

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information PDP Charter DT Meeting TRANSCRIPTION

Thursday 11 June 2015 at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Translation and transliteration of Contact Information DT on the Thursday 11 June 2015 at 1300 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-transliteration-contact-11jun15-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Chris Dillon – NCSG
Sara Bockey – RrSG
Justine Chew – Individual
Jim Galvin - RySG
Rudi Vansnick - NPOC
Amr Elsadr - NCUC
Petter Rindforth – IPC
Peter Green (Zhang Zuan) – NCUC

Apologies:

Peter Dernbach

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund
Lars Hoffmann
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Nancy Peregrine: Thank you very much mediator. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the Translation of Contact Information PVP Working Group call on the 11th of June 2015. On the call today we have

Chris Dillon, Peter Green, Petter Rindforth, Rudi Vansnick, Sarah Walker, and Jim Galvin. We received an apology from (Peter Dunbar). From staff we have Julie Hedlund, (Walt Hopkin), and myself Nancy Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Chris.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much indeed. And let us move into agenda point three, which is the statements of interest. And this is the sort of formal part of the meeting in which we need to ask you whether your statement of interest has changed since our last recent meeting. And hearing nothing and seeing nothing, that means that we can move forward into the main part of the meeting -- or one of the main parts -- which is our final look at the final report.

And I'd like at this point to thank two colleagues who sent in edits over the -- actually neither of whom is present, but I'll do it anyway -- two colleagues who sent in edits over the last few days, so this is Amr and Justine sent in edits. And once the report appears in the Adobe Connect, then basically the idea is that the version which we will see is based - is basically addressing Amr's and Justine's comments. And through a lot of proofreading things. And one or two things - I think I had mentioned CCTLDs at one point and that's got - that has got admitted.

And basically sort of fairly straightforward edits. And then we have received from Petter a substantial edit and we've been having a lot of trouble with the latency on the list, so we've been sending messages to the list and they haven't been displaying for some amount of time and I think this could have happened on this occasion. But anyway, so we have been asking, you know, whether we have full consensus or only consensus.

And we had been thinking that we have full consensus, but actually -- as we know from our meetings over the weeks and months, you know -- the reality is that a lot of these things are, you know, are controversial with IPC and Petter is saying that they do not agree with one of the recommendations. I

think it's just one, but it may conceivably be more. That's recommendation number one. And so in that case, that means that we need to make that clear and I believe that does change the consensus level. But - ah, I can see Petter has his hand up, so Petter, would you like to pick this up.

Petter Rindforth: Yes, Petter here. Thanks. I'm sorry to be late, but I hope that it's possible to just -- I don't know where (unintelligible) -- if I can put forward some just quick minority statement. And not to getting everything to be too complicated, in fact it's - what we have problem with from IPC point of view is the recommendation number one. I think most of the - well, maybe not the conclusion that actually refers to number one, but the rest of the recommendations we have discussed together and I think I can formulate it - a quick note that it could be seen as an acceptance of that recommendations. So just not to make it too complicated.

Chris Dillon: Okay. So - actually rather than jumping in now, I can see Lars has got his hand up and he has more experience with these things than I am, so I am going to - Lars, would you like to take this up?

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, Chris. Yeah, just to (unintelligible) Chris and I will be editing the record afterwards accordingly, obviously. And Petter, is it - so I understood it correctly that you don't support the first recommendation, but -- apart from the recommendation to recommendation one - the last recommendation -- you can support the other ones. And even if - but any way, what I would suggest is that we change the consensus level obviously to consensus instead of full consensus and for the further recommendations that you don't consent to.

And I would suggest that if you look at the reports -- I should really go to the page -- if you look here on recommendation one that we put that level of consensus and then we put just below their remark your position with your explanation there. And that we do that for all the recommendations for which you wish to do that. And if I can put you on the spot, it would be great to have this at the very latest close of business today, if that's possible.

Petter Rindforth: Yes.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you.

Petter Rindforth: Certainly. I'll do that. Thanks. I know I was late after.

Chris Dillon: Okay, so thank you very much for that. And Rudi, I can see you've got your hand up as well, would you like to pick up something?

