

**GNSO  
Operations Steering Committee (OSC) GNSO Council Operations Work Team  
16 September 2009 at 16:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee (OSC) GNSO Council Operations Work Team teleconference on 16 September 2009 at 16:00 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 the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-ops-20090916.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/index.html#sep>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Ray Fasset  
Wolf Ulrich Knoben  
Ron Andruff  
Robin Gross  
Ken Stubbs

Staff:

Julie Hedlund  
Rob Hoggarth  
Glen de Saint Gery  
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Avri Doria

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon. On today's call we have Ray Fasset, Robin Gross, Wolf Knoben. From staff we have Rob Hoggarth, Julie Hedlund, Glen DeSaintgery and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. Thank you.

Ray Fasset: Okay. So this is (Ray Fasset). Thanks for joining. As an agenda for today I think it's pretty clear we are at the - what I consider the final stages of the draft RoP.

We've had the documents circulated recently. Based on our call last week we asked for OSC Council feedback. We've received that feedback. In addition

we've received feedback from ICANN's Staff Council primarily which I think is a good thing.

And our objective today working under the timelines that we are all aware of, our objective today is to finalize as a work team the draft RoP so that we can communicate this to the OSC who will -- well in effect what we're going to do today is send the - what we consider as the draft RoP approved by the work team to the GNSO Council, that's in effect what we're going to do today.

So the GNSO Council will then take a vote next - I believe on the 24th of September, we're going to take a vote to then take it out for public comment. Okay, so they're not necessarily going to vote that they approve of the procedures, they're going to vote to take it out for public comment.

Where in essence from what I understand it's actually going to be the new council members that are seated in Seoul that will vote to approve - formally approve the procedures. And the significance of that is that when the ICANN Board will take action also approving it based on the recommendation of the new council in Seoul.

So that's kind of the logistics of where we're at and what we're doing. So it's important today that we take the feedback that we've received as we requested, incorporate the edits that we as a work team believe should be accepted and move it on, if you will.

So with that said, I don't want to make this too confusing but I think we have two documents that we're working with today. We're working with a Chuck Gomes edited version that was sent to the list and we're working with an ICANN Legal Council document that also has edits in it.

(Wolf) do you have -- since (Wolf) and I are the two on this call today that are on the work team. I think -- Robin are you there?

Wolf Knobens: Yes (unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Yes, I'm here.

Ray Fasset: Great.

Wolf Knobens: (Unintelligible) (Wolf) speaking. So I do have those two documents. I wonder where the comments which came from (Steve Metallis) is being reflected.

Ray Fasset: Okay. So I think, you know, again working under that the timeframes that we are. Chuck Gomes, Chair of the OSC digested those comments from (Steve). He's had some knowledge on some of the issues that (Steve) raised based on discussions we've had back and forth up till now.

He was able to answer some of those which again it was sent to the list in an email where Chuck was able to provide some exploratory comments and where in other areas Chuck took some of (Steve)'s suggestions and actually put them -- edited them into a version of the document.

So somewhere edited in, somewhere provided explanatory response and not necessarily edited in. Our - what we can do is do the exact same thing. You know, look at (Steve)'s comments, put in what we feel to put in, look at why Chuck chose to interpret those and edit it in, accept the way Chuck has done it. So that's what's -- that's how that is being handled. Does that answer the question?

Wolf Knobens: Yes. I only would be sure that (Steve Metallis)'s comments have already been taken here and are part of the first document which we are just...

Ray Fasset: Right. So what Chuck did was provide the edited version, his edited version to (Steve)'s comments. Obviously (Steve) will (secede) on that which again I forwarded through the list this thread if you will.

Now what did not happen is (Steve) come back and say, "Chuck, I don't agree with how you interpreted this. I don't agree with -- you didn't put this part in that I was talking about." So I'm going to take that as an affirmation that (Steve)'s okay with how Chuck went about this.

Wolf Knoben: Okay.

Ray Fasset: Okay. So I think as in terms of efficiency today my view in this is let's go ahead and look at Chuck's edits to (Steve)'s comments, see if we agree with it as a work team where, you know, where applicable...

Wolf Knoben: Okay.

Ray Fasset: ...and, you know, approach it that way procedurally.

Wolf Knoben: Okay.

Ray Fasset: Okay. And then similarly with the comments we received back from ICANN Council go into that document and see if their edits -- and they have a couple questions in there too that I think we should discuss and provide response to as well.

Wolf Knoben: Yeah.

Ray Fasset: And basically attack it this way towards a final version that is likely going to incorporate these two documents -- hello (Julie) are you listening?

Julie Hedlund: (Unintelligible) (Ray).

Ray Fasset: Good luck with that, okay. So it's going to be a little challenging. But I think we can do it. Okay. So my approach here is that we've got to pick one of the two. I'm thinking let's go ahead and start with Chuck's edited version. Let's

start there, go through it, see what he's done with (Steve)'s comments and see if we like it.

Wolf Knoben: Okay.

Ray Fasset: Okay. So I believe -- yep I have that one open. And if we all have that one open I believe his first comment comes in in Section 4.1(b).

Wolf Knoben: Yeah.

Ray Fasset: Okay. So now I'll try and dovetail between the two because this was also one that council brought up so maybe we can kill two birds with one stone here. So what we say here is each house will be allowed one candidate for GNSO Council Chair. And now...

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: I'm sorry (Ray), this is Rob.

Ray Fasset: Hey Rob. Yes?

Rob Hoggarth: I just wanted to confirm that everybody's looking at the same document.

Ray Fasset: Sure.

Rob Hoggarth: You know, the latest document I thought that I had seen was from Chuck with his changes as of 12:55 on yesterday afternoon. Is that the one you're operating from or is there...

Ray Fasset: Yeah, my heading says -- yeah, I believe that is the one I am looking at. Final draft clean with Gomes edits, 15 September '09.

Julie Hedlund: Right.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: And this is (Julie Headland). So the first change that we will be looking at would be under 3.5 Quorum, Chuck G, you know, 9, 12:55pm.

Ray Fasset: Oh, yeah, you're right I missed that one. Okay. Yeah, let's go there. Okay. Thank you (Julie Headland). Okay. All right.

So the question that (Steve) put forth here is, you know, do you need to have a quorum to initiate a meeting? And we talked about this as a work team I think back and forth on this. Why are we doing that? Why are we saying that there needs to be a quorum in order to initiate a meeting?

Do we recall -- I honestly I don't recollect. I know we discussed this and we felt it was important. And I believe -- I think Ron had some comments on this or -- but I honestly just don't recall. Why did we make that a requirement? So that I can respond why it's there because Chuck deleted it, right?

Wolf Knoblen: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, Chuck deleted that sentence out. So our--

((Crosstalk))

Ray Fasset: Yeah, go ahead. Yes, go ahead, thanks (Wolf).

Wolf Knoblen: Yes I saw that but I really -- I'm just reading that right now, Chuck's version, which before me okay. Also I must be thinking that what was (unintelligible) but I don't remember so why we did do that. So maybe one really had arguments but I don't recall that myself.

Julie Hedlund: (Ray) this is (Julie), may I make a comment?

Ray Fasset: Yes, please.

Julie Hedlund: I think that language was actually there from the original. I don't have the original pulled up. But I think we were saying, "Yes, that's okay," and we didn't delete it. I don't recall any adamant arguments that there -- you know, in our discussions that there should be a quorum to initiate a meeting.

Ray Fasset: Well, you know what, I'm -- very rarely (Julie), I'm going to disagree with that. I really -- I don't think this (that is) originally. I could be wrong. I don't think...

Julie Hedlund: No, that's fine. And I -- please disagree with me because I don't have the original in front of me as I mentioned.

Ray Fasset: As you know, I rarely do that but I think there was a reason why we said why we wanted a quorum it's just escaping me as to what that is. So but as we sit here today those of us on the work team call, I just heard one person say that, you know, what they're reading here as Chuck modified it, it seems to make sense. I don't disagree. And we have Robin on the call. Is there -- if there's no voice of objection here I'm okay with the way Chuck has edited this.

Ken Stubbs: (Ray), it's (Ken). I can live with it too.

Ray Fasset: Welcome (Ken). Thank you very much for that.

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob Hoggarth. I'm not inserting an objection here but just as an observation from what I recall from your discussions in Mexico City I believe it was and when this item first came up and there I believe the issue was the concern that meetings not be held by minority groups.

In other words there was a general sense of fairness that it wasn't appropriate for meetings or discussions to take place without there being a

certain level or number of participants and representatives from the various stakeholder groups. So that I think was the reason for the discussion and debate about the quorum issue itself.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, I think that's really the logical reason that I can determine. Some issue of fairness as it pertains to who's on the call when.

Wolf Knoben: It's (Wolf).

Ray Fasset: Yeah.

Wolf Knoben: I think -- (Wolf) speaking. I was just looking through my notices here from the Sydney meeting which I was on a call here and there was something really (unintelligible) their arguments. So how could we ensure a minimum of participants?

((Crosstalk))

Ray Fasset: Yeah, let's look at that in the context, okay. So really what our role as a work team is to vet this stuff out, prepare what we prepare and then, you know, it always (sees) very material to our work. They approve what we're approving.

So what we're doing correctly here is we're getting back the feedback from the OSC as to what they like to see and that's part of the process here that I think we have to appreciate. So I'm okay with this.

