volunteers for a group that may either help you on the way with some of the things that (Jeff) talked about.

I don't know what your reaction to that particular suggestion is but start to form the group such that in the event that your RFI doesn't produce a

satisfactory response where we are prepared and ready if not having done some prior work so that's what I'm hearing. (Brian), you want to say something.

Brian Winterfeldt: Just very quickly. (Brian (Unintelligible), IPC. I just wanted to support (Jeff)'s concerns in the sense that I think trademark owners are, you know, obviously watching this issue very closely. We're very concerned about the position of the URS. You know, you go back to the IRT and there are a lot of things we asked for that we did not get.

The few things that we're getting are critical, critical, critical and I think (Jeff)'s point is important in that what needs to be achieved and what needs to be fast or we might as well just do UDRPs especially with (unintelligible) an option. So I do think it's really important and I'm happy to lend support as well in any way I can to help you with that.

Jonathan Robinson: Great, so it sounds to me my measure isn't what we've got here is a degree of resonance about how deep we go at this point and whether we start to open up the policy questions until we are certain we have a problem but nevertheless we become prepared and perhaps even have some initial informal discussion as part of that preparation to convene and form a drafting team if and when that's necessary. Does that represent, is there anyone feel strongly that doesn't represent where we've got to here? (Alan)?

Alan Greenberg: My only modification would - I was just forming the team and actually having it ready to have its first meeting slightly different than being ready to form a group as soon as we see it needed.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm sorry if I spoke unclearly. That's exactly what I intend. I think we go for a call out onto the list to form the team and in fact my personal view is I have no reservations about that team having informal dialogue amongst themselves about some of the issues that may either be coming down the tracks or already on the tracks.

But as to your initial suggestion of the reform that we begin to work on drafting, I think that's probably premature until we see some of the outcomes of the processes. So I think we'll speak to you and the council that's - is there a last word you'd like to say or if I've said something to conclude.

Olof Nordling: My last word is thank you for the support and well, I look forward to trying to have a call with that drafting team late next week for example. (It is urgent) to have something fairly early. We have to have the providers lined up fairly early next year in order for them to also the detailed implementation and complication with the registries and support. Are more questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Struggling to put this one to bed. (John).

(John): I'm a little concerned that this field team six approach that you're suggesting still undercuts the point that both (Brian) and (Jeff) has made that you could get the smartest people on the planet together to think about this but what is their agenda. What is it that they need to address?

And if we go ahead and create this team right now essentially we are diminishing the strength of the call for a little insight before we begin deliberation. So I would be against you know having a team on call until we knew what they heck they were on call for.

Jonathan Robinson: Would anyone like to speak out because we've really got two issues to (speak about) and there's an opportunity for some sort of group that are ready to deal with the issue should they appear or this - yes, Thomas.

As much as I like the idea of forming group and I would be more than happy to work with that group, I think it's a little bit risky for us to put together a group that is expecting to deliver results and we don't have the fact base to work on.

And we've been asking for months and months to get information about the process as it (unintelligible) to (select) it, to see what the cost drivers are and where we need to streamline in order to improve it to meet the cut target which I fully agree with the previous speakers.

The (unintelligible) huge part of the community relying on the program to be implemented at a very low price. So we can either let go of quality features nor can we increase the price. I think that we'll have very detriment effect on the credibility of the program.

So I think we should wait for information first in order not to be the ones that don't deliver but once we have that information we should be working on that further.

Jonathan Robinson: I think we've got to be cognizant of Olaf's request to be on notice that we need to be - I mean, given the critical nature of where this sits in the process and whether we like it or not there may well be a need to respond urgently and effectively at the time.

So we need to have that in mind and the readiness and willingness. I've heard two or three or four volunteers already ready to go but it seems the balance is let's wait until we have all of the facts on the table. We really need to probably close this. (Alan), are you changing any element of that?

Alan Greenberg: I have a very short one. Olaf, if we're looking at things that should be done in the interim before we have any facts, one of them must be ICANN starts preparing to figure out how you're going to fund the difference in cost on an interim basis until we get experience with the process before we start changing what the rules are. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Sounds like a (puzzle) for the budget.

Olof Nordling: Okay. I take this as a request that we ask the providers to come up with the detailed costing of the process as they see it. I get back to you with that and we can go from there. Is that a kind of compromise? If you have a drafting team or volunteers in standby for something like that?

(Man): Yeah, that's what we've got.

