

**Transcription ICANN Singapore
Update on GNSO Review
Saturday 22 March 2014**

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.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#mar>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Jonathan Robinson: So the final item we've got today is a discussion of the proposed GNSO review.

Jonathan Robinson: Let's start the recording, commence the session, and we can have some introductory discussion with Jen who can give us some background to our involvement with this and what's gone on. And then in that time, I'll expect we'll be joined by Ray who can then take us through the presentation.

Why don't we just take one minute for everyone to sort of stand up and stretched their legs for a moment because this is our last session and we've all been stuck for awhile. So let's just take a couple of minutes, and then Jen, if you'll bear with us and then we'll start the recording and get on with things.

So everyone, please don't leave the room or break into total anarchy, but if you could at least just stand up, stretch their legs, feel that you can move around for a minute or two.

All right, thanks everyone. I'm glad you've had an opportunity to just briefly stretch your legs. If I could call you back to the table so that we can call the meeting to order for our final session. I can see Ray is joining us here in the room, so Ray, come and join us up at the table here and be welcome.

All right everyone, if we could start the recording for our final session of the day in which we're going to touch on the forthcoming GNSO review.

I'd like to welcome our NomCom appointed Councilor Jennifer Wolfe on the telephone who has got up at some unmentionable hour to join us. And we're

fortunate to have Ray Plzak who is an ICANN Board meeting, Chairman of the Structure Improvements Committee, and in that capacity, responsible for amongst other things the review processes of the SOs and ACs I assume.

So welcome Jen on the telephone. Thanks to all the Councilors and for everyone in the room for bearing with us during a long day. And I think I'll hand over to you right away Ray to kick off and let us know what's going on, where your latest thoughts are and where you've gone too.

Ray Plzak: Thank you Jonathan. Please excuse my voice if it gives out from time to time. I've been at it steady since 8:30 this morning.

First of all, I want to express my appreciation for the work that Jen did with the staff members. This is something that we put into place at the end of the Buenos Aires meeting; we thought it would be beneficial to have some sort of a GNSO participation in the development of this as we move forward.

Since I last gave a presentation on this which was in Buenos Aires at the Board GNSO Council Session, there have been a few things that have happened and I think we're pretty much all aware of those things that have happened, that have changed the environment a little bit since last year. So that has influenced a little bit of which we're going to go with the GNSO review.

So before I start, Jen, is there anything that you'd like to say?

Jennifer Wolfe: No, no. I appreciate the opportunity to have been involved in working with staff, and I know you're going to give the full update.

I guess once you're finished, one of the things I'd like to discuss with Council is the idea that we had thrown out to conduct a self-review in tandem with this review. But I'll let you run through your deck and then we can come back to that issue.

Ray Plzak: Okay, thank you. So slide please. That's somehow or other the projector, so it's the wrong slides because there's more to that slide.

Jonathan Robinson: It's not (unintelligible) properly.

Ray Plzak: Right and I just want to make sure that everyone else can see it. So while they're doing that I'll go into this.

First of all if you look at the bylaws, the bylaws say that reviews are supposed to do two things. One is to determine whether or not – that's it, good. Is whether or not the organization should continue to exist, literally (unintelligible). And the second thing is that look at organizational effectiveness.

Well since several things that have occurred, we thought that it would probably be best not to even think about looking at anything that might cause us to say, "We need to change the structure of the organization," because the organization structure could change with the result of everything else that's going on.

So leaving that aside, we're going to be focusing on organizational effectiveness. And we're going to be doing it in such a way that we're looking only at the effectiveness at the way that things are being done.

We're not going to be looking at the capacity of the organization to look into the future as far as the environment changes. And so that's one thing that we would normally do in a review, and that's one of the things that had talked about as far as doing so. So the objective is to only to examine the organizational effectiveness.

We're going to use an independent examiner as well as staff and also some participation from the GNSO, and I'll get to those in a while.

But the independent examiner is going to be selected by a competitive bid. And this independent examiner is going to have a tightly scoped contract.

For those of you that endured the last review of the GNSO, the contractor was able to basically go out and figure out what he wanted to talk about, spend time figuring out what the organization is supposed to be doing, and then go out and charge around. And that was true not only the GNSO, but true of the rest of the reviews, so we're not going to let that occur this time so we're going to keep him focused. And I'll go through in a minute how we're going to do that.