So while we may not have full representation of our work team on this call and we're making an edit here that we know there was discussion about but can't quite put our finger on, really what's overriding it to me is, hey, we're hearing from the OSC what they're going to approve. So, you know, unless we have some sort of objection, let's go ahead and use the process as it is intended.



Rob Hoggarth: (Ray), Rob Hoggarth once again. I know you're not looking at both documents in tandem, both the general council's comments and...

Ray Fasset: We can.

Rob Hoggarth: ...the Chuck/(Steve).

Ray Fasset: We can.

Rob Hoggarth: I've got them up side by side on my screen.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: And the only reason I raise that is that general council's office did have a comment on this section and so I thought it might be appropriate to consider that as part of this discussion.

Ray Fasset: And you know what Rob, now that you mention it, that might even be more efficient. You know, as we go look in each section here where there's an edit, let's look at the other one at the same time instead of doubling back. Actually that might be more efficient.

So that's a good comment. So let's -- okay, so let's go look at the -- let's open up, or I did, the council, legal council opinion. What are they saying here?

Ron Andruff: Chairman Ron Andruff on board. I apologize for being late to the call. I've been here for a few minutes. I just wanted to let you know I'm here.

Ray Fasset: Too late you can't join now.

Ron Andruff: Oh, sorry, then I'll have to be on my way.

Ray Fasset: All right, Ron, welcome aboard. Glad you could make it. Thank you.

Ron Andruff: Thank you.

Ray Fasset: All right. So what's the council saying here?

Ron Andruff: I'm sorry, I just (unintelligible) the question was, is this the one that (Julie) sent, GNSO Council Operating Procedures Review, Rob Hoggarth shared with ICANN legal staff. Is that the one that you're looking at?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, yeah. Ron this is (Julie). The file should read -- it should have at the end of it in parens SE edit.

Ron Andruff: Yes. Thank you. I'm on that page.

Ray Fasset: Okay. Can someone interpret for me what it is the issue here that probably Samantha has brought forward?

Rob Hoggarth: I think what Samantha's observing is that the standard as currently drafted, she's flagging for your consideration that the quorum definition here doesn't require a majority of each house. And that may or may not be of significance to you guys.

But what that leads her to conclude is that there could be a meeting that would be held and a vote couldn't take place. I didn't view her comment as one that said, "Oh, you need to change this," but just to note that as she interpreted it, you could conduct a meeting and you wouldn't be able to - the council itself wouldn't be able to conduct a vote.

Ray Fasset: I think that is the intention, right? We can conduct a meeting...

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah, then she says at the end that this needs to be worked through and we haven't had the benefit of talking with her real time about these edits, (Julie)

in the interest of getting you guys to be able to see these comments, circulated it, probably haven't been able to meet with Sam.

But I think it's a reflection that she said, "Gee, you know this could be an area that you guys have some concern about." But I think you guys have actually discussed this in the past recognizing that at least when it was originally drafted prior to Chuck's edits, the thought was, "Let's make sure that there's fairness. We're not going to have a meeting if we don't have a quorum which is at least, you know, a majority of voting members including one person from each stakeholder group." And then there's that final sentence which essentially says, you know, we aren't going to take a vote unless there's a quorum.

Ken Stubbs: I'm sorry you got cut off, we're not going to take a vote unless what?

Rob Hoggarth: Unless there's a quorum. I think that's essentially what you guys intended on the last sentence which says, "Whenever a vote is taken, there must be a quorum." My own staff observation on that would be that you might want to say, "Whenever a vote is initiated there must be a quorum." But I think that was certainly her intent there.

Ray Fasset: Okay, okay.

Julie Hedlund: (Ray) this is (Julie), may I make a comment?

Ray Fasset: Yeah, please.

Julie Hedlund: Or a question really. (Ray) from your experience with the GNSO Council meetings, isn't there now a requirement to have a quorum when a vote is initiated?

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Ken Stubbs: Well wait a minute, let's take a step back there. I'm going to use an example and it's only an example. It does not reflect any position. Okay. Here's a situation that occurred in the past when I was on the council and there would be some concern about whether or not this could be manipulated in such a way so a vote could never be taken.

A few years back there was a vote that was taken to recommend to the ICANN Board that term limits be put in place. There was vociferous opposition from three of the constituencies on this point to the point that they refused to vote.

And what I'm afraid of is if you have a situation in the future -- and please correct me if I'm wrong and if I'm way off base let me know -- where there is an intense desire not to move forward with a vote like this, every time a vote came up these people could leave the meeting thereby rendering it without a quorum, thereby in effect making it impossible to ever vote on a specific issue because people would purposely leave the meeting so it would become (inquorate) or whatever the word is.

So we just need to look at the ramifications of something like this. I hope you all understand and if I'm speaking out of turn, please, I apologize.

Ray Fasset: No, I think what you articulated (Ken) there is if it's a vote, if the subject matter of whatever's being voted on happens to impact the GNSO counselors directly, there's going to be motivation to use the rules in a way that prevents the vote. So I mean that's a very clear-cut example. There could be other examples of how this particular threshold that we're requiring could be manipulated.

You know, I think -- with this said I think my recommendation here for discussion is to go ahead and accept Chuck's edit and insert the word "initiated." Whenever a vote is initiated there must be a quorum.

Ken Stubbs: So in effect what will happen is that needs to be part -- that needs to be coded into the voting procedure so that before the vote commences, the chair needs to formally ascertain whether a quorum is in effect before the vote even commences. And also how do you deal with absentee votes in terms of something like this?

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob. Glen may be able to answer that question at least with how it's currently conducted.

Glen DeSaintgery:Sorry...

Rob Hoggarth: Glen?

Glen DeSaintgery:...did you want me Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, ma'am. It was just -- you know, (Ken) made the observation that there are many opportunities to potentially gain some of these systems. And I thought it would be useful for you to just briefly share without completely taking us down a different tangent, (Ray), just for Glen to share with us sort of what the process is now for initiating a voter for taking a vote.

Does the chair, Glen, you know, confirm once again that there is a quorum and then you conduct the vote? I know she does that at the beginning of the meeting to confirm whether there is a quorum.

Glen DeSaintgery:Indeed, Rob, when there is the slightest question about there not being a quorum, and I can see on screen for example if people have fallen off, I tell the chair if she's not aware of it that there is no longer quorum or that there is quorum.

Ray Fasset: Well here's...

Glen DeSaintgery:So we do that before a vote.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, so here's a way to word it. We could say, "Whenever a vote is initiated, the chair will ensure a quorum is present."

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes. Then the thing I'd like to say is I completely agree with (Ken) and without going into the details, I know of another example and (Ken) does too where a vote can be completely distorted because people fall off the call.

Ray Fasset: Hello?

Glen DeSaintgery: Hello?

(Ray Fasset): Everybody still here?

Man: Yep.

Ray Fasset: I thought I heard a disconnection. Okay. Well, you know, if we go down the path now of unwinding this quorum threshold, then the opposite effect of that is you start having, you know, unrepresentative calls taking place, calling for potential voting that, you know, could become unwieldy.

So there's a downside. If you remove the quorum requirement, there's another downside to that. Now it can be used a different way, manipulated in a different way. You know, two people are on the call and they're, you know, calling for a vote - voting actions. So...

Rob Hoggarth: (Ray).

Ray Fasset: Yeah.

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob. I think without belaboring this point too much I think that fundamentally the way you have all approached this and the way folks tend to behave on the council is assuming good faith. And there's a certain point at

which you can perhaps find yourself over-engineering the process. I'm not suggesting we're at one end of that spectrum or the other right now.

Ray Fasset: Right.

Rob Hoggarth: But at a certain point you almost have to, you know, understand that yes, if somebody has a really, truly evil intent, they can find a loophole in just about anything. And it's just a matter of you guys determining how detailed you want to get on some of this.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, so here's my recommendation. From what I'm hearing I'm okay with going ahead and accepting Chuck's edit, that a discussion can take place even though there's not a quorum.

But I would modify that last sentence where it says -- I would rephrase it as, "Whenever a vote is initiated, the chair will ensure that a quorum is present." And, you know, we land on that side of the fence. Anybody object to that?

Man: Nope. No objection from me.

Robin Gross: No objection.

Ray Fasset: Okay. (Julie) did you capture that okay?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, (Ray) I did and I've made the change. And I am preparing a version dated today where I'm indicating these changes as I go, so it should be fairly quick to prepare the final version when we're (completed with the call).

Ken Stubbs: (Ray) this is (Ken) again. I apologize, for some reason in the middle of our conversation there I got knocked off the call. So...

Ray Fasset: Sure.

Ken Stubbs: ...I just want to pick up one thing and you may have gone way past it already. Okay. We talked about initiating a vote and ascertaining that a quorum exists. How do we deal with a situation -- and I just have to be frank, this happens more often than you would imagine, let's suppose the Names Council call is scheduled for -- what's the normal length now Glen? Two hours? Hour and a half? Something like that?

Glen DeSaintgery: Two hours.

Ken Stubbs: All right. We get that -- and this happens more often than you would realize it. Let's say you're almost at the two hours and you have two or three open issues and you have to get off the call. And let's say there were votes that needed to be taken, okay, but those votes are now going to be taken after the call would normally have ended.

Now I'm wondering whether or not there should be a process in place that would allow me hypothetically to pick up the phone or email Glen and say, "Glen, I've got to leave the call but when this vote comes up, I want to cast my vote this way."

