

New gTLD WG Transcript 30-04-2012

Avri Doria: This marks the start of the meeting. On the agenda we have the roll call, then I put in an issue resolve open issues concerning the Prague face to face which is essentially the choice between A and B since I don't think anybody came out for C the three meeting option.

Then the next item is our standard review issues from the three charter items. The first being the objection process, status and open issues. That includes discussion at least of the current amendment being submitted to ALAC which I expect will be Cintra, although I didn't put that in there. And then an update on the status of the gTLD application's dashboard.

Then a discussion on where we seem to be at with Bart and reporting on the JAS meeting that was held since our last meeting. Then very little to say about it, but want to talk a little bit about the third item, the gTLD follow-up that begins in earnest real soon now. Then review of any pending items that we've got that haven't already been covered, and then any other business.

First, I'd like to check does anybody have any other business items that should be added to the agenda at this point? Yes, go ahead, I see your microphone lit so please talk.

Cintra Sooknanan: Hey Avri, this is Cintra.

Avri Doria: Yes, go ahead; I see your microphone lit. So please talk, is it only me not hearing Cintra?

Yaovi Atohou: Good morning everybody this is Yaovi.

Avri Doria: I heard this is Cintra, but then I heard nothing else. Cintra, do you have a comment on the agenda?

Cintra Sooknanan: I think perhaps we can settle, it's fine for this meeting (inaudible).

Avri Doria: I can't understand a word you're saying. I picked up something like time for this meeting. Do you want me to add time for this meeting to any other business?

Alan Greenberg: Maybe typing is the better answer.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes, okay, I will add that, come up with add that to any other business, that was time of the call. Anybody else have anything else to add to any other business? Anybody else have any suggested changes to the agenda, or should we go ahead as stands? Okay, I hear no objections; let's go with it as it stands.

Would Natalie do a role call please?

Nathalie Peregrine: Of course Avri. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, this is the new gTLD Working call on the Monday, 30th of April 2012 at [13:00 UTC].

On the call today we have Cintra Sooknanan, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Hong Xue, Avri Doria, Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, and Rudi Vansnick. We have two apologies from Olivier Crépin-Leblond and Andrew Mack. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich and Nathalie Peregrine. I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you, okay. The first item resolve open issue concerning the Prague face to face meeting. As I said I think we're down to two choices, both of which are the two meeting options, but I didn't do a careful count. My impression is that we're pretty much split over whether to have A or B.

Now, I put myself down as an A person, thinking that there were two separate working group meetings, but of course these were open meetings and anyone could attend either and assuming that within our new gTLD Working Group meeting, we would have a status update on the review group.

I'd like to understand from people the reasoning for (inaudible) since I obviously don't get it in terms of this group having one and then having a joint new gTLD [specific] group. And so I'm wondering if someone who is in favor of that option could explain to me the reason and I see Tijani. Please. Tijani, I don't know if you're mute. The floor is yours.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Can you hear me now?

Avri Doria: I hear you now.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, thank you. So I think that it is better to have a joint meeting better than the review (inaudible) because the staff will prepare the right room for attending, but if you put it as a meeting of the regular team and the whole number of the gTLD group will try to attend this meeting, it will be a mess.

Avri Doria: I see, okay, that's actually a very clever reason, it's not sort of a programmatic one, but it is very clever. I wonder if Heidi can comment on, is this necessary in order to have a big enough room. Because if it is I totally understand.

Heidi Ullrich: Not necessarily, no. Currently I have scheduled one new gTLD working group on (inaudible) and then we have a joint group and review group Tuesday 16:30 to 17:00.

Avri Doria: So you've currently scheduled ...

Heidi Ullrich: Just to point out we don't know who the review group members are going to be, so we don't know whether – how many of those are going to be in Prague. You know a lot of them might be participating remotely as well.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes, I would expect that we would certainly need a large room on that, because as we saw with our meeting in Costa Rica when we had the new gTLD, there are lots of applicants that seem interested in what we're up to.

So I think making sure that we've got sufficient participants room beyond the members of the group is probably a good idea. I think that the reason that Heidi just added which is at this point we don't know about the review group and how many and whom and whatever, that there is certain sense in using the joint meeting as an umbrella just to make sure that it's organized. They may have just been picked; they may be in the process of being picked, so I think I started to switch from being a supporter of A to supporter of B. I don't know how the other supporters of A feel about going with the B option, which is the option that is currently scheduled as I understand.