Olof Nordling: Thank you. May I just add one more thing which has nothing to do with the URS but concerning a little exchange (unintelligible) in (Regina)'s council yesterday. The question how the selectee should occur and I responded to that question and I think that's been taken as a wholesale idea that well, all right, we have a noble (HRT) too which doesn't at all learn from its past and that's not what I said and it is (out of) context widely from what I said.

So I would like (unintelligible). Well, I believe and trust that we live and learning organization and whatever we do will to actually learn from that process and the mistakes and the advantages and the way we went forward and used that second round of such a process. So just to keep the record straight. Thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olaf. And I'm sorry this first item, we've got a relatively full agenda for this wrap-up session but I think we all recognize that this is one of the key items in the critical part of the (GTLD) program and it needs to be got right as soon as possible at the right price and compliant with existing policy if at all possible.

And I can't clearly to attend the session that follows. (Alan) scheduling issues prevail again in a sense that I think there's a half hour over that with the end of this session. Thanks again, Olaf.

Olof Nordling: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Right. So next on our agenda. I hope that most of you will have seen the agenda that was circulated or suggested in any way on the email list. It is up in the Adobe room as well. We needed to look at next steps on who is our key letter which I think (Brian) is going to help us with. Thanks, (Brian).

Brian Winterfeldt: Thank you, Jonathan. We haven't had a huge amount of movement since the last update at the GNSO working session over the weekend. I did circulate a rough draft which based on some of the good feedback I received was rougher than I even realized when I originally sent it.

But I have a revised version that I put together. I have received a bit more feedback from counselors which I'm incorporating into a new draft that I hope to send out by Monday. So I would just encourage any counselors who have additional thoughts or feedback beyond what's already been circulated on the list to please send that to me by tomorrow close of business.

In addition there has been updates to the chart that (Margie)'s making from at least one constituency. I'm not aware of any other movement with people's positions with regard to whether or not a PDP is required on any of the points in the report but there are additional movements beyond the one group that's already forwarded them to me.

I'd also ask (obviously) that be sent to me by tomorrow close of business as well and we're basically going with a letter format and we will be attaching - I apologize in the draft the circulator didn't have it - but we will be attaching the detailed chart so that the board will see essentially a summary of where the various constituencies are with regard to the different points.

And we'll also have an opportunity to look at the very detailed grade chart that was drawn up as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, (Brian). Any comments or other input?

Man: (Unintelligible) speaking. We became under pressure (unintelligible) this meeting and regarding that item because it was supposed that the board was going to take a position with IRT. So after having discussed with the board as well so I think they're going to postpone that position. The question is is there a timeline for that, what kind of pressure we have behind with that. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good and fair point. Yeah, (Brian).

Brian Winterfeldt: I think our understanding is the board said they're going to be acting at their next meeting which I believe is in a couple weeks so that's why we do want to try and get the letter to them early next week to give them time to review it and have time to consider it prior to their acting.

Jonathan Robinson: So it's slightly less urgent than we first thought but nevertheless get it sorted out so that's great.

Brian Winterfeldt: Right. So we're going to be voting on it today while we were sort of panicked and rushing and fortunately it did get postponed so we do have more time and this will hopefully give them time to really absorb out feedback.

Jonathan Robinson: So (Thomas) was there something on this still?

Thomas Rickert: No maybe I missed something. Will we take advantage of the little bit more time to try to reach more consensus positions?

I think we should maybe so, you know, finalizing the letter as it is one thing but also trying to maybe bring the groups closer to each other would be beneficial as well.

Man: (Unintelligible) would like to?

Brian Winterfeldt: (Thomas) that's a great point. I actually did start going down that path on a very - trying to do that very quickly again when we thought we had less time than we do.

It's kind of incredibly complicated. And I actually spoke to some of the board members and described kind of where we were at and what the feedback is going to look like.

And they really felt like at this point and as people brought up in other discussions previously we've had over the past week at this meeting with regard to the report from the Review Team that they felt like the - they've received, you know, direct feedback from some of the constituencies already.

They know that there's going to be this divide from the council. And frankly the amount of time and energy is going to take to get movement they felt like wouldn't be incredibly productive.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes Margie (unintelligible) but do follow-up (Thomas).

Woman: All right, go ahead.

Thomas Rickert: I guess what I'm trying to say is that, you know - I - if I remember correctly there were two positions on the privacy proxy subject where we had consensus, full consensus on one item. And I think on the other one there was just one may be. But apart from that everybody said yes.

