

**ICANN Prague Meeting
Motions/ Workload discussion- TRANSCRIPTION
Saturday 23rd June 2012 at 13:00 local time**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Stephane Van Gelder: ...with the workload discussion and then end with the discussion on motions. So please take your seats and we'll start in one minute once I have the green light from the operator that this session is now being recorded.

Coordinator: The call is now being recorded.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you very much. So we're 15 minutes early, we'll start the next session on our schedule for this Saturday, and that is a session that deals with first of all, workload issues. The idea from this came I believe from a message which I sent to the council just a few days or weeks ago, I forget now, explaining or complaining I guess you should say, about the volume of documents that we get before ICANN meetings.

And as you know, there is a system in place whereby there is a deadline that is 15 days before each meeting, and that deadline means that all documents that will be used for the meeting must be in by, essentially means, on that day everything is published. And, you know, you wake up with 700 pages to read.

So that was the start point discussion which I hope will be a little bit wider or a lot wider. On the difficulties we all face in the ICANN community with the

workload, the amount of documents that we have to read, my initial beef with all that was also that as far as the GNSO council is concerned, we are expected to deal with policy matters often based on the documents that we receive 15 days before a meeting.

And if you have that volume of documentation to read, you are bound to miss important stuff for those of us that actually read the stuff. I mean, it'd be interesting to know who's read what, but I won't put anyone on the spot. And that means that when we come to doing our jobs, which is making policy, you know, taking decisions on matters that are crucial to the work that goes on at ICANN, we may not be sufficiently well prepared to do that.

That's the worry that I have had for a long time, I know it's shared by a lot of you on the council, and I think it's useful. I don't have any ready-made solutions, if there were I'm sure someone else would have thought of them by now, but I think it's always useful to have that discussion and see first of all if other people are having the same issues that we are having, and how we can try and better deal with those issues.

So to try and introduce us to that discussion I'll turn it over to Jeff who had, because I was absent yesterday, Jeff went to the informal ICANN chair session with the CEO that happened on the Friday, and I know that there was some useful discussion there on workload and the amount of work that we have to deal with.

So let me turn it over to Jeff as an introduction and then we'll hopefully have a good discussion on that. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Stephane. You know the first question of whether anyone else has this issue, I think this issue combined with responding to public commentary period, I kind of view it similarly, I think it was universally held by whether it was the GAC the ALAC, the SSAC or who am I missing, sorry the CCNSO,

everyone pretty much had the same comment and has the same issues. So this is not something that is unique with the GNSO.

And in fact a lot of what some of the other groups have to do is react to the documents that the GNSO puts out as well, so they're all dealing with it, and the short answer is that there is no real concrete answer to this, as Stephane said, if there was they would have thought of it years ago, and this is not a new problem.

But some of the ideas, I guess there were some ideas that were floated out as to how to ease up the workload a little bit or to at least provide more time. I think combined with the workload and the amount of documents was, there were some groups that find it very difficult to because of the nature of their groups, provide comments within 21 days. Because everything now has gone to 21/21, a 21-day comment period followed by a 21-day reply period.

Technically the reply period is only supposed to be a reply to comments that were made during the initial 21-day period but if you look at some of the things that actually, the reply period is used by some as an extension of the original commentary.

So you'll see some original comments in the reply period. And of course everyone has their own needs and you know while some were suggesting that we lengthen the initial comment period to 30 or something longer, I tried to pull it back and say but that's, you know, people are actually asking how PDP is going to move faster, not take longer, so we need to find the appropriate balance.

So some of the items that were discussed yesterday included that we all said we would go back to our groups, included things like an early notice by staff as to what are the comment periods that are coming up. Oftentimes, none of us have a clue and all of a sudden we don't know there are comment periods until they show up.

And I think the GNSO policy has actually been pretty good about that. And we actually have it on our pending comment list but also talking about all the other things that ICANN staff puts out that all of a sudden show up on, in this case June 4 or June 3 and June 4 that Stephane (unintelligible). So an early notice on all of the things that may be coming out for comment, and then asking each of the chairs to look at that and to basically put in a request if they think a comment period is going to take longer.

So let's say something came out from ICANN staff on whatever it is, if Stephane gets some feedback from the GNSO, saying, "Hey look, 21 days is not going to be enough to respond to this" then Stephane would send a note to the ICANN staff in charge of that and say, we need more time, whatever that is.

So I think that might help a little bit with some of the groups and also, an upfront notice, this doesn't really happen with us as far as a, the GNSO as a whole. Because usually when there's comment periods, we respond as individual constituencies or stakeholder groups. But the other organizations like the CCNSO the GAC, they all respond as organizations, so it's basically a notice from each of our individual groups as to whether we intend to file a comment.

So that ICANN staff knows even if it's a day or two late that the comment's going to come in. that they have a heads-up, that people are actually working on comments. So if there's a 21-day comment period, and the registries know for example that we're working on a comment, we're not going to get it in in 21 days, if we could at least give ICANN staff notice that we're going to file a comment on this, we're working on it, it may take 23 days instead of the 21, that that might help as well.

And one of the topics that came up to avoid everything coming out the June 3, June 4, was a kind of informal rule saying that we should avoid any

comment period during the ICANN meeting or one week prior or one week after. Because we know that a week prior people are leaving and it's too soon before the meeting. And a week after because some people stay later and it's hard to get ICANN staff and then people (unintelligible) one week later.

So having this sort of informal three-week blackout period around each meeting where there wouldn't be any comments that would be due. Because right now if you look at the schedule, and I don't think this is with PDPs or anything, but if you look at the comment period as to when they end, some of them end on the 24th, some of them end on the 25th, some of them end on the 28th, all during the ICANN week. And even though you have a reply period after that, it's still not a good practice to have a public comment period end at or during an ICANN meeting.

So those are some of the ideas to just throw out there, people agree or don't agree with those, just to kind of get some feedback.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks a lot, Jeff, and we'll open it a queue for discussion, I've got Marika, Margie, Alan. Let me just add a few words to steer the discussion if possible just before that. I'm very interested to hear what Jeff just told us about the recap in the discussions with the other groups yesterday. Obviously it's not a surprise to any of us that other groups have these problems. I'm just forever surprised actually within ICANN that all the solutions to our problems are actually I find very timid.

