**ICANN
Transcription
Thick Whois PDP Working Group
Tuesday 18 June 2013 at 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Thick Whois PDP Working Group on the Tuesday 18 June 2013 at 14:00 UTC. 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. The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-thick-whois-20130618-en.mp3

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jun

Attendees:
Marc Anderson – RySG
Roy Balleste – NCUC
Avri Doria – NCSG
Christopher George – IPC
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Volker Greimann – RrSG
Frederic Guillemaut - RrSG
Carolyn Hoover – RySG
Marie-Laure Lemineur - NPOC
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Susan Prosser – RrSG
Tim Ruiz - RrSG
Jill Titzer – RrSG

Apologies:
Don Blumenthal – RySG

ICANN staff:
Marika Konings
Mary Wong
Berry Cobb
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: Please go ahead. We're now recording.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Thick Whois Working Group call on Tuesday 18 of June, 2013. On the call today we have Avri Doria, Christopher George, Alan Greenberg, Carolyn Hoover, Steve Metalitz, Mikey O'Connor, Jill Titzer and Tim Ruiz.

We have apologies from Don Blumenthal and Roy Balleste who might join the call. We have from staff Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Berry Cobb and myself, Julia Charvolen.

May I remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes? Thank you very much and over to you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Julia. Just checking if I'm as faint as Julia? I might switch over to the...

Alan Greenberg: You're marvelous...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...dial in line. Oh marvelous. I love being described as marvelous. Cool. Okay usual deal we've got a pretty short and we've got the draft to take a look at that I think is pretty darn close to final if not final. And then talk a little bit about the public comments and the Durban meeting and wrap it up.

So we'll take a moment to see if anybody wants to change the agenda or update their Statements of Interest.

Okay well what's on the screen in front of you is the latest draft. Marika circulated it in the middle of last week. There haven't been any comments on the list so this is, I think, sort of the last call on the initial report unless there's something substantive that people want to change.

The draft has actually been pretty stable for three or four weeks now so while I certainly don't want to stop anybody from making a substantive change I guess I'd be a little bit surprised.

We did have one note from Roy Balleste on the list and I was sort of hoping that he'd be on the call. I looked at his note and I think that his note is fairly consistent with what we're saying which is that privacy and data protection is a big deal and that in the future that issue is going to have to be looked at.

But I think that his comment is also consistent with our conclusion that it's not necessarily going to get looked at by us; it's going to have to get looked at by others. So that was really the only comment on the list. And so I just - I think want to give that last chance for people to raise their hand and then maybe if there aren't any hands up just let people tick their tick marks that say yes this draft is ready to get shipped.

All right I'm seeing tick marks starting to go up. Let people, like me, find the little tick mark gizmo. There we go. That's great. Okay I think we're done on the initial draft. Way to go, folks.

All right let's take a moment and sort of bask in the joy of this being done and then move on to the planning for the public comment forum. Susan, welcome to the call and the Adobe room. We've just sort of given a thumb's up to the initial draft and so there are some tick marks remaining. This is your very absolutely last chance to throw your changes in but otherwise we're moving right on to the second agenda item. Tim, go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, I just - I hadn't read Roy's note so I don't want to drag it out or anything. I just wanted to comment briefly on it if that's okay?

Mikey O'Connor: Sure, go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Okay. I just wanted to note as we go forward and maybe look at that a little bit closer, you know, after the initial report is out and that - and our discussions begin again based on comments and things that, you know, I don't disagree that the privacy, you know, as another - and data protection is an issue but I just want to make sure that it's clear that that isn't just here, I mean, we're not - in other words, like, for example, the new gTLD policy requires new gTLD registries to be thick. We already have some thick registries.