Rudi Vansnick: Thank you, Chris. Rudi for the transcript. Yes, with regards - with input and change in the context of full consensus going to consensus -- specifically as on recommendation one -- I'm just wondering if it has any impact on the recommendations to question two. Who is going to be the cost if one party says that it should be mandatory? We know that there is a cost related to that mandatory situation. Do we have to take action in the context of the responses to question two; yes or no? That's what I would like to know if we need to change anything over there.

Chris Dillon: Petter, can you scroll down so I can see it on the screen -- the number two -- just so I have it in front of me. Okay. I think it's got a - it seems to have got a bit stuck, hasn't it? That's a nuisance. But I think it's true, there is a connection - ah, yes, it's moving. Good, good. But - ah, yeah, I think I've got control. There is a connection between the first two recommendations. However, because most parties are - you know, actually saying full consensus on recommendation number one as well, I mean, I don't know whether we still have to answer the question in the event that just one party is not agreeing with it or - I mean, I don't know what good practice is here.

Lars Hoffman: Come again, Chris. What was the question?

Chris Dillon: So basically if we were in the situation where a lot of, you know, we were actually in a situation where perhaps 50% agreed with recommendation

number one and 50% didn't, then I think we would have to - you know, then we would have to, you know, to make changes to recommendation two. But I'm actually wondering whether -- where we're in a situation where most people are full consensus - are consensus right through and just one party is not consensus on the first one -- whether we still have to ask - to answer whether we have to make changes to recommendation two as a result of that. I mean, I honestly don't know the answer.

Lars Hoffman: Let me just check recommendation two. I was just looking at consensus levels, I'm sorry. Yeah, I mean - so the consensus level in principle is - so it's up to all the individuals to express a consensus with the various recommendations. And as far as I understood Petter, he said recommendation one and seven are the ones that he does not consent with. And so would be full consensus with the others and consensus for those.

Chris Dillon: Thank you, (Lars). Now, I've got a hearing problem, because I didn't hear number seven at all. Petter, can you clarify this, please?

Petter Rindforth: Yes, Petter here. I think you said recommendation number two that would not - I can't see that that is contradictory.

Chris Dillon: Well, as regards recommendation number two, you know, I'm - I mean, I'm wondering whether we can just leave it. But, you know, I'm prepared to be corrected if others wouldn't be the best way of dealing with it, because...

Petter Rindforth: Well, just to clarify, what we think is that the burden to lay on the - all this collecting and maintaining the information. So (unintelligible). But again, I didn't see that on - I may read the wrong thing, but I didn't see that on number two. So that's why I wondered...

Chris Dillon: No, no. At the moment, it's just - you know, it's just indicating the other decision. But, you know, the issue is whether it's necessary to put both sides

in here. I don't know the answer to that. Petter, whilst you're there, may I confirm that - are you happy with recommendation seven?

Petter Rindforth: Let's see what's - this is on page 20 here?

Chris Dillon: Yeah, yeah.

Petter Rindforth: (Unintelligible). Yeah, I see no problem with that.

Chris Dillon: Okay. It was just a hearing problem. And actually, Amr, I think we...

Petter Rindforth: Yeah, okay. What I relied upon was the finalizing - finding and relation to charter question two. That said something based on recommendation one to seven. The question of who should decide - who should bear the burden of translating. That's - so yes. So, number seven - no -- as I said -- I don't want to mix it up too much. And I think that's - you all have done a good work on the other recommendations that are more to clarify the language and technical aspects, even if it's non-mandatory. So at least -- as I see it -- now it's just speak for myself. I've - I accept that. This - good recommendations, whether or not it's mandatory. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Okay, thank you very much for clarifying that. Now, there are a couple of hands up and I'm afraid I missed the order, but - well, actually what I'm going to do is just sort out the chat room first and then we'll have a look at the hands in - upstairs. So - okay. So - actually we need to wind back some amount of time. So we have Rudi asking about the cost but Amr saying to Petter, "I imagine this to be the case, it is why I wanted to point out the option of minority statement." Amr also pointing out obviously recommendation number one is the big one.