Does anyone object to going with the one new gTLD working group meeting, and one joint new gTLD review group, but with the understanding that that joint meeting is primarily about review group stuff? Does anyone object to doing that? As I've switched from A to B now, any of the other proponents of A want to say anything? Okay, then we'll leave things as Heidi scheduled them which is option B and if we have any issues when we get down to the detail of what's in the agenda, we can review some of this again.

Do we have Cintra online and able to talk at this point? No. In which do we expect to have Cintra online and able to talk? Otherwise, I can basically take the objection process status but okay, they're dialing out now. Why don't I start with the SARP data and then we can come back to the objection process status.

At the SARP status meeting and I regret that Carlton isn't online but perhaps some other people from the JAS meeting are and they'll be able to add to what I say. At the JAS working group meeting there was basically an acceptance of the proposal that was put forward by the staff on having what they called, what was it, the CRM, I don't have it in front of me.

But anyhow a community advisor that were from the JAS group who only participate in terms of giving advice and comment on process issues, etc and the policies, but are not participating in the selection of applicants, merely in the understanding of criteria, etc. And of course Johnny was on that call, so he too can correct me and add, and I will ask, okay so it was CMR, not CRM. I transposed characters as I am one to do.

And then the group went through and came up with a first group of suggested members of this. What was seen is that of course the participants in this will have to meet the same SOI and COI standards as any of the chosen SARP members. One of the things that was pending on this was how many of these CMR or community – community member representatives would be participating is we didn't know the number of SARP applicants. I mean we didn't know the number of support applicants, let me get my words straight. And also there still is an open issue; this is an issue I believe brought up by Tijani on whether there should be multiple review teams or a single one. And I think that that issue if I understand correctly is sort pending seeing how many we're dealing with. That discussing that in the abstract was sort of difficult. So that was that.

In terms of the names of people the original core team that was in existence was suggested flash nominated for that, and that includes Cintra, Alan, Tijani, I don't have my notes in front of me, Cintra, Alan, Tijani, there's myself, who am I forgetting and Rafik were in that group. Then there were a couple others...

Male: And Alan.

Avri Doria: And Alan, sorry if I forgot Alan, and then a couple other people were added to it. then there was sort of a kerfuffle in the email list afterwards about one of the applicants where it was declared that she was conflicted, and therefore couldn't be a member and I'm not quite sure what the status of that is.

Now obviously with all the delays in TAS etc, we still have time to work all this out you know what the latest news is who knows when the review might be. It might not be until Prague. So we do have time to straighten out the membership a bit. Tijani, I see your hand up, please go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jamee: Thank you Avri. So two point. The first point is for the discussion on the list regarding the number of CMR members. There was a section about [Ann] and [Ann] said she wasn't convinced anyway, and she was angry because people talk about her conflicted situation. But she said she don't want to be on this group. This is the point.

Another point regarding the...

[loud music on line]

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I propose that the selection of the SARP will be not done also – I didn't propose that the CMR members [give] the direction is not done only by the coordinator, because I see not there. And I'm told that I see that the CMR must have the say on the selection, it must not be only the job of the coordinator. But most importantly the staff objected to it and the group agreed with that. So thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I hadn't realized that she had withdrawn her list. I didn't see that particular message on the list. But anyhow that's for the JAS group to follow. Cheryl said that you hard to follow Tijani, I'm assuming that people can hear me but basically the points were – your main point was that one, in terms of this issue one of the people having been declared conflicted, that person had indicated that they didn't really want to be on this thing anyhow, so what's the issue.

And that you had another issue that you had suggested that the members of the CMR be included as part of the group, selecting SARP members as opposed to it just being done by the coordinator, but that that suggestion was rejected by staff. Did I catch all of your points? Because I was having trouble hearing you also.

Tijani Ben Jamee: Yes, very good, thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. So that's pretty much it for now on the SARP, nothing has happened since that JAS meeting and – yes, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, yes in terms of what Tijani said, he also did say that he was in the minority on the group and the group generally agreed with staff on who should select the SARP. In terms of Elaine, my recollection is that was a complete red herring, that at some point [Alane] is the name, not Alan but [Alane] was put down on the list, it was mistranscribed as Elaine and that's when the whole thing started. Elaine had not been on the JAS call, she never said she was going to be – wanted to be on a CMR or CRM or whatever it is, and that whole thing was a complete red herring.

