

**ICANN Brussels Meeting
VI PDP WG Meeting with the Council
TRANSCRIPTION
Sunday 20 June at 0900 local**

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 call is being recorded.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Welcome everyone to our next session for the GNSO and this one is to have a report from the vertical integration PDP working group that has been holding I think two meetings a week for quite a while and lots of other stuff going on.

They've had some interesting sessions that some of us have seen a little bit of this weekend. So looking forward to this report and I'm hoping and I think that in talking to Mikey that there should be plenty of time for interaction as well.

Now I do want to go over a few things and sorry some of you will hear these several times today. But there are probably new people in each session so we do have a meeting protocol that we're using here in Brussels that has been evolving for a while. First of all, our sessions are open to everyone as I think you know. These are not - these weekend sessions are not official GNSO Council meetings and no council decisions are made in these meetings.

As far as seating as you can tell, councilors are asked to sit around the table and other key individuals like in this case the co-chairs of the working group staff support for not only the council but for the working groups. We're going to follow a pattern where we'll give the opportunity for councilors to ask questions and make comments first.

But we will also then if time permits allow comments and participation from the audience as well. In that regard, Glen, do we have a mic for that purpose? Okay. So we will have a mic available for that and would ask that if you do want to participate from the audience when that opportunity is given that you would come up to near behind where Jaime and Stephane are there at the bottom of our U table set up here and speak from there so that most people can see you when you're speaking.

I will try and monitor the time in terms of control. In all cases I encourage you when we're having the open discussion here to keep your comments as brief as possible and to the point so that we give opportunity for as many as possible who would like to speak. And we'd also like to give preference to different people speaking.

So with that said, let me turn it over to Mikey and maybe say first to both of you for being willing to co-chair this. This is just an easy task, right? No problems? So thanks and I think everybody who has volunteered and spent a lot of time on this working group so far and is continuing to do so. That is very much appreciated. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Chuck. This is Mikey O'Connor along with my co-chair Roberto Gaetano. Looking into the audience, it's great to see a lot of people - getting a second channel of audio, which is (confusing). Okay - from a closed (computer).

So my plan is to take you very quickly through a status update and encourage you to essentially give us because Roberto and I are not here to debate issues with you or to get into a debate. We'll probably tend to encourage folks from the working group to respond to questions of that nature rather than us. We very much want to hear comments on this but like I said, a fair amount of time (unintelligible). So with that, Marika, if you could push the slide forward one.

Some of these slides are from the very early days of the working group when we were trying to figure out how to tackle this. And I decided that just for a sort of historical record it (unintelligible). We had a bunch of interesting scope questions to deal with, a bunch of process questions as well as target dates that were startlingly (pushed aside).

I'm not going to actually go through some of these. Some of these are sort of documenting our process for ourselves. But what we wound up arriving at was sort of two PDPs for the price of one, which we are doing an incredibly fast run through the formal PDP process in order to try and get our results back to the council.

This document formally known as (DAG) (unintelligible) - but we have a lot of uncertainty in terms of the (amount) - for example the (other five) - all of these assumptions are certainly out the window. This is a project with a fair number of degrees of uncertainty. Based on assumptions that will be no (B5) after certain dates on that basis.

So to the next slide Marika. It gives you a picture that we drew of the process that is essentially wrapping up here in Brussels. This is the first half - very fast. So we just want you to be aware of the fact that this isn't a random process. This is executing again and for the most part we are on schedule. Probably about three or four weeks late but given the ground that we have covered Roberto and I are quite comfortable (with that).

If you go to the next slide Marika, again, a pie chart that I don't want to take you through but just to let you know that there is a plan (for this) after Brussels that will probably launch but there is a key contingency and right at the end of this. Marika, if you could go then to the next slide, we'll make sure that you and I are still in synch.

I wanted to just spend a minute - this is a personal slide. I wanted to take just a minute and the working group - we're taking a process that normally takes 450 days, 500 days to take the Whois and compress it down into (180). We have a very unusually large group of members who work incredibly well and given the difficulty of this issue, work with (grace and humor and good reception).

The occasional (scuffle) but for the most part pretty collegiate. We have been following an approach where individuals and groups have proposals, the wiki, I think we have 12 but there are multiple drafts of those. Everybody is a little bit overwhelmed by the email volume. It struck me - there is a language barrier when - that which might want to be - because basically (1000) emails were not all (status updates types of emails) tightly written, simply thought through - almost brief (I guess).