So we've looked at four work methods; one is to examine the documentation, records and reports. That will be done by the independent examiner and that's going to primarily involve an interface with staff to do that type of work because they have access to the repositories of those documents and records and reports.

For example, I would look at records and reports if I want to gather some specific data about meetings, the way meetings are conducted, when noticed is given. And I would like at minutes, when they're published and so forth. And I would take that and by examining the document that described the procedure by which you're supposed to conduct meetings, I would then be able to make some observations as far as you're effectiveness in following that procedure.

The 360 Assessment; this is something that is new, something that we have talked about in previous discussions. In that we're going to use well formed surveys, I guess is the best way to talk about this, and we're going to be – the unit examiner is probably the one that's going to be doing the mechanics of it. Staff will be involved in it as well and the GNSO will be involved as well.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Ray Plzak: When I get to roles and responsibilities, I'll tell you how that's going to happen.

We just had ATRT2 and they made some assessments. And we are certain that there are things in there that may have applicability to the GNSO and to this process. And so we're going to ask the independent examiner to integrate those assessments.

And so in some cases it may say, "Well we don't have to look at this because ATRT2 looked at it." In other cases it will say that ATRT2 looked at this and it looks like there may be further examination needed. And in other cases it will say, "Well they didn't look at this so we must look at it."

And then we're going to do limited interviews. If you recall previous reviews, they generally lasted over two or three meetings, and you had several members of the contractor walking around and conducting interviews. And to a certain extent, I don't think there was much rhyme and reason about how to really select people. That may be just my personal opinion having been interviewed over the course of several reviews.

But I do remember the interview that we had in Wellington when the GNSO review started. At the time, there were four regional registries; I was the CEO of one of them. And so we were being interviewed by the reviewer about the GNSO.

And it became apparent to us very quickly when he was asking us questions about the GNSO, that he didn't understand how the GNSO worked. And so we spent most of the time, as the Chief Executive Officers of the four regional registries who allocated and assigned IP addresses, telling him, "Hey, this is really how it works." And so we don't want that kind of stuff to happen again.

But we do recognize the value of interviews. And the strategy behind that is going to involve how we're going to select people. There may be some people being selected that have not done surveys and there may be some

people who have done surveys who will also be interviewed. So that is something where we'll be involved with discussions with the GNSO to figure out who those people are.

In addition, not only will we be talking to people inside the GNSO, we'll also be talking to people outside. And part of the 360 Assessment is that not only do we look at having members of the GNSO fill out surveys, but we'll be looking at members of the other SOs and ACs and actually have staff people do it too. So it's particularly the staff that's involved with the GNSO, filling out these things, and somebody that maybe on a periphery. So we're trying to get a larger picture.

One of the things we're also going to try and do with these surveys is determine what is the sample size that we need and the distribution of the sample to maybe be able to draw some statistical inference from this. I don't know if we'll succeed at that, but that's something we may want to look at.

Criteria; it's objective and object and quantifiable. And in previous briefings, I've showed you examples of it, but it really is down to very specific questions that are going to be unambiguous, and they will be very clear if it's a yes/no or if it's a gray area and pick between one and ten or whatever. But the idea is it's very objective which then makes it easier to measure.

Select from developed lists; we already have developed the lists and I think there's about 130 items on those lists. But we certainly won't necessarily generate surveys that use 130, we'll probably want to do some calling in that area too.

And by the way, the surveys – the individual surveys – are not going to be large surveys. There's nothing worse than sitting down and taking a survey that's got 120 questions in it, and you know, by the time you get to number ten you'll probably be done with the survey and you've just got to get through the rest of it. So we recognize that as well.

And so some people may be taking more than one assessment survey, but those are strategies that we're going to work through.

And so the criteria is going to be used for everything; the examination and the 360 Assessment and the interviews. Next slide please.

Here's the timeline. Now this is the five-year timeline and it's not quite five years. But really quickly, we are not in the pre-review stage and we think we can get everything done between now and sometime in May, which basically is finalizing the plan, preparing the 360 reviews, and also preparing an RFP and selecting an examiner.

That RFP contracting process is going to be the standard process that ICANN uses for all of its contracts; we're not inventing something new here. The actual review itself, we see it taking a year, but it's not only the conduct of the review, it also involves the preservation report, recommendations and an implementation plan. And I'll go through more depth and detail about the report and recommendation process later.