Avri Doria: Actually I remember it differently but that's okay. I remember both of them being mentioned at different times and that she was discussed on email at some point, but whatever.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I thought she was discussed on email only after Carlton said she should withdraw, okay.

Avri Doria: Is Alan on or not on?

Alan Greenberg: I don't know.

Avri Doria: Okay, so we'll have to clear that up with Rafik. Rafik and Carlton who are the Chairs of JAS and it's JAS that's been empowered with selected the CMR because of the continuity of JAS. So we'll just have to – I will get in touch with Rafik and Carlton and try and understand exactly who beyond the core you know subteam that's been following up with staff and the Board is on this. Any other questions or issues on that?

Tijani Ben Jamee: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, is that Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jamee: Yes, I concerned that Alan is on the group, Alan.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Anything else on SARP now? If not I will turn – go back to item 4a which is the objection process status and open issues led by Cintra which includes a discussion of a current amendment being submitted to ALAC on the objection process status. And if Dev is on the call, a brief status on the dashboard, otherwise I think between Heidi and I we can give the status. So Cintra, the floor is yours.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thanks Avri. Okay, two weeks ago after our last call, the wording for the call for the New gTLD RT was finalized and that was sent to the ALAC. Since then I know Tijani has come back with a suggestion [concerning] the functioning of the gTLD RT, and that change is just really to see that they review the comments that come in and they actually work with ALAC on it.

I don't know the status of the call since then, and I'm going to ask Tijani perhaps if he's got an idea of when that will be approved by ExCom. Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jamee: Normally at the next meeting, but now I don't know.

Avri Doria: This is if I could interject. I asked Olivier when he let me know that he wasn't going to come if he had any estimate on that, and he said I'm working on it now.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, so (inaudible) and hopefully we can have that covered quite soon.

Avri Doria: This is Avri again. Does everybody in this group know the content of the change? Perhaps we could just quickly go through the content of the change.

Tijani: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Tijani: It was the [one that everyone has received it]

Avri Doria: Okay, now I can hear myself echoing. Cintra you may want to check on (inaudible).

Cintra Sooknanan: Avri, I think that's –

Avri Doria: I'm wondering I guess and people have seen it, and we don't want to repeat what it is on the call, for some reason. I wonder whether anybody in this group has any comments on it, since it hasn't gone to ALAC yet, does everyone in this group believe that that's an appropriate change, you know if I understand it essentially, it's taking this group more out of the loop and putting more interaction directly with ALAC and covering the writing of reports, if I've been following it correctly is who is actually responsible for writing, and then there was a clause about when the group service period ends.

And I don't remember if there was anything else. And I just wanted to make sure that the people in this group knew what the changes were, I don't necessarily believe that everyone reads every word that comes out in mailing list. And I just wanted to give an opportunity for people to comment on it, if they had a comment to make. Thanks.

I guess nobody has a comment on it, okay. Okay, I see Hong, yes, please.

Hong Xue: Yes, I read the text drafted by Tijani, I agree with that. But I want to know more about the function of review. To my knowledge the review group is primarily to facilitate the community comments and a proposal for objections. Review does it mean that the group will be to some extent summarize the comments, make abstracts, I want to know more about the meaning of review. Back to Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Dev or Cintra would you like to comment on that? Hello?

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi Avri, sorry I apologize. I actually think it's appropriate for the group to actually take an initial step in reviewing. I know this comment was reviewed by Tijani so I know maybe he would also have thoughts on this, but I really think it's appropriate at this time. I don't see (inaudible). I don't see that our, well the gTLD Review Working Group really needs to micro manage that aspect of it. I think it's appropriate for the Review Group to actually handle it like this, and while [relating also] with ALAC or the RALOs I still want those comments there. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Answer Hong's question about the process of review and if I understand correctly, the review group won't be initiating for example any comments. They'll only be [reviewing] the comments that people put in and as Hong says reviewing them, synthesizing them, packaging them, but not adding content that wasn't in comments and is that presumption which I think is what Hong was asking a correct presumption about what the group will be doing. I see Dev's hand up. Dev, please.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes, but I have to agree with what you said Avri and initially and again, the review group was not really meant – was going to like look at the comments on the fifth and the sixth week of the BPC, and I think the sixth week or the third month of the objection period. And I note also that they'll just look at the comments, not make any judgment as to whether it's suitable or not, but then facilitate it, okay well there's enough comments on this, let's try to draw out the comments.