For example we have an obvious problem with comment periods. But there's never a solution to do anything but lengthen them or shorten them or just have them not happen during the ICANN meeting week. No one ever questions the actual format of the comments themselves and whether they are as useful as they could be.

I think that's also true and these are others, you have very wide-ranging discussions, and we're not trying to find a solution today but I think that's also

true for the way we do reports. And we might, I'd certainly encourage the council to going forward, to think of that, especially as dare I say we are supposed to be starting a new GNSO restructure process next year I believe. So considering the last one nearly killed us all off, we probably don't want to do that very soon but that's one of the things that we might want to look at during that process, is exactly how do we format.

For example, reports that happen during a PDP process. And some of the reports I find very, very difficult to deal with, because there's so much stuff in them. And now we have improved this in the past with one-page summaries on the reports with executive summaries and things have got, you know, have really improved. I'm not saying there's not been any work on that, but I'd be really interested to try and brainstorm this by turning things around rather more substantially than just changing comment period dates.

And instead trying to find solutions like, for example, the stuff that we've seen happen this week for this meeting with the decision to cancel Fridays. Which I know is very controversial, I know lots of people are not keen on that decision, but it is something that I see as an attempt to change fundamentally the way we do things and try and improve our processes. Whether it works or not is different whether it was done in the right way or not, I don't want to debate that right now, because that's not the object of this discussion. But it is a big change and I'm glad someone's at least trying to look at the way we do things and change them significantly.

And so I'll stop preaching there and turn it over to Marika. I have Margie, Alan, anyone else? (Thomas)? Mary, Jeff, Mikey, and Wolf. Marika?

Marika Konings: I think Wendy wants to be in the queue.

Stephane Van Gelder: And Wendy, sorry Wendy.

Marika Konings: And yes, this is Marika. Just one, in response to your question what goes into a PDP report, I think that's actually prescribed in the PDP manual, at least a minimum number of elements that need to be covered in the report which is often a result of lengthy reports, but the group's trying to do their best, at least in the executive summary, to really call out the main elements enough and come to the council to really present, you know, what is in there, and whether it is more to make sure there is a (unintelligible) detailed discussions.

And just to Jeff's comment on upcoming public comment periods, I'm not really sure if everyone's aware, but actually on the, if you go to the public comments section on the ICANN web site, it has there an option to click Upcoming, and I think there are now like almost 30 topics listed there that will open over the course of this year or have already opened.

And you know, as part of the ATRT and recommendations as well to improve this process, you know we have on an ongoing basis try to predict what is coming out and I think the council has also been asked like, do you know any topics and we from our, the staff side also try to add what topics we foresee coming up throughout the year and I know that's being done in other parts of the staff as well. So I'm sure there's room for improvement but it's something that already exists currently.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you much.

Margie Milam: Yes, I wanted to point out that we do have a public comment forum open for the PDP and that's the IGO issue report that Brian Peck spoke about this morning. So maybe that's something the council wants the public comment period to be extended. The rule today is the minimum not the maximum and so, if you could just because the first part expires Brian this week? The 25th, you could tell us, you know, in wrap-up or whether you'd like some more time, we can certainly give more time given the fact that it's in the middle of, you know, a meeting.

Jeff Neuman: You know, just to respond, I understand that's the minimum but we were told that that's the standard now. But to respond to that, the point isn't that we want longer or shorter, we don't necessarily want longer but we want it to start earlier so it doesn't end during ICANN week. That was the point.

So if the 21 days had started instead of June 4, but had started May 20, then 21 days may have been enough. But the problem is that everything starts, all these documents come out on June 4, you know the 15 days before the meeting ends or whatever it is, maybe that was June 1 just for the dates. But in essence all around the same time, so the real point was, don't put ourselves in a position where that happens. Let's get the documents out earlier or later as opposed to getting them out where it ends.

So I for one would be very upset if we decided to extend comment periods because we're trying to work on a process to make comment periods, sorry not comment periods shorter but the whole process shorter, by starting out a preliminary issue report and already extending that comment period, you now doom this PDP to take that much longer.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Jeff. Once again, you know if you think out of the box we could run comment periods concurrently with other stuff, for example which is something that I know questions have been asked about that before. I mean, you know, if we continue to have this discussion about how long and just going back to your point Marika about what's in the PDP process now, that was the point I was making earlier on.

I understand that the result of what we have is the result of the rules that we have in place now. What I'm saying is do we need to change them going forward. If this organization is to remain viable in the light of, for example, 2000 new GTLDs and all the work that that's going to generate. (Adam).

(Adam): Thank you. I think you've just hit it right on the head that we have to figure out how to get the processes done more effectively. And maybe there's parallels,

maybe we start working on the results of the, on the interim report here, even we know that there may be some changes because of the result of the comment period.

There was general feeling that 30 days often wasn't enough for some SOs or ACs to come up with reports, especially given the specific timing of it, and the result was let's shorten (unintelligible) 21 days. I think there's general acceptance at this point that 21 (unintelligible) does not work for a whole bunch of reasons and I don't think we need to agonize over that, hopefully that will change. But clearly we're going to have to be more innovative in how we manage our time to get the actual work done.

I find it exceedingly frustrating that we had a, I won't call it a gentleman's agreement but there was general consensus several years ago that we did not include the time of the ICANN meeting as a comment period. And then we have this year, where there were comment periods that ended yesterday. There were comment periods that end during the week of ICANN and just after the week of ICANN. It just doesn't work, I'm tired of having to fight the same battles over and over again.

I don't know whether it's because of a lack of corporate memory or people just don't care. But it's a waste of my time and a waste of our time to have the same battles year in and year out. I wish we could find a way of fixing that.
Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you, Alan. (Thomas).

(Thomas): Thanks, Stephane. Couple of suggestions with respect to the work there was discussion, Stephane you thankfully kicked off on the GNSO council list. With respect to comment periods, I know they're listed on ICANN's web site, but I'm a visual person. I think it would help me a great deal to have a visualized master calendar, where we can see where they start, and then I think it's

easier for staff as well for those who start comment periods to see that they should equally distribute for the year, not conflicting with ICANN meetings.

One might also think of the maximum of comment period being open at the same time, in order to reduce the workload, particularly when they go into their, when they deal with the same topics, I mean requiring the attention of the same target groups.

I also thought that, and that would apply both to those documents put out by ICANN as well as to comments, that we might consider character limits. In order to avoid exceedingly documents, because I think that keeping things short and simple will (unintelligible) should be applicable in the ICANN environment as well.

