

**ICANN Singapore Meeting  
NCSG Part 2  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Tuesday 21 June 2011 at 16:45 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 now being recorded.

Avri Doria: Thank you very much. Okay, oh, I lost it again. There it is. So the first motion is the adoption of the IRTP part B final report and recommendations made by Tim Ruiz. Which one of our counselors would like to speak on that?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Are you going to speak on that, Rafik? Tell us how you're planning the vote. Is there any issue?

Man: Microphone.

Avri Doria: The motion is up there. Okay, if another counselor would like to take it instead of Rafik, then that's fine. But I'd like someone of the counselors who must know these by heart by now to speak on it and give us basically a rundown of where we're going.

Rafik Dammak: I'm not sure if -- how do you say that?

Woman: Can I help out?

Avri Doria: Please, please.

Woman: So this is the interregistrar transfer policy part B of five work groups. This is a report that they've passed on unanimously out of the working group recommending various processes for transfer between registrars.

It sounds as though these are good, solid recommendations that clarify matters sort of technical coordination and don't raise policy concerns from our perspective or that of non-commercial registrants. So I think we should be prepared to support it.

Avri Doria: Any difference of opinion or questions in terms of that, anything that really needs to be discussed? Anybody have questions about it? Any curiosity at all? Everybody has read it and is happy with it?

Man: I think (unintelligible)...

Avri Doria: Put on the microphone. Oh, speak into the microphone.

Man: On the thing, the table, the registrar are happy with that, so they want to finish IRTP working group.

Avri Doria: I didn't understand. So you're saying the registrars are unhappy with this?

Man: Happy.

Avri Doria: They are happy. But that's okay, okay. So no other comments on that one, so we're comfortable with people voting yes. Okay, wow, there's lots of stuff in this one: resolve B, resolve C, D, resolve G. Oh, this is a long one.

Okay, motion two, regarding the revision of the GNSO council operating procedures relating to proxy voting. Yes, made by Wolf-Ulrich Knoben,

seconded by (Stephan). Anyone want to speak to that one? Bill Drake, yes, this is your inspiration, wasn't it?

Bill Drake: Yes, I caused this problem. No, it's a simple point, actually. The way the rules have been written in the proxy section of the procedural guidelines kind of were based on the way other stakeholder groups work. So there was a presumption that stakeholder group would give instructions to the council member and so on as to how to vote and I kept saying we don't do that.

We -- our individual members, our council members are bound to instructions. We allow them to function freely and, therefore, the rules have to accommodate that reality.

I went back and forth with (Phillip) for an unbelievable amount of time over some very arcane little possible tweaks. Finally we ended up with language that he found appealing, which I thought was not optimal but at least not injurious to our interests and so we said fine.

So the prox language now reads something like, you know, a person, a counselor holding a proxy should follow one of the following methods in the proceeding order, A, follow any constituency or stakeholder group guidance if applicable or if provided, B, vote their own interest -- sorry, vote their own conscious -- or sorry, vote as instructed by the person whose proxy they have.

And then, C, if they have no instructions, vote their own conscious. I actually thought it was problematic to have C that the possibility that somebody -- you give a counselor a proxy and they just make a decision based on their own view of things how you would have voted.

But there were circumstances of which one could imagine that going awry but overall this is better than what we had before, so it's not a big deal and

everybody, I think, is unanimously backing the revision except for Rafik, who would like to speak.

Avri Doria: Okay, Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Just to check with, so for example, for the case of -- how to say -- the (NCA), the non-comp appointees...

Bill Drake: I think there is separate language for the non-comp appointees. This wouldn't apply to them. This is about people who are representatives, elected representatives.

Rafik Dammak: Because...

Avri Doria: Yes, I was part of the group. We were working this and we got into a fair amount of complexity and we got even to the point where, yes, a -- you know, they have each other as possible proxies. They have their homeless, houseless one as a possible proxy.

And, in fact, the rule as I remember it being written is even written that you can get a proxy from anyone, you know, and so the (NCA) could indeed be proxied by someone else or someone could ask the (NCA) if I remember the rule. Yes?