And it's not the Review Group that is actually the one sole arbiter in trying to come up with the comments. It's just going to be – it will be actually probably the review group looking with the people who are making presumably good enough comments on that gTLD to come up with the draft comments, and especially for the objection statements which has been a suitable format for the dispute resolutions (inaudible). So I just to relate to what Tijani says.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Hong, does the answer the question for you adequately?

Hong Xue: Well, Avri the line is not very clear. I would be grateful if you could – well, it's happening for me, thank you Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, so if I understood Dev's answer was that essentially they are reviewing them and there are specific periods at which they are reviewing them. He didn't use the word synthesize, but I think that that's part of it, but he did correct what I had said before, in that they will not be the sole authors of either a comment or an objection, but they would work to assist as it were those who made the comments, those who suggested the objections and such. Is that a correct interpretation Dev?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes, this is Dev, yes.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks, so Hong it is a review function, but it's not even the complete offering of what was said, it's cooperative, it's an assistive and informative role as well as perhaps a synthesizing role. So at this point, does that cover the question?

Hong Xue: Yes, it does. Thank you. As far as the review board is not going to change or add the substance of the comments, I'm okay.

Avri Doria: Okay and I believe that that is the case. And of course ALAC will be overseeing it as it were. Any other issues on this part in terms of the amendment? Any other questions or comments before handing the floor to the next – to Dev on the dashboard? Okay, no comments.

In which case, in the chat is the review group work space, I don't know if that's where the dashboard is these days, but Dev the floor is yours to give an update of the status and where things are, and perhaps give a little sales pitch for the dashboard demo that's coming up later this week, but certainly not to get into the details, because that's what the demo talk is about. So Dev the floor is yours.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, hi, thank you very much Avri, this is Dev. Okay this is the link to the new location for where the application dashboard will be and it's called the At Large new gTLD application's dashboard working group. I think we'll probably still refer to it as the gTLD dashboard informally.

I moved across all of the information from the prototype dashboard and it's already working. So right now there is no comment pages or discussion forums yet, but the macros do work and I think it will be ready for demonstration; it will be fully ready for demonstration on Wednesday.

I was thinking of attempting and I have not completed it, to try to come up with some documentation in time for Wednesday's call, to try to walk through the different steps that the review group will be doing to adding a comment forum on an evaluation panel, adding a comment forum on objection grounds, and how do you update the status of the applications table. And also how do you use the ICANN dashboard for lack of a better word to track the application status and you know sort by community base, geographic name and so forth.

So I think that will (inaudible). I will be happy to answer any questions.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Does anyone have any questions on either the status of the dashboard or on the upcoming demo which I guess is Wednesday, the 2nd of May, the only thing that's missing from what Heidi wrote was the UCC on it.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: 2100.

Avri Doria: 2100, thank you Dev. So does anyone have any questions for that? I recommend that if you can make it to this, you do and to see how it works. I've looked at it some, I think it's quite a nice piece of work, it should help the people doing the reviews somewhat, but depending on the numbers, it will still be a lot of work. Any further questions. Yes. Any further questions on the dashboard.

Oh I have one Dev, this is the one demo that we're putting out, will there be others. Have we planned others? Certainly they'll be some training sessions for the review group itself once it's hit, are any demos planned? Is a demo something that we want to do for example in Prague? I guess that's just a question from all over, or is this one demo it?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well, that's why – this is Dev, thank you Avri for the question. I think – well thinking about the training, that's why I said we have to do it in the form of slides, where they'll just walk through a live demo of the dashboard. So that they have the documentation at the end of this that could be given to the group members or to the potential review members and because I think – well, I think it should be well in the application comment period unless there's an even earlier significant date, even more significant with the [TAS] system. So there's not going to be another formal one unless it's a [safe practice], but having said that, I mean obviously I will be happy to walk through with any review group members and have them how to do it, how to understand it, if they have any questions, I'll be more than happy to answer them.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Any comments, questions, whatever on the new gTLD application dashboard? Okay, any further questions or items on the agenda process at all before we move onto another item? Seeing none, I'll get the gTLD follow up.

Now, just basically when Cintra and I did a swap of her taking the objection process and me taking the gTLD follow up, I haven't actually done much concrete work lately, but have been thinking about it. One of the things I'm thinking about is sort of putting a dividing line between two separate activities.