Most of the email was very substantive so on top of the volume the person also had to (be working) and it's very hard for them (sometimes). As Chuck mentioned, we have been meeting twice a week for the last three weeks almost totally out of control but not quite out of control (during the meeting for) four hours yesterday morning.

We are working very hard. This is a group that is very dedicated. If you can push forward, Roberto and I both have connections to chemistry. Roberto works for the Atomic Energy and was (unintelligible) - (the analogy) is that the proposals that we have been seeing going through the working group are molecules comprised of atoms.

One of the things that we did in our meeting yesterday is we took a step back from the proposals and tried to isolate well, what are the major atoms? What are the major issues? What are the big components? The slide that's on the screen now is the result of that discussion. They're arranged not by priority but just clumped by sort of topics.

We touch on a couple of interesting things. The first interesting thing that I want to point out is that the (top brand) atom is basically shared across pretty much everybody in the working group is that the situation with the clients and enforcement presents us as policymakers as very difficult.

There are a number of policy instances that have come forward in which conversation is this will work but are we confident that the ICANN (enforcement for clients function) because if that isn't there then we are concerned that we are - so I'm not exactly sure how that will find its way (into the proposal) but I wanted to bring it (into today's meeting) because I think as other working groups report this might be a theme.

The other three clumps are clearly lots of facets having to do with cross ownership issues. That's the core of our mission here. Two other things that will undoubtedly be a part of - there is a very deep conversation going on now (on sections for policy exemption) (unintelligible). (They're a gaggle in agreement).

How those get handled clearly is something that the group (unintelligible). The final clump has to do with whether or not this is huge (unintelligible) - (that this institution will be rolled out). There is a lot of conversation about that and (what people have to say). Note that I'm being fairly careful not to tell you what those things are.

But that's partly because we're closer to done but we're not done yet to have the final answer. This is a status update and not - that said, what we did yesterday after we broke the molecules, we did do an exercise yesterday morning and (we have) the result of that conversation. But before we go to those slides I want to (go through this) ad hoc exercise just to say (and share this with you) to talk to us about (certain things that) have to be considered.

Okay Marika, go ahead. So yesterday we reassembled our ends and created two molecules that were - so I want to go through all the fine print. The fine

print is really more for the working group than it is - this process is so fast we basically sort of self documented as we go. There are wikis, there are photographs of flip charts that we made yesterday.

But with that, let me just run through the - one big topic of discussion is whether or not - (unintelligible) - control versus ownership of - control, there will not be control irrespective of ownership. The (molecule is also saying) there is a 15%. At the bottom there has clearly been a lot of discussion (of that). A pretty extensive discussion of (at least one section for registrants single) - defining terminology.

One way to think about this is (to take) - (rather than talk about the way we develop the gTLD registrants). That organization does not distribute - final big facet of discussion yesterday - don't really want to present this to you - what our work project is starting to look like. We're very engaged but we're not going to.

So the final slide is really the choice that we face when we change. If we come out of Brussels with just absolutely no way that we can get (the symptoms). It's shut down (at first at very high speed). (They can take a usual 15 months). That's one possible outcome. Another is that we're making pretty substantial progress but we need more.

That's the difficulty with that is that we're very aligned with the do not delay with the gTLD roll out. (Unintelligible) - favorite choice and when we checked amongst ourselves yesterday that we think we're going to get there. We think we're going to get there fairly soon, probably not this week (unintelligible).

Launch the second half of this rapid one, which is we need to go through another round of public comments. In other words - a lot of details that will (undoubtedly) - all of that will happen over the course of several more months. Our goal is still to be able to deliver you an interim of course - reporting to you from a status standpoint. Roberto, do you have anything?

Roberto Gaetano: Just a quick thing. While Mikey was talking we used this - we used a lot of nuclear energy in these analogies. It's true that I work for the International Atomic Energy Agency but I work in programming in IT.

And so there is one thing, one analogy that I would like to make between this process and the modern software development techniques. I'm thinking about the scrum as a methodology for where you go - you identify the limits of the first version of the application you want to develop and you go to several points and then you try to narrow them down and you present the prototype. And then the prototype is okay half okay but it needs work. And so you go back to the element and you develop the element and then you come up with a second prototype and that's basically the process that we are using. So we have identified what we call the atoms, which are the sticky points and we are discussing on the points.