Now here's the problem. If the vote actually comes up and can be initiated, Glen would say to me, "(Ken) there's no problem we can -- if you're not here we'll probably do the balance by mail, you'll be able to cast your vote by email."

But if I'm not on the call technically at the time that the voters initiated, technically there's not a quorum and yet I had every intent to vote and -- do you understand what I'm saying?

Ray Fasset: Yeah, yeah, yeah, I do.

Ken Stubbs: And Glen will tell you this is not an unusual circumstance.



Ray Fasset: Understood.

Ken Stubbs: These council meetings go over all the time.

Ray Fasset: Understood.

Ken Stubbs: And if not then you force the Names Council in order to meet that requirement into scheduling all of the votes early on inside the two-hour deal to ensure that a quorum will be there for that vote.

Ray Fasset: Right. Okay. So you've hit on a couple of really touchy issues there or complicated issues. And one of them was email, you know, so email my vote to Glen or I'll email my vote later to the list and the issue there is we are really confined on how we can use email in a voting procedure by the bylaws.

And to complicate matters further, what we've decided to do on last week's call is we agree that there is a need -- we believe there is a practical need by the GNSO Council to be able to use email in a way to voice an opinion or otherwise vote. Okay? Which is really what a vote is, right?

So but we've decided to defer that because that's going to be a touchy discussion, how do we interweave the ability practically speaking to do this in a manner that doesn't conflict with the bylaws and how it interprets what absentee voting is which it includes electronic voting or email voting as one mechanism to do absentee voting but where only in these specific instances, there are like four instances. I think we outline them later.

So I am suggesting here for today that, yes, you are correct (Ken) in a practical sense but in order to seat the council in Seoul I think we're okay with where we can give this in terms of a status as of now. But we know that we have to look at this concept of email voting later.

Ken Stubbs: Yeah, okay. Fine with that then. So we just have to do some fine-tuning. I'm going to use some other examples that can create some very embarrassing situations in the future if we don't deal with it.

Ray Fasset: Sure.

Ken Stubbs: We need to make certain -- this is a global forum that we're operating in and I think of my friend in Cambodia, (Norberd), on a regular basis. There is a possibility that could exist that telecommunications may go down and yet they may have email.

So (Norberd) sends an email to Glen saying that he's unable to get back into a call but that he wants to vote on an issue and he wants this vote to be cast in such a specific way. We need to have a process that recognizes that telecommunications are not as efficient and as effective in all parts of the world as we move forward with this.

Ray Fasset: Right.

Ken Stubbs: So we can push it off now but we can't push it off forever.

Ray Fasset: Exactly.

((Crosstalk))

Ray Fasset: We're going to need direction from the new council.

Ken Stubbs: Right.

Ray Fasset: I mean to help us prioritize. This working group...

Ken Stubbs: I think there's a very simple way of doing that and I won't get into it in depth now. But basically every council member could be assigned a specific identity

code that they can use in an email to Glen that would sufficiently identify to Glen that this person is in fact acting in this capacity and would allow her in the future to be able to do some things that could be outlined future. I don't want to take anymore time now but there are ways of dealing with it.

Ray Fasset: No, that's a great (unintelligible). Authentication is absolutely a key aspect to absentee and email voting, et cetera. And something too that I want to point out and I want to discuss at the end of our call but I can move it up a little bit which is, you know, what do we do after we send this off to the council today? What's our next call? What's our agenda item going to be about?

There's nothing stopping us from jumping right in to the email session again and coming up with these procedures. We're just saying as of today in order to meet certain deadlines don't count on these two sections being proxy voting and email voting to be completed by Seoul. We're just being clear and up front about that. That doesn't stop us from continuing to work on it though.

Ken Stubbs: I think that's exactly what you need to say.

Ray Fasset: Good.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Stubbs: We're going as fast as we possibly can within the bounds of our mandates...

Ray Fasset: Right.

Ken Stubbs: ...trying to make sure that everything is done and is delivered in an equitable manner.

Ray Fasset: Right.

- Ken Stubbs: And in order for us to give you the deliverable that you needed today, we've accomplished this but there are following areas. Don't -- just tell them we're working on it. It will be available but we don't...
- Ray Fasset: Yeah.
- Ken Stubbs: ...want to give you a half a (loaf) on any of these issues. We want to make sure that it's deliberated properly and dealt with.
- Ray Fasset: Yep. And for the record those types of footnotes are contained in the document and also in discussion with the OSC this has been made clear to them and they are completely onboard with us in this regard. So I think we're all saying the same thing. We're in good stead. Fair?
- Julie Hedlund: (Ray).
- Ray Fasset: Yeah, (Julie)?
- Julie Hedlund: This is (Julie). Can I ask a question?
- Ray Fasset: Yes.
- Julie Hedlund: Where do we stand then on the language in 3.5? I have made the change. I think the last change that you recommended was the second sentence would read, "Whenever a vote is initiated the GNSO Council Chair will ensure that a quorum is present." And I've also deleted the very first sentence which was Chuck's suggested edits.
- Ray Fasset: Yes, I believe that is acceptable for today unless there are objections. Understanding that we have other issues to work with on this as it pertains to electronic voting, et cetera, those sections may, you know, obviously effect this. In order for it to work better, those sections will effect this but as of today this is where we're at. Any objections?

Man: No.

Ray Fasset: Okay, good. Thank you (Ken). Those are very practical comments that we need to understand. All right, so again in following Rob's suggestion which I think is a good one, we're going to try and work on these two documents in parallel.

So I'm going back now to Chuck's document and I'm looking at his next comment which has to do with 4.1(b). So, you know, he highlights it, each house will be allowed one candidate for GNSO Council Chair. His comment is, each house would be responsible for determining how to nominate a candidate.

Now that drives to (Steve Metallis)'s comment which is and I think ICANN Council's comment as well -- let's look at ICANN Council's comment on this, 4.1(b). Okay. Okay, so I think if I'm interpreting the council's comment correctly is, you know, where is the process for nomination by a house?

Well we are actually saying that that is up to the house. We're not saying it. We're inadvertently saying that. So Chuck is coming in by I think saying it. "Each House would be responsible for determining how to nominate a candidate. Now we could add words...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Stubbs: ...need to attribute that candidate, not a candidate but their respective candidate.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, or a single candidate.

Wolf Knoben: Yes a single or one, yeah.

Ray Fasset: Yeah. Each house would be responsible for determining how to nominate one candidate.

Ron Andruff: In fact it should be each house is responsible, not would be.

Ray Fasset: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: ...this is policy. So each house is responsible.

Ray Fasset: Yes. Yeah, yeah. I think that's an improvement too. So each house is responsible for determining how to nominate a single candidate.

Rob Hoggarth: (Ray) this is Rob. Just with a note here, that -- Chuck's addition there is in fact a comment, not an edit, so...

Ray Fasset: Right.

Rob Hoggarth: ...so you can play around with it any way you want. I think what you're looking to do is maybe adding an additional sentence. Is that what you're proposing?

Ray Fasset: Well actually I was hoping not to. I was hoping to combine the issue council was -- council is reading what we say here and asking a question. How does the house nominate? Well they're asking the question because we're not clear.

So now what we are trying to be clear on is each house will be allowed one candidate. So we're trying to be clear on that. And where we need to sharpen up is being clear that each house will decide their one candidate.

So the question is, can we combine those two concepts into one sentence where we say, "Each house would be responsible for determining how to

nominate the single candidate”? Or do we want to break it up into two sentences? Doesn't matter to me.

Ron Andruff: If you add the word “their” you don't have to break it up.

Ray Fasset: Okay. So, “Each house is” -- sorry to pick up on Ron's comment. “Each house is responsible for determining how to nominate their candidate.” Which is different than “their candidates”, right?

Julie Hedlund: (Ray), this is (Julie).

Ray Fasset: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: I think because we're saying each house, we might want to say, “Each house is responsible for determining how to nominate its candidate.”

Ray Fasset: Yeah, right. Its candidate, right. That's proper grammar. Yeah. Now that could lead someone to question though, “Well does that mean that we're only allowed one candidate?” “Well, I don't know, let's go back and ask them. Who directed this?” So maybe we just need to be clear.

All right, let's do two sentences. “Each house” -- the current sentence is, “Each house will be allowed one candidate for GNSO Council Chair.” Now let's add a new sentence. “Each house is responsible for determining how to nominate its candidate.” Now we're clear. How's that?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yeah, works for me.

Ray Fasset: Okay, okay. All right. So that takes care of Chuck's issues or anything here else on the council side so I've got that document open now. Does the chair have to be a member of the council?

Wolf Knoben: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Does the chair have to be a member of the council? Yeah. That goes without -- yeah, I look at that as well of course that goes without saying. But since somebody has raised the question.

Wolf Knoben: They came -- (Wolf) speaking -- because (last summer) they should have chaired the (elected) from outside of the houses. So that could be read as outside of the council, you know.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, yeah. Well, you know, yeah, you're right (Wolf). What are we intending here?

Wolf Knoben: Well it's only (unintelligible) okay there's only one, one member outside of the houses it's the NCA.

Ray Fasset: Well no anybody can -- a house -- I think what we're saying here is a house can nominate anybody, you know, it doesn't have to be an NCA. Anybody they feel is qualified for whatever reason. They don't have to be a member of the house or of the stakeholder group.

Wolf Knoben: You're sure?