              So that - those issues are sort of - they're bigger than just what we're doing here. So while we might want to address them in some way or acknowledge them in some way I guess I'd be cautious about how deep we want to dig into it because it's a bigger issue than just what we're looking at right here. So I just wanted to point that out.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. And that's pretty much what we say in the conclusion, you know, in the initial report. The language on 770 - line 78 if you want to zoom down to that I think is where the nub of this part of the report is. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, what he's saying is he agrees that what we're talking about is beyond the remit of this working group but he wants to make sure that we note forcefully that ICANN better be thinking about this in the future. And I think we're doing that and if not we will need, in the final version, to make that stronger. But I think everyone understands this is not something we can stick our head in the sand for the next five years about and pretend nothing is going on around us. But it's not...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think that's...

Alan Greenberg: ..remit of our particular job to do.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, unless...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry. Do you want to repeat that last part, Alan, I walked right over you.

Alan Greenberg: I think we're all violently agreeing on that.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that's right. Avri, go ahead. Oh, you may be muted, Avri. It's pretty silent although your little microphone looks okay. Oh that's funny you're - am I the only one who can't hear Avri?

Alan Greenberg: No, you're not.

Mikey O'Connor: No because interestingly the little microphone broadcasting thing from Avri says she's speaking. That's a new one. Well, how do we deal with that? Avri's typing. Yeah, it's too bad. I - and it's the little Adobe Connect. Are you sure that the mic on your computer is active, Avri?

Alan Greenberg: Otherwise it wouldn't be hearing anything.

Mikey O'Connor: Well that's true.

Alan Greenberg: And it's claiming it's hearing something.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I was - actually I can see Avri's note in the Chat and I'm going to make the same point. I think that what Avri said in the Chat is while the privacy issue may be bigger some contend some part of it is still specific to this issue. And I think that if, during the public comment cycle, there's a scenario that comes up that's defined that's specific to this issue that we may get to talk about that. And so I don't want to rule that out.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: I think we're all agreeing that this...

Alan Greenberg: ...public comment.

Mike O'Connor: Yea, exactly. I think that's right. And I don't think that anybody disagrees with that either. So I think we're pretty much all in agreement on that. And the main reason I was hoping Roy would be on the call is so that he could participate in this discussion. But we certainly have another whole phase of this to dig into this again.

Okay Avri is still trying to speak but it's just not working. I don't know what to tell you, Avri. Frustrating. Well these technical transitions sometimes aren't quite so easy. If you want to dial in, Avri, and take another run at it by all means do so but we'll go ahead and run down the rest of the agenda in the meantime.

Marika, do you want to sort of walk us through the comment - the public comment forum planning item? I imagine you have ideas on what you want to talk about there.

Marika Konings: Sure. So this is Marika. So the idea would be that now following the call I finalize the report that basically means accepting all the changes, adding in a date, adding the attendance information and prepare, as well, then the language for the public comment forum which I think it will be largely based on what is on the executive summary.

I think the one question is the amount of time we want to allow for public comments noting that this will run into the Durban meeting. So I can make a - what I can do is basically write the language and make some suggested dates and maybe just push it out to the mailing list hopefully tomorrow or on Thursday for people to comment whether they think the dates are, you know, sufficient for people to provide input or whether we need to give more time on one end or the other.

And then basically once that feedback is received I think it's ready to get published and we can share it among the different mailing lists. So I think ideally or at a minimum and is something that I think the PDP Manual says that on the initial report there should be a minimum of 30 days.

And I think we've typically interpreted that to mean that the initial reply period should be 30 days although, you know, you could argue that the combined period is, at least there's 30 days would need that requirement as well that I think in practice we've done at least 30 days as an initial reply period. So I think it requires having a look at the calendar where that takes us and then see whether that is acceptable.

So basically it would publish, for example, publish on the 24th I think 30 days basically get us to 22nd of July around about there so that's, you know, just one week after the Durban meeting. So the question is does that give people enough time because we're planning a session there as well to present the report and, you know, maybe raise some of the questions that we've raised in the report or give people an opportunity to ask questions.

Would that give people enough time to actually submit their comments or do we allow for maybe one or two additional meets after the close of the Durban meeting for people to fill in their initial comments and then have after that a 21-day reply period which of course does bring us then I think halfway or almost towards the end of August before the public comment period closes.