Woman: (Unintelligible - off mike). In the section that talks about proxy voting there's a comment about quorum. It says an absent counselor does not count towards quorum even if a proxy has been established. A temporary replacement, if present, would count towards quorum.

Avri Doria: Should I explain it?

Woman: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay, among the measures -- there are three measures for an either absence or abstention for cause and one of those is a directed vote, one of those is a proxy and one of those is a temporary replacement.

A temporary replacement is someone where someone is going to be absent for the next two months because they're going off to a mission in Antarctica.

So the stakeholder group, by whatever measure the stakeholder group uses, appoints someone as a temporary replacement, so that is a physical person who then attends the meeting and is, therefore, counted in quorum, whereas, if you walk in with a proxy to the meeting, you still only count as one person, not as two persons in the quorum count.

Quorum is basically a count of bodies, not a vote.

Any other comments, questions on this one or are people fine with it getting -- any issues about it getting approved? One other point I'd like to make -- and this relates to our charter -- when Bill was talking saying our charter does not force a vote, that is indeed correct.

We have language in there saying council representatives from the (NCSG) could vote as they believe is, you know, representative of the group and, of course, it's a diverse group. You know, they have the option of deciding how it is and they need to answer to the group for how they vote.

However, we do have the clause in the upcoming charter that sort of says the policy committee with the approval of the executive committee can direct a vote. So if the policy committee felt it was reasonable for whatever reason to direct a vote and the executive committee said yes, it would be the policy committee that would decide.

In our case, our charter would decide how the vote was directed with the executive committee deciding that, yes, it was reasonable to direct a vote. So we do have that in our upcoming charter. Yes, Bill?

Bill Drake: Since I have not looked at the charter in some time, can you remind me was that base don consensus, those decisions?

Avri Doria: No.

Bill Drake: That was based on voting?

Avri Doria: I believe so. The policy committee has always been a rough consensus group and I believe that with the change the executive committee is now also. I'd have to go back and check the voting counts, but yes.

Bill Drake: So one could conceivably have a situation where there's a direction given -- let's say somebody is from a constituency that doesn't agree with another constituency. There could be a majority vote saying that all counselors are supposed to vote a particular way?

Avri Doria: There could, theoretically and then...

Bill Drake: Over and above the views of their retrospective constituencies?

Avri Doria: Well, remember, the counselors are (NCSG) counselors, not constituency counselors and each of them may apply to zero, one, two or three constituencies assuming we had three or more constituencies.

So, yes, remembering anything, though, the executive committee decides can also be overrun by an appeal mechanism. So it's something that I don't think, you know, we'll be engaged in often but it is there as a possibility.

For example, as was being discussed in the (NCUC), the (VNCSG) could decide, for example, that in the future they believed that the membership should vote on how the counselors would vote in an election or something and that that would be something.

So you can basically come up with methods but it is not something to be used easily. But it can be done.

Okay, as I say, happen every time an edit went on with the charter I did send people notice saying read it, comment it, whatever and I must say the most faithful one I knew of doing it was (Brendan) who was constantly saying but you misspelled this and other things he brought up, too. But he always seemed to catch the typos and, of course, with me that's relatively easy.

Okay, so that does it for that in terms of the motions. Is there anything else coming up in the council meeting that makes it interesting? Updates, so is there something you want to -- no? Are there going to be any really good discussions that we should look forward to and have viewpoints about? Yes, please.

Man: I think (unintelligible) (you) made about drafting -- (fronting) the drafting team for the outreach task force, if there is someone from the -- you are? Okay, good. I wasn't (unintelligible), so I don't think that I'm going to (unintelligible). I was asking who from the (NCG) was going to volunteer (for this).

Avri Doria: Okay, anyone? Yes.

Woman: I'll be providing an update from the workshop that will be held just immediately before the council meeting. So I don't think in the council meeting we'll get anywhere near figuring out what our next step will be after that workshop but given that what we're talking about is a committed review of the three elements -- competition, consumer trust and consumer choice --

12 months after the introduction of the new GTLDs, if people could start thinking about what our preferred next step might be that would be helpful.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Okay, and, Bill, I have to go back and correct myself. The executive committee remains on full consensus unless they take a vote to do something else before discussion of an issue.