So it might be beneficial to indicate in the letter that we're going to take action or even have taken action.

I think we would look extremely bad if the board as a consequence of the letter initiated or requested an issue report themselves.

So, you know, then we would show that we're unable to act and they would jump in. So I think where feasible we should be at the top of things and not in reactive mode.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay Margie?

Margie Milam: I think my comments kind of along these lines. I sent an email to the list pointing out that the letter only talks about whether a PDP should start or not. It doesn't talk to the substance of the issue.

And I think that's part of the, you know, sometimes when people look to the GNSO council that they expect to see is a separate issue on what does the council think about the recommendation as opposed to yes or no on a whether a PDP should start.

So if the letter's going to go in the format that (Brian) suggested I don't know - - and maybe we have more time -- if that's something that can be done or is that just entirely unfeasible?

You know, is council going to work to try to see whether there is some consensus on the actual recommendations themselves. Because that is something that's - useful to the board as opposed to, you know, PDP no PDP, you know, it's like it's not very substantive. I mean it's helpful, you know, from a process perspective but not really from a fundamental should these recommendations be adopted. So, you know, something to think about.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Margie. I know Wolf's in the queue here. I mean I'm sympathetic to that as a principle.

But my understanding of the discussion we had around this was which was pretty substantial was we went through it recognized that there was sufficient diversity of opinion, that it was measured and quantified in the various areas.

We actually discussed that and arranged that with the board when we saw them. And they said that's no problem. We understand that you're a diverse group.

And so my recollection of it is that we are not falling short of what is might be expected of us by synthesizing that and providing that a digestible format that diverse set of points.

So I'm - while I'm very sympathetic to this desire to act to be seen to act to be effective that's my - I'm - I just thought that we had done this pretty thoroughly and realize that in this instance if there is an action that we should take or a specific recommendation we could focus our thoughts on that so Wolf?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes fully agreed from my side as well. So I would like to not to repeat what you did in the public comment period, you know, already.

So the stakeholder groups and the constituencies we commented on that. We brought up our views on that. So and I don't see that there is something to add on top.

So why not could staff just structure that in that way and put it let me say in your report to the board on top of that what we are right now doing? We see recommendations about PDPs. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Margie yes.

Margie Milam: Yes. (Unintelligible) talking about is I understand, you know, most of the stakeholder group submitted comments during the public comment forum on the recommendation.

We would take those and put them in a chart and then it would talk about the substantive issue and may be act, you know, so kind to show the trends if

you well and the different stakeholder groups and constituencies so at least it's a, you know, some sort of consolidated thing.

You know, maybe it's not a, you know, a global whatever council consensus position. But at least, you know, it might provide a snapshot to the board on what's that, you know, what the thinking is within the various groups.

And so is similar to what (Brian) was doing on the very narrow issue of whether a PDP or not PDP. But, you know, you could say, you know, for recommendation one, you know, there was, you know, in the statements there was support.

And so there's no real work I guess that needs to be done from each of you. If you all just agree that that's a reasonable approach to take we could certainly do that from a staff perspective.

Jonathan Robinson: So this goes back to the essence of what we were talking about in terms of some sort of executive summary which says yes I thought that's what we agreed to.

Perhaps we all need to have a last look at either the letter that (Brian)'s writing and make sure that the cover letter and make sure that that works.

Or Margie are you suggesting that there's an additional component so yes, so you're going to prepare for us a synthesis that is that...

Margie Milam: On the substantive based on what was already published in the public comment forum. So it's going to look very similar to what you just saw for on the PDP issue.

But this is actually on the substantive issue of what the various groups think about for each recommendation.

And then, you know, the summary letter I'll take the same, you know, that (Brian)'s done or maybe we can work together -- whatever you prefer -- can synthesize the, you know, summary, you know, so that the board has something simple to look at as opposed to, you know, ten different statements or six different statements.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Can we (Brian) you want to say something?

Brian Winterfeldt: Right I was going to say that Wolf's suggestion is actually excellent and I think Margie's point is very good. And I'm happy to work with Margie.

And I think we could probably have one letter and probably two appendices, one being then PDP yes or no and then one being a synthesis of the substantive. And that way we're getting back to the board with a more complete picture.

Jonathan Robinson: Great that sounds fantastic. So if we could draw a line under it at this point and it sounds like we've got agreement on that.