In terms of structure of the comments, I think that one could consider a completely different type of taking comments. My impression sometimes is that many people, many of those who write comments want their own comment being out there and sort of own what they have and want their work displayed. I think what could be better serving the community and also helping reduce the time required, to analyze the comment, is to ask people to put it in portions, to make small points with character limits and then have that as a poll system.

So that if I come in next and see that I like this idea, I just can give my credentials so that you can, that you see who, you know, supports which ideas and only if you have a brand new idea then you would open another idea or thought section in the comment area.

And I think by doing so, particularly in light of all the new entities probably entering the ICANN arena that might help reduce the workload on all sides.
Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you (Thomas), Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Stephane. (Thomas) just covered some of the points I was going to make at least some of us have been having some discussions and you know messages posted to the list. So I'll try to be constructive and add a couple more.

I think your point about, Stephane, about the formatting of the reports, if I could take that a bit further. First of all I want to say that as an academic, as a researcher and a professor, I really appreciate all the reports that ICANN staff puts out. The length could be problematic in some ways, but I think having that kind of document is useful and in some cases actually necessary for corporate institutional memory if nothing else and certainly for reference.

I guess the point then is, is there something else that could be done. Not just the executive summary, the one-page summary, which really doesn't give you the full flavor of the work that they're working groups put in, or even some of the substance of the recommendations that the group might come up with.

So I was thinking of on the lines of having something that's more of a beefed-up summary but coordinating that with two things. One, the policy update webinar, and two for our purposes, for the GMSO community, the council meetings and in some way in terms of timing them, coordinating them and coordinating the presentation so that they are, if not seamless, at least they're various avenues of information so that you're not just one person sitting there going through a 100-page report and then 100-page report and then three scorecards, and then trying to figure out if you want to submit public comments.

Those are quite rudimentary thoughts but maybe some coordinating thinking behind that, as you said thinking out of the box. Then a related thought was that there are different members of the community who have different levels of interest, experience, and background. So for example, in making some of

the presentations, some of us might find some of the background material unnecessary. Others might find it very necessary.

So we might want to delve a little bit deeper to think about what are the purposes of particular presentations, whether during a council meeting or during a webinar or something else, and structure each differently depending on who you're targeting it to rather than do a one-size-fits-all. I know it's gone from steps toward changing that for our own council meetings but I think we might want to look at that further and drill down a little more deeply.

Then finally and this may be adding somewhat to workload but I feel obliged to mention it, again talking about newer members of the community, and we always want more people to participate in working groups and volunteer and so forth, is the workload, is that for us, it's particularly scary and intimidating for them, not even knowing where to start.

And I know some of us have been in working groups with newer members and we've all been there ourselves. For example, a question will arise, well what's the (unintelligible consensus? And another question will be well what format should we put our recommendations in, whether it's high priority, whether it's medium priority. We might have to look into some specific training for members of the community before they participate in working groups or something like that.

Like I said, it might be adding on to it, but if we can do it in a way that takes into account the fact that the purpose is to make us more efficient, then it might be worth considering.

Stephane Van Gelder: (Unintelligible) had an idea about training or doing an academy or something.

Mary Wong: I wasn't going to go there in this session because I do see we're talking about that later on, but it might be a meeting.

Stephane Van Gelder: Yeah. Just to your point Mary about I think you made an important point and this is an open discussion, but about the barriers for entry for newcomers. For anyone that's not in this process, any of the reports that currently are produced, do make it very difficult I think to understand or penetrate what's going on.

I actually disagree with the first point you made about the fact that the reports are necessary even if it's just for you know collective memory of ICANN. I believe there are, I mean just to go off tangent completely, the written press have this kind of problem and has gone through this kind of process, whereby it used to be the norm to write for magazines for example, to write extremely long articles.

And as time has passed on with the Internet and people having less time to focus on anything, it's become the norm that short is better and that you can't fight long-winded articles that go on page after page. I believe we have the same kind of evolution to do at ICANN. If we want to make it easier for people outside to be able to understand, maybe we don't, you know, maybe that's the secret plan to make it difficult for anyone else to sit in these seats. But I don't believe that's the case.

So I know that any of us who have ever made, have ever shown an ICANN report to anyone, be it in their (unintelligible) work for, to name names, companies so, you know, you expect people to know basically what's going on. They just run, you know, you show them a report they run in the opposite direction.

I believe there are things that we can do there to change that. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, and one of the things that I've, you know, in some of the groups that I've chaired in the past, and Marika knows this, is I always insist on you know,

I know we have to say the background of how we got there, but I always insist that that goes into an appendix for all the groups that I've chaired.

I just think it's important to document but it doesn't have to be the first ten, 12 15 pages of the document because then people are asleep before they actually get to the - even though you have an executive summary, you should still put that in an appendix.

You know, two things I wanted to touch on, and Stephane had brought up the GNSO overview. I have a personal view on that, and I think, and I've talked to a couple of the board members and senior ICANN staff and I've asked that they consider or try to figure out a way to lay the GNSO review at least a year, not just for the issues that we've talked about and we've just come out of it, but I think you'll see in 2013 a very big change in the GNSO community, with new TLDs coming up and there's going to be a lot of issues that arise because of that.

And it doesn't make sense to me to start a review process that by the time that you have the review completed it's already outdated, right? So you know, you're going to need to look at 2013 and probably 2014 to see the effect of the new GTLDs on the GNSO community and since we're doing a review of that time period it doesn't make sense to me. So I've had that been a complete personal opinion, it hasn't been discussed within the registry stakeholder group or obviously in the GNSO, but that's something I've had.

On the new innovative ideas, we need to be a little bit careful because I think some of the other groups have some new ideas as well on workload. And one of the ideas that came out, which I said I didn't think it was a good idea, but it was basically to allocate, say okay, during this year in 2013, next year, we can have a total of 50 public comment periods. Whoever uses those slots up, maybe five are reserved for this group, five are reserved for that group, the other five are reserved and then for the rest, the first come, first served kind of reservation of slots.

I don't think that's, I said that didn't make sense, in GNSO obviously, we can't predict everything that's going to happen and we can't enter a rigid system like, where you'll only have a certain amount of public comment periods a year. So let's just be a little bit careful, maybe we do need to have some flexibility and it's good to be innovative but let's also think of the ramifications of that kind of thing.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks very much Jeff, Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Stephane. My name's Mikey O'Connor. I'm coming at this from the perspective of a person who works on a lot of working groups, and just have one idea, and that is we on the working groups tend to look at the ICANN meetings as the fenceposts. So there are three a year, so we structure our work so that the work is done in time for the ICANN meetings.