Just to note, of course, it doesn't necessarily mean that the working group cannot already get started. I think some groups had already started basically after the close of the initial period with what they've received today just starting to look at that and add additional comments in as they come in.

But again that's a bit of a decision for the working group on how we would like to plan your next phase of your work and what you think is the appropriate

time to give the community to review the report and provide input taking into account that there is travel involved to Durban as well back from Durban what would be reasonable from that perspective.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Marika. And that is an interesting puzzler. Certainly having it end right after Durban seems like a stretch. Steve, go ahead. Sorry...

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I'm not sure I understood the - what the options are. If we started a public comment period now even if it was the minimum period it would extend beyond the Durban meeting...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...42 days.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: So why don't we...

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is the Marika. The question is if that would give people enough time noting that maybe some, you know, maybe some new issues are raised as part of our session in Durban or people suddenly think oh having heard that I really need to go and submit comments. Do we give enough time then to people if they would only have a week after the Durban meeting to do so. I think that's the main question.

And if people think it's fine that we close one week after the Durban meeting that that should be sufficient time as they already have a heads up now and they will have during the Durban meeting and the week after, you know, that's perfectly fine too.

I think it's really to get the working group sense what you - from your experience with your groups as well which I presume several of you will be

preparing comments with what will be, you know, reasonable taking into account the ICANN meeting and travel back and forth.

Steve Metalitz: Well this is Steve again. I'm not sure what your calendar looks like but my calendar shows that six weeks from tomorrow would be July 31. That would be almost two weeks after the end of the Durban meeting. That's 42 days. I guess I would just vote for having the standard public comment period.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...so you mean that would be both the initial period and the reply period together?

Steve Metalitz: Yes because I don't think anyone...

Marika Konings: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: ...pays the least bit of attention to that anymore. A 42-day comment period, that's the only way it could possibly work and that's how people deal with it. So...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Right. And I think - and this is Marika. And I think it's something we can make clear as well. For example, in Durban where we say, look, we are in the reply period or the reply period is about to open but people should feel free to submit them because we will accept and review and recognize those comments that are received during the reply period. That may be another way of dealing with it.

Mikey O'Connor: Tim.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, I agree with Steve. I think if what we're saying then is that - it closes two weeks after Durban. I just think, you know, to be realistic I don't know how much really happens the week after an ICANN meeting.

You know, it takes time for people to get home especially when, you know, it's where it's at because whether you're from Europe or Asia or the, you know, North America or whatever, I mean, it's a long trip for, you know, most of those who are going to be involved in ICANN work. Hopefully we see more involvement from Africa.

But the point is after an ICANN meeting people are tired, they're traveling and not a lot happens in that first week after an ICANN meeting. So I think going another week after that makes a lot of sense.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I guess my question is whether one week is enough given - I mean, it seems to me that most of this report is pretty straightforward and then there's one incredibly nuanced issue in there so we want to give people another week to pull those together and run them through their constituencies conversations. That's the only thought I've got.

Tim, is that new? If you want to go again, go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: No, just hadn't put my hand down. But I wouldn't disagree with that either.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. Steve, go ahead.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I wouldn't either but I don't think anyone was suggesting one week. I think Tim was suggesting two weeks. And I think that's about...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Steve Metalitz: ...what 42 days comes out to so...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, Marika, I think you've got a sense of the group that it's okay to let this go past Durban not too far - not too close to Durban because folks are going to have a really hard time getting comments out right after the meeting. So two or three weeks after Durban sitting in to the, you know, putting - I agree with Steve's point that, you know, everybody treats the reply period really as one thing. And so if we just take the whole 42 days and drop it in.

Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I was just going to say we don't have any hard deadlines looming up. The next meeting is way off. Let's give people enough time so that we're not criticized for giving insufficient time and...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: ...go with it. I mean, the extra week or even two weeks is not really going to make any difference to us. We're not likely to have a lot of work coming out of the comment periods. We know there are going to be some comments. You know, I'm sure there'll be some that we haven't considered but most of them I think we will have.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think that's right. Marika, does that...