Anything else regarding to the upcoming council meeting? If not, I'll move on on the agenda. We still don't have Brian, so I'll keep going. He obviously -- it's hard to -- okay, I will talk reportive actions. I think both of these are relatively easy.

The initiation of the financial committee function, I created a mailing list. There's a bunch of people on it. It still could have more but there was at least one from each of the constituency and candidate constituencies.

There have basically been I think essentially two emails on it. The first one was kind of my initial one and with a suggestion that does (NCSG) need funding and if it needs funding, how does it need funding with an opening suggestion of perhaps we want to come up with a notion of a voluntary contribution from members, certainly not a required but a voluntary one.

And the only response on that list so far -- and I think that this was just still open to people that have financial sensibilities and want to help (NCSG) and its financial future. I think anyone is invited.

We haven't even had somebody put themselves forward to be the leader of this yet. And I can't be but I can act as the coordinator until such time as we do have someone who's willing to be a leader because that makes them the treasurer of (NCSG) also by definition of our charter.

Of course, a treasurer with no treasury is an interesting thing to be. And in response to my statement that, you know, that we should put together a

program of voluntary contributions, I think it was (Milton) responded by saying that's a really bad idea because it's just have you ever had to chase down people for contributions. It's a miserable life; it's really hard, that would never work.

And so perhaps we should talk about contributions from our constituent constituencies who have their own fundraising method, etc cetera. That's as far as it's gotten. There's been an open suggestion. There's been a counter suggestion. We haven't gone very far.

We can talk about it more here, though I would want to break for PIR and Brian but I also encourage people who, A, are into talking about financial issues and how the (NCSG) deals with the issue to let me know and basically you can be added to this financial committee function, which basically, as it's defined in the charter, is each constituency gets to put people in and then we get to invite other people who have some sense about financial issues -- you guys can sit in the middle if you wanted; you can sit (unintelligible) -- etc cetera.

So let me know if you want to get...

Man: Sorry. (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: You want to be on my left side. It's far better. I'm always moving to the left. But, anyway, so I'll come back to that if people want to. But at this point I'd like to break the discussion there and welcome Brian and ((Martin)) from PIR and the floor is yours.

Brian Cute: Thank you very much and thank you for having us, a lot of familiar faces. For those who aren't, my name is Brian Cute. I took on the role of CEO at Public Interest Registry on February 1st and thrilled to be here with you and thrilled to be in the role.

I understand clearly a very strong relationship that we have between PIR, (NCSG), (NCUC) over time and it's very well appreciated and thank you for the opportunity to let you know what's going on at PIR and what we see coming down the road and where our interests might be crossing or certainly concerns might be crossing.

Since taking on the role, for those of you who don't know, I've been in the industry since 2002 on the registrar side and registry side. So I have a good appreciation of ICANN and all that that entails.

But PIR was and .org in particular really an eye opening experience for me because while I'm certainly familiar with .org until you take the helm or get inside and really appreciate with .org means to the community of users, the public interest values that stand behind .org, it's a very compelling story and I'm really thrilled to have the opportunity to take PIR forward and .org forward, particularly with the challenges that we're facing.

Not just new TLDs, as we all know, and the conditions in the market and for registrants that that's going to create but also other things in the environment that are beginning to put pressure on the system and pressure on registries.

The two things that I think are top of mind for me is, one, new top level domains. PIR will continue to be as it always has been, a strong advocate for best practices and the proper rules of the road and protecting registrants and the new top level domain not being about just an exploitative opportunity from the commercial standpoint.

PIR was very active in the development of the (dag). We're going to continue to be active. As you all know, there are some important, critical issues that are still open and not closed. Yesterday was a very big day but there's now lots of work to do, so we'll be very engaged.

On non-new TLD or outside ICANN issues and the environment, one that's got me particularly concerned is the growing pressure from governments and from law enforcement on registries and registrars but the DNS in particular and I know we've all seen legislation in the U.S. that's pending that would put some owners requirements on registries with respect to takedowns.