Which means we all show up with reports at exactly the same time. Because we're getting ready for the ICANN meetings.

Why are we always getting ready for the ICANN meetings? Why don't we break the habit of reviewing everything at ICANN meetings and instead, you know, what we're describing here is a project management problem where things are lumpy, it's lumpy three times a year because we're in the habit of reviewing these things at ICANN meetings.

So we don't have to do that. We could review these things on some of the other GNSO council calls. But in order for that to work the way those calls happen has to change. I as a member of a working group have never been invited to present working group findings to a GNSO council meeting at any time except at an ICANN meeting.

But I'd be happy to do that, and as a result of taking that artificial once, you know, once every third of the year lump out, we could reduce part of this

problem by just making the pile of paper lower but more frequent through the year. So that's my only thought.

Stephane Van Gelder: Just address that Mikey, that's probably pure chance or coincidence, because we do have regular updates with people coming in from working groups during our teleconference meetings that happen every month currently. So it's maybe just that the work that you're doing currently has not, there's not been an update schedule for that and that's probably my thought because I've not scheduled one in the draft agenda. But we do do that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I know, but you know what happens, I mean it's not so much me, I'm not saying that I'm the person, but sitting in the working groups, the fenceposts are the ICANN meetings. And we structure the working groups to hit those fenceposts. So if you told us on the working groups, "You don't have to hit the ICANN meeting, you can hit any fenceposts you want," and in fact we'd kind of prefer it if you didn't hit those fenceposts, we could do that. But our habit in structuring, I mean you know, I'm only on five of them right now and we've set them up so that the reports come out on that date.

Stephane Van Gelder: Yeah. That's an interesting thing for us to know because I don't think there's ever been, certainly from where I'm sitting any conscious word to working groups from the council, "Do your stuff per the ICANN meeting calendar." Actually the word I often try to give is "Get your stuff done as quickly as possible and make that report two page long." But, you know, I understand that's the basic problem, that's the premise of this discussion that's the way we got into this discussion.

We are all working for the ICANN meeting calendar, that's why we get reports, as we were explaining earlier on at these ICANN meetings, that's why you know, and as you've explained and that's a very useful view from the working group perspective, the working groups are working to that calendar

as we all know, which means that we are probably self-limiting ourselves. So thanks for making those points.

I have, let me just run down the tube, I have Wolf, Wendy, Liz, Alan, Chuck, (John), I've got Margie, Kristina, and then Marika, and then I'd like to close the queue and move on to the motions. So let me just say after, sorry (unintelligible) is next, I have, was it Margie, Kristina, and Marika. Thank you. Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you Stephane. Much has been said which I can agree to, (unintelligible) the structure of improvements and formative improvements in the public during the public comment period, I fully understand that and would like to see an improvement on that. For example, the structure, you know, we have different formats of comments, and maybe there could be some report given by staff in structuring that a little bit better.

One point I only would like to add here is with regards to prioritization. A lot of history this prioritization, and you remember very well, when we had a long discussion about that, and it had only a limited consensus on that how to prioritize our work here, I would really like to come back to that point, because from my own experiences, so when I am at home or in my office so I'm I do, I have my own priorities. On the one hand I get priorities from my company, I get priorities from my home, I get priorities from where else.

Then I am looking at what can I do, so I have got the feeling that the loss sometimes here on council level also we, that they would like to, and how, a process, how we would like to prioritize our work so, because we are just collecting and work is coming in. So there is a point I would like to raise and would like to initiate, to think about. Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Wolf. I have Wendy next.

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks. Two brief comments. One on the reply comment period. It seems that we're treating the whole thing as one long comment period, in which case there are 42 days for comments and some people, 21 days for replying, most people just bring up new issues there. Which is fine, but we might as well just call it what it is. And on the amount of reading and discussion, I would love to see us spend more time discussing and deeming documents read before the community gathers. And even evening presentations read.

I know people spend a lot of time preparing presentation slides, both staff and members of the working groups, the members of the community. I think it's useful to condense things down, but we can read the slides and circulate it and then spend all of the time engaging in discussion and commentary, rather than spending half of a period watching the slides scroll past.

I think what we gain is hearing one another engage in real time.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks. Liz.

Liz Gasster: I just wanted to, this is Liz Gasster, I just wanted to comment briefly on the issue of helping the new council members and helping people who are new to the ICANN community understand our processes and ways of doing things. And one of the requestor recommendations that was in the GNSO report was to develop a curriculum for new council members and for individuals who are new to working groups and we, staff had been holding off doing that until the working groups process had been complete and the new PDP process had been complete.

But we do have draft modules, training-type modules that we're planning to release shortly on the following areas: the role of the GNSO council member, GNSO council members have received a document with this headline on it before, but this is a much more fleshed out version. And abbreviated explanation of the formation and operations of working groups, a guide for working group chairs, a guide on the new PDP, and then also a guide on the

various technology tools that we use, since a lot of people coming in from other places in the community may not be as familiar with say Adobe Connect or wikis or those kind of things.

So hopefully that will make it a little bit easier and more accessible for new participants in the community, and we will be circulating those as drafts for all of your input, because we do want to make sure that they're readable and of appropriate length and look forward to your input on those and hopefully that will at least help to resolve one aspect of what you're discussing. Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks Liz, that's good to know. And good to know that we'll be getting them as drafts as well. Look forward to having a look at that. Alan next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Two comments, first on the concept of us targeting meetings as the threshold, the target that we're working towards. There's no question that to some extent we use meetings as warning signs that another third of the year has passed and we really want to get something done, so we try to make that target. But the honest as often or maybe oftener if we're doing our work properly, we're not using it as a target as a time threshold, but as an opportunity to get input from the wider GNSO council, from the GNSO council, the wider GNSO and the public in general.

And that you can't necessarily do by scheduling something for a meeting. So we are using it as a threat, as a clock that's ticking, but we're also using it for real reasons, and I'm not sure we can get around those. I think we can solve at least part of the problem by making sure the comment periods are not necessarily fully synchronized with the release of the report. And you know if you're in a working group for instance that issues an interim report, you still have work to do even if you haven't, if the comment period hasn't finished. You don't have to waste time if the comment period is elongated to skip the ICANN meeting. There are ways to address that.