Ray Fasset: Yes. What I'm thinking here is well once they're elected to chair then they're a member of the council but they don't need to be a member of the council prior to being elected chair.

Wolf Knoben: Is that really the case...

((Crosstalk))

Ray Fasset: I don't know.



((Crosstalk))

Ray Fasset: I don't know. I'm just talking out loud. What do others think?

Glen DeSaintgery: Sorry, can I say something here (Ray)? This is Glen.

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: I know there was -- (Ken) may remember this too at some stage -- there was talk of wanting to know if somebody who was actually not a representative from one of the constituencies or the stakeholder groups could in fact be nominated as member of -- as chair of the council.

And I think at that stage there was -- legal said, "Well nowhere in the bylaws does it say that the person has to be a member of the council." That is a representative from one of the stakeholder groups.

Ray Fasset: Well...

Glen DeSaintgery: I think that's probably where the question has come in.

Ray Fasset: Well, okay, so the candidate does not need to be a member of a house or stakeholder group or constituency or whatever. But once elected chair -- I'm interpreting this question to be once they're elected chair, are they a member of the council? Or am I not interpreting the question correctly?

Rob Hoggarth: (Ray) this is Rob. I think the concern is that no house be able to manipulate the system by nominating someone outside the council, getting them as chair and then allowing them to vote. I think that was really the intent of your efforts here.

You know, whoever it ends up being if you all agree that it's okay for whoever is ultimately elected not to be a member or a participant on the council then at the very least whoever is named doesn't get a vote because that would be potentially (gaining) the system.

Wolf Knoben: (Unintelligible) (Wolf) speaking. So I really am a little bit surprised (unintelligible) because I was not aware that this could be the meaning of that paragraph.

My understanding was (up to now) that the chair should be -- also the candidate for the chairperson should be a member of the council. So I don't know what is really the case in the past that this has been open to anybody else who has been nominated by any (constituency). I'm really surprised if that is the case. Okay. I will stop again to think over.

Ray Fasset: Well, that's a good question. So how does it work now? Do you have to be a member of the council to be nominated for chair?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Yes, yes. So we're not clear on this point.

Wolf Knoben: So I would stay with that.

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob. I think that was just the gist of Sam's comment. It was, well it's not clear so you guys need to make sure it is clear.

Ray Fasset: Yeah.

Wolf Knoben: Okay.

Ray Fasset: All right, so we're saying -- we're bleeding two different things here unintentionally. What we're trying to say in spirit is a member of the GNSO Council does not need to be a member of a house, right? We all agree on that. But then when it comes to a chair, okay, the chair must be an existing council member.

Wolf Knoben: Well, it's (Wolf) again asking so because I understand the election process for the council right now is that there will be representatives from the stakeholder groups. (Unintelligible) so at least -- and then from the houses, so stakeholders' groups and houses.

So they will appoint members to the council and then the question then (unintelligible) the chair. The chairperson is -- well really I understand is elected through the houses. I am just thinking so how (it works). Does it mean that the house members, the council members of different houses appoint the chair or not?

Ray Fasset: Well maybe we just need to clarify it. Maybe I'm making too much out of this. Maybe all we need to do is say that the chair must be a member of the council. Maybe we just need to say that and then we're done.

Ron Andruff: That's what we should do. Keep it simple. I agree.

Wolf Knoben: But (unintelligible) I understand the question came up because it was a question about the candidate for the chairperson. Should he be -- must he or she be a member of the council or not? Now if you say the chair must be one, okay. After he has been appointed to a chair then he could be a member or he will be a member of the council.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, yeah, exactly. So I think all we need to do to clarify this is to say that a chair must be -- to be elected chair you must be a member of the council and we're done.

Wolf Knoben: Yes, to be elected, okay.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, to be elected chair -- for the candidate -- the candidate must be a member of council in order to be elected chair.

Wolf Knoben: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Okay. I think we need to add that. I was reading way too much into this. I apologize. So any objections?

Rob Hoggarth: (Ray) just to confirm for (Julie)'s benefit then the second sentence of 4.1(b) should be, "A candidate for GNSO Council Chair does not need to be a member of a house but must be a member of the council."

Ray Fasset: Bingo. That's exactly right. And we're -- and that solves the issue.

Julie Hedlund: (Ray) this is (Julie). I've noted that. (Ray) let me ask a question here if I may.

Ray Fasset: Yep.

Julie Hedlund: I have just received an email from Samantha Eisner on the ICANN legal team.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: I had asked whether or not they had any suggestion for language in the Section 3.5 quorum that might - that we might want to consider to avoid the type of issue that we were discussing where someone could, you know, sort of (gain) the system or prevent a meeting from happening, you know, or vote from happening if we didn't have a quorum.

She did make a suggestion for language and I don't want to bring us back if we want to move forward. So I'm asking whether or not you might want to hear that. Otherwise...

Ray Fasset: Yeah, I'm willing to hear it now because it's still fresh in our minds so go ahead. Let's hear it.

Julie Hedlund: Let me read it for you. So the first sentence then would read, you know, because we were deleting what was the first sentence so...

Ray Fasset: Right.

Julie Hedlund: It says, "A quorum is the majority of the voting members of each house and must include at least one member of each stakeholder group." And then she doesn't change that last sentence which we changed about a quorum must be initiated, you know, when a vote is initiated, et cetera.

So the change is that she's just massaged the language a little bit saying it's a majority of the voting members of each house and must include at least one member of each stakeholder group. The way it currently reads is...

Ray Fasset: I think you're adding "in each house" after voting members.

Julie Hedlund: It says, "A quorum is a majority of voting members which includes at least one member of each stakeholder group. So she's making just a very minor change. And in fact...

Ray Fasset: So go ahead and read the sentence one more time for me.

Julie Hedlund: Let me read it. "A quorum is the majority of the voting members of each house and must include at least one member of each stakeholder group." That in fact -- so I think that's very -- the difference is that we say, "which

includes at least one member of each stakeholder group.” And she suggests “which must include at least one member of each stakeholder group.”

Ray Fasset: Okay. I'm not sure that addresses the issues we were discussing either way (of the sense) there how this could be manipulated. But I like -- I think it's crisper. I will say that.

Julie Hedlund: I mean I think her point was that if we are mandating the, you know, the requirement for a member of the stakeholder group it's more clear to say “must” as opposed to...

Ray Fasset: Yeah, yeah. Again, yeah, making it crisper. Yeah, I mean I'll take that. I think it is crisper for what it is we've decided the intent of this to be. Is there any objections to this approach to making it crisper?

Rob Hoggarth: This is just Rob. Obviously I can't enter an objection as a staff member. I would note though that I think that's a rather substantial change in that right now you guys at least in the initial draft have suggested a simple majority of members and this is a more stringent requirement which requires the calculation to take place on a house-by-house basis.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, yeah.

Rob Hoggarth: But if you're fine with that, that's okay. I'm just noting that I think it's somewhat substantial in that respect.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, it's strengthening it. I agree.

Julie Hedlund: (Ray) this is (Julie). So to Rob's point, is that more restrictive though than the...

((Crosstalk))

Ray Fasset: Yeah, it is. Yeah, it is more restrictive. It's strengthening the spirit of what we were saying. Yeah, and I don't view what Rob has said as an objection. You know, again I kind of default to where we were. I was fine with the way we had it before the input by Samantha and I'm still fine with it and it's less complicated. So, you know, I'm just interpreting it as let's keep what we had.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, and (Ray) this is (Julie). And certainly hers was simply a suggestion and...

Ray Fasset: Exactly, exactly.

Julie Hedlund: ...it's up to the work team to decide. I will revert to the language that says, "A quorum is a majority of voting members which includes at least one member of each stakeholder group."

Ray Fasset: Yeah. Now we could say "must include at least one member of each stakeholder group." And I'm okay with changing "which" to "must." Or "and must include." If we want to put the word "must" in instead of "which", does it matter? Does anybody feel that's a material difference?

Ron Andruff: It's Ron. It is a material difference but I think it's a warranted one. Must include makes more sense.

Ray Fasset: I agree that's crisper. So if we can get the...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Stubbs: I agree with that too.

Ray Fasset: Okay. All right. So let's get the word "must" in there in place of "which" however it sounds correctly, okay? Do you want to read a sentence back (Julie)?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I was just doing that. Thank you. Okay. "A quorum is a majority of voting members and must include at least one member of each stakeholder group."

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: And the next sentence just to remind everyone is, "Whenever a vote is initiated the GNSO Council Chair will ensure that a quorum is present."

Ray Fasset: Yes, I like it. Okay. Okay, so...

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much (Ray). I didn't mean to interrupt there but I just...

Ray Fasset: No, it's an improvement. It's an improvement. I think it's better. So that's good. Thank you. And thank Samantha for us.

Okay. So we have 4.1 -- we're back to 4.1(b). There are just some minor edits that Samantha also put forward that I don't have an issue with, might be crisper. You know, it's basically the last sentence which is, "Should chair be elected from outside of the houses?" I'm fine with that. Any issues?

Man: No.

Ray Fasset: Okay. So now trying to stay consistent, is there anything in the next section by Chuck? No, I don't see anything. Okay. So let's stay with Samantha's version here where again she's putting in some -- I don't know -- maybe what I call fixing the language.

I don't see material changes in what Samantha is bringing forward. I view all of these edits I believe while looking at them again is simply just making it crisper.

Man: Yeah.