And then, given a year from February of '15 to February of '16, to implement the recommendations. And so that will involve the corrective action that may be as a result of the recommendations. It also is the time which the implementation will cause integration into the strategic plan, the operation plans, the budget, and also into the risk assessment systems so that this report is not sitting out by itself but is actually integrated into the organization.

Because there were talks like, "Well, we have to institutionalize it." Well the way to institutionalize it is to get it into these processes."

Well the report itself will be published so that other people can take advantage of the recommendations that were made with regards to what happened with the GNSO. So there's a self-improvement thing across the organization; certainly the ASO or the ccNSO could gain from the experience and the reporting that's done there.

And lastly, during this phase, there will be some monitoring of the implementation to make sure that everything is going smoothly.

Then there's the two-year period from March of '16 to March of '18 where we're going to be gaining operational experience; you're going to work with that system.

Now, fully realizing that also during this whole period of time all this other stuff is going on, and so that's obviously going to impact some things. And there may be some of these recommendations that because of what's happening with the rest of the world that will not be implemented. So we have to be flexible to understand that. And if it comes to pass that that happens.

And then lastly, from April of '18 to December of '18, we will be conducting the effectiveness of self assessment. That's where you're going to sit back and look at yourself and say, "Well how well did we do?" And that will actually be part of what's handed off to the next review that occurs. And so that's part of preparing the report for the next review.

I'll stop here real quickly and take a few questions and then we can move on.

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible) and then Avri.

(Sommer): Yes, this is (Sommer). Ray, thanks for being here with us today.

I wanted to ask you a question, and just to make sure that I didn't miss anything, you said that the criteria used in the review would be measurable and quantifiable, mostly or in a sense, some yes/no answers and easy to measure.

I was wondering what the wisdom in that is. So why not use qualitative means to – in the review. I think, especially in an organization with multiple stakeholders who interact with each other and work together, qualitative data

on how this happens could be really helpful in finding out measures to improve this interaction.

Ray Plzak: Quality also could be objective too. The way you ask a qualitative question could be objective as far as you determine things.

And a simple example of that is when you ask somebody how well something is being done, that's a qualitative question. And then if you give them a graduated response of, you know, like I said, select from one to ten or something like that, that's an example of how you could do something qualitative.

Now, to take that a little step further, in the limited interviews, you could actually then get into a little bit more in depth of exploring. So the qualitative – I may have been maybe a little bit too emphatic about things being objective, but the idea is being measurable.

You can measure quality too; people do it all the time. You know, how well do you do something is a good example. You know, I do this well, I don't do this well. I have room for improvement, I don't have room for improvement. And some of the things are I did this or I didn't do this. So it's both.

(Sommer): Yes, I'm sorry. I think I would just make a distinction between not necessarily measuring quality, I'm talking qualitative analysis versus quantitative analysis. So you could measure quality and then you'd have the quantitative analysis of quality.

Ray Plzak: Yes.

(Sommer): But I just think especially when you're studying organizations with stakeholders interacting with each other, in essence studying the angiography of the organization, how it works. A qualitative analysis could be really helpful, especially in a review to improve...

Ray Plzak: The qualitative analysis occurs when you sit down to write your report and do the recommendations and so forth. But the comment is well taken and we'll make sure that that happens, okay?

And who is next.

Jonathan Robinson: Avri.

Avri Doria: Avri (Unintelligible). Thank you Ray.

It looks well thought out and well-scheduled, but – and obviously a very strong fan of reviews after a year in ATRT2.

But one of the comments we got in ATRT2 was our reviewing ourselves. And looking at this, out of every five years, we're basically spending three years in review. And even if it's a sideline level, it is somewhat disruptive the whole time it's done.

So – and I understand the need to review every five years, but I wonder about having developed the process that spends three of the five years actually doing the review. And so I just wondered if you guys had sort of looked at that and sort of how to sort of find a better balance between the amount of time you spend in review and the amount of time you actually spend doing what you're doing without being in review.

Ray Plzak: Thank you for that nice thoughtful pitch.

We actually had an agenda item that we discussed yesterday in the SIC meeting where we talked about the notion that we have to come up with a framework, a unified comprehensive framework, where these things all work together.

And so as you go forward, that things complement each other, some of these activities could definitely occur at the same time. But that's a well recognized thing and it's another piece of what we're trying to accomplish inside the SIC.

And certainly the strategic reordering of things that may occur because of all the other activities is going to influence that because in the end, reviews are actually – reviews are a measure of accountability. And so they all get played together.