I'm intrigued by the thing that Jeff raised of limiting it to 50 or some number of comment periods of year and allocating them. I wonder what happens if we exceeded, if we're over the limit. I see two nice possibilities. Either we don't have to work and that certainly limits our workload, or on those issues we don't have to ask, we can just do it ourselves and ignore any community input. Which has some merits, it may not yield a result that everyone will like but it's sure more expedient. So maybe we want to institute that.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Alan. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes from VeriSign. You know, we're, this has been a great discussion, a lot of good ideas suggested. I've come to the conclusion in recent months that ICANN's in a place where we just stop making individual improvements here and there, and look at the whole picture. We need to get our heads together not just the GNSO, cause it affects all of ICANN, including our interactions with the board. Maybe even kind of start from scratch in our thinking.

How can we improve, we know what the needs are, we know what the problems are. How can we do this differently? We've evolved from 1998, 1999, most of the things we do are kind of, that's the way we did them and we've tweaked them. We need to stop tweaking and look at the whole picture and see how can we make these weeks more effective, what we do these weeks, what we do in between, and so forth.

And it's going to take some work, we're going to have to involve other SOs and ACs but we can start thinking about that and how to do that. It's not going to be done in an hour session or a two-hour session. It may take a half a day session, but we should start looking at the whole picture.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Chuck, and this is exactly why I wanted this session on, you know, because it is a way of, I agree with you, it's an excellent discussion. I'm a little saddened to see that we do tend to have better

discussion when we're discussing, you know, the processes than the actual issues themselves. But maybe that's because we haven't had time to read the reports and we don't know what we're talking about when we're discussing the issues.

Anyway Joy you just put your hand up. I actually closed the queue just before so if, let's just see how that goes. I've still got (John), Margie, Christine and Marika, we do need to talk about the motions as well. So, let's just maybe if the four people just before you aren't too lengthy then we can transfer you in. So (John).

(John): I appreciate what Chuck said but my history suggests that as unwieldy as I can be on a daily basis it has not reached the point of extremis where I'd be open to that kind of change yet. I think you've really got to be on the ropes before you're willing to think about things like that.

I am a little concerned though and taking off from where Mary started about the need for efficiency. I believe that complexity is the enemy of efficiency and that we have grown far more complicated, certainly in the nine years that I've been paying attention to ICANN, and I believe that this past month we saw another significant increase in the level of complexity at ICANN which will also bring in a host of new people who will need to be brought up to speed on all of the acronyms and legacy acrimony, I suppose.

So, the only point that seems clear to me is that there will be an emerging professional class much as there is in Washington, DC, that can devote almost full time to the issues that affect the businesses that they represent. This became clear to me in the course of my time working with (Steve) and (John) and others working on the consumer trust competition, working group, is we were having two-hour conversations every week. And I began to cancel my participation in more of them than I was participating in, just because the level of complexity and the demands to deal with that complexity, it intruded

too deeply into the rest of my life. I am not a professional ICANN representative.

And so I worry about that. You know, I remember the old phrase about the worst thing that happened to government in America was the development of air conditioning because it allowed Congress to stay in session all year round. I worry that we have become a year-round professional class devoted to the interests of the companies that we represent. And that may ultimately streamline things because we'll all sort of know the handshake, but it might also include the kind of serendipity that I have long thought, that I have long felt every time I've come to these meetings. So I don't know if that's a positive view of the future or a negative one, but that's what I think right now.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, (John). Margie.

Margie Milam: Alan said what I was going to say.

Stephane Van Gelder: Cool. Kristina. While she's walking up, Marika do you want to explain your point?

Marika Konings: I can be very brief because (unintelligible) Margie's making the same point but just to say as well, it has been very effective in setting an ICANN meeting deadline for working groups to get them focused and really, and a tangible deadline whereby they need to deliver their work, as soon as in practice, a lot of times that really helps in groups, you know driving their workload is something.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks, Christina.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, IPC. This is kind of a mish-mash just based on some observations. I guess starting, and if I've misunderstood what any of you meant to say, I apologize, but to the extent for example that Mary was suggesting that it would be necessary to have some kind of training in order

to participate in a working group, I strongly disagree with that idea. I think it will really not only decrease the ability and the number of people who are able to participate, but frankly at a time when this organization is taking arrows from what I refer to as the outside world, I'm not sure that you want to add to that.

I do think just agreeing with what (John) was saying, I think we really need to be cognizant as we're talking about things like working group public comment et cetera. What change we're going to see with the influx of new participants, you know, (unintelligible) quite candidly that once all of the (unintelligible) do decide that they're going to go through with this and they do have registry agreements and they are members of the registry stakeholder group, that by virtue of some of the corporate structures of them, it may not only not be possible for them putting in comments in 21 days, but it may in fact affect the ability to register stakeholder groups to do so.

So I think we need to be very judicious at this point of not only talking about shortening comment periods, but also talking about making any changes that could fundamentally change how entities that have kind of put a stake in the ground to say, "Yeah, I'm planning to participate in this space." How they can in fact do that.

I do think, I recognize Marika's point that having the ICANN meeting as a goal is helpful but I don't see why you couldn't just change that to a GNSO meeting, I completely agree with Mikey, I found in many cases that work was not necessarily being done as thoroughly as it needed to be at the working group level in part because everybody was just really barreling full force down the road towards this ICANN meeting deadline, and I think if you can spread it out I think it will be more helpful.

And finally to the extent that they have these newcomer to ICANN tracks, which I think they've been doing, I think it would be really helpful to include something in those about working groups and public comment. As someone

who recently had occasion to plow through about two applicant guidebook comment periods, you know some things came through very clearly to me about, "Gee, it's really much more helpful if people actually use bullet points as opposed to bury their point in the middle of the paragraph." And gee if you have specific language that you think should be changed, put it up clearly.

And I would have to say in a 15-minute conversation with not only the folks who put in public comments and the folks who have to review them, that you could probably come up with a pretty handy list, you could write your public comments however you want, but as a practical matter, it's more efficient for the entire organization, everyone participating, if you keep this, these suggestions as to how you may want to format it. Just a mishmash of thoughts.

Stefan e Van Gelder: Thank you very much. Joi I think we have time for you.