Ray Fasset: You know, adding the word “nominees” after the unsuccessful votes, you know, we’re kind of - that kind of goes without saying, but it sounds better when you say it.

But I don’t see material changes in (Romanate 1). Anybody? Okay, so let’s go to 2. All right, her question - so (Samantha) has a question. It’s gonna be a tie between the two candidates, or a tie between candidates and none of the above, correct? This is a tie based upon the scoring, the raw vote or the percentages in each house.

Julie Hedlund: (Ray), this is (Julie). May I make a comment?

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: I think what she’s asking - I think she understands, you know, in a case of a tie, I mean she’s asking I think that it’s a tie between the candidates and none of the above. And she’s asking is that correct. And then - because it doesn’t say what a tie is. I think she’s asking this question because we don’t really define the word tie.

Ray Fasset: Okay, so...

Julie Hedlund: We don’t define how a tie is determined.

Ray Fasset: Okay. Okay, so if we said in the case of a tie between two candidates. That - does that clarify what a tie is? A tie has to be between two people.

Man: Well actually I’d put - to make the point none of the above. So that would - the two have to be included, in case of a tie between two candidates, or between a candidate and none of the above, a second election will be held. But is there a chance for - yes, there is a chance for none of the above. That’s correct, yeah.

Rob Hoggart: Look at that new second sentence that (Samantha) put in. The candidates shall remain the same for the second election. All right, so does that address the issue right there? If we say none of the above is a candidate, I don't know if that's correct or not. But if we assume that none of the above is a candidate, then we're saying outright, in the case of a tie, the candidates shall remain the same for the second election.

Ray Fasset: Well again, I think it's important that we - that the definition is there. Because if we don't say that if none of the above is a candidate, I think it would be inferred if we said in the case of a tie between the two candidates, or a tie between the candidate and none of the above, a second election will be held.

The candidates shall remain the same in the second election, may not fit with that language because a candidate is not - none of the above is not a candidate. It's just a no vote.

Julie Hedlund: Right. This is (Julie). (Ray) I want to agree with Ron, and I think that that's maybe what (Samantha's) getting at, two things really. One is to define precisely what the tie is between, which could be two candidates, or between a candidate and the number above. And then I think she's adding a sentence that says - that makes it clear that it would be the same candidate in, you know, in the election.

Ray Fasset: Okay. No, I'm okay with that. If we want to - if that's where we want to be crisp, is defining what a tie means, between two candidates or akin to none of the above, I'm okay with that. And then I think the second sentence can go away?

Julie Hedlund: Which sentence? The second sentence...

Ray Fasset: The candidates shall remain the same for the second election.

Julie Hedlund: I think Ray, this is (Julie). I think she's making the point that we're not saying that there couldn't be different candidates for the second election. Do we want to say that the candidates are the same? Because we don't say that there couldn't be new candidates. We just say in case of a tie between you know, two candidates, a second election...

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...will be held.

Ray Fasset: All right.

Julie Hedlund: But we don't say whether or not it has to be the same candidates.

Ray Fasset: Okay, okay right. We're inferring that with the third sentence. All right, let's leave it in. Let's leave it in.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, I think if you - to understand I think her comments, she's being very, very specific that we not infer. And so she's adding language...

Ray Fasset: Yeah, right.

Julie Hedlund: ...where we might be making an inference that someone - it may not be obvious to someone.

Ray Fasset: I agree, that's what I call crisp. So I'm okay with defining time, as Ron pointed out, and leaving (Samantha's) new second sentence in there.

Julie Hedlund: And then do we want to add language, that says how - what - on what is the tie based? Is it based on the percentages in each house? Which I think it is, but we don't say that.

Ray Fasset: A tie is based on a percentage of votes, equal percentage of votes, right?

Julie Hedlund: I'm not making any suggestions, I'm just putting it out there for discussion.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, I don't want to go, you know, there is a balance here of, you know, trying to script for every scenario or every (unintelligible). Because I could look at - let's look at the last sentence. It says an election for the new nominees will be rescheduled for no sooner than 30 days after the unsuccessful vote.

Now, what if the house doesn't put forth a new nominee? Then what do we do? You know, so we can keep going on and on and on. You know, an election for the new nominees. Well what if there isn't a nominee? What if one house doesn't put one forward? Is it then gonna be the one that did versus none of the above? And now we're saying none of the above is a nominee? You know, so we can go on and on and on with this.

I think where I'm falling right now is go ahead and expand this number to defining tie the way Ron suggested, leave the second sentence in. I have not - we've not seen any pushback from the OSC people. They've looked at this, they have not flagged this as a big issue. But I do think some of (Samantha's) comments here are definitely making it crisper. But we have to draw a line somewhere.

You know, what does a tie mean? Well the tie means equal, you know. I don't know, I don't think we have to define that in terms of percentages. That's my feeling. Anybody else have a thought on that? Okay. So I'm okay with accepting the rest of (Samantha's) edits too.

I think it is - that last sentence is crisper, where we say an election for the new nominees will be rescheduled for no sooner than 30 days after the unsuccessful vote, which is consistent with what we, you know, did in number 1 above. So does anybody have any further comments on this section? Or objections, anything? Are you there?

Man: Here, and agree with you.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Man: Here, and agree.

Ray Fasset: Okay, thanks folks. All right. So moving on, number 3. (Chuck's) document doesn't have anything in there, but (Samantha) is doing her crisper drafting for us. So let's look at this.

Julie Hedlund: Oh (Ray) can I ask a question real quick?

Ray Fasset: Oh yeah. Go ahead (Julie).

Julie Hedlund: I thought it's - okay now actually maybe I think it's already here. But was there any discussion of some different language that went into the - some additional description in the area of the score, and how the score is determined? Or has that been included here?

Ray Fasset: Oh yeah, yeah.

Julie Hedlund: I'm just making a comment here, and maybe it's been incorporated, and (Chuck) - cause I'm reading number three.

Ray Fasset: Yeah there is, there's new language here that I sent to the list that (Stephanie) didn't - (Stephanie van Gelder)?

Julie Hedlund: (Stefan) actually, it's a guy.

Ray Fasset: Right, all right. (Stefan van Gelder), is that correct?

Julie Hedlund: That's correct.

Ray Fasset: Okay, flagged this one as potentially - he - you know, he understood it. But he wasn't sure that others would understand it. So he thought it could be crisper. So I put forth a potential edit to see if (Stefan) would - what his reaction was. He liked it. (Chuck) came in and said yeah okay, that is clear. And I forwarded that to the list. So I don't have it in front of me.

Julie Hedlund: I can pull it up, if you'll hold on for a second.

Ray Fasset: Yeah. Have others seen it? It was on the list. Have others seen the language?

Julie Hedlund: No.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, I think (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: I have it.

Ray Fasset: Yeah. I think we can replace 3...

Julie Hedlund: Yeah.

Ray Fasset: ...entirely with the new language.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah let me - can I read it off?

Ray Fasset: Yeah, please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Sure, okay. The leading candidate will be defined as the one with the highest score. The score will be determined by adding together the voting percentages attained from each house. The highest percentage attainable in each house is 100.

The maximum score a candidate can achieve is 200, as a result of attaining 100% of the votes from the contracted party house, and 100% from the non-contracted party house, and in parens, 100% plus 100% equals score of 200.

Ray Fasset: That's a mouthful. But it's clear, so the OC people liked it. So it's saying the same thing we're already saying, it's just saying it a little more long-winded. Does anybody have any objection of just putting - swapping out what's in 3 now with what (Julie) just read?

Man: No objection from me.

Man: No objection.

Ray Fasset: Okay, great. Thanks for catching that (Julie). Okay, so I'm into number 4. Again, nothing on (Chuck), but on (Samantha's). Okay, so again, crisper. In the event that candidate - now here's a good catch though. I mean neither candidate reaches the 60% of each house. That's a good catch, that's important. Threshold and the candidates do not tie, a second runoff ballot will be held between - yeah.

So other than I thought - I think is a good catch and putting it in each house, the rest of it to me is just, you know, making it crisper and more correct as to what we're trying to say. Does anybody disagree?

Man: No.

Ray Fasset: Okay. So on to number 5, same catch, 50% of each house. Again I think the spirit remains, no substantive changes, and I'm fine with those edits. I think it improves the - what we're saying. Any disagreement?

Man: No.

Ray Fasset: Okay. So onto C, what do we have here. Each house shall select the vice chair within its respective house, yeah that's proper grammatical. Okay, D. Again, just clarifying I think - what has she deleted. And vice chair may not be elected from the same stakeholder group, a chair may not be a member of the same stakeholder group of either - yeah. I think it's saying the same thing, just differently. Any objection or disagreement?

By the way, I do see these edits from (Samantha) as improving our work. So I'm appreciative of her doing this. I think E, same thing. This is not a material substantive change. I like the edits. Okay, onto G. Again, I don't see material - I don't see substantive change, just making it clear.

Man: Agreed.

Ray Fasset: Okay, thank you. All right. So hold on, I'm switching back and forth now between documents. It looks like 5.2 Notice of Meetings is the next one. Nope, (Chuck) has something in 5.1. All right, so this is back to (Steve Metalis), right?

All right, so what - I think what (Chuck) is doing here, he's capturing (Steve's) comment and incorporating it in here. And again, I'm gonna default to the fact that (Steve) didn't come back and say sorry (Chuck), no you did not capture what I meant. He didn't do that.