It's an environment that could very quickly in the coming months, if we don't have some thoughtful engagement among all the parties to try to find a framework where our interests and values are not sacrificed at the whims of law enforcement, this could become a very difficult environment for us in, you know, 12 to 24 months if it's not properly managed.

So PIR, you can count on us to be looking for constructive ways to address those pressures and come to more reasonable solutions. I know this group is going to be very active and we look forward to working with you.

Just one example of what we've done recently is there was a technical paper developed with respect to the impact of the protect IP bill on DNS sect written by some of the leading lights, you know, Steve Crocker and Paul Vixie and others, and Don Blumenfeld, who you may know.

Blumenfeld is on our staff. He participated in the drafting of that paper. And so we're participating. We are not for profit. We continue to be that. We don't engage in lobbying per se but we want to be active in influencing for the right outcomes.

So that technical paper, if you haven't seen it, I can, you know, circulate it to (Aubrey) and she can get it to you but it's had very good impact in the environment in making the legislators stop and think about the impact of these types of laws on the operations of DNS, the impact on DNS sect, which is a really critical component to the security of the ecosystem going forward.

So you'll continue to see us very active on those fronts. The last thing I want to tell you about without taking too much time and I'm certainly open to any questions you have is that with respect to new top level domains, we are exploring and strongly considering going after the new TLD .ngo for non-governmental organizations.

We've been giving this some thought for a number of months. We certainly see a distinct community in NGOs. We've done an awful lot of research with the community and it's clear that there's a large community that has a strong self identification with those three letters and we think that there is a service that we can provide to that community very consistent with the service we've provided to the .org community.

So that's something that we're continuing to explore. We think public interest registry is a not for profit and our longstanding service to community is the right entity to work on that TLD, work with the community and bring value to that community.

And interestingly, a large percentage of that community is found in the developing world and that is another area we're going to focus our resources very hard in the coming years. So I wanted to let you know that.

We're looking for friends and input and assistance anywhere we can in making sure our outreach to the community is constructive, well-founded. We understand the needs and that if that's something that we achieve that we can do that well. So that's an update of what's going on at PIR.

Avri Doria: Thanks. I'd like to open it up to questions. Before I do, I have stated before as part of disclosure that I was providing some -- more research consulting to PIR and the research consulting to PIR that I've been providing is on this particular topic, on .ngo. So I figured I'd amplify my disclosure. So does anyone have any questions? Yes, Bill?

Bill Drake: I'm just wondering, Brian, in your -- I guess you've done some probing around and talking with people about the extent to which they identify with the term. Have you run across in the context of that inquiry any of the discussion among the people who think that the term NGO is problematic in so far as technically in fact, you know, the chamber of commerce is a non-governmental organization and, you know, so on and so forth?

I mean, non-governmental is a very broad category and most of the people I deal with use the term (sole) society organization, for example, in Geneva. Many people prefer CSO as a rubric. It's not a big deal. I'm just curious have you guys dealt with that argument and just decided that because of the historical legacy branding that we stick with the term that started to get used in the 1940s or how did you approach that question?

Brian Cute: Excellent questions, all. We've come across the CSOs. We're familiar with that. The question of, you know, who is an NGO and who isn't is actually central to the offering that we think we can bring to the community.

NGO, we would operate as a closed domain, not an open domain. Org is an open domain. But it would be for NGOs only and, therefore, that implies there is a definition, a universe. We've done a lot of research on that.

I'm not going to tell you it's a clean, clean, black line all the way around the circle but this will be a closed domain exclusively for NGOs. We understand the community relies a lot of on contributions to the public.

Having the wrong folks register and abuse that TLD would be a serious detriment to the community, so we are fashioning it along those lines and, Bill, you're asking the right questions. We're doing the research. I think we have a solid understanding of what could help the community in that regard.

Bill Drake: If I may, I think you're answering a different question from the one I asked.

Brian Cute: Fire away. I'm sorry.

Bill Drake: It's not a big deal. We're all tired and I shouldn't even be belaboring it but I'm just curious what your opinion was. My question is not whether or not you will carefully make sure that people are nonprofit or noncommercial but rather whether the term NGO versus (sole) society does have different resonance with some communities. I'm wondering if that was taken into account or not.