Alan Greenberg: Err on the liberal side in this particular case.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh I love erring on the liberal side in all things. Marika, is that okay? That...

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. As I said what I can do is push this out to the list hopefully tomorrow and Thursday probably with a view of publishing on Friday so maybe we can avoid the Monday where - because there's more reports are getting published as it's a publication deadline for Durban.

So that will give people opportunity as well to look at the dates and then maybe think about it again. And if there are, you know, no comments we just run with I think what people have - the feedback people have provided to date.

Mikey O'Connor: Great. I note that Roy is on the call. Welcome, Roy. And I've also noticed that there's been sort of a nice conversation in the Chat. And maybe Avri's microphone works so if it's okay with the group I'd like to circle back. Roy, we've already sort of given the initial report a thumb's up and we're sort of on - we're heading into Agenda Item 4. But really your email was the only substantive comment we got. And we spent some time talking about it.

And Avri wanted to make a comment but we had technology troubles and we've had a conversation in the Chat. So with the forbearance of the group I'd like to just circle back around and...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: ...repeat that part of the conversation. Somebody spoke?

Alan Greenberg: That was Avri.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh it was Avri. It's working. Hot diggety. Let me start - yeah...

Avri Doria: Oh you actually (can) hear me.

Mikey O'Connor: No, no it works fine. Why don't we start with you and then, you know, if anybody else wants to chime in they can too and I will and, Roy, you're welcome to join as well so, Avri, over to you.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. As I was trying to say I was not disagreeing putting the report out as initial. All I was saying is that I wanted to leave open the discussion

and the issue that there are perhaps, and I know it has been difficult to convince the group and Roy has done a really fantastic job and I pretty much just been watching and missing way too many meeting so I really have no leg to stand on.

But basically want to still argue that there are issues that I believe certainly, and I think others, are different for individual registrants who must now transition regimes of privacy than - that those are specific issues related to this group that fall within the wider issue. I'm totally supportive (unintelligible) in another PDP or what have you on the wider interests. I just think based on comments that could come in, hopefully, or whatever we don't close the topic.

And at one point in the discussion it felt like everybody was in violent agreement that there was no more to be said. And I just wanted to get the note in saying I think there's more to be said; let's see the comments but no problem with the report going out as initial. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Avri. And let me just add - and, Roy, any time you want to jump in feel free. But let me just add that the sense that I've got is that there are two things. We've got the very - the broad issue of privacy that we describe in the conclusion that starts on 778.

We may have an issue with - that does indeed fall within our remit. We haven't been able to identify it or document it up until now but we're not closing the door on that possibility. And, you know, looking forward to the description of that scenario coming out of the comment period. I think that's a fair summary of the sense of the group.

If I've gone off the rails, by all means, correct me. And, Roy, does that sort of align with what you were trying to bring forward in your comment on the list now that you've had a chance to settle in? Roy is typing. He may have audio trouble.

Anyway, yeah, all right. Well if that sounded about right then I think we're set. If it didn't sound about right by all means when you get your connection back stick your hand up and we'll circle back to you.

But with that I think we're going to then go on to the Durban meeting planning agenda item and back to Marika for that.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. So I've requested a slot for the Durban meeting. And I think we're currently looking at Wednesday from 12:30 to 2:00 but this is still tentative because there are still quite a few moving parts and things that need to be slotted in but that's the latest information I got on where our meeting currently sits.

So basically it's for the working group to discuss how you would like to use that meeting. I think the current description basically said that, you know, it's a presentation of the initial report and one of the objective of course is to have people, you know, provide input or ask questions and, you know, eventually hopefully we can encourage them to provide any further input they have as part of the public comment forum.

So I think it's for you to discuss how you would like to run that meeting. You know, is it just - should I prepare a slide deck basically covering what is in the report and the recommendations, some of the questions we've highlighted? Is there a different kind of format you would like to pursue or explore for this meeting?