But right now – and that's why we're trying to keep this thing as unobtrusive as possible as far as what all the other activities are.

In the end, the desire is for some of these things to be like financial audits. They happen, and most people don't know that happen, but they're very, very important. And so that's the whole idea and that's the idea behind involving as much as you can, examination and so forth, and limiting where you can the intrusion upon the work that's being done.

There's nothing worse than having to stop what you're doing to explain to somebody what you're doing. And that's what happens with these reviews and where they've been conducted in the past. And that's primarily because of the method that was used to do it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Ray. I've got Chuck up next and then Steve.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes. Thanks Ray and to the whole team for all the work that's gone into this.

A couple of things; the first one is this. This seems to assume that the review will result in relatively easy corrective action. As you know, the last time we did a review it is major corrective action and it took a few years I think just to implement it.

I guess my question for you there, I am accurate that that's an assumption in this? And maybe I'll stop there and come back to my second issue after that.

Ray Plzak: We're anticipating that by not going into the whole structural viability capacity thing that these will be easy course corrections to make. Because that's going to happen – the capacity and everything else is going to happen as a result of everything else that's happening, and so we're consciously staying away from it. So that's a reasonable expectation.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks and so I missed that. So a major – this is not going to include major structural – okay; I missed that. I'm really glad I asked it because that makes a lot more sense that.

The second point is I'm looking at the timing, of actual months for implementation there, and part of implementation is integrating into plans and budget. And boy, that would have to happen right at February 15th to really get into the budget schedule, at least if we're ever successful in getting detailed enough budget information so that the community can submit comments in a meaningful way and still have an impact on the budget.

So I'm thinking that the timing is a little bit off to correspond to the budgeting cycle. Again, that's assuming that we ever get the improvements in the budget cycle that are really needed.

Ray Plzak: Well we're looking at the path to the budget being primarily through (unintelligible) plans and operational plans. And so getting there is how you get things into the budget.

So for example, if something is going to cause you to launch a project of some kind that it actually gets into an appropriate operational plan, in which case it gets into the budget cycle for that operational plan.

Chuck Gomes: Understand that. But to be able to effectively have a budget early enough for the community to comment on, including for the GNSO, you would need it,

based on all the work we've done and the finance – not the finance committee, the budget ad hoc group, you really need that be the end of February at the latest, even if you've got a good operational plan.

That's one of the problems – well, this isn't the place really to talk about the budget issues. But I really do think that the timeline there is going to be a little bit off, at least according to what some of us are hoping will happen in the budget process.

It's not enough just to have an operational plan or framework like we've had in the past, we've never had enough budget detail to effectively comment on the budget in time to have any impact in terms of what the Board decides on in June.

Ray Plzak: Okay, in the interest of time, I will tell you your point is well taken. And I'll be glad to take this whole discussion up further, and we can meet at our usual place.

Chuck Gomes: Let's find a better place.

Ray Plzak: Yes okay.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. I've got Steve and David, and I know Ray is keen to move on. And all of us probably are because of the time of day. Steve, go ahead and then I've got David.

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco with the BC. Ray, thanks for this.

And the bylaws provision that drives all of this gives the Board the authority to define criteria and standards -- that's a good bit of responsibility – about the inflexible parts of it which are whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve to effectiveness.

So one of the things we asked about the year ago when we met with staff was would the Board undertake to define what is the criteria and standards of the word effectiveness going in.

So does your plan anticipate that the effectiveness of the GNSO will be defined even before we go out and find a consultant?

Ray Plzak: The effectiveness is going to be a result of what's being measured. In other words, I'll go back to the simplistic example I gave with regards to meetings.

If I look at your meetings strictly from the standpoint of the process or the process of conducting elections, there are certain elements that are essential for you to accomplish because you have a policy or procedure that says you're going to do certain things in a certain way.

And so if I just look at that, I can draw a conclusion with regards to your ability to conduct an effective election. I can't tell you whether or not it's fair or not; that's an entirely different question.

Steve DelBianco: I see. So it's more about effectiveness or procedures, not effectiveness as if the policies that we develop are effective at achieving the objectives of the organization; a much smaller measure of...

Ray Plzak: Now that's said, now when you talk about you can measure policies from that perspective, in fact there's something that the GNSO should be doing on its own right now, is do an outcome analysis. And maybe at an 18-month cycle or something from the time you put a policy into effect, to look at did it do what we thought it was going to do, did it cause new praxis and so forth? And so that's a different way of looking at things.