And then (Rudy's) right, the two recommendations have an association; that's also true. The association is actually between recommendation number one and the text referring to findings and relation to charter question two. Okay.

And then Amr just - is just saying that he misheard seven as well as I did, so okay. And now what I would like to do -- because I didn't see who's hand went up first -- I'd like Amr just to have a word because he hasn't spoken yet.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chris. Actually I think Rudi had his hand up first. I think the order that you see in the AC room is - so Rudi, please go ahead.

Chris Dillon: I'm not very good at multi-tasking.

Rudi Vansnick: Go ahead, because I want to hear your intervention. I'm rather coming back to a more global perspective.

Amr Elsadr: Okay, thanks. This is Amr, then.

Chris Dillon: (Unintelligible).

Amr Elsadr: Alright, I just wanted to address a question that you had, Chris, regarding whether the recommendation would have to be changed or not. I don't believe that is the case. I believe -- as Lars pointed out -- the level of consensus indicated on the recommendation one can be changed, but that doesn't necessitate the actual changing of the recommendation itself. And as long as a minority statement is placed in relation to that recommendation, then I think we should be good to go.

Chris Dillon: Okay, thank you. That was also what I - that was also what I was tentatively thinking. But, you know, I'm not particularly experienced. Rudi, would you like to come back to that?

Rudi Vansnick: Thanks Chris. Rudi for the transcript. Well, I'm playing a little bit devil's advocate. As to recommendation one, it's a quite strict black and white. It's a yes or no. There is no grey in between. It means that it has an impact on the question two anyway. And as Petter was arguing that when this question would be asked to IPC who should bear I heard him saying registry, registrar.

That puts a weight on one of the parties that -- in this case -- would have to react to that statement too, I think.

So I'm just trying to play the devil's advocate and having in front the meetings in Buenos Aires that could be a lot of discussion back and forth. And putting the whole question in the direction of, yes, but please -- before you put this as a final motion -- have this answer integrated in your report. That's just playing devil's advocate, no more, no less.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that other opinion. I think it's very useful and helpful. Now I think I do remember the order this time. Lars, would you like to add something at this point?

Lars Hoffman: Sorry, Chris, it's an old hand. I apologize.

Chris Dillon: Okay, no trouble at all. Well, we have somebody else with his hand up. Amr, would you like to take this up?

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, thanks Chris. Amr again and I just wanted to come back to (Rudy's) last comment. Of course the charter question that we have here is not on deciding who should bear the burden, it's on who should decide who should bear the burden. And in answer to that question, I -- if I am not mistaken -- I don't believe it's the IPC's view that the registries and registrars should make that decision. I'm guessing they might think someone else should make that decision.

I am not sure we've actually heard from the IPC on an answer regarding charter question number two. When the IPC comment came in during the public comment period, they indicated who they would like to bear the burden, but they never indicated who they think should decide - who should make this decision. If header or the IPC would like to include the answer to that in the minority statement, that would - I think that would be fine as well.

But I would point out that this information wasn't actually shared with the working group at any point, at least as far as I recall. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that Amr. There's some - this grammar in the -- and I can see Lars is agreeing with you -- you know, as far as I know, this question hasn't been answered. The grammar in this charter question has caused endless confusion right through this process. If I ever see a PDP -- which uses, you know, who should decide, you know, who should bear - I mean, this sort of grammar is, you know, it just hugely slows things down.

So, you know, if I ever see that again, I will scream. You know, we have just fallen into this trap so many times over the course of our calls. You know, just something about it is very difficult to understand. Anyway, Petter, would you like to pick this up?

Petter Rindforth: Just quickly. I think that the initial comments from IPC was that they had no objection to the recommendation. And we put forward some notes. So as you said, there was no clear - no rather yes to answer. I read it the version we have now - read it again and -- as I said -- I hope and I think still that we can deal with just noting on recommendation number one. That that would be the best.

Chris Dillon: Yes. Okay. That - and then with a minority statement. As far as I know, that would probably sort us out here. I mean, it's also possible that the change from full consensus to consensus could cause issues elsewhere in the document. So I don't know, Lars, what you think about this. Because we're actually fairly short of time before the deadline now, but exactly what - in fact, actually we are majorly straying into the next steps and procedures. But perhaps we should visit that now before we - I think it would be useful. And I can see you've got your hand up. Lars, would you like to address this?