Joi White: Thank you Stephane. I just wanted to pick up on some of the comments that were made earlier by Chuck and Alan and also by (John). And as one of the relatively new GNSO counselors you know, I certainly found this an intriguing, interesting, sort of challenging site to come into, and I think one of the observations I would make just sort of echoes some of the earlier comments is that we seem to spend a lot of time on, is trivia that gets in the way of the meatier discussions that we need to have.

And I wonder whether we shouldn't take some of the time that we have as counselors to get a foursome, sort of symmetric meatier discussions, perhaps one tradition is rotating those by I think the group's choosing a particular topic that they would really like to discuss, the council's to discuss together and just rotating the opportunities in meetings. So we actually get to some of the things such as GNSO working relationships with other you know, with the GAC, rather than having those tacked around (unintelligible) work, so that we aren't seeing the bigger picture of about our council effectiveness.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you very much. I actually think we've improved a lot in that area over the past few years, and detail is important as well, and process is important, and we do need to discuss that, and certainly I can say one (unintelligible) feedback that I can provide on this new format of council leadership that has been in place since (unintelligible) was chair, which was three, two, three years ago. Which is having one chair and two vice-chairs.

It's, I certainly found it very useful to free the chair from the actual issues, from the, and just to let the chair concentrate on the actual running of the council as it were, just making sure things are done the way they should be. And I'm fortunate to have two very good vice-chairs both very much on top of the issues and can speak for their house and represent their interest groups. And I think they do so very effectively.

So I think the process has certainly worked very well, and that was certainly the case when Mary was vice-chair as well last year. And so that's one of the avenues where I think we've improved, and where we've become more efficient, but a lot of good ideas today and let's hope that we can continue that discussion, the discussions that we've had, and take some of these points forward.

Right, now back to switch to a discussion of the motions that we have on the agenda for Wednesday.

(Thomas): Stephane, is there going to be any sort of follow-up to this discussion? Or is it going to be transcribed and archived?

Stefan: It's already archived (Thomas), we archive everything, and we'll put out a 200-page report. Some time before the next ICANN meeting, two hours before, maybe. No, the - sorry to be so flippant - but the idea of this was an open discussion, I think your question's very good. Where do we take it from here, but this is another area where I think we've improved, and we do, we're,

you know, some of the obviously, a lot of ideas come out of these discussions but one or two ideas do tend to stay with us.

We do tend to come back to them. And do try and move things forward. I mean, if you look at what's happened over the past few years, we have as a council introduced new ideas that we just done on the fly basically, the latest of which is for example the consent agenda. Which is not something that we've done officially yet although we've asked the SCI to do it, to have a look at it, using our official processes. But in the meantime, we're not stopping each other from moving forward on those ideas.

And I think this is another area where we can do that, some (unintelligible) (Thomas) is the discussion will continue if we'll band together and push it forward, and there's nothing stopping you or anyone else from taking that discussion forward, taking away some of the ideas that were expressed, giving them some thought and coming back and maybe even tomorrow or during the week (unintelligible) which is always a good opportunity to do that on Thursday, and saying look, this is a good idea, what can we do about that?

(Thomas): Thanks, because I think that some of the ideas that were voiced definitely are worthwhile to being implemented sooner or later.

Stephane Van Gelder: I agree. Thanks very much. So let's move on to the motion discussion, the first motion we have on our agenda for Wednesday is one that was made by Wolf and seconded by (John). It was deferred from the previous meeting, the previous council teleconference, and it has seen a lot of discussion on the list, so I expect we'll see some of that here today.

Once again, as a reminder to maybe not to the council but to everyone else, this session is an opportunity for the council to talk about the motions, hopefully thresh out any issues that some may have with the motions, maybe

work on them so that we get to the council meeting on Wednesday and the process is relatively streamlined.

So let me open up for discussion on the motion that was made (unintelligible) seconded by (John) you have it on the screen in front of you. And (Thomas), you have your hand up.

(Thomas): Thank you Stephane. I have the chance to talk to (unintelligible) earlier about this motion, and I'm very much thankful for bringing this up and being so diligent in order not to, you know, lose track of this type of action. My feeling though is that the motion covers, to a large extent it's not completely what has already been dealt with in other action lines, and I think that it would be worthwhile finding out during this session whether the council comes to the conclusion that the topics covered by the motion are actually (unintelligible) with other projects at the moment, in which case I would kindly ask Wolf - Ulrich to withdraw the motion.

But that's only in case we feel confident enough that the subjects are dealt with, and then a possible suggestion to move forward with the, to table this and in one, two years' time to see whether the other projects have actually covered and completed on these issues. And if that was the case, then it could be completely shelved, and if we find out that there are certain things that are underway, do not adequately cover the issue or do not resolve them completely, then we could bring it back up.

But I see, you know with limited resources I see duplication with this effort, and I think it would be a sign of maturity for the GNSO council to carefully analyze the work that is going on in parallel and getting rid of those that cause the duplicate work. Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you very much, (Thomas). Anyone else want to get in the queue? Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thank you Stephane, and (Thomas) as well. What is the motion about?

We know from, I've just briefly, (unintelligible) written, so we thought that the issue of who has access, so and we discussed a lot on the list and what is it about and last time, that it is clear that it referred to certain documents which are on the table coming from the SSAC and others, that this is included in a policy development process and it commences, that is what the issue about, and the other is, okay, and this is like uncertainty.

I myself and the constituency where I come from is, has with it about, whether it's covered or not. It says okay, it says the council shall review by end of September whether the RAPP has commenced and has concluded this issue, or whether alternative approaches should be pursued.

Let me just explain from my, we have discussed the ARA, we did this afternoon as well, and what the ARA is one topic, so they are, those items are dealt as well, and the uncertainty comes from that so that, on the one hand, we are not members of the negotiation teams, so that's the one thing so we really don't know what is going on.

We receive signals from the reports and so again which I have seen on the list of the contentious documents they tell me there are documents, yeah, there are documents discussed and but they are contentious, they are controversial and I don't know what is going to happen this (unintelligible) things.

It's the uncertainty behind of that and that is the reason why we come up with this, with this motion, maybe we can discuss that, maybe this motion comes too early, maybe this motion could be revised, amended in a manner which covers better what is already covered in (unintelligible) so this is just to be open here to tell you about that and that is the background.