And when we have a certain level of consensus then we say okay, what's the molecule that we can build with these atoms and that is the prototype. We circulate that and then somebody is happy, somebody less and then we identify what more work has to be done and then we go back to the drawing board and the next cycle.

So the molecule that Mikey has presented, that is the prototype. That is not satisfactory at this point in time so we go back to the atoms and we'll be working in the next days on the atoms and then bring another prototype of molecules and that will go on. And the last bit I wanted to add is that in the discussion yesterday I was just noticing how important this compliance is.

I realize that everybody has worries about the compliance and the ability of ICANN to enforce compliance. And I was thinking gee, my employer has established rules and enforces and checks the rules. And for establishing rules we have about 20 lawyers that design the international treaties that they then propose to the member states and so on.

And there is this kind of effort and then finally once we have the international treaty in place we have the compliance, the equivalent of the compliance, which is the inspectors who verify the compliance and those are ten times more than the lawyers. And I don't have the impression that this is the situation that we have in ICANN.

Mikey O'Connor: Roberto is also the master of understatement. Okay. That's it for us. We have Chuck, you can manage our time for us but we would very much like to hear testimony from you. Quiz us on the atoms in the molecules and call on our friends. And Roberto and I are - love to talk in analogies. It's our job to make sure that that process continues terribly.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. What I'm going to do is I'll open up the queue. Before I do that I want to make a - especially with regard to timing. If I'm correct on that assumption is (right there).

The assumption is correct that there probably will not be an (unintelligible) - (way too late to not cause delays). But I do think that (it's hard to hear recommendations and) - but that being said then a couple of solutions that have quite a bit of support, I think that's good news. I'm not suggesting that a better solution - but because the time is even more compressed if I'm correct in my analysis, that would still be good information.

(Unintelligible) - my comments in regard to that - I don't know - question first (unintelligible). Much of the schedule is driven by - (so let me see here). And that's probably not one that we - (unintelligible). My thought is to get to (initial) - thank you. We have Adrian, I have Alan, I have Ken, Stephane. So thank you for that. That doesn't change my assessment. I still think that probably causes delays. So now I'm opening up and Adrian is first.

Adrian Kinderis: Thanks Chuck. Adrian Kinderis. So I'm just trying to get my head around all this and I appreciate how eloquently you put everything and I also appreciate that you (said that when comments need to be made) - I'm just trying to think.

Rolling the clock forward, we get this report, I check my email whether it's finished, what do I see content wise as far as what the actual outcome is? One is where you are right now is it going to be a number of different solutions or one because if it's a number I don't understand what are we voting on? If there is a solution you can give us as a council we'll vote on that and we'll put that to the board.

If it's a number of solutions I don't see where we have room to go and why we would need a comment period. And I don't understand the process with the different strategies. I think if you can elaborate on that.

Chuck Gomes: Well, let me tell you where we would like to be, basically where you want us to be.

Adrian Kinderis: Right where you are now as chair or co-chair or junior chair, right now do you believe that that is possible?

Chuck Gomes: I think it is.

Adrian Kinderis: Because I'm talking to many of the members of that group and they are adamant there is no way you can do it.

Chuck Gomes: Well, if that's true then we're done really.

((Crosstalk))

Adrian Kinderis: And you did say that. I do acknowledge that.

Chuck Gomes: There are three choices. You and I, we adamantly do not (get it).

Adrian Kinderis: It does concern me and I don't know if it's anecdotal and you can take it for what it is but in speaking to some of the members of the working group when you say (so vehemently).

Chuck Gomes: No, there is no (unintelligible).

Man: Just a quick response, yes we don't have consensus on the full solution now. We didn't reach it yesterday. At the end of the session, of the four-hour session I was asking the question to (the group) and said who thinks that we have going forward now that we are in a better position now than we were when you left your home to come to Brussels?

And everybody said aye. So I think that we are moving. If you think that we are going to get within a reasonable amount of time to a full, complete solution that will solve all the problems and will be the happy idea of solutions for everybody, this is not going to happen. The people that have given you feedback on that, they were right.

But what we are trying to do here is draw a scenario by which assuming as baseline the no vertical integration that is the baseline that the board has given, whether we can have some limited case in which everybody is comfortable that we can allow some sort of integration. And I think that in a limited number of cases we have the possibility of reaching a consensus of the team.

Now the question and I'm positive on this. I'm absolutely convinced where we may differ now in the working group in terms of analysis and estimates is how expensive those cases are because a lot of people in the working group would like to have a general solution that will abolish the separation and there are other people who are absolutely adamant saying that in no way we can have any exceptions.

