

# New gTLDs WG 05-12-2011 -Transcript -EN

Gisella Gruber: [Inaudible00:00:09] Avri?

Avri Doria: Can I do the review of the agenda first and then we will do the roll call so that people have those last few minutes to get in if that's okay? On the agenda after the roll call we've got a review of action items from the previous meeting. That's sort of going to be a standard stand-in there but what I would like to do with that is look at it, say anything quickly in terms of its status. But if it involves discussion, to actually discuss it at the agenda point and if it isn't covered in the agenda then need to make sure we cover it.

But as opposed to, I noticed what happened last time was we spent a lot of time discussing it and then when we got to the agenda point it was half discussed already. Then we have an update on the support conversations. There is not that much to say yet. Then there is the objection process - no then there is the ALAC advice on the most recent applicant Guide Book. We still have sort of a pending thing there of are we going to send the letter or are we not?

And are we going to put together a larger document that discusses the issues going in sort of for historical/future contributions' sake. And then we get to the objection process looking somewhat at blue-sky and continuing it. And I've put the address of the blue-sky exercise from the Wiki just about an hour ago, I updated the Wiki from the ether pad. The ether pad is remaining open and I'm trying to keep it coordinated. And then any other business. Is there any other business that belongs on this agenda that I've left off that people know about?

Okay is there any objection to this agenda and carrying through with it as it has been presented? No, okay then we will go with that agenda. I have to keep within a strict hour today because I have another commitment right after. So I will try to do that. And could somebody please do the roll call now, thanks?

Gisella Gruber: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on this very new gTLD Work Group call on Monday, December 5. We have Avri Doria, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Evan Leibovitch, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Cintra Sooknanan, Sebastien Bachollet, and Carlos Aguirre.

Apologies we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Hong Xue, [inaudible 00:03:20], Mohammad Al Bashir, Tijani Ben Jemaa and from staff today we have Heidi Ulrich, myself Gisella Gruber and I would also please remind everyone to please state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. You are also reminded to mute with \*6 and unmute is \*7, over to you Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you, okay now we have three items on the agenda - do we have any way to display the action items from before or does anybody have the page quickly that can be shown with those three items.

Heidi Ulrich: Avri I will put those in the link in just a minute.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Dev has already done it, thank you. Basically the three items, Avri and staff to create a blue-sky Wiki space ideas regarding the new