Brian Cute: It was taken into account, yes.

Bill Drake: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. At the moment I've got a good list of Maria, Rafik, Constantinos, Wendy, (Debbie). (Maria)?

Maria Farrell: Actually, mine is on a different topic altogether, so I think there is some follow-up questions that might be...

Avri Doria: No, I think it's probably just good to go through.

Maria Farrell: Fair enough. Maria Farrell, I haven't met you yet. Nice to meet you. I'm just wondering what your thoughts were on current and upcoming issues on the GNSO agenda and any particular issues that are of interest or relevance there.

Brian Cute: Well, I understand that GNSO, not on the agenda per se, but had an interaction with the board the other day and brought up the issue of revolving door policy and I just want to say here, here. I thought that was excellently done and if the GNSO wishes to continue focus on that issue.

I had written a piece in (Circle ID) where I raised this as an issue because in the new TLD round with staff going into the industry or industry going into

ICANN it's kind of an obvious issue that can be addressed fairly easily and it's a perception issue. So I applaud the GNSO for raising that issue in particular.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And next, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, (Aubrey). I heard the expression developing in countries, so I want to ask what Brian wanted to say about that and I think he is also worried about the (trans working group), so what is the PIR thinking to provide any kind of support for any of the applicants from developing countries. And I think it would be really nice if PIR can make public and participate the public comment, etc cetera.

Brian Cute: Thank you for that. In fact, we did sign on to a letter just a few weeks back supporting the jazz effort. We do support the jazz effort. The developing countries and the not having barriers to entry for applicants in other parts of the world is very, very important.

And actually there's other aspects of the (dag) where we will be active. I don't know if folks have looked at, for example, the registry fail over escrow requirements. It's very important.

I mean, having registries fail over and having registrants be, you know, twisting in the wind is something we all want to avoid. But currently ICANN has a formula proposal that actually could tie up a fair amount of cash even for a low domain under management type of TLD base.

I'm sure a lot of new applicants have not run the numbers but that's an issue we'll be working as well because that, while an important priority, could actually create a barrier to entry.

So we think there's other aspects as well and we're fully supportive of the principle.

Avri Doria:           Constantinos?

Constantinos Roussos:       Thanks. Hi, Brian. I will go back to the issue that you mentioned, the protect IP (act), the domain name takedowns and seizures and the obligations that are imposed upon you.

Actually, we had a pretty interesting discussion this morning in the (NCUC) and it's more of me letting you know that (NCUC) basically objects this unreasonable, if you want, tendency that we see lately towards these form of protections, especially when intermediaries like registries are being placed in such an awkward position when there is no jurisdiction.

You don't know which law you have to choose and I know that PIR made a choice. So it was more of an issue that -- it was more me trying to tell you that you have the support of (NCUC) in the context of where you're being -- the position that you are, which is a very awkward position in relation to domain name takedowns and seizures.

Brian Cute:           Thank you very much. We -- just so you know, we have given a lot of thought to this internally as well in terms of engaging with the community. We have been posting on our Web site takedown requests that we receive in order to be transparent about this.

The (Roha Direct) Takedown, I don't know if you saw that, but a case was brought in court so we're following that very closely to see what the outcome of that. But as important as those issues are, and they are, I firmly believe that engagement in education of law enforcement and governments is really critical here.

You know, if any of you know (Bobby Flane) from the FBI, he is representative of someone who's thoughtful, who's trying to get the parties together to come to a better place.

(Ice) on the other hand, is demonstrating behavior that's just not very thoughtful. And so, you know, we really need to play our own role here, too, in trying to educate them and bring them along into a collaborative approach to addressing these issues instead of a very onerous legislative solution and heavy-handed approach.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And now Wendy and then (Debbie), so Wendy?

Wendy Seltzer Thanks. Thanks Brian and (Martin). Also Wendy Seltzer, also wanted to follow up on Constantinos o the response to domain takedowns. Just as representatives of non-commercial registrants of domain names we really depend on our registries and registrars to provide secure and stable location pointers for our online identifies.