Those are the extreme views but I'm confident that we are approaching a situation by which we can introduce some elements in this run. And then the question mark of whether a more complete study, that includes the economic study, that includes and can bring further down the road to a second round. But we are contemplating on the first round now.

Adrian Kinderis: Put it like that, that sounds achievable yes. And I appreciate the way you put it.

Chuck Gomes: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: A quick comment on the previous discussion but it blends into the next one. When we talk about consensus at ICANN we have 49,000 different versions of it. And it becomes important to be precise.

And are we talking about a unanimous consensus, full consensus, a general consensus with a few minority reports attached to it? I don't think any of those is better or worse but I think we need to be precise. And my other comment is very much in the same line and I'll give an example but it's not limited to this.

Part of what you said might be in the registrant case or whatever the wording was that the organization that gets it would not be allowed to distribute domains to outside parties. When you say things like that if you can clarify it now, fine. But in general when you say things like that it's important to be precise. And in that case are you talking about distributing second level domains or any domain? There is a difference between the two.

Normally within ICANN and within the gTLD program we are only looking at second level and what you do at the third level is always your business. I'm not sure if you're prescribing or the group is allowing or being more rigid for the single registrant or not. So I think it's important when we put out reports or put out comments and I'm part of the working group, that we be precise so

there is no option for interpretation and we don't have two people agreeing to something where they each have different understandings of it.

Chuck Gomes: Tim.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah. Just kind of going back to your question about whether there is any room in the comment period to shorten those things up, I would adamantly oppose that concept.

This thing is going pretty fast. And in fact so fast that there is really little substantive discussion about the real issue. And then we were talking earlier about the public interest with the review team and really all this has really been is a debate and negotiation between competing interests in this whole application process.

Very little substantive discussion about the actual harms that have been brought up or some of the issues that have been brought up in the different economic analyses or even the more recent ones. So to then take that further and cut the public out by shortening the comment period I think would be a huge mistake. And it brings into question the validity of the results of this working group completely in my opinion.

So I would highly discourage going down that road. And just that in regards to the delay, there should be no delay. The board has had the resolution that there be no vertical integration. The interpretation of that by the staff is in the Version 4 of the draft applicant guidebook. So the guidebook is there, more or less complete. So let's just move forward. If this group completes and has something that is substantive that can be acted upon in time, great.

If not, not. So I don't think there is any question of delaying the applicant guidebook. To me that is not an issue. That's going to be completed regardless of what this group does or doesn't do. And so I hope that continues to be the view of the board and the staff.

Chuck Gomes: Stephane.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks. So this I think is a clear example of where even within one group you can have widely dissenting views. And the view that Tim has just put forward for example, is probably not the view that everyone within our group would have.

But that's what you're having to deal with on a daily basis within your group. And you asked a question earlier on. Adrian likes to first of all be nice and then hit people on the head. I prefer to do it the other way. So I'll start by being unpleasant and say that I really don't think the group is working fast enough.

I think the group is working incredibly hard but as you know, as council liaison in our private meetings, leadership meetings from the side, I have said you have a charter in front of you. It's your job as co-chairs to make sure the working group works within that charter. And one of the clear objectives there, one of the clear statements from the charter, which I helped draft, was that there should be no delays.

So I do not think you should be coming to the council now and asking the question of whether more delays are acceptable because your instructions from the council were very clear. Having said that, now comes the nice bit. I think really you have to be commended both you two and the group in general have been working to reach consensus.

I would disagree with what Adrian has said earlier on, from what people are telling him. I don't know who he has been talking to. I would say my own feeling is that you are close to consensus and the document that was sent to the VI earlier on today and that you just put up on the slides, which was done by a member of the group and not yourselves, shows that we're on the way to consensus.

So I would just like to know if you really echo that feeling. But my feeling is that by meeting twice a week, putting in so much time and I think the council really needs to understand how much time and effort. You gave a short presentation saying there had been more than 2000 emails since the group has started. Mikey, Roberto, I believe you have read every single one of those emails.

So just for that you deserve a medal. Do you feel my assessment of being close to consensus is correct? And if so, why can you not provide a report before September?

Roberto Gaetano: You know what is my worst nightmare in terms of our schedule to go to consensus? And I'm telling you this openly. My fear is the dip in commitment that is traditionally coming at the end of a face to face meeting.