There is the one activity that is already fairly advanced, that Cintra did a fair amount of work on, that Cheryl did a fair amount of work on, on basically gathering together the pre-application opening issues that At Large and ALAC and all have about the problem. And we have discussed taking that list and basically turning it into something that was somewhat more narrative, and getting that done certainly before the review of the program started. So I see that as one activity.

But I want to try or at least I'm suggesting that we try and separate the issues that we had going in, and the issues that come up post the application period, not that these can't be included in the same document, if that's the way it works out but from a content point of view, there is sort of a bright line and one takes a look at what's going on now and starts to make a list, and start to flush out that list.

For example and I don't know if the group will decide that this is something that they want to discuss further in our review, and I wouldn't suggest discussing it just yet, because it's still early I fear. But the whole application process and the TAS and such, seems to me an area just from watching various other At Large depression faces could be something that we may want to develop a position on and include in the comments about how it rolled out. And this was the first step in rolling, and it does appear that there is fair amount of comment that one could make about it. You know both good and bad.

So first of all I'd like to open the floor to basically two topics. One of the topics is the sort of strict division I'm trying to call for between the narrative of what the issues coming in were and the narrative of the issues that we've seen and want to discuss. Now we may get to a third point where at the end we have a chapter at the end that says, see I told you so. I think we probably don't. It will obvious but there could be a cumulative summary at the end, but I don't think we need to talk about it. So that's one issue that I'd like people to just comment on if they do have a comment.

And on the second whether you know at this point it looks like TAS should be something that at least has a tentative place, or the application process has a tentative place on our list of issues to discuss. Anybody want to make a comment? Does anybody disapprove of the process suggestion I'm making of a strict division between the things we cross coming in, and the things we discuss in the process? Does anyone object to that? Just give me whatever the red mark is, that's right the circle with the white X. Okay, so nobody disagrees with that, that is a way of proceeding.

Does anyone disagree with putting tabs down on that list as the first – or actually I'll probably not have per se though that's part of it, but the application process as one of the items on the list? I would think another item possibly would be the whole press campaign, or the whole capacity raising informative campaign would be another place where we would have comments. Yes, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Can you elaborate on what kind of things we will be discussing if we put tabs on the agenda?

Avri Doria: I'm not sure; I've just seen a lot of conversation about the appropriateness of the process, about the kind of delay about how the delay and information was handled, etc. So when I'm suggesting that we're putting something on it, I'm taking a guess looking around and saying is there sufficient concern to comment.

The second step would be we open a period where people in the group and community do comment and then we look at it and say you know, that's pretty vacuous there's nothing there. Whereas I think if we put for example the other topic that occurred to me while I was speaking on the degree to which new gTLDs and especially the applicant support program were adequately – but discussed or that you know there was sufficient global information period would be another one.

So I guess I'm not really sure. At this point I'm just looking for is there enough warrant to put that on the list for now or not?

Alan Greenberg: In my mind TAS is not one of the things that should be on the list. You know because there's plenty of people that are commenting on this whole, how well ICANN has handled this. In my mind many of them are speaking out of the wrong orifice of their body, but nevertheless, that's a personal opinion.

The only thing that I think might be warranted and only after the fact, once we see the results is the batching process.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes, we haven't seen that yet, and so yes whether digital archery is a good method and works.

Alan Greenberg: There is by the way, I don't know if you've seen (pool.com) is offering hit the enter key for people and if they don't get them into a good position, they won't charge for the service. They are that sure that they're going to be able to gain the situation.

Avri Doria: Okay. I see a couple I agree, Alan and yes, okay. Anyone else wish to comment? So I – okay, Tijani also agrees. So at the moment we do not have that as an [interest]. Do people think that we have the whole four month information period on the program itself, and applicant support as an issue, we would probably want to comment on? Any discussion on that as being an item on the list? Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jamee: Yes. While we are not-

Avri Doria: Okay and I see a green check...

Tijani Ben Jamee: ...participating in the process of the Support Review Program but the group can also discuss and follow up about this program.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. At this point as I say I'm just trying to build the list. Over time we would start working on discussing what points we want to make about these items. Okay and I saw a positive check from Cintra.