So, so far for (unintelligible) thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, and thanks Stephane and I support (Thomas)' comments, but it's still, I'm still trying to get my head wrapped around it and maybe I'm just stuck.

But I'm trying to figure out what it is specifically, just a concrete example of something you want to make sure that's addressed in a PDP if it happens that is not covered by the other work that's going on, not just in the, with the RAA negotiations but the work that's going on with the roadmap for implementing the (SSAC-51) with the work that's being done on the WHOIS studies, with the work.

What is it that you're so concerned about, that you're so worried about a concrete example that you need to not just, to have a motion right now that we have to approve to make sure it's covered and really the appropriate place to cover these types of things is when a PDP starts it's the charter, it's not to do a motion now, to come up with something that you want to cover later on, it's when we talk about the charter for that group because that's still under our control.

The board tells us we have to do a PDP but the charter itself is under our control. Just put it in the back of your mind, write a note to yourself and remember it at that point in time to come up with a motion now just creates a whole bunch of ambiguities and makes it, it sends a message from the GNSO council that we believe that there are certain issues that may not be addressed until we're reserving the right to put that in.

So I agree with (Thomas) that I think until we come up with a concrete example and once you come up with that concrete example why it can't just be in the charter document, I don't see the point of this motion and it's really creates duplicative work.

Stephane Van Gelder: Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Just briefly, and that is a, the, my explanation from where I come from, from a telecom company, so I checked the documents and I saw okay, you are dealing with reviewing and the (unintelligible) protocol for example, and (EVR) reviewing and the (EVR) renewing other technical items.

So for me when that I read that (unintelligible) road map it's very much technically formulated, so that's my impression of that. So from a company which is operating services the operation of these things and handling of these things is a crucial issue that means it's not only the technology, the technique it's just, is behind of that, it's how it is handled and during the process.

Who joins the process from the registrant through the registrants, (unintelligible) registries and wherever and how is that handled and during the process. Who joins the process from the registrant, (unintelligible) registrants, (unintelligible) registries and wherever and how is that handled.

And this is what I, what I am still missing so that's, this is one part of that so for, that's my explanation to that.

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay. Can I get some, and (Mike) are you standing up because you wanted to speak? Can I go to (Mike) (unintelligible)?

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Stephane and right off the bat, this is Mikey O'Connor again. Apologies to my counselor because I'm going to give you new information and I wish I could've done this ahead of time, I didn't see this on the agenda. I was on the RAP working group and was part of the group that drafted this recommendation and I just quick checked around with a couple other colleagues on the working group, and I just kind of want to replay the bidding on this particular recommendation from the RAP.

This is a pretty narrow recommendation about Port 43 and what we did is we did a little research study to see how many registrars answered on Port 43 and we found some, you know some percentage that didn't and we sort of said, you know in this big of a long laundry list that we came up with out of that working group we came up with this recommendation which said you know we should really tighten that up, we should really make that particular performance standard tighter.

I think that the trouble that we're running into right now is that that's a fairly stale recommendation given the events over the last several years. Since the RAP drafted that there's been a lot of good work from the WHOIS (RT), just a whole host of other things.

And so as a member of the working group this is one that if you said thanks RAP working group but roll this one into a subsequent study, maybe follow Jeff's idea of keep it in our minds for the charter of a subsequent working group because it's a, it's a very narrow, very specific, it is an issue, it's real, we've documented it, but I'm not sure that this is one that we need to lose a lot of sleep on and so as one of your constituents Wolf I apologize for kind of throwing you under the bus on this one but there you go. Anyway sorry, that's it.

Stephane Van Gelder: No that's useful Mikey don't, don't apologize. You may have to explain yourself to Wolf afterwards but...

Mikey O'Connor: I may have to buy him some beer.

Stephane Van Gelder: Yeah. No. Thank you. Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. And thanks Mikey, I think that's what I tried to get and I didn't do it as eloquently as you did at the last council meeting, because when the RAP group talked about access it was, it was in that kind of context, it wasn't what's written here which is that it's reliable and enforceable because that

adds a whole dimension to access that was never intended by the term access by the RAP group.

And that's one of the other reasons I fundamentally oppose this motion because you're now getting into policy, which has been the same WHOIS policy rut that we've been in for 12 years, and if you want to ensure that no work is done you'll change the term of access.

I mean so I think any time we do something new with WHOIS you have to be narrow enough and mutually understand, and each group understands completely what those terms, how those terms are being used.

And that's what the definition of access was in the RAP group, that's the definition we should follow here and not broaden it to something that was never intended, and I do think that with that you have (SSAC-51) you have the RAA negotiations, you have a whole bunch of other things going on, take WHOIS that, that as Mikey said has made this pretty stale.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks. (Unintelligible).

Man: This might be irrelevant now (unintelligible) I think things are moving on but just Jeff you said that the (call it) into motion with the words accessible and inappropriate or liable enforcement consistent in fashion it wasn't with the RAP WG had intended, is that, do I understand you correctly?

Jeff Neuman: That's correct. When the RAP group is talking about WHOIS access it was not talking about reliable information or enforceable information, it was talking about access to Port 41 and making sure that the connection itself and being able to get the data was, was reliable.

Man: So I have...

Jeff Neuman: But I fear that the way it's used here is more of a policy discussion and what makes the data in WHOIS enforceable it just, it confuses concepts.

Man: So I have a follow-up. Well I'm actually looking at the RAP working group report and on Page 13. Recommendation 1, the GNSO should determine, blah, blah, what additional resource and process are needing to be ensure that the WHOIS data is as accessible in an appropriate reliable, enforceable and consistent fashion, it's in the report.

Jeff Neuman: I understand that's one of the recommendations but that's not the recommendation that deals with WHOIS access.

Man: It says WHOIS access right in the top there.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. (Unintelligible).

Man: I'll refer you to Page 13.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I'll go back and read it.

Man: Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: But it was my understanding that the access (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) sure that you might want to...

Jeff Neuman: That's okay.

Woman: So (unintelligible) exactly correct, that's specifically what it says in relation to the WHOIS access recommendation of the RAP working, the only thing that has been added here is I think it responds to a, I think a proposed amendment that either was (Joey) or (Wendy) in relation to the you know and does not violate freedom of expression, privacy and related rights, that was

what's added, but that first part comes verbatim from the RAP working group recommendation on WHOIS access.