Or do you think that it's actually not necessary at all to have this meeting and we, you know, can just do with the public comment forum and announcement that's related to that? I think that's the main question.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Marika. Any thoughts on that from folks in the group? I've got some but I don't want to prejudice the conversation necessarily. I think that the

exception of the one issue that we've, you know, certainly focused on this is a pretty straightforward thing. But that one issue is really interesting.

And so I think that a slide deck that sort of departs from the norm in that, you know, many of these slide decks sort of have a boatload of kind of bureaucratic stuff in them, you know, the working group was formed and the fun, etcetera, etcetera.

If we could sort of thin out the bureaucratic part of the slide decks and sort of bring people quickly to, you know, a short description of what the differences between thick and thin Whois, why, you know, what our - I'm sort of mimicking - I'm tempted to just take Rick Wesson's email, the one where he put the decision tree yes or no thick Whois and then discussion why - throw that up there but - that's a joke. That's a joke.

But anyway, you know, sort of a content-focused slide deck that gives people a chance to understand what this issue is, understand how narrow it is and then elicit comments in the room I think would be very helpful for people because I think the conversation needs to get broader now. So those are sort of my thoughts right off the bat.

Steve, take it away.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, this is Steve. I would certainly agree with eliminating the bureaucratic part of it to the extent possible. I do think it is important to put it in context for people to indicate that, you know, we've had thick gTLD registries for a decade or more, that the vast majority of gTLD registries are thick, that all the new gTLD registries will be thick.

But beyond that context I think we should just, you know, whatever presentation we have really should just cover the points that are in the draft report. I would not want to see one point, you know, drawn out and become the whole focus of the presentation.

But I think we have actually gone through a lot of issues and had a lot of good discussion about them and a certain amount at least of expert help in figuring out how a thick Whois requirement would impact them. So I think we - I just hope we would have a - we would deal with all the issues in the presentation. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, thanks Steve. You're absolutely right. And I was sort of replaying what I said as you were speaking and thinking I didn't mean it to sound like that. I think the other thing that I would like to amplify in the slide deck is why we're doing thick Whois.

I tried to insert some of that why back into the report. And so, you know, sort of thin down the bureaucratic stuff, amp up the topics that we discussed and the place that we're at and a discussion of why this is something that we worked this hard as a group to agree on is a pretty good deck.

And, you know, from there off we go. Any other thoughts? I don't see hands up. I see a little chat going on in the chat box. Okay I think we're - we can take Avri aside and explain why thick Whois is a cool deal.

So Marika said in a private Chat that she'd be happy to take a whack at a first draft that people can tear apart. I think that's a good idea. Maybe send it to me so I can get my fingerprints on it, Marika, and then we'll get it out to the list.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: And go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: No I was just saying okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I'm not sure we need a meeting to review it. Do we want to make next week's meeting optional after we take a look at this draft? Because I think we're done except for that. And, you know, I know we all have a lot of stuff going on right before Durban so I would be inclined to announce to the list that the next meeting is tentatively going to be canceled. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Mikey, I had to step away for a moment. Are we talking about the presentation for Durban or something else?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, the slide deck - no, this is the slide deck...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I've never seen a presentation that Marika prepared that needed a meeting to discuss. Email has, as always in my past experience, been more than sufficient for counseling her if we thought something needed to be different.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I'm with you. And emphatically. So let's do that. Let's get a draft out. And let's also tentatively cancel I think the rest of the meetings until Durban and let people at least know that we're thinking that. And then if we need to turn one on again we'll do it but other than that I think we should give ourselves a little vacation from this one and get on to the other stuff.

Anything else that people want to talk about - oh, Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just to confirm that it's difficult for us to tentatively cancel so either we cancel or we schedule a meeting then we cancel so...