So I guess I'll end this one now unless somebody wants to suggest other things that belong on the list. I will try to get the list at least started on the Wiki before the next meeting, and I'll put the one item on it, and then we can start to collect comments and issues as time goes on. I will not put the application itself/tab on the list at the time, unless we have another discussion where people convince people that it belongs there. But I had no one in this meeting spoke up in favor of it being there, and I only heard and saw comments saying, nah, it doesn't really belong there.

Any other comments on this new gTLD follow up issue? Okay, as time goes on, I will be looking for people to take the history part and get them to do editing and such so that it does become a nicely polished narrative, but we're not there yet.

Okay, anything else on item 4 review of issues from our work item set that was not covered that should be covered before I move on. I see no hands.

Fine, review of pending action items not already covered during the call. Do we have a – we have the list, can someone put up the, let me see it's in the agenda, I think, action items from – no, there's none in that one. It's the one from the week before; I would need to look at.

Heidi Ullrich: Avri, this is Heidi, (inaudible).

Avri Doria: Okay, I just want to make sure we're not letting anything drop on the ground. Okay, while that's coming up, we can come back to it, I'd like to give the floor to Cintra to talk about time of the call. Go ahead, Cintra.

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi, this is Cintra.

Avri Doria: You had a little group, so please.

Cintra Sooknanan: So we sent out an email a few times saying what was the most appropriate time for this call, what is 15:00 hours or 21:00 hours, and I think there was expressed some suggestions that maybe we ask you in kind would be 21:00 hour time would be better. Whereas that time is inconvenient with Hong who cannot work on the (inaudible) time. So I just want to get some consensus here and any objections to the existing time at 15:00 hours.

Avri Doria: So in other words, the decision of the group was that we no longer do alternation, but that we pick one time that is the time, is that a correct interpretation?

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes, that everybody can attend.

Avri Doria: Okay and the time that you're suggesting that everybody can attend is this 15 – whatever we're time we're now, the 15:00?

Cintra Sooknanan: 13:00 right.

Avri Doria: 13:00 okay. Is there any comment on that? I see Tijani agreeing. I see Evan having stepped away. Does anyone disagree? Obviously those of you on this call are the regulars and it did seem that we were having an alternation that the only effect was it made it hard for Hong which is not a really good effect. So seeing no disagreement; Heidi is there any reason not to do this that you know of in terms of somebody having already filling in the other slot or something? Or are fine slot wise.

Heidi Ullrich: I think we're fine as we are.

Avri Doria: Okay, so seeing no objection, that means that we go a single time, the 13:00 UTC or we're still staying on the bi-weekly, I mean every two weeks at this point and seeing no objection to that, we'll move on. Okay, so we're now no longer alternating, fantastic.

And I guess the issue will be ignored until it comes up again. Until somebody complains or somebody's schedule changes or something. Okay, thank you and thank you Cintra for taking care of that and making it easier for people to know when this meeting is.

Okay, going back to the pending action items not already covered, the CLI issue was the only action item and that has most certainly been covered and I think it as well covered as it can until At Large led by ALAC comes with a sort of unified position on how they want SOIs and CLIs to be handled by individual working groups. So I would like to declare that action item closed.

Okay, we are at 54 minutes on the hour. I have no other agenda items. Does anybody else have anything else that we need to discuss before I close today's call? Seeing none, I thank you all. Our next meeting will be in two weeks, same time slot as this, and what date is that. That is the – well, today is the 30th, so that will May –

Male: The 14th.

Avri Doria: 14th, I'll announce right now, there is a good chance I'm going to be attending the WICIT week in Geneva, there is a good chance I will ask Cintra to Chair that one in my stead, but I'm not quite sure what my schedule is, but there is a likelihood that I'll be either in a meeting or in an inconvenient place, but I'll let you all know. Cintra hopefully you're available for the 14th to Chair should I not be able to. Yes, Cintra I see your hand up.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you Avri, just to confirm we are continuing meeting at every two weeks.

Avri Doria: Unless there is a call that we need to do more frequently at this point, and I don't see it.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, great. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Yes, I think we say in two weeks until such time as we find ourselves overloaded with work and coming to the end of the meeting and going oh my, how are we going to finish it, and we therefore but I don't see us as there. I think review group and others will be having their own meeting and that will be time consuming. Anything else before I close? Cintra your hand is still up, do you have another issue, or it's just still up. Thank you. I see no other hands. Thank you all, good meeting, and I'll talk to you then. Bye-Bye.

[End of Transcript]