Stephane Van Gelder: And (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Just if I could quickly respond, when just so we understand when you talk about, because you can't take the recommendation in isolation without the discussions that occurred, I mean you can but that's not the way it was intended.

So is your understanding just through, we're talking about access, I mean access that's consistent and enforceable, was it your understand that access meant the physical access to Port 43 or the physical access, I just I think when you look at these terms reliable, enforceable, I'm just feeling like there's a disconnect here between what our organizations think.

Stephane Van Gelder: Can I just...sorry can I just, we've got four minutes left and we do have another motion that we need to talk about maybe very briefly but I don't want to take time from the next session, which is important as well, so that motion was made by me, it hasn't been seconded yet so this is an opportunity to call for a second.

The motion is on the IRD, the (unintelligible) internationalized registration data working group. We have discussed it already and you know that we are looking at approving the final report from that group which was revised following (SSAC) input into that work and we would like to approve that report and send it on to the board and we commit to providing it via, with regards to the recommendations to the board in due course.

So, and thanking the group for their work, is there any, and the reason I have made the motion is to basically try and move this on, it's not because I was specifically involved with the work it's because I'm trying to do some admin stuff on this and try and get this moved on.

I have Chuck, Ching, Zahid. Thank you. Zahid has seconded the motion.
Okay Ching.

Ching Chiao: Thank you Stephane. I did reply to you previously, I planned to I mean in my personal view on to second this motion but I, but I thought and we, and also at the registry group we did have some that much of the discussion on this issue about we have something like the kind of a placeholder where a sentenced if something coming up with some policy and the implication the council we will still have to consider that.

My understanding, and maybe somebody else on this working group can help me, and correct me if I'm wrong, is that we're looking at four recommendations in this, in this revised report and actually we are talking about, you know the four recommendation actually potentially we'll have to run this by at least from the registry point of view and also from the registrar point of view, by the in house technical team whether this recommendation can be worked or not.

And I understand in the issue report on the recommendation number two does have a room for a potential issue report or even moving (BP) for the contractual part of the IR feed so I'd just like to (unintelligible) by saying that I hold my, you know the you know trying to second the motion simply because I thought we should have this once again not just registry but other constituencies in the GNSO should have, you know further thoughts into this motion or this report.

So maybe Chuck you have something to add?

Stephane Van Gelder: Yeah thanks Ching. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes from VeriSign. I guess the thing that puzzles me with this motion Stephane is why is it being forwarded to the board before the GNSO council or the GNSO has reviewed it and provided these recommendations.

Of what value is that to the board, are we just communicating a -- we got this, we're going to review it and we will provide advice later. If I'm a board member it doesn't help me very much if I haven't, if I don't have your feedback on it.

Stephane Van Gelder: Because the work was done by the group it was re-worked following, because this is a joint piece of work that we're doing with (SSAC) as well re-worked with them and we now have a final report. So we can look at it, send it back to the working group, which (SSAC) did, or we can just continue following on the process and sending, sending it to the board. So that's a basic answer, I saw two hands, Liz and Ching. So Ching and Liz.

Ching Chiao: Thank you. Thank you Liz. Actually just following up on Chuck's question and your, your reply is that I saw on tomorrow's agenda we still have a chance to talk some with (SSAC), I'm not sure it's on the agenda for tomorrow's (SSAC) painting, but I thought there could be chances for the, at least for the council to talk with the, with the (SSAC) I mean representatives or actually staff on this particular issue.

And personally if I have the approval others in, on the registry group sitting in the council I would be happy to make a friendly amendment saying that the alternatively we can, you know we received the, we received the report and they're, they do very good work but they really need some further thoughts from at least, you know the registry and the registrar to, you know.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks. Thanks to both of you for making those points. Let me add by saying that, you know, there is out, if there are outstanding issues then I'm happy to ask, propose that the motion to look at them if we need to, to hold off or consider friendly amendments that really is what this session is

for and I'm happy to do that, once again the aim is to try to move this on but not try and move this on without looking at what needs to be done. Liz?

Liz Gasster: Just two things, Liz Gasster. First I understand that the (SSAC) has completed its review, so even of the revised reports, so it is simply waiting for the GNSO to act and then its hope is that jointly this report would go to the board.

I feel a little bit responsible for this motion and the language in it because it was something honestly that I suggested to the chairs, and the reason why I did is because when I read the joint report and read these recommendations it was my view just based on my WHOIS work that this was going to take a lot of discussion in the GNSO before it could go to.

Unless, well because my concern was that if the board received this kind of a rubber stamp from the GNSO without any discussion or recognition of what some of was involved here that the board because it asks for advice on this in 2009 could turn around and say to the, a second GNSO okay, you've approved this report as is, now go implement it.

And my concern is that the GNSO hasn't really talked about these recommendations and that there are recommendations that may be of concern and so my effort in drafting the motion this way was to provide a mechanism for the (SSAC) and the GNSO to present the, a report that the board has been waiting for since 2009 to it.

But flag it to the board to say even though here's the, here's the advice that you asked for from the working group but the GNSO still has advice it wants to give on this and hasn't had a chance to discuss it so it was merely a mechanism to get the report to the board without delaying it for the discussion that in my view was something you all wanted to do.

Now others on the staff have said that that was not a good idea on my part, and that we really shouldn't have just held up the motion until you all did have full time to vet and discuss these recommendations and decide whether you wanted to proceed to move this report to the board or not, so I'm just explaining why I took the approach that I did, I got a lot of criticism even from my colleagues saying this was really probably premature to handle it this way so that's how it, we are where we are.

The language of the motion could easily be rewritten based on what you all want to do next.

Stephane Van Gelder: Yeah. Thanks for making that point (Liz), much better than I did.

Chuck Gomes: Can I respond very quickly Stephane?

Stephane Van Gelder: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes again. I'm perfectly okay with the sentiment you just expressed. I didn't fully pick that up in here is my problem.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks. Alan and then we'll close.

Alan Greenberg: Thanks.

Stephane Van Gelder: Five minutes overdue.

Alan Greenberg: This is not an issue that I've been particularly involved in but I'm really troubled that something that's been going on for two plus years, three years we're now being told that registries and registrars have some problems with it and need to discuss it. It's awful late in the game for that. Thank you.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you. So let's bring that to a close, we are six minutes into the next session, let's have a two-minute break if we can then we'll go

straight into the discussion of our meetings with the GAC and the board, GAC today, board tomorrow. Thank you.

END