(Unintelligible) we've got on the proposed agenda is the next steps on the IGO PDP and any ideas there might be for expediting these. Is (Barry) here to talk about this?

Berry Cobb: I thank you. Yes so the PDP was just approved yesterday as everybody realizes. And staff is already taking some steps to try to help in the expedition of the PDP.

First and foremost we've already started the first draft of the charter to try to help move things along. And we'll also in parallel be trying to put initial work plan together with some of the key milestones for all the requirements to meet the PDP.

Something else that we thought of and with the council's approval is one step within the PDP is to communicate out to all of the stakeholder groups and constituencies and go ahead and try to receive their comments so that we can have those ready for when the working group is formed or the drafting team and working group.

And last in terms of just trying to schedule the efforts of the PDP there's basically two options and it really kind of depends on the participants of the working group itself.

At the very minimum would recommend weekly meetings at least two hours. And depending on what the work plan is like and given the schedule we may even look to even have two meetings a week just to try to finish it up as quickly as possible.

And so basically those are the kind of the steps that we're taking now and we welcome other input from the council.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments? (Jeff)?

Jeff Neuman: So one of the things we could do is - and I haven't talked to the drafting team but maybe start with a merging of the drafting team with - a drafting team of the IOC Red Cross with new a drafting charter team I guess or the new charter for the IGO INGO PDP.

Although I'm not volunteering for chair I'm just saying, you know, it's a possibility to merge the two.

I also think that what's very likely to come out is a request. And I've talked about this with some drafting team members.

I'd like to get a budget from ICANN because I'd like to actually have an independent law firm and we can decide how we do this and make sure it's international.

But I'd like to hire a law firm to actually do the legal analysis, an independent one, one that does not report to ICANN that does not report to any player.

And I have no preconceived notions of which this would be to actually finally give us a legal opinion that we need on these issues specifically on the treatment of these two groups and the differential treatment of these two groups.

The two groups being the IOC Red Cross is one group or even those (two), that could actually be split too and IGOs and INGO's on the other hand.

The sooner we get the budget the sooner we start looking at law firms to do this I think the better. So I think ultimately in the end we can form this group all we want and we can have two hour discussions.

But until we get some authoritative legal analysis it's not going to go very far. So that's just one of my suggestions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Jeff). Go to Chuck and then (Olaf).

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan and welcome as new chair. The - two things, first of all let me follow-up with what (Jeff) just said. I think that's a really good idea.

Most of us were in the GAC session with the board earlier this week when this topic came up. And there's clearly an understanding at least by some members of the GAC that the law is absolutely clear on especially with the IOC Red Cross names. We need to answer with regard to other international names as well.

So I think (Jeff)'s suggestion is critical and the sooner that can get going the better.

Secondly and I'm sorry for not bringing this up yesterday during your council meeting but I didn't see a good opportunity so - and I missed it.

So but there the drafting team actually made some other recommendations that haven't been dealt with. And a (unintelligible) was communicating with the GAC.

And so we don't need to deal with that right now but we need to deal with it quickly. The goal was to explain to the GAC why we felt the PDP was necessary and what advantages of a PDP were and then also to invite their feedback in terms of our decision. That is a crucial step.

So again it doesn't have to be done here but I think you might want to at least initiate maybe a small group to get that so that response can be prepared and sent to the GAC as soon as possible.

Jonathan Robinson: It's very practical and appreciated suggestion Chuck. And I think, you know, it may have been possible had we not had our meeting with the GAC put aside but nevertheless we need to deal with it now.

(Jeff) is that something you would be willing to lead in terms of making sure communication happens or...

Jeff Neuman: I would be happy to be part of it. I think we're in an interesting stage right now because the drafting team recommendations are out for comment.

And I would not really like to act - I mean I don't know we could ask the group, do we act of recommendations that are out for comment while they're still out for comment?

We do that (unintelligible) but I view as kind of separate because that was already in the works. Chuck do you have a thought? I'm fine doing it and helping with that but...

Chuck Gomes: Sure and I'd be glad to help too but your point's well taken. But I think there's a little bit of work that's going to have to be done to solicit from GNSO participants in terms of the rationale for a PDP.

Some of it we are at a captured in the drafting team but we wanted to invite others to add to that.

So I think that collection of the rationale and beginning to formulate it could happen in parallel at the comment period goes on.

You wouldn't actually have to send the communication until after that's done. Does that make sense? Does that work?