So I'm gonna approach this in a way where it appears to me (Steve) is okay with (Chuck's) edits to his comments. Does anybody have a problem with this approach? Okay. So in the first full paragraph, provided that all members parti - in 5 - this is section 5.1, first full paragraph. (Chuck) deletes speak and speak to (unintelligible), provided all members participating in such a meeting can communicate with one another.

Okay, he's using the word communicate with instead of speak in here. And that was in response to an issue that (Steve Metalis) brought forward. I don't



have any issues with making that edit. Does anybody else? Okay. All right, second full paragraph. I think I see another edit in here that again, is being driven from (Steve Metalis') comments that (Chuck) is incorporating.

Okay, so except where determined by a majority of vote - of members of both houses, of the GNSO council present at a closed sessions appropriate in-person meetings shall be open to physical or electronic attendants by all interested persons. Again, I don't see an issue with adding in-person in there. Does anybody see anything substantive by putting that in?

Ron Andruff: No, I don't see anything substantive. But I just kind of wonder, you know, I don't understand the logic.

Ray Fasset: Sure.

Ron Andruff: I close - okay, council present in a closed sessions appropriate, in-person meeting shall be open to physical or electronic attendance. What's an in-person meeting? A meeting. A meeting's physical or it's electronic attendance? I mean you can only have one of the two. I'm not sure what the in-person adds to that sentence, in fact kind of causes me to not understand the sentence very well.

Ray Fasset: In-person meeting shall be open to physical or electronic - in other words, to be able to call in. So the meeting...

Ron Andruff: What's in-person mean? Open to a physical attendance?

Ray Fasset: Yeah, so...

Ron Andruff: In-person meeting, that must be, you know - when was - when would you - what other type of meeting would one have? You're saying it's only a conference call?

Ray Fasset: You know, for example, a meeting of the GNSO council during an ICANN meeting. So that's an in-person meeting by the council.

Ron Andruff: But I'm saying once you - as soon as you start talking about an in-person meeting then you've got to start talking about a non-physical meeting. So I would just say meeting shall be open to physical or electronic attendance. I agree with the way the sentence is written as it is right now, that's my point.

Ray Fasset: Yes, okay. So that - what that wants me to do here is go back to - okay, what's (Steve) saying. All right, this is the second paragraph, correct? Okay. Second - no. Hold on, bare with me. All right. Apparently the issue is the second paragraph - this is (Steve Metalis) now, okay? Is the second paragraph intended to allow for non-member participation in teleconference meetings? This has generally not been allowed up to now.

Shouldn't that be on a list and only basis? Or does this paragraph only apply to face-to-face meetings? And I'm kind of with you Ron. I'm not sure how (Chuck's) edit captures the issue that (Steve) is raising. I think for now I'm kind of looking at (Ron's) thought process and agreeing that I don't think (Chuck's) edit's doing anything for us here.

Julie Hedlund: (Ray) this is (Julie). Can I make a comment?

Ray Fasset: Yeah, yeah please.

Julie Hedlund: I think (Chuck's) edit is basically saying that this paragraph does only pertain to face-to-face meetings, I mean in person meeting face-to-face. So he's maybe trying to address (Steve Metalis') you know, question, suggestion that this paragraph only pertains to face-to-face meetings. And that was the inclusion of in-person. Of course we can disagree with that, but I think that might be what he was trying to do.

Ron Andruff: Well but I mean the title here - the headline is Conduct of Council Meetings. So I think meetings could be - should be construed to be either physical or online meetings.

Julie Hedlund: Right, I agree with you Ron. I'm just...

Ron Andruff: Yeah, I know. I appreciate the clarification. I'm just again presenting my argument that, you know, if this is conduct of council meetings, and we're to explain how that's going to happen, I think meetings should be more general as opposed to in person.

Ray Fasset: I agree with that thinking. Anybody have any other thoughts on that? Because I think we don't accept this edit at this point. And I will respond back to (Chuck) that the reason we did not is because exactly what Ron just said.

This is conduct of council meetings in the general sense. If we start going down the path of conduct of an in person meeting versus a teleconference, you know, we're going - you know, we're branching off again. Not that we shouldn't.

We'll let them tell us, the OSC says, or the new GNSO council says, you know, we need codes of conduct here for in-person meetings, and we need them for teleconference meetings. And we can do that. But as of now I think we do not accept this edit, and I'll explain why. Any issues with that?

Man: Okay.

Ray Fasset: Okay. All right. So 5.2 - has (Samantha) been in there? 5.1, no. Okay, so 5.2 there is one edit each by (Chuck) and (Samantha). Okay, so (Steve's) question is why do we change it from five days to eight days. And then we had eight business days. I don't know, what's (Steve) asking?

Man: Is (Ken) - (Ken) are you still on the call?

Ray Fasset: Yeah, why the change from five business days advance submission of motions to eight? It's gonna make it even more difficult.

Ron Andruff: Well yeah, that's why I asked if (Ken) was on the call, Chairman. Because I think that, you know, their concern was that this would make - I think (Steve's) comment was this could make things drag out longer or take longer.

Ray Fasset: Right.

Ron Andruff: But I wanted to ask (Ken) what his feeling was as a counselor. But doesn't sound like he's still on the call with us.

Ray Fasset: Well (Chuck's) solution to the question that (Steve) raised was changing business days to calendar days. Again, I've not heard pushback or feedback, or, you know, questioning from (Steve) on (Chuck's) proposed change here, so...

Ron Andruff: Well let's put in - why don't we do that? That would make some sense, less than no later than eight calendar days before the GNSO meeting. That's - because we work, you know, 24 by 7 around all week long kind of thing on these things. So...

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Ron Andruff: ...that would make sense to me.

Ray Fasset: All right. So no objections to that change? I accept it. And then (Samantha) has a nit here where in the second paragraph of 5.2, adding GNSO before council. That would make sense to me.

Ron Andruff: Agreed.

Ray Fasset: Okay. So we're on to 5.3, Who May Make Motions or (vast) Cast Votes. Okay. All right, so (Steve) I think is raising the point of, you know, what are these sentences even for? So (Chuck) is asking that question. Are these sentences even needed, now this is the latter half of the paragraph, first paragraph of 5.3.

Okay, so let's look at this and understand what their purpose - try and understand it. I guess I could make the case that they're not needed. Does anybody have a feeling strongly as to why they are needed? So we're getting a suggestion from OSC basically to take these two sentences out because they're just not needed. I don't disagree necessarily. Does anybody...

Ron Andruff: Which specific sentences? Would you mind just...

Ray Fasset: Sure, I'll read it. Acts by the GNSO council members present at any meeting at which there is a quorum shall be acts of the GNSO council unless otherwise provided herein, and then parens, see section 5.4...

Man: Yeah.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Ron Andruff: Yeah, yeah. And so they're saying that long sentence has no merit.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, yeah. Just saying nothing, right.

Ron Andruff: Who May Make Motions or Cast Votes. That's it, yeah. So it finishes - that sentence, that paragraph could finish easily with persons who are not council members may not vote, period, end of paragraph. I would accept.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, all right. Okay, Rob.

Rob Hoggart: I'm sorry. I seem to recall that this was a specific request by somebody on this team to have that language in there, but I don't recall who that (unintelligible).

Wolf Knoben: Well it was (Steven). So we have had some discussion about it. Because it used to be a sentence in the form of by-laws I think. And we did not understand, because that was a different formulation. So we tried to understand what it meant, and then we were of the opinion okay, anything which is acted by any - by the members of the council is an act of the council as a whole. So that's the only thing. But if there is nothing to be explained here about that, if that is clear enough, so we don't need it.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Wolf Knoben: So it is only - that's okay if there are some people sitting from the council and they are doing some acts, then they are doing that on behalf of the council. That's what it says, nothing else.

Ray Fasset: Okay. My - yeah, my own view is, you know, that that is the spirit of what we're already saying. I don't think we need to say it. Those two sentences are causing more confusion than helping, I think. Anybody have an objection - a strong objection to go ahead and removing those two sentences I guess?

Man: No.

Ray Fasset: Okay, let's go ahead and do that (Julie Headland), okay?

Julie Hedlund: It's been done. Thank you.

Ray Fasset: All right, so we have something on - is there anything in (Samantha) there, 5.3, no. Okay, so next one is (Chuck) again. We're in 5.4. And by the way when I do say (Chuck) just for the record, it's in response to (Steve Metalis')

issues he's raised. Okay, so 5.4. (Chuck) deletes something here. Oh okay, here we are.

This is the issue that speaks to - and we discussed this as a work team, you know, should abstentions be counted as votes against? Obviously we're getting some strong feeling here from the OSC members that no it shouldn't, and (Steve) I think even went on to say gee, I didn't like that way back in the last time we went through this whole thing. So now where we landed on this, my recollection is that well, you know, what does the board do?

You know, do we want to be consistent with the board, or not be consistent with the board, that's our choice. And we chose to be consistent with how the board treats abstentions. And there's also these - there are gaming issues involved as well. But that wasn't - that was really more secondary. The primary thing we wanted to do here was just remain consistent with the board.

If we delete the sentence, like we're being asked to do, then we will be inconsistent - the GNSO council voting procedure will be different than the board. So I'm tossing that issue back out there again, cause we've talked about this. What are thoughts, discussion.

Ron Andruff: Chair I will get in that queue, this is Ron.

Ray Fasset: Yeah please Ron, go ahead.