And so I think we are very interested in coordinating in whatever way we can to help with those responses, to help with the communications of how important it is that there be defined process for domain name security and anything we can do to help and anything we can do to coordinate communications we are I would say eager to help with from the non-commercial users constituency.

On your new registry consideration, I would be very interested in talking with you, anyone really, about ideas for how to make registries more secure for communications considering questions like traceability of access to the registry and protections for privacy of both of those registering domains and those making requests for the domains and interested in seeing the technical innovation as well as innovation in the choice of strings.

Brian Cute: Thank you for the offer and it's well received. And I agree with you. We need technical innovation to address some of these issues. My own worry is that the environment has become such that I'm not sure that the traditional role of registries as those that resolve the DNS in the neutral fashion is going to survive in tact.

I think the pressure is building from so many different fronts that we may be past the point where governments can be convinced that these critical assets of the DNS are not where you should go to address the bad actors and it's unfortunate.

The Protect IP Act thankfully after some influence on (Quaka), registries and registrars were dropped out because we were in (Quaka) and we were targets and that was really worrisome. So at least we've dodged that bullet in this iteration but I just want to share with you when I look across the landscape I'm very, very, very concerned. This is going to require a very aggressive and thoughtful engagement.

Man: Very quickly. I'm sorry to be -- and of course, at the same time you have the (PDDRP), which you really need to monitor very closely as to how it's going to be used. And the position, again, (out of place) with the registries and registrars.

Brian Cute: Absolutely. And to your point on the new TLD, if you don't mind, I'd like to turn the mike over to (Martin Botterman), chairman of our board who's been deeply involved in our NGO effort -- oh, sure, sure, before I do that, yes.

(Debbie): So this queue is almost like we should have planned it in advance. This is flowing wonderfully because what I wanted to talk about was in the past Red Cross has spoken very, very well about .org at one of these meetings before and I just wanted to do it again because we've got a new CEO.

PIR has always partnered very well with the American Red Cross and our societies and I just wanted to say thank you publicly and just to share with this group some more great examples of how they are good corporate citizens.

I didn't know if you all were aware that during the Japan relief disaster, PIR decided to waive the renewal fees for one year for all the names that expired during the time of March 11th through June 11th and were able to get some of the individual registrars to participate.

So I think that's another good example of partnering with organizations that care. And just wanted to publicly make sure that this group is aware that they do the right thing and they stand behind NGOs.

And a Red Cross story, when we had two of our disasters, members of their team brought to our attention some Web sites that they thought were sketchy and I thought that that was outstanding and just wanted to say thank you, thank you and thank you for organization that relies on having, as Wendy said, a very safe and secure and stable platform to operate and to do important work. Thank you for all that you do.

Brian Cute: Thank you, (Debbie).

Avri Doria: So, (Martin)?

(Martin Botterman): Okay, a little bit more on the background (unintelligible). I've been able to see Brian come in and that is a great experience for those of you who know him. You'll agree with me. For the others, you will find out if you haven't done that yet.

Really it was such an opportunity to serve the NGO community better. The question on the (CSO) or NGO bill that was in fact many in the domain consider going (CSO) because NGO is a name that gets tainted in some areas.

We see one of the things where we can make a difference is make sure that if there is a new disaster we don't have all these new briefcase NGOs pop up and say, hey, send us money. We can help by putting in a (bird) in there.

They will not get a Web site if they just exist for that reason unless they get the explicit support of other recognized organizations within the community.

Otherwise they will face a two-year waiting period or something like that. For something like that (unintelligible) they're still working on the finances. So in a way, I think that with that the domain for NGOs will add to the concept of NGO.

(Simple) society organization just doesn't cover the same (load). With that said, I think so far we do find a warm response and indeed seek, as Brian said, so well more guidance on how to get involved because one thing is to define it for those who are deeper in the NGO world, you know, there's one definition that all NGOs would agree upon.

And but there needs to be some bottom line and the second is so how do you challenge that and how do you deal with that in a proper way benefiting from the community itself?

We believe that this is an opportunity to move forward. Some may choose to stay in the (unintelligible) domain. Others may choose to step over. It's whatever organizations need.