So when we get to the end of Brussels people will go back home and they have achieved so much, they have done so much that they deserve kind of a period of decompression and distressing. Some people who have made long trips might stay here in Brussels or in Europe for a few days and it will be very difficult from our part to bring together the working group on the day after we come back from Brussels.

And then we have what is traditionally the holiday season in Europe and that is my biggest concern. If the working group, if the members of the working group can hold to the type of commitment that they have shown in the last month and we can continue from the day after the end of the meeting - okay, two days after the end of the meeting in Brussels, then yes we can achieve consensus.

But the problem is that it's going to be very difficult to deny to the people that have been working so hard in the last three months the possibility of taking a

period off. We have to continue and we can take off the moment that we have the final report that is going around.

Mikey O'Connor: Let me chime in as well. This is Mikey. Two points - one, you have to keep going back to this rapid prototype. Will we come to a prototype? For sure. Will it be soon? For sure. Will the September date - clarify the date that we have?

In order to make a September date where we have gone through the public comment cycle, etcetera, etcetera, we need to have (commitment of the group) - or we're late. But we have a very narrow window in which we (can arrive at consensus). That said, how confident am I?

Adrian Kinderis: I'll just come back with one point. Sorry - this is. I think the board has made it clear and this may not have been the council's intent when the working group was started. But the bag (B4) solution, they expect you as a working group to provide us with the means to provide them with a different solution.

That is the goal you must work towards and it's not acceptable for me personally to consider the fact that the (B4) solution could stay in there because.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. We've got about 15 more minutes. I have Kristina in the queue and (before I give - it's really hard). And I've got Tim as well and I would ask you please - although I don't want to turn this - that was going to happen. So let's go ahead, Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: I'll be fast. First, Tim said a lot of what I was going to say about trying to shorten - outside of ICANN land watching what this particular working group in which the members are determined - are watching. And I would very strongly urge - and will also tell you right now that I will do everything I can to block that kind of proposal.

Second, I just want to kind of note for the record that I'm a little concerned after having been a member of the working group - of a single registrant, single (leader) model that what is being identified as coming out of the meeting (out of ten) - haven't had a chance to review it. But I'm just putting the marker down that (I need to do that).

Mikey O'Connor: (Representing that) (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: I just wanted to clarify the notion that that's the footnote it said at the bottom of 1.9 (in there). And it says and talks about the board retreat in Dublin in May 2010 but it was said to the board that one, the draft proposed strict limitations on cross ownership of domain names (unintelligible); two, a very strict interpretation that these resolutions might create unintended consequences; three, staff should reduce language in the agreement matching a minimum approach, blah, blah, blah;

Four, the board encourages community input and comment on the correct approach for these issues in the absence of GNSO policy and five, the board will review this issue again if no GNSO policy results in this topic. So it is not a matter of if this will be resolved (or not). I want to make that quite clear because I think that there was (the opinion) that if we don't find an answer we can just (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. You're absolutely right Adrian to factor that in.

Alan Greenberg: Good point Adrian but at least there is a process. We should not delay the (unintelligible).

Tim Ruiz: I just want to comment that as councilors when we look at this, I'm just a little concerned with some of Stephane's comments and hopefully maybe he can clarify. But that his direction to the chair or junior chairs was his personal

viewpoint and not the direction of the council. Don't get those two things mixed up.

Stephane Van Gelder: I started my sentence by saying on a personal level. So I think that was clear.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. If there is anybody else who would like add their view to this, arguing pros and cons of different (items)? I probably did and he doesn't like that at all. I'm sure you two could have a good debate on that. My apologies. Right here between Stephane and Jaime (unintelligible).

The comments to within as possible a certain (amount of time). Okay. Would you come up here please like I said to where Glen is?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Do I have to? Can you all see me here?

Chuck Gomes: I would like you to come up to right in the middle of the...

Eric Brunner-Williams: This is Eric Brunner-Williams. I have a question actually clarifying - working groups tasked to create by the policy recommendations for. Is the working group tasked to create and provide a policy recommendation for an imaginary type of application, one having no registrars?

Chuck Gomes: I don't think that the charter of the - possible alternatives to what's on the table right now.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Milton, I think you wanted in the queue?

Milton Mueller: Yeah. I didn't hear your report Mikey because I wasn't here yet. But I did hear Stephane. My name is Milton Mueller. I'm at Syracuse University. I did hear

Stephane characterize the proposals in the list as representing - yesterday there were three groups.