Ron Andruff: I would say that the logic is to keep things consistent within the ICANN process. I thought (Chuck) responded to (Steve's) comment, you know, relatively clearly. I personally stood on the - I personally do not like the idea that an abstention is a no vote. So I agree with (Steve).

But at the same time, I think to start creating different voting mechanisms within the GNSO and the board is fruitless. I don't see the purpose of that. So

I think we need to concede the point, while we may not like it, that abstention is a negative vote, we're following the same process that the board is following. And should the board make a change in that regard, so would we at the GNSO level.

Ray Fasset: Well I kind of feel the same way as you Ron. I don't like going down the path of doing inconsistencies. There's (unintelligible) for (Robin), (Ken), any thoughts on this based on your experiences in the council? Or is the council - should it be looked at differently than the board?

You know, (Steve's) point was there is the potential for conflicts of interest at the council level, more opportunity likely for abstentions, you know, than at the board level. If I were to ask him, that's probably what he'd say. So there could be a case as to why it should be different at the council level versus the board level. Does (Robin) or (Ken) or (Wolf), any strong feelings on this?

Wolf Knoben: Well (Wolf) speaking. We - if we remove that like (Chuck) is doing, so for me is it true or is it not true? Because it doesn't matter now whether it is in or not in, this sentence, you know? It only says this has the effect of making an abstention count the same as a vote against. I cannot judge on it. So is it true or not? I mean we don't make - we don't say it has to be counted as a vote against, we only say it has the effect.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Rob Hoggart: (Ray), this is Rob. If I can interject in. I think this - we may can discuss this together as a team before as well. This goes more toward the calculation of the final results I think, particularly of the percentages, using the very simple example of, you know, ten counselors ready to cast a vote in a house for example.

If five say yes and five say no, then you don't have your 60%, right? You only have 50% yes. But if two of those counselors choose to abstain, and those



votes are not counted as votes cast, then you're doing a calculation of five out of eight.

Ray Fasset: Right.

Rob Hoggart: Yes? And so that vote passes. So I think that's what this query ultimately is intended to address. I'm not sure what the effect is. I mean the bottom line though is that an abstention is not a vote cast, and we do make it easier to pass things.

Ray Fasset: Well (Wolf) is making a point. He's saying okay, so let's read that last sentence. Abstentions count as votes cast. So in the scenario you just - example you just said Rob, it would still be 10. It would be counted as...

Rob Hoggart: ...no votes. That's right, it would count as...

Ray Fasset: So he didn't change it, yeah, so (Chuck) didn't change it, you know? Right? So (Steve) raises the concern that abstentions should not be counted as votes against, (Chuck) offers the deletion, but doesn't change the result. It still would be...

Rob: That's correct. Excellent point.

Ray Fasset: So I guess we got to, you know, leave that up to (Steve) to come back again. There will be a public comment period. Steve is obviously part of the OSC. If he feels this strongly about it, there's gonna be a couple other avenues from here to - he can offer some language, whatever it is. So okay, so not - yeah? Who's that?

Julie Hedlund: This is (Julie). Yeah, I just wanted to point out that the council will consider this. And so in that sense (Steve) will have yet another option to consider.

But I agree with you that I think that it's still clear that some abstentions count as votes cast, and that (Chuck) is simply taking out the - this sentence, which is somewhat extraneous, that then goes on to explain this has the effect of making an abstention count the same as a vote, etcetera. So - but just to point out yes, this will still have more discussion in the council, as well as in the public commentary.

Ray Fasset: Well okay, yeah. I mean the council discussion in the near term is simply gonna be okay, should we take these - this document out for public comment, these rules and procedure. That's it. They're not gonna be discussing the substance of it, they're only gonna vote on whether to take it out for public comment.

I mean I suppose they can discuss the substance of it, but they're not gonna - to my knowledge of the process here, they're not gonna be able to go in and change anything from - all they're gonna be doing next, their next step is vote for this document to go out for public comment. And then it's gonna be the new council that gets (seeded).

Now whether (Steve) is on that or not, that is gonna go through each one of these, or analyze it, and offer edits and changes, and whatever it is they want to do in order to vote on approval for it. And then it's at that time it goes to the board. So the existing council, to my knowledge of the process, and somebody correct me if I'm wrong, the existing council members are not going to be editing this.

They could vote not to send it out for public comment for whatever reason I suppose, no one anticipates that. But I don't see edits coming from the council.

Man: That's correct.

Rob Hoggart: That's correct, although - again this is Rob. I guess there is the possibility for comments to be made at the council meeting, and say oh let's change this. Certainly it's possible, it's not likely or probable. But I don't think there's a prohibition from counselors...

Ray Fasset: Yeah.

Rob Hoggart: ...providing additional input.

Ray Fasset: Good point. So yeah, we'll learn as we go. All right, so I guess what, you know, what I'm saying is yeah, we're looking at the part (Chuck) deleted. I think we're seeing that deletion as an improvement, we're not changing the substance of what it says, even though (Steve) raised a concern. So - and we're gonna go with it.

Man: Yeah.

Ray Fasset: Anybody have any issues or objections to that? Okay.

Ron Andruff: No issues, no objections. But unfortunately Chair, this is Ron, I have to drop off the call. I have a (unintelligible).

Ray Fasset: Understood.

Ron Andruff: Apologize to everyone, thank you very much.

Ray Fasset: Thank you Ron.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Ron.

Ron Andruff: Catch you later, bye-bye.

Man: Okay.

Ray Fasset: Okay, so keep - let's keep moving forward here.

Wolf Knoben: Yes I have to - I have left 15 minutes.

Ray Fasset: All right, we're gonna do it (Wolf).

Wolf Knoben: Okay.

Ray Fasset: All right. So - all right so the next one is C under (Chuck's) comment, Page 8 of 9 is Section 7. And by the way...

Man: Ray?

Ray Fasset: Yeah? Go ahead.

Man: Yeah, do you want to skip back to (Sam's) comments? Most of them are just small nit edits.

Ray Fasset: I didn't see anything. Oh yeah, you're right. 5.6.2, okay. Yeah, well are you at 5.6.2 Rob? Is that what you see?

Rob Hoggart: Yes, well 5. - the one just above that, yeah. 5.6.1 there's just a...

Ray Fasset: Oh yeah, yeah.

Julie Hedlund: Oh that was a - this is (Julie). That was a correction that should have been taken out.

Ray Fasset: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: So that's nothing. But I think her point for 5.6.2 was that we mention - we refer to discretion in that last sentence, but discretion goes back - the

reference is to a sentence that's a couple sentences back. And I think, you know, she was saying that that was sort of a tenuous reference. Meaning we're saying to ensure balance the chair has discretion to delay an intervention, blah, blah, blah.

And then there's another sentence intervening, and then it says such discretion should not be exercised for a point of information, etcetera. And she's like well what discretion are you talking about? And then she was wondering how would a council member seek a point of information? We don't describe that.

Do we say they seek a point of information by raising their hand, or, you know, asking to speak at appropriate gaps? You know, why are they seeking, you know, this, you know, how do they - what's the process I guess I should say.

Ray Fasset: So if we change the first part of the sentence where it starts with such discretion, if we change that to chair discretion to delay an intervention should not be exercised for a point of information, is that what we're trying to say? When we say such discretion, we're saying chair discretion to delay an intervention?

Man: I think that's right.

Ray Fasset: Okay, yeah. All right. Now what about the rest of this being highlighted? A point of information is for GNSO council members seeking information from a chair do not intend - why does she highlight that?

Julie Hedlund: She highlighted it - this is (Julie). She highlighted it because she had some questions about how does one go about seeking, you know, asking for a point of information. Should we describe that here.

Meaning rather than just saying a point of information, and what is a point of information, then do we want to go on to say a GNSO council member raises a point of information by asking the, you know, by asking to speak in an appropriate gap, a point of information is information to be sought from the GNSO council chair, as well as other council members or the secretariat.

Meaning who are we asking for information from? Is it from the chair? Is it from other members? Do we want to describe that here or not? I mean it's up to us - you I should say.

Ray Fasset: All right. Well we sort of open with a description of the process. At a physical meeting, a GNSO council member may raise a hand and wait to be recognized. So I think for some bit of expediency I will admit, I think we just go ahead and change that first part that is unclear about such discretion to the chair's -

Julie Hedlund: (Ray) I...

Ray Fasset: The chair's discretion to delay an intervention should not be exercised for a point of information.

Julie Hedlund: Right, right. Yeah I was gonna say, the GNSO council chair's discretion to delay any information...

Ray Fasset: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund:): Right, okay.

Ray Fasset: Okay, and then let's keep moving. Any issues with that? (Wolf)? Leaves me and you. Rob are you still there? I know (Ken's) gone right? Okay. Does (Chuck) have anything here in 5.2, or 5. - I'm sorry, 5.5. All right, so I'm not seeing anything - I don't see anything additional from (Chuck) until Section 7.

So let's just keep moving on through (Samantha). The next one I have is 5.7, (Seeding). I see those as just improving, okay? 5.9. Again, same issue. Now response to what? At the very end.

Rob Hoggart: I think there you could just replace response with explanation, and make it an explanation.

Man: For an explanation.

Ray Fasset: Ask for an explanation, yes exactly. That's a good suggestion Rob, thank you. Okay so we've got an or in Section 7 for (Samantha). No issue to me there. That's in by the way 7C. Oh it looks like she also has a colon - or semicolon after B. So if that was already there, I can't tell.