Lars Hoffman: Thank you, Chris. Yeah, this is Lars. So the next major step is to submit - once this is signed off -- never mind when -- but once it's signed off the next

step is to submit a motion to the GNSO Council for their consideration of this report. And the deadline for that is Sunday - this coming Sunday, 23:59 UTC. The - it needs to be submitted by a GNSO Councilor, which is somebody - the liaison, which I believe is Amr, who just put his hand up. Amr, do you want to interject?

Amr Elsadr: Lars, why don't you go ahead and then I'll add some after you're done. Thanks.

Lars Hoffman: Okay, I was just wondering whether you wanted - yeah, no problem. And so as long as we can hit the deadline that's fine. I have the motion already drafted. So we would be fairly good to go as soon as we send this through. So Petter can do his changes by tonight and then we can put it back into the mailing list to see if anybody else has any objections. And then if Amr is free Friday night or even Saturday morning, he could send it on to the GNSO Councilors. Amr, over to you.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Lars, this is Amr again. Yeah, as council liaison for this working group, I would have said that it would have been more desirable to perhaps send a copy of the final report and a redline version indicating the changes on the preliminary report from the initial report at least a couple of days ahead of the motion so that GNSO Councilors would have an opportunity to read it before considering the motion.

But obviously we're a bit tight on time. I also wanted to point out -- and this is sort of an exceptional case which I hope we won't have to resort to -- the GNSO operating procedures now allow for motions to be submitted past the 10-day deadline. But this gets a little tricky, because then if a single councilor objects to the submission, then the motion would be considered not submitted and would have to wait for - until the following council meeting.

So yeah, as Lars said, it would be better to submit this motion before 23:59 UTC on the 14th, which is Sunday, I believe. But if we do miss that deadline,

we could still submit a motion past the deadline, but knowing that it may sort of - will not be - won't be deferred but it may be rejected and would have to be picked up the following council meeting. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Amr, thank you very much for clarifying that. I think it does mean effectively that we will do well to finish by the - by 23:59 on Sunday. I think that sounds to be the way to go on that one. I can see you agreeing with that. Alright. Well, I think let us just ask this question. I think we're very nearly done on this agenda point, but I would just like to ask whether there are any other substantial edits to the - you know, anything substantial in the recommendations that we could still address?

I think proof level reading things we, you know, the dots and dashes we can do, but just anything similar, really. Ramifications from that site, for example. Amr, would you like to pick up something there?

Amr Elsadr: Yep, thanks Chris. This is Amr and I apologize for ranting on and on today. I've actually been wondering whether I should bring this up or not. I kind of like the recommendations the way they've been presented and with the level of consensus for each one.

I'm just wondering how honest that actually is because Recommendations 2 through 7 are all being made based on the fact that Recommendation 1 is the way it is. So indicating that we have full consensus on the rest of these recommendations as opposed to Recommendation 1, I'm not actually sure how accurate that is.

If you recall during the public comments received from both the IPC and the Business Constituency of the GNSO, they all read on these recommendations only if Recommendation 1 mandated transformation of contact information into a single language of script.

So kind of indicating full consensus now although this is meant to reflect the consensus of the working group, not that of the public comment of course, and we don't have any Business Constituency members on the working group that I'm aware of. But we do have at least two members of the IPC on the working group.

And presenting this as full consensus here when it goes to Council, I'm just wondering Business Constituency Councilor will have to say about that as well. These are just thoughts and I figured I'd share them with you. To be honest, I was wondering whether I should or shouldn't. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Amr. I think it's true to say that the logic is a little strange and, you know, it's something that could be annoying. So I'm actually really glad you raised it.

However, Lars is more experienced. I wonder what you'd like to add.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you Chris. Yes, this is Lars. Thank you Amr, it's a very good point and I thought about that too.

The (unintelligible) so in my understanding is that (Pent) is obviously free to - and Peter for that matter, is free to indicate whether or not they content any of the others as it seems to be contenting so far to other the recommendations, is free to change that obviously.