When I was back -- when I came onboard (with the work), of course, when I was invited, you look at the Web site and see (unintelligible). And basically what was very clear to me is that (Orec) had a very good reputation already for quite some years.

And if there are any comments it's about not being that much of a closed domain that some people hoped it would be in the past. And now we have the opportunity to offer that closed domain for those who need that next to the (unintelligible). So we're very happy to pursue that and also of course Brian is here from the board.

Avri Doria: Thank you. So are there any more questions or comments for either Martin or Brian? If not, thank you. Thank you for coming and thank you for talking and thank you for all the help that you've give us over the years.

Brian Cute: Thank you all very much.

Avri Doria: Getting back to our agenda, we can close it quickly if people want to. We had four more items but there's a rip roaring board GAC meeting that we can all go to. We need to talk about policy planning for what we do between now and the next meeting, otherwise we find ourselves not having planned on what we want to do.

We had the two projects -- the project -- the document issues related to DHS seizures. (Amar) is working on that but hasn't gotten very far. There is a wiki space for him so hopefully between now and October that can go further.

We have an election coming up, council seat. There will be four seats up for election. Three of them will be for two years. One of them will be for one year. This is so that we can get back on cycle because we've got the three board appointees up for election, those three.

The current holders of those seats are eligible to run again. We basically, in the transition part of the charter we indicated that their board appointed term counts as a first term same rules of -- I'm forgetting the word but basically you only get two terms. Whatever the right word for that one is. Term limits, thank you. As I say, I'm thinking about too many things.

So the same term limits apply. They will have completed one term and they're eligible to run for a second. Also we have one that is just normally up in its time so that we can get back on the three each year we're basically going to do -- and what I'm proposing to the executive committee and I think there's general acceptance is that we've got a list of candidates, you know, hopefully longer than four but at least four.

Top three votes are the two-year roles and the next is the one-year vote -- I mean, one-year role. None of the above will be on the list, so if none of the above is in the top four we obviously have an issue. Yes?

Man: I think that's a very good plan but I think that we should also leave it open if someone wants to volunteer to run for just one year and there is no objection by anyone else then we can actually say that if it is for the one-year spot that it makes sense. You know what I'm saying?

Avri Doria: It makes the election, setting up the election more complicated.

Man: Oh, okay.

Avri Doria: Now, what we could do is sort of set that if you're in the top four and you want to volunteer that you are the one-year slot. That makes sense. But to have the election bifurcated into those two groups gets difficult. But certainly we can say the fourth person is the one-year term unless one of the top three says I want to do it for just one year and then that seems fine.

But we can talk about that. The other election we've got -- we've got two other votes and then I'll get to you. We've got two other votes and then I'll be finished.

One is our charter requires that we approve the charter given to us by the board and others. The charter that we submitted was a charter that we approved. We submitted to the board. We went through a year of editing process. The board is now approving an edited version of it.

It comes back to us. Remember that we have a hard threshold of the membership. Now I'm going to go through an exercise to make sure it's only of the active membership and not of the membership that never answers their email.

But we have a hard threshold of that and also we need to elect an (NCSG) chair. So we are done once everybody that has a comment and wants to talk about something is done. So I had Rafik and then I had Bill.

Rafik Dammak: Just a question why there is post for one-year term?

Avri Doria: Basically, because we want to have three elected each year and as we've got six seats and we want to have three on two terms but because -- I think is it Wendy's term, no. Whose term is it?

Woman: Because the three board appointed counselors were all appointed in the same year...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: And yours is the other term that's up for reelection. So that's why we've got four this time. And in order to get back on a three and three balance, the easiest way to do that is to make one of them one year and then next year we've got three again. Yes, Bill?

Bill Drake: I simply wanted to thank (Aubrey) for serving as our chair through this important transitional period in (NCSG)'s development and all the work she's done.

Avri Doria: Thank you. But I will be gone by the next time we have a meeting. So in that case is there any other issue, categories, any other issues, any other discussion on any of this stuff that went before? No? In which case, have fun. The meeting's over. Thank you.

END