Jonathan Robinson: It makes sense to me. Right I've got a queue of people that we need to make sure we deal with. First is I've got you up (David) and Margie (Mason) and (Thomas).

(David): Yes just wanted to say that I strongly support the idea we'll have next review of our law firm on this just to I think heading in the right direction.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (David).

(David): Yes pretty much the same thing. I've - I mean I've been following this issue since the beginning and the - it's become plainer and - as we - even as we learn more about the legal issues it's become clear it's also become obvious that there's a lot of, you know, quite unusual more that's quite difficult to untangle but we really do need some standard legal opinion.

I mean I think the Red Cross has been bringing to their credit have been bringing some quite some experts to help out.

It is unusual law. It may be difficult to find a law firm that really wants to, you know, is happy to delve into both humanitarian law and Internet law at the same time.

But let's try it. We really do need to get some clarity on some of these legal issues that are really not there at the moment.

Thanks (David). And Margie?

Margie Milam: On the question of whether to retain a law firm to do this it would seem that we would need some sort of formal request either by the GNSO Council or the drafting team.

But it's not, you know, hearing a couple voices saying that it's probably not enough for us to go out and actually spend the money.

So I don't know if that's something that, you know, you want to take a vote on or have, you know, and then we'll people will take it internally. But just, you know, I don't disagree with the approach.

I think, you know, the information is important and certainly part of the PDP process to gather the research when appropriate.

So it's not a question of challenging the request it's just trying to find an appropriate formal mechanism to do that so we can, you know, get the funds and do that, you know, initiate the work.

Jonathan Robinson: All right thanks Margie. I have a queue but I sense that you were you looking to respond directly to Margie's...

(David): Yes just another quick point I think it's you'll need a formal letter but I think you can help and get the budget and talk and think about the cost and think about the...

Margie Milam: Sure.

(David): ...(unintelligible) allocate.

Margie Milam: (Unintelligible) and do, you know, background work internally to get something like that set up knowing that we'll get something formal to request it.

(David): Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: Great thank you. (Mason)?

Mason Cole: Just from the registrar point of view I just want to say I think this is a sane plan to pursue. Given the history of the issue we had - we didn't have advise (unintelligible) from the GAC that said IGOs don't rise to the same standard as Red Cross. And the Olympic committee may. That's very likely to change.

I think if we - we need to justify the basis of our decision based on competent legal interpretation and not the claims of those who were interested. I just think it's a wise move for the council to take.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Mason). So hearing pretty good support for that, I'm hearing Margie said that she's going to start to socialize that internally and start to do some of the preliminary work but we will need to bring this back to council formally perhaps as soon as our next meeting. Margie?

Margie Milam: And on a separate issue we needed a liaison from the council for the drafting team over the - I guess it's now a working group, right for the PDP if we can nominate someone.

Jonathan Robinson: Any volunteers right now? (Stephan)?

(Stephan): Obviously not volunteering. But just wanted to remind you (Jonathan) that you also need to find someone for the ICANN Academy Working Group because I will not be continuing in that role.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Stephan). Yes?

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: (Mason)'s well I think we're looking for a liaison to...

Man: Oh to the GNSO or the GAC?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. All right so we go back to that item. The next two items we had were - which I think Rob - is Rob Hoggarth not here to address them. I think I - we need to just be aware that those were on the agenda was - I'm sorry, I deliberately left you off but you seem to have reentered.

Thomas Rickert: I know. No hard feelings though. In terms of communication this is sort of a follow-up to our discussion yesterday.

I think it's two different topics or layers one of which is the communication with the GAC. The other layer is the board response to the questions raised by the GAC to the board.

So I think that we should - we maybe (Jeff) or somebody else should be talking to the board in order to ensure that they make some clarifying statements in their response to the GAC's concerns about the PDP.

You know, to refresh your memory the GAC was of the opinion that sort of the PDP would now be used to mingle with loss that were existing. So I think there was some confusion or misunderstanding on why the PDP is needed.

And so I think that that should be the first step that we make ourselves heard and that some information on that is included in the board response.

And then afterwards, you know, once the recommended period is completed and stuff like that then we can do a substantial communication with the GAC directly.

Jonathan Robinson: Is the something which can be (unintelligible) by putting something down in writing as well as in discussion?

Thomas Rickert: The letter to the board you mean, could certainly be done. My proposal would be to talk to the board and ask them how they intend to respond. And if it's all well then there is no need for further action.