One of them really did not work out a molecule or proposal (a bit). Only one of those proposals has been submitted to the list. One of the proposals, the group I was in with I think Jeff Neuman was the recorder and I don't - that proposal had significant differences and in many ways was more liberal than - I don't think the differences are irreconcilable but there are still significant differences.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Let me quickly clarify that. This is a good example of sort of just in time work where the request from me went to the recorder, the crews at 4pm yesterday. They worked late at night.

So just to restate, I did sit there and debated with myself as to whether to even put this in and I decided to put it in because it represented an example. I'm very excited about something. I'm not sure.

Chuck Gomes: Are you finished?

Stephane Van Gelder: This is Stephane. I think I was trying to...

Chuck Gomes: Hang on Stephane. Jeff, you're next.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Hi. This is Jeff Neuman. Just a short comment not about the substance but maybe to put Kristina at ease because Mikey made a statement and it generated some worry.

No one in the working group before or even now recommended that we do away with the public comment period or make it shorter. That has never been discussed in the working group. I know how things kind of do - you might leave this meeting and then go rush to your groups and go oh my god, this is going on.

It's not going on. It's not a request. It's never been before the working group so I hope that issue dies here (quickly).

Chuck Gomes: Stephane.

Stephane Van Gelder: Yeah. Thanks. Those two - both comments made by non-councilors just now I think show that there is clear communication problems here. Milton said I characterized something as being close to consensus. I was asking a question of the two co-chairs.

So I don't think asking a question is characterizing anything. And now Jeff has just mentioned the comment period. Mikey was asking a question of council. He wasn't saying we should do away with. He was asking a question unless I'm wrong, Mikey. You correct me if I'm wrong - saying is this a way to get to objective? That's all.

So one of the problems with a 60-odd person group is that people need to listen to each other and if they don't then you get into problems.

Chuck Gomes: As junior co-chairs go, let me point out how much listening has been going on. That's the reason there have been 2000 emails. (Quite diverse, quite diverse). But Margie, could I ask you to look up the (bylaws) real quickly for the process that we're working under, (if they are in this)?

And I just want to communicate to everybody what we are under right now in terms of bylaws is.

Woman: I actually was looking at it when he started talking about it. There are two public comment periods, the initial one we have already done at the initiation of the PDP. And then when the initial report gets published it says that there is a 20-day public comment period to follow the initial report.

Chuck Gomes: Why don't you walk through the process beyond there briefly?

Margie Milam: At the end of the 20-day period the staff manager is responsible for reviewing the comments and including them in the final report. And then the final report is to be submitted to the council chair within 10 days after the end of the public comment period. These are the time periods that we all know haven't really been met in the past, particularly the shortness of turning the report around because I'm sure that there are working groups that want to work on evaluating those public comments. But that's what the Annex A says.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. So I just want to help a little to make sure we're all aware. And Margie is exactly right, we - that the timelines especially. Yes. Let's see. I have Kristina and then Kathy.

Kristina Rosette: I was just going to follow up on Margie's point that there are only 10 days.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. We can call a special meeting or again, we can (do that) when we come to it because we all know that the timelines are way off. And we're glad that there is a PDP. (Thanks Tim). There is a PDP working group that we'll be hearing from more this week. Still, let's go to Kathy.

Kathy Kleiman: Kathy Kleiman with PIR. And I am a member of the working group and I just wanted to thank the co-chairs and all the members of the working group. I have been part of a couple of working groups in the past and this is one of them.

And they is certainly a really hard and good faith effort to try to come to some consensus and really to explain (that) for a long time. And some of us are fairly new to the topic, a number of the working group (in fact). And had there been a re-exploration of the issue, those that have been doing it for two years thank you and for the whole working group. We're trying really hard and I just wanted to let you know.

Chuck Gomes: And not seeing anyone else I'm going to have Tim be the (last). Thank you everyone for what I hope was a helpful discussion for the working group. And again, let me reiterate what everyone else has said.

Thank you many, many times over for all the work that is going into this. It's very much appreciated. Now before we go to the next session I do want to make an announcement. I know we had a schedule change that was put out on the list changing the time for the new gTLD with Kurt to 1:00.

That has been reverted back to the 2:00 timeframe. So our planning meeting for the board dinner tonight will be at 1:00 as originally scheduled. New gTLDs will not be discussed until 2:00 right back here in this room. Thank you.

END