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...clarification.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, this is a Midwesterner going fine, fine then, we'll cancel them and reinstate them if we need how about that? Okay I think with that going once, going twice, I think we're done...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Mikey, Volker actually has a question in the Chat about how to handle the presentation. I guess presumably - I don't know if Volker's on the...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Oh that's a good question. What's your preference folks? I'm happy to go either way. I could pitch it or we could split it up by people who led sub groups or any other variant. What were you thinking of, Volker? I said two things and you said sounds good.

Alan Greenberg: That's what we need, more unequivocal people.

Mikey O'Connor: Coffee, tea or milk? Yes. Okay, he's coming in. He's saying give me a second. Give me a second so that you can speak or give me a second...

Volker Greimann: Yes...

Mikey O'Connor: There we go.

((Crosstalk))

Volker Greimann: I started dialing in over the computer so I think (unintelligible) speak. No, I'm fine either way. I think it makes sense to just present it by sub group maybe so everybody would have the most insightful information available when we present; that would make the most sense if schedules allow at least, yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Volker Greimann: Do we have a direct presentation at the GNSO Council as well?

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, we'll have an update I think. That one's undoubtedly going to be a bit shorter. There's no Council action required so I'm - correct me if I'm wrong, Marika, but the Council will see this during the update cycle but not during their public meeting, isn't that right?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. That's correct. Probably when we get it published we'll just send it to the Council mailing list for their information and it's scheduled to be presented during the weekend session as an update. But as you said, there's no (road) or anything required from the Council at this stage. So unless they want to have it on their agenda for a particular reason I don't see it as an item on the Wednesday schedule.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Alan and then Volker.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, first question: When is this presentation going to be?

Mikey O'Connor: The big - oh that did come by while you were gone. It was Wednesday from midday - 12:30 to 2:00.

Alan Greenberg: Just before the GNSO meeting.

Marika Konings: Yeah, that's the correct. I think the GNSO meeting is currently scheduled to start at 3:00. And I'll check on the update to the Council. I believe it's Saturday but I'll double check.

Alan Greenberg: Well that was the one I meant. Okay. I would suggest a no-decision decision at this point. Saturday morning let's decide who's going to be available and divide it up at that point or assign it all to our honored chair.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I mean, my preference would be to get lots of people up - not at the Council update. I think I can do that one on my own.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: It's probably going to be 10 or 15 minutes tops.

Alan Greenberg: That just gives...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: But...

Alan Greenberg: Are you still there?

Mikey O'Connor: Boy, Alan's - I can hear him but it's like he's speaking through a machine gun sound effect.

Alan Greenberg: I stopped speaking, that's why.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh.

Alan Greenberg: I was just saying that we have plenty of time to decide. I, for one, know I'm going to be in Durban but I have no clue what my schedule is going to be at that point. A combination of ALAC and ATRT, you know, I'm not going to predict whether I'm going to be there. If I'm there I'm delighted to present my four words. I think we can just leave it undecided with the understanding Mikey will take anything that can't be handled by anyone else and...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: ...decide sometime before Wednesday.

Mikey O'Connor: Well but I think that the takeaway from this one is those of you who were leaders in the work of the sub groups - either leaders of or active participants in - should plan on, you know, being available to present the pieces of the work that you did. Because I agree, I think the people who did the work are going to be much closer to the nuance then your absent-minded chair. So I think with that we have a plan.

Tim's got a thought. Will a presentation leave time for comments, questions? Absolutely. If so a thorough presentation is good but should be concise. I think we have an hour and a half and that seems like ample time to get through the, you know, a fairly substantive presentation plus a pretty good conversation after. I can't imagine the presentation taking more than half an hour or 45 minutes which would leave another half an hour or 45 minutes to an hour for comments. I think we're okay there.

Okay anything else? All right then with that I think we'll sign this one off. Thanks, all, this has been great. I think we've got a good product and a good plan and we'll meet again in Durban.

Marika Konings: Thanks, everyone.

Alan Greenberg: Thanks.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks.

Marika Konings: Bye.

Julia Charvolen: Bye.

END