And if they would like us to add information to inform their response than we can put something together. Would you like me to take care of that or...

Jonathan Robinson: Yes sure. That would be - sorry (Thomas) that would be helpful.

Thomas Rickert: Okay and since I have no much more time than I expected until (unintelligible) yesterday I also volunteered to be the liaison to the academy unless somebody else wants to put his or her name forward.

Jonathan Robinson: Great having you on and thanks (Thomas). Wolfgang?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I support the idea to ask for external legal advice. But I think it's important if we ask for the advice that we formulate the very narrow question which would not go into the series of international organizations.

So I think there is an argument in the GAC which says, you know, these two organizations have a unique status which are different from all other intergovernmental law or nongovernmental organizations.

And the outside legal answer should refer to this very concrete (direction) whether this is true or not true.

And there is no need to have, you know, extensive studies about the legal status of - or the other organizations which are on the PDP.

I think the question is indeed whether there are some organizations are have the special status or whether all organizations, you know, are treated more or less on the same similar.

Jonathan Robinson: (Jeff)?

Jeff Neuman: Yes I agree. I think that's one of the questions. I think there's another question which is the distinction I made yesterday at the meeting which was its one thing to say that the law protects against certain uses of those names.

It's another thing to say that the law requires a registry or registrar to block the registrations of those names.

I happen to believe based on my legal experience in case law that I've read and certainly in the United States and in Belgium and in a number of other countries that I've actually personally had to litigate in that the loss does not require registry registrar to - or I should say it differently that a registry or registrar by merely acting as a registry or registrar in those jurisdictions is not contributorily liable for any kind of use that is made of those names.

So I think your question Wolfgang is absolutely right. We need to get that legal question answered.

But we also need to get the question answered as to what our registries and registrars required are not required to do.

Because the GAC made a statement or some members of the GAC made a statement kind of I think confusing the two. Because even if the law requires - protects against certain uses it's a different question.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, great argument. Bertrand I'm - go ahead.

Man: Sorry good morning. I just happened to pass by the door. The moment I heard this I took the opportunity to share one concern.

On a (unintelligible) as a board member one (piece) that I sense in this debate is that we're at the danger of going in the direction that will be extremely uncomfortable for the board in particular.

Because if the two tracks continue basically one on the GAC side and one on the GNSO side getting into the legalese very, very deeply want to lose track of what is the purpose of the discussion which is basically to make sure that there is no abuse of those names and any non-registration is a tool.

And it should not become just a matter of principle. It should be organized around the appropriate use of whatever series of letters are concerned.

But if we continue the two tracks without enough discussion on both sides the board will be left with basically a sort of rock and a hard place situation where there will be two very strong recommendations on both sides. And it will be extremely hard to re-harmonize them.

And so what I would like to encourage everybody to think about is to focus an asset that to be absolutely transparent. I've said that to the IGOs that have approached me as board member to talk about this. And I said that to GAC members.

The focus is on preventing abuse. And protection is a tool but it cannot solve anything but it should not be overused.

And so the encouragement is to develop as much as possible the contacts between the IGOs, the GAC members and the community NTAG and the GNSO.

Thus include doing whatever legal inquiry you want. But the goal is to focus on what is the purpose. And the purpose is to make sure that those terms are not used inappropriately like the others and there are many pragmatic solutions that can be achieved.

We have a period of six months until Beijing. And I encourage very strongly dialogue among those different actors to see whether they are pragmatic steps, even voluntary steps that could be taken to alleviate the pressure and show the common commitment to the interest of users and the global interest. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. I know we've got a couple - we've got (Jeff) and Chuck. I mean unconscious that we are - we - the time set is going to sandwich us and we're going to have to take a hatchet to the remainder of the agenda.

But I think that, you know, we're dealing with some pretty important issues here with the URS with this particular issue as well. So let's hear from (Jeff) and then Chuck.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Bertrand. Is he still here or did he leave?

Bertrand de la Chappelle: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Oh sorry. You know, I'd be curious to know what recommendations you have so that we can - I know it's on two tracks.

We've tried to reach out to the GAC. We've tried to get them to work with us. You know, it - unless and until they work with us or they allow us to work with them it's going to proceed on two tracks. There's just no other way around it.

I would love to work with them. I've had separate conversations with individuals from the GAC but, you know, I don't see a way around the two tracks.

I understand we could focus on preventing abuse. But I mean many here would argue that we've been working on preventing abuse in the names. That's how we came up with the URS and all the other stuff there.