The Business Constituency has no representative on the group.

And it is also the fact that - I think I have to look at the exact wording of the guidelines, but I believe that this is about, as you also said Amr on your comment, it's about working group members. And so for example, ALAC might also disagree to other, GNSO group might have disagreed in their comments, but the principle of the group is obviously there to take this into account and either change their opinion or make arguments by those views

are not reflected in the consensus whatever level it might be. And I think we have done that.

And in addition, as I said earlier, everybody is free to change or support this or not. And we followed the PDP process; we gave everyone the opportunity to raise their voice.

Peter, who apologized for the call, I thanked him again off list and he has not come back to say he would put forth consent. So there's nothing we can do at the moment apart from - Peter has clearly said where he stands to include that and then call the consensus level from there.

And if groups don't agree with the outcome, then they should have been more active in the process than only submitting public comments. I think that is my view point. Thank you I guess; thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that Lars, and I can see Amr putting his hand up to agree with that.

And (unintelligible), it's funny. I was just about to ask actually Jim and Rudi about their opinions and I'm very pleased to see Jim put his hand up. Please take the floor.

Jim Galvin: Jim Galvin for the transcript. I have a question more than anything with respect to including the dissenting view in the document.

What does the process actually allow? You know, I'm not sure who this question is for -- probably Lars -- but if anyone has any insight that would be great.

And what I mean by that is - it's funny; a little bit to what Lars just said. Is the only way to get a dissenting view into the document is in order for that to happen are you required to have been a part of the working group in an

active part of the process? Is there any way, from an external mechanism, to get that included into the document without having participated? Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Lars, I wonder what the answer to that is.

Lars Hoffmann: I think Amr had his - Amr, do you want to go first?

Amr Elsadr: I was going to answer the question, but Lars I would be happy to let you go ahead.

Lars Hoffman: Go ahead, go ahead Amr; go ahead. I've spoken enough today.

Amr Elsadr: All right, thanks.

Okay yes, Jim, having a dissenting opinion without actually being a member of the working group takes on more than one form. You can provide the dissenting opinion to the initial report, not the final report, if you're not a member of the working group by submitting public comments. And then the public comment is included in the report as part of the Public Comment Review Tool which is included here.

So obviously, although the Business Constituency does not support the recommendations that the working group has made, their views have been included as an annex to the final report in the Public Comment Review Tool. So in a sense, that's them including their dissenting opinion although they are not part of the formal consensus call which is limited only to the working group members.

But working group members who have a dissenting opinion are able to attach a minority statement clearly indicating that there is not full consensus among the members of the working group, and these are the recommendations that the minority disagree with and the reasoning for that.

But apart from that, I'm not sure. And just to add, of course, that the Public Comment Period involving the initial report of the working group is not limited of course to only the GNSO. And neither is participation in the working group.

And so in none of these steps are limited to GNSO participants, and they're open to anyone whether even if they are member of any of the ICANN SOs or ACs or not.

So I hope that answers your question. Thanks. And I guess Lars can fill in any blanks I might have missed. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much. Amr, would you like to pick this up briefly?

Lars Hoffman: I'm going to go with you meant Lars. I'm going to go with it Chris; thank you.

Chris Dillon: Oh sorry Lars.

Lars Hoffman: It's okay. We do look very similar. Sorry, that was my office.

So, yes, Amr is absolutely correct. Obviously one mustn't forget that membership of the working group remains open, so you know, you don't have to start at the very beginning and you say well, if you only joined partly from the end, you can't submit anything.

You remember that (Taskar) joined the group I think five/six, seven meetings ago maybe in May. If had specifically with the statement, he would have been very welcome to add a statement to this.

So you don't have to at every meeting but you have to be a member of the group in order to get a formal minority statement into the paper.

Two things in addition to that. There's another public comment that gets out before the Board vote, but nothing, if I'm rightly saying, you can submit

anything up for the GNSO vote. But after the GNSO part is for the Board adopt, there's another public comment where everybody is free to state their position or their support for the recommendations. And you don't have to be a member of the group obviously.