Julie Hedlund: (Ray) this is (Julie). So (Chuck) had a comment on the first sentence under 7, GNSO Council Absentee Voting, if we want to do these concurrently.

Wolf Knoblen: Yes (Ray) it's (Wolf) speaking. So I think that's a basic comment. It's really a basic question. So what is it about absentee voting? Is it limited to a number of issues or items? Or should it be to any kind of voting? So that's the basic question here.

Ray Fasset: That is the basic question. Now I've become a little confused on this point, in that I thought that the by-laws were specifically identifying where absentee voting can be used. Is that true or not true?

Wolf Knoblen: Yes, wait. I understood from the discussion with (unintelligible). So from her experience she was explaining, it was limited up to I think three cases before, because the council - the general council was of the opinion on the level of the by-laws only those cases can apply. That was the answer. So now we move this - the absentee voting to the level of council rules of operation.

So that may be different from that perspective, I think. So - and it could be open to all items I think. So it could be. And my opinion - my personal opinion is we shouldn't open that. Because while I think - so that would open the council meetings to let me say more or less volunteer meetings. Let me say that that way, and not being obligatory for the members. And I would like to see some obligation for attending members personally.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, yeah, yeah. So you're creating a motivation to attend, right?

Wolf Knoben: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, yeah, okay.

Wolf Knoben: And if you don't limit that list so there is no more - there wouldn't be a motivation.

Ray Fasset: Right.

Wolf Knoben: Or there would be less motivation as they say.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, yeah. I agree with that. That's good practical thinking. I'm also in favor of leaving it, you know, specifically defined with these four areas. It's consistent with what the by-laws are dictating. I don't get (Chuck's) second sentence on the comment though, where he says the (unintelligible) may consider expansion of this. I'm missing something here.

The (unintelligible) may consider expansion of the list in their ongoing work. If we expand the list of what can be considered as absentee voting, we're changing the by-laws, and we can't do that. What am I missing? Rob? Are you there?

Rob Hoggart: I'm here. I don't have a good answer for you.



Ray Fasset: It seems like if we try as a work team, or to expand this, and so this is where I guess I'll have to ask (Chuck) for clarification. In the meantime I think we leave this section as is.

Wolf Knoben: Well I could find only one point. Let me say, if it's something related to let me say amendments to the rules and procedure. I mean, you know, what we are talking about. So that...

Ray Fasset: Okay, yeah.

Wolf Knoben: ...could be a point.

Ray Fasset: Okay. Yeah I suppose. But I think we go ahead and leave this. We leave this as is. Any objections?

Man: No.

Ray Fasset: So in this case I'm gonna ask Rob's opinion. Are you okay with what - the way this reads now Rob? I'm asking.

Rob Hoggart: Yeah, no thank you. I think so.

Ray Fasset: Okay. Let's keep moving. So what does (Samantha) have for 7? Looks like just minor nits. I don't see anything there, and I'm okay with accepting those nits. I don't see anything further on (Chuck's) document that we need to discuss. Assuming (Julie) has been able to capture everything we've been doing along the way, we're in pretty good shape now. And we have one document again.

Julie Hedlund: Right. Ray can I just point out something...

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: ...that (Samantha) had noted. I don't - it's maybe not substantive, but I just want to note it. In Section 8...

Ray Fasset: Oops, I missed it.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah.

Ray Fasset: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Well and in fact, I'm just looking...

Man: There is no Section 8.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, I'm just looking at my numbering. Well nobody caught that.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, it's under 7.

Julie Hedlund: So Section 7, so the last section observer should be Section 8.

Ray Fasset: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: But further to Section 7, in the last paragraph in Section 7 she has added the sentence, the meeting in which a vote is initiated must be quarried. And I think she did that to make it consistent with Section 3.5, a quorum - for saying that a quorum must be present...

Ray Fasset: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: ...when a vote is initiated.

Ray Fasset: Yeah. Well I think it's consistent. I don't think we're being inconsistent by adding that. We're not creating ambiguity in any way, are we? I don't interpret it that we are.

Julie Hedlund: No I don't think so, I just wanted to point that out.

Ray Fasset: No, no, yeah I'm glad you did. I'd like to go ahead and put that in. I just want to - I'm just trying to read it from a different perspective where okay, we've put that in, now we create some new ambiguity to this whole concept of quorum. I don't think we are. (Wolf), you okay?

Wolf Knoblen: Yeah, I'm okay.

Ray Fasset: Okay. So all right. Now we've got one document again, right (Julie)?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Well we will shortly.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, we will shortly. Okay, so next step. So I'm trying to move a little quick here because I know (Wolf's) got a (hard stop). Okay so next steps. Let's get the clean version (Julie) if you can today. I did promise on your behalf that we would send it off, yeah we'll send it off to council, okay? What we'll need is - what do we need? We need a clean version, and I suppose - why don't you take and - how are you gonna do a redline version?

Julie Hedlund: Well I wasn't sure because...

Ray Fasset: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: ...for one.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

Julie Hedlund: He wants just a clean version.

Ray Fasset: He just wants a clean version sent to the council?

Julie Hedlund: That's what I got.

Ray Fasset: That's what - that's all he asked for, right?

Julie Hedlund: That's what I read.

Ray Fasset: Okay, let's go ahead and do that, let's follow exactly what he said. Let's send only a clean version, and if the council wants to ask us for a redlined version, we'll handle it as the request comes in.

Julie Hedlund: Right. I mean I'll work on a redlined version.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, yeah.

Julie Hedlund: It's just gonna take a little bit more time because I have to double back on all the changes, and bring them into that redlined version. But we can do a clean one more quickly. And I was also gonna suggest something too, and Rob maybe you want to chime in on this as well. Right now I have, you know, I don't have live links to the by-laws.

But what I had thought to do was to include in this procedures as an Appendix the by-laws, the by-law sections that we're referencing that is here, and to insert in this document live links to those sections of the by-laws. So that when someone gets to, you know, where that phrase is, you know, see this part of the by-laws, and they click on it, they're gonna go to the Appendix and see that bit of text.

And then they'll be able to go back. I have to work out exactly how that will occur. But I think I can do that quickly enough to still be able to include that in the document for (Chuck) for the council today. But I - before I initiate that work I just wanted to check it and see if that would be useful.

Rob Hoggart: I don't think that's necessary for this purpose.

Julie Hedlund: Okay.

Rob Hoggart: As you know (Julie), you and I have had discussions in the past. You know, we built this on the previous version of the operating rules and procedures. I think it reads quite awkwardly to have all these inserts. But I think it's ultimately the most effective way to keep everybody apprised and clear as to where certain things are.

So I think that will be very helpful in the final version. But in terms of just evaluating the existing operating procedures, I don't think it's necessary. But that's just me.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. Okay (Ray) what do you think? Is that okay do you think?

Ray Fasset: Yeah, I think for today's purpose we're - I agree. We can leave it out for now. I think later it will be more efficient. And I think Rob said it eloquently. It's, you know, having all these inserts is not the optimal way, but it's the most efficient way we have to work with right now.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. I don't want to do any more work than I have to.

Ray Fasset: You're welcome, you're welcome. Thanks for offering.

Wolf Knoben: Okay thank you very much, I have to leave right now.

Ray Fasset: Okay, very good. Last - yeah, anything left for the record is just gonna be housekeeping now (Wolf), okay?

Wolf Knoben: Yeah, thank you.

Ray Fasset: Thank you very much.

Wolf Knoben: Bye.

Ray Fasset: All right. Now (Julie) will you be posting a - we've kind of gotten away from our Wiki page. I don't know if anybody out there in the world is looking at it or trying to follow along.

Julie Hedlund: No, I'll put it up (Ray).

Ray Fasset: You'll put it up. And you'll give a - can you give a little brief paragraph explanation to that, okay this is the version that has been sent to the council for their review, whatever.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, I'll be happy to do that.

Ray Fasset: Just something real brief.

Julie Hedlund: I'll indicate that it's been reviewed by the OSC, and the version to be sent to the council, etcetera.

Ray Fasset: Thank you, that would be good. All right. Now what I was gonna say to the rest of the work team members, but unfortunately they're not on, is, you know, we would I suppose technically have a call scheduled for the 23rd. We've been going now I think five or six straight weeks now with weekly calls. I was gonna give the team a break if you will. But I'll handle that by email.

So with that said, I'm gonna ask the meeting to be adjourned, and end the recording. Unless there are any objections from the ICANN participants.

Rob Hoggart: Thank you very much (Ray).

Ray Fasset: Thank you. Thank you Rob, all the assistance, and to (Julie).

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. I'll give this (Ray) to you shortly, probably in like the next hour.

Ray Fasset: Very good.

Rob: Hey (Ray), this probably feels very anti-climactic to you, but this is a significant conclusion here. You guys have done some tremendous work. And, you know, everyone sort of just dropped off at the end I think, you know, tremendous bank for your leadership and exercise of working this through. It's been a real (slog) and you guys have done a great job.

Ray Fasset: Well thank you very much. And I kind of take that same tack. You know, if there's not a lot of dissention and arguing and disagreement going on, so everybody feels they can drop off and move on to more important things, that means we did something right. So very good. This is very good folks. And thanks for the support.

Julie Hedlund: Oh thank you (Ray), great job.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Rob Hoggart: Bye-bye.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks.

Ray Fasset: Bye-bye.

END