Bertrand de la Chappelle: Sorry I don't want to belabor. This is not about saying don't do it. It's your responsibility, you make the choice. That's not the point.

The point is that you know that any kind of disputed situation even on a (unintelligible) basis you can escalate the kind of how do you say, the lawyers talking to lawyers that develop their case until it's impossible to harmonize.

The acts that are to be taken into account and discussed with are not only the GAC, it's the IGOs themselves.

And that they don't necessarily understand every nook and cranny of this whole thing. They don't even understand sometimes what's the current situation in the existing TLDs.

And so engaging with them to show that there is an understanding of their concern but that sometimes they can be overstating some of the rights that they think they have and focusing on what is the purpose is my recommendation.

Jonathan Robinson: Well I understand your point Bertrand. You're advocating diplomacy and worried that diplomacy might be a casualty of bringing in legal advice or in case we've got to proceed with caution and how we handle that. So I think it's - but the challenge is how to do that do that but there we go Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes and I'll be brief, Chuck Gomes again. I'm all for dialog and I think most of you know that and dialogue with the GAC included as well as IGOs and Red Cross and IOC, et cetera.

In the case of the GAC there's a position being taken that it's all covered by law. So there's no question it shouldn't even be a PDP.

And until we resolve that issue I don't know if they'll even talk to us. They might not anyway. But the (unintelligible) I think it's really important if it's possible to get the independent legal advice.

Now it doesn't only apply to the GAC's position with regard to IOC and Red Cross names. It also applies to the IGOs and in the international names were considering in this PDP.

I (unintelligible) said all the IGO submissions, the Red Cross and the IOC submissions, the GAC submissions, the board analysis all that, I mean they all sound pretty convincing but frankly they don't all agree.

And we really need that if we can get it, some independent view. I'm not an attorney. I'm certainly not familiar with international law and a lot of you are in the same boat as me. And so for an effective PDP I think this is a critical piece.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. I mean we've got a number of more sort of administrative items and some substantive items that we need to deal with. We'll go through those.

And I'm basically going to very briefly talk to each one. I know (Alan) wanted to say something. I know (Thomas) wanted to say something. This is a substantial issue. We've had some great input on some of the mechanisms by which we should deal with it.

It seems to be pretty strong support for this, the formal legal analysis. I know it goes to theme we've talked about before which is basing policy based work on substantial and relevant information. So (Alan) is there anything more you'd like to say on this? And then (Thomas) that we really have to go into a wrap-up of the wrap-up. Yes?

Alan Greenberg: Yes and this is very short. In discussions with a number of GAC people as recently as this morning at breakfast there seems to be an increasing understanding in the GAC that they need to get involved in the policy development process, not just toss documents over the wall after it's (unintelligible). That's encouraging.

I'm - I don't think they know how to do it but there seems to be a belief they must do it. So that's a better prognosis than we had before.

Jonathan Robinson: (Thomas)?

Thomas Rickert: Thank you. I just wanted to take advantage of the fact that Bertrand is still in the room. We were planning to approach the board to make sure that an answer to the concerns raised by the GAC was informed by us, you know, so because he will get back to the GAC on this specific point.

So I think in terms of your diplomatic approach we could piggyback with you and take that as a starting point and explain why we need this PDP.

It's not just about protection. Regardless how that -what the protection ultimately will look like but to make the GAC understand that an exemption

process may be needed which would be covered by the existing rules for reserve names.

And so I think we might be able to open the door a little bit in collaboration with you. And should you be the person inside the board that was willing to, you know, help us with this let me know. It would be greatly appreciated.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thanks (Thomas) (unintelligible) I mean I think you Bertrand for being here actually because it's great to have your involvement and engagement outside of simply, you know, board GNSO liaison.

And that's one of the things that's concerned us in the past is that we have these kind of semi-polarized discussions with the board. And this kind of level of interaction is great.

Everyone I meet it's seven minutes to 12:00. I have a hard stop at 12:00. I suspect many others of you do as well.

So I'm going to talk to the items on the agenda. I'm going to ask you not to intervene unless you absolutely have to and just try and bring this lot to a close.

As I said at the outset I - it was slightly sprung upon me to chair this. I mistook (Stephan)'s humor for an actual commitment to chair this meeting.

So but I think we, you know, these clearly URS and this topic we've just been discussing are substantial important critical topics. So I don't think it was wrong to spend a lot of time on them.