And we won't be looking at it here. And that's why we also want to go back and look at what the ATRT2 said about this, and so we may not even have to go that way.

Steve DelBianco: And then just one final question. Would the Board predefine what it means by criteria and standards? Because you said earlier, you want the consultant to come back with only minor structural changes.

Ray Plzak: Well I'm anticipating minor structural changes, yes.

Steve DelBianco: But are you going to try to constrain them in their recommendations to say, "Any recommendation you make for structural changes should be minor." In other words, you're going to constrain going in or accept their recommendations and trim out stuff that you believe is too big.

Ray Plzak: Well, I won't necessarily constrain them going in, but I may take a look at what they're saying and say, "Okay fine, this is all well and good. However, we're doing all this other stuff right now and so this is probably better placed by putting it over here."

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Steve.

((Crosstalk))

Man: A lot of sort of academic methodologies that use interviews for sort of qualitative investigation which I guess is what you're using. You have what's called a roller-snowball methodology where it's one of the questions you ask the people you interview which is, "Who else should I be interviewing?"

Now I'm mindful that you do want to constrain the number of interviews because, you know, it's very easy to get a lot of data that you can kind of drown in with an interview and it does a lot of waste.

But the goal of things like that is really to identify people that you would miss in the process particularly because they may be unengaged or not sort of in the mainstream – I mean in this case, people who, you know, the issues with the GNSO are such that they're not very engaged. And they hopefully would be to people (unintelligible) some very useful (unintelligible).

Are there sort of provisions in the review to identify people who aren't engaged with the GNSO and why rather than sort of concentrating on those who already are and (unintelligible) details.

Ray Plzak: We have discussed how to identify for the interviews and certainly one method. And so we haven't finalized that, that's one thing we're going to do and it's one thing we're going to ask your help in doing.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great Ray, let's you...

Ray Plzak: Okay, next slide please.

Okay, the review process. The review itself is going to consist of the examination, the 360 Assessment, the integration of the review of the ATRT2 assessments and the interviews.

The report; this is different than last time. Last time there was a report with recommendations prepared, and then there was a working group that was put together which wrote a report on the report. And eventually that is really what went out for public comment. And so it almost begged the issue about why did you have the first report if you're going to write report on the report.

So what we're going to do differently is that the first thing that's going to come out from the review is going to be what we call Draft Report Number One. And the first thing that's going to happen with that is it's going to go to the GNSO for clarification and rebuttal. In other words, we all know that they may get something wrong or they may not understand what was being said. So the opportunity is going to be there for the GNSO to provide clarification and actually to rebut some things.

And so that result of that exercise will look (unintelligible) back into what's called Draft Report Number Two, and that is what is going to go out for public comment. So what goes out for public comment is the report with the

recommendations and something that's been done that has been through a clarification rebuttal process, so you don't have to have that during the public comment period.

But it's also another opportunity for some additional clarification rebuttal to be offered by people from the GNSO in that process.

Then there will be a final report prepared, and then that will be sent to the Board for acceptance. And the Board, at the time they accept the report, will direct the preparation of the implementation plan. And there the plan is going to be prepared, coordinated and implemented. I'll tell how that's going to happen when I get through roles and responsibilities. And it's that plan that gets approved. Slide?

Okay, roles and responsibilities. Structure improvement committee need to do three things. It has oversight, and because of oversight we would be expecting to receive from staff, from time to time, reports. The committee will receive – will accept a report and actually prepare a recommendation for Board action to accept the report. And when the plans are prepared, the committee would be the one that was going to be preparing the recommendation for Board action.

Staff; staff is going to be involved in designing the 360, prepare the RFP, select the examiner, monitor the process as it's going on, and they will provide support to the examiner. They will manage the report process and prepare the implementation plan.

The examiner/auditor will do the examination, will do the 360 assessment, and to a certain extent, will also do interviews. And they will be the one that's going to integrate ATRT2 recommendations. Will be involved in preparing the report, and will participate in the clarification rebuttal process.

The last item over there, review working party. We know that we don't want to have a working group inside the GNSO, and we don't want to have a

charter discussion. And so we decided the best thing to do was identify, from the GNSO, a review working party to help look in this.