And yes, I think that's it. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Lars. And just before going to Jim, I'll just mention briefly that Julie has put some text from the guidelines on the window on the right side of the screen. And that seems to be very much supporting the conversation we're having and the direction it's going.

Sorry for keeping you waiting Jim. Would you like to add something?

Jim Galvin: Yes, no that's okay. I was listening to all of the answers. You know, this is my first time going through the formality of a PDP process with ICANN working groups, so I want to make sure I've got all these details straight in my head.

And this is, you know, interesting. I'm just struck by, and Lars kind of touched on it there at the very end with his last comment about the membership of the working group being open, and I'm struck by what that means to actual voting and what a vote really means.

I mean in principle, anybody who has a particular position could find a way to overrun the working group to make sure that position is presented, inhaled and voted a certain way.

But okay, so thank you. That explains. I'm in favor obviously of what's going on here and the group, and I certainly don't object to any kind of dissenting view being included and, you know, the rules will allow for that. But thank you.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Jim. So that's some very very interesting ideas in that. I'm glad they don't apply on this occasion.

Okay Lars, would you like to?

Lars Hoffman: Yes, I'd just like to add something to Jim.

For example, there's in fact a president - and Amr I'm sure will remember this - whereby members of the working group have dissented with the conclusion is reached. But because of the process being what it is so that the group gets together to find consensus level and then they reach it, everybody has been heard and everybody has been tried to be included, they dissented in the report.

But when it actually came to the vote and the GNSO Council, it was the NTSG I believe on the first IGO/INGO working group I think, they supported the recommendations for the stakeholder group that actually opposed the substantive recommendations in the report. But because of how the process was run, they saw no objections to opposing what was a consensus recommendation. Amr I'm sure can fill in the blanks here, thanks.

Chris Dillon: All right.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thanks Lars. This is Amr.

Yes, Lars just brought up a big mess that I hope the GNSO never ever sees again on that working group.

Lars Hoffman: I take it back, I take it back.

Amr Elsadr: Actually there may be some similarities between what happened with that working group and what happened with this one. And that was very strange

situation. Mind you some, not all, were or nowhere near being as messy as they were.

But that working group actually submitted two sets of recommendations. I think the recommendations were almost 50 in total. And the recommendations were divided kind of in half; half the recommendations had the full consensus of the working group and the other half of the recommendations only had the consensus or the support of a minority of the working group members.

So there was actually consensus, not full consensus, but there was consensus against a lot of the recommendations coming out of that working group which was really really weird.

But, so yes. The GNSO Council actually had two votes on that particular PDP where the Council voted - where there was two motions; one submitted for each set of recommendations.

And technically I guess we could do that with this one as well, but I would prefer not to; I would prefer just to have just one motion on all of the recommendations and not sort of divvy them up between the recommendations that have full consensus and the ones that don't. I just think that's a bit messy and undesirable and probably confusing to GNSO Council as well; it sure was back then. Thanks.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Amr. And I can see Lars is agreeing with you in the Chat Room and that's certainly my instinct as well. Let's not go messy. Now a few things in the Chat Room going on including at least one other interesting thing.

So yes. Rudi wrote the question - this is it. "Do we have to do a vote?" Amr came back saying, "A vote is only necessary if the Chair decide it is necessary."

Normally a vote is not conducted. The working group is supposed to reach consensus, not vote which is - although I'm not very experienced with this process; that is my understanding as well. Rudi is saying, "Thank you for clearing that up."

Then we've got Julie saying to Amr, agreeing with him and saying, "The guidelines say care should be taken in using polls that they do not become votes." Yes, I remember that. "The liability with the use of polls is that in situations where there is divergence or strong opposition, there are often disagreements about the meaning of the poll questions or of the poll results." And then she very much agrees with Amr.

And then Rudi is saying to Julie, "Thanks for the clarification. Absolutely." And Rudi is saying, "Amr, that's what I'm afraid of." Okay, and then Petter is saying to Amr, "I understand that you strongly support four to five different recommendations." Okay.

Right, that seems to have been a very helpful discussion. That raising all sort of very interesting things which actually go, you know, beyond this working group.

I'm wondering if there is anything else that we need to - that would be good to do now during this meeting and the sort of next steps and procedures. I mean obviously we can still email each other on the mailing list, but we're just so much running out of time.