Some of the other areas we've got coming down the tracks are clearly that Rob wanted to talk to us a little bit about My ICANN.

We saw that. I know it's close to Fadi's heart but we did see that in in his opening speech. I'm sure we'll hear more about that through Sally and others.

The council review I attended a session this morning just prior to this meeting that was run by (Ray).

I think he recognizes whilst it's important to get things moving and understand what the implications of undertaking the review process I think he is as cognizant as many of us are that we've got a lot on our plate.

So whilst the importance of it is recognized we need to work within the time constraints and everything else we're trying to do.

So it's there and it's on the agenda but there are some rather more urgent things to be dealing with right at the very minute.

But so some - we'll come back to that though on the draft - on the status of the drafting team on the list. We need to pick up on the defensive registrations and there's a board request on that, Wolf's work on the ATRT selections, certainly management of policy workload and privatization which is something that Margie had put under it.

But I don't know if you want to say anything about that Margie but I intend to work with staff and with council and staff to pick up on our existing project workload, look at mechanics and methods.

And I'll be very, you know, I've already tapped (John) on the shoulder and I'll be looking to others of you about any methods or thoughts you have whether it's, you know, traffic light systems, hands in the air systems -- whatever it is to try and organize our priorities rather than simply have a work list that we - we're working with.

We get a request here on assigning someone to manage the GNSO schedules for Beijing. My understanding is that typically fallen on the shoulders of the vice chairs but we can - we will need to look at that pretty soon.

Great well (Mason)'s just indicated he'll be happy too which would be very, very much appreciated by myself, staff and others I'm sure.

One of the things I did want to cover very briefly with you now was setting up the upcoming GNSO council meetings.

We have a set of about three meetings between now and - or set of meetings between now and the end of the year that are predetermined.

Personally I'd like to look at the 12 months ahead schedule. We got a little bit - we got ourselves a little bit of a twist around summer this year.

I'd like to have a mapped out schedule for the next 12 months so that we all know exactly where we stand and get that agreed.

How in the next council meeting could someone remind me? And I think that's coming up relatively soon.

Woman: (Unintelligible) again?

Jonathan Robinson: All right so I - my - 16th, 15th. So that's almost a month away. I'm tempted to stick with that rather than start risking the changing people's schedules now.

So my suggestion to you is that we stick with the schedule of meetings. But please come back to me if there's any - or and Glen if there are any issues with the meetings between now and Christmas.

But as I say I'll be proposing a set of meetings probably right up through the whole of calendar year '13 just to make sure we've got a view of where we're heading on all of this as soon as possible and people's diaries are set.
(John)?

(John): Well I would agree that we keep the November 15 in the December 20 because there are a number of things that we want to expedite. The consumer trust discussion needs to happen pretty quickly.

So I wouldn't want to lose one of those meetings in order to - but after the first of the year whatever.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. The 20th of December. And so really that's - so we will work to those. I couldn't agree with you more. I think we've got have two meetings between now and the end of the year with everything that's on our schedules.

I mean I guess it just remains the one question I had was about brainstorming. We clearly did the brainstorming at the beginning of this meeting. It seemed to be quite useful. It got us in a mode of working early on.

So we can discuss that on list. But I'll be tempted to keep that in that order next time around and be good to hear from you on that.

I think the last thing I'd just say is thank you again for the trust you've put them in voting for me. I know there was some challenging discussions. And it was very, very clear that, you know, (Thomas) is an extremely well qualified candidate.

Either of us it was said to me on many occasions could do and could have done a good job.

I sincerely hope I won't let you down. And I'll be relying on the support of, you know, this extremely well qualified council of individuals to pull together and work as effectively as we can.

Because that's the kind of promise I have made is effective prioritization, useful productivity and effective engagement outside of the council. And those are really my sort of three strategical thematic things that I think we'll have to be working with. But really I very much look forward to working with you all and thanks. I think we've had a successful meeting. Are there any other points before we wrap up?

Woman: We also need a volunteer for the Whois working group, a liaison?

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible).

Man: Since I'm a member of that group anyways I will take over that role.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: (Unintelligible) inform you I was just told I've been reappointed as liaison for next year.

Jonathan Robinson: Wonderful (Alan). All right thanks everyone. I hope the rest of your day is successful. We'll look forward to meeting online and in the corridors over the last few hours and of course see you all in person in Beijing. Thanks again.

END