And so they would be involved with coordinating the 360 and actually could provide some input as far as the criteria is going to be selected, would be involved in coordinating the interviews, identifying people to be interviewed and maybe some of the interview strategy, obviously very much involved in the clarification and rebuttal, and would be involved with the staff and the preparation of the implementation plan.

I'll stop here for a few questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you – sorry about that.

Ray, just one question on that. On the design 360 that's a staff responsibility, is that done in consultation with the community or is it strictly a staff design?

Ray Plzak: If you look under working party coordinate 360, I mentioned the fact that they would be involved in helping to select the criteria. In other words, you've got a big long list of criteria.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Ray Plzak: So yes, there's some collaboration that's going on there.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, you can move on.

Ray Plzak: Okay, the next slide? Thank you.

So I will be around here until Saturday. So if you can find me when I'm not in a meeting or something someplace, I would be more than glad to chat with you guys about this. I don't think you'll want to discuss this during your council sessions or any of the other sessions with the Board; I'm not sure. Because I'm sure that everything is going to be taken up with all the other things that will be going on.

But I'm certainly available as much as I can be to engage in conversations. If there's a group of you that want to try to get together and talk about this some more, I'm more than willing to do that as well. You just have to coordinate through the staff.

But I'll tell you right now that I'm pretty much committed, but I can maybe find a place to say I'm not going to go to something and meet with you guys because I think this is very, very important.

So with that, I'll say thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you very much Ray.

We have a placeholder on our Council Meeting on Wednesday for this. I'm not sure whether we'll retain that or not. I'm happy to take some feedback on that given where we are now.

We've also got Jen on the line and I know she might want to make a couple of remarks as well. So Jen, why don't we hand over to you knowing it's very early in the morning for you and been a long day for us. But I think we've got you up and it will be great to hear from you since you (unintelligible) along the way as well.

Jennifer Wolfe: Thanks Jonathan. And yes, I know it's a very long day for you all, and I appreciate the opportunity just to close out this topic.

Just one thing to add to Ray's presentation. When we look at his roles and responsibilities slide and he talks about the review working party, one piece we had discussed was the ability of the GNSO to conduct its own-self review in tandem with the external review.

And so my suggestion, and I'm looking for feedback, would be as the measurement criteria is developed through this process, that we actually look at what sort of self review could be conducted in tandem so that we could compare those results so that we don't just have the external review but we also have a self-review being conducted at the same time based upon the same measurement criteria so that we can compare the results when it all comes together.

So I know it's the end of the day. I'd be happy to, you know, take questions or comments on that. And happy to help continue to move this forward and look at how we could conduct the self-review in tandem with the external review.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Jen. I know Ray wants to come back with a comment or remark on that.

Ray Plzak: Yes, what I want to say is that the data is a very, very valuable thing to consider doing.

When I was the vice-chair of the SSAC and the SSAC was undergoing evaluation for their review, we actually conducted our own internal review using the same criteria in questions that the reviewers were using. And we actually produced our own recommendations report.

And so we actually were able to sit down and have a clarification rebuttal battle which is we put up what his recommendations were, what our recommendation were, and we resolved them. And in several cases, what the reviewer recommended went out the door, and what we recommended stayed in.

So there's a great deal of value to doing that. I don't know if you're going to have the time or the wherewithal to do it, but it's a very, very valuable way of working inside this review.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks both. I mean that's certainly some of the message I've picked up along the way. I worry a little about the time given the time scales you've now described to us Ray, and everything else that's going on. But I think we'll keep it on our agenda and see how we can fit that it.

I think it's probably time to call it a day. We've got a very short time between now and when we need to head out. So unless there is a – Maria, go ahead.

Maria Farrell: Sorry, I know I'm trying everyone's patience, but I just wanted to wish Bret Fausett a big welcome to this group.

And to note that in 2005, one of my first GNSO Council meetings when I was with staff, and the council working sessions were closed, and they were not public like this one is now. Bret actually kicked up a big fuss about it. He didn't win that battle but I think they were open pretty much from then on.

And so I just wanted to note that, and to note that, you know, these things don't just happen by themselves; people have to do them. So welcome to the Council.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thanks Maria, thanks Bret. And of course I failed earlier in the day to acknowledge Dan being on our calls. Before, we haven't had his physical presence before at our meetings, so welcome Dan as well. And we'll obviously look forward to spending a little bit of time with one another this evening.

So let's call the session to a close, and I suspect Mary has an informational announcement for us. So we can stop the recording and hear the information announcement.