And so Rudi is raising something about next steps and a motion in the Chat Room. Lars, would you like to say anything more about the next steps or are we actually more or less done?

Lars Hoffman: Well I think - thank you Chris, this is Lars for the record. I think we'll send in the clean and the redline copy from the initial report as we did before to the group tomorrow morning. We set a hard deadline, and then I will coordinate

with Amr to see if he can then submit the motion with a document to the GNSO Council preferable tomorrow ready.

Chris Dillon: Thank you very much for that. And actually there is little - there are a few developments in the Chat Room. So Rudi was bringing up the possibility of a motion, and then Amr is explaining how (unintelligible) works which is motions shouldn't be submitted until the minority sustains the submitted and the consensus level is adjusted.

Okay, and then Rudi is saying, "Of course." And Amr is saying, "Lars, sounds good to me."

Okay, right. I think we can probably move into Any Other Business. I actually only have one thing but I wonder whether anybody else has anything they would like to say.

All right, well in fact I said the same thing at the end of the last meeting but, you know, I'll say it again because, you know, it was slightly different people on the call. And it is really just, you know, to thank everybody for the huge amount of work that has gone into this working group over a long time. That's many many meetings.

It's been a very enjoyable experience and it's also been a learning experience for me. I've always been very honest about saying that there is a huge (unintelligible) - I still don't know how to admit that. But you know, a lot of learning going on, extremely pleasant, you know, just as an experience. And I'd really like to thank everybody who's been involved with this.

And I have a feeling that there will be other work within this area and I'm certainly keen to be involved with it, so it may well be that we end up doing similar things in the future. I do hope so; that would be very enjoyable and I shall miss it hugely.

And yes, okay. There's a couple of things in the Chat Room but just go to Lars. Lars, is there something you'd like to pick up?

Lars Hoffman: Yes Chris, thank you so much. I just want to echo that from the staff perspective. And (Unintelligible) and Nathalie think that it's been a great pleasure to work with you and Rudi on this and obviously with all the members of the group as well.

It's been almost a year-and-a-half but it's been very enjoyable. And there will be when all this and if all this should go through, there will be an implementation review team that will be made up hopefully mostly of members from this group hopefully because members of this group will have the best expertise in what exactly was discussed and how when it comes to implementation. But it will be open to everybody so look out for this space.

And yes, back over to you Chris. Thank you very much for your hard work; it's been very much appreciated. Thank you.

Chris Dillon: Oh I should - I mean when I was speaking earlier, I was really referring simultaneously to, you know, all of the working group members. That goes without saying the Staff as well, and, you know, we just worked so much over a long period of time.

Okay, so it's actually great to hear that, you know, (unintelligible) this, at least some of us will be back together on the Implementation Review Team, and I'm obviously very keen to be involved with that. So what I was saying before has come true; sort of prediction really.

Few other things in the Chat Room just to wind down. "Thank you very much," Rudi (unintelligible) wishes.

And Amr is saying something about the Board. "When the Board is considering GNSO adopted recommendations, the AC, ALAC and GAC

(unintelligible) advice is contradictory to the GNSO recommendations. Just thought I'd (unintelligible)."

Really - yes okay, that's really - and Rudi in fact is saying, "Very interesting not that I'm in favor of that indifference. But I just wanted to note a possibility in the overall process."

And Justine is saying, "I look forward to receiving an update through the email list and next steps so it's clear what is expected of the working group members if anything remains."

And Julie is just saying/echoing what Lars said. And thank you very much for the good wishes.

Amr is just saying, "Working group members have the option to join an Implementation Review Team to assist Staff in implementation of the recommendations that they were intended by the GNSO/Board. This only begins after the Board has authored the recommendations and makes them actually (unintelligible)." Okay, yes.

And there are a couple of things coming through. And thank you very much Amr for your good wishes. And Rudi is saying, "Could we get a few months off?"

And then Justine is saying, "That's the PDP I was referring to was the minority position for this final report." Okay. And there's a little bit more is just coming through in the Chat Room, but Lars, is there something you'd like to raise?

Lars Hoffman: Sorry Chris, I was on mute and it wasn't (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Chris Dillon: And Amr is also very much thanking Staff absolutely with huge amounts of reason. Okay and Peter Green is saying something.

Of course, you know, I think a quite a few of us will meet in Buenos Aires, and that's very much something to look forward to I think. Simply coming to the end of this, we really need to celebrate.

Waiting for one or two to come through. And Peter is saying, "A year-and-a-half (unintelligible)." Thank you very much for that Peter.

Okay, (unintelligible) in the Chat Room. Oh yes, this is Amr to Justine. "Don't imagine that there will be much to do as long as nothing in the report has changed. Just the consensus level on Recommendation 1 on the Minority Statement."

Yes, let's hope. We were just doing a bit of a double chat with the report I think. But yes, I think we can see the light at the end of the tunnel. And Justine is saying, "Pretty much (unintelligible)."

Amr Elsadr: Chris, this is Amr. If I can ask a quick question.

Chris Dillon: Sorry, I missed your hand.

Amr Elsadr: That's okay. Just what you said, you said that the last double check, and I'm wondering what you meant by that. I certainly hope that we won't be seeing anymore changes in the report.

Chris Dillon: Well, yes. I mean the only thing - I mean it's just me being careful because occasionally when you have a late change to a document then, you know, there are always going to be proofreading things. I was quite surprised that we were able to find so many proofreading edits.

Now the thing is when you do a bigger change, then sometimes that might set something else off. So obviously I'm really hoping it doesn't, but it's just sort of slightly saying what could happen is if suddenly become aware of something that's affected by, you know, the change today, then we may be on the mailing list saying, "Look, we think what we need to do is take this approach." So it's sort of a safety net. It's probably not necessary but that's the reason for it.

Amr Elsadr: Inject - this is Amr again. I'd actually prefer we try not to make any changes past the consensus call because yes, it's just a...

Chris Dillon: Okay, that...

Amr Elsadr: Yes, it becomes a bit confusing and we've all given our positions I guess on the report as is and wouldn't want to have to rethink that after any changes are made. So as far as I understand, now we're just waiting to change the consensus level on Recommendation 1 and add the Minority Statement that Peter will be providing apart from that.

It just seems strange to have a consensus call and then have to review the report again following that. So you know, yes. I just wanted to point that out or at least voice that opinion.

Chris Dillon: Thank you Amr. We have perhaps been over liberal in the past. You know, we have set deadlines and then we have allowed all sort of things after them, actually particularly with the Public Comment Review Tool. You know, we really were very liberal there, and you know, I think we got a better result.

Okay, this is the time that we don't do that. So it really is, you know, we will make those changes and then that's the end.

Okay, a few things in the Chat Room. So a conversation with, you know, Amr and Justine. So Amr and Justine (unintelligible) bingo, thanks. And Justine

says, "Just from what I heard of the push for the minority position, it sounds like a serious change."

That was, you know, that's certainly my - you know, that was the reason for my caution. Justine is agreeing with Amr, and Amr is saying, "Yes we have been liberal but time is tight."

Yes, it's true. I think it's very important that we do make that - actually it's not - it really is vital that we make that deadline Sunday 23:59. We really have to make it.

So I think the technical expression is end of mister nice guy, isn't it. So yes, it means this time we really have to stick to it. I think I am just being paranoid, and Amr is smiling in the Chat Room.

All right, okay. Well we are more or less at the top of the hour in fact and I think we're done. So I would just like to thank you very much for another very good call during which we got a lot done. Amr is saying he wasn't just smiling in the Chat Room.

Okay, I'd really like to thank all of you for, you know, obviously (unintelligible) but also for the last 18 months. And hope that we'll be able to meet at quite a few of us in Buenos Aires.

Oh yes, what I really need to say is Bon Voyage. Have a very safe trip to Buenos Aires those of you who are traveling. All right, goodbye then and thank you very much.

Rudi Vansnick: Goodbye.

Petter Rindforth: Bye.

Lars Hoffman: Thank you Chris.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks.

Nancy Peregrine: Thank you very much (Louisie), you may stop the recording. This call is (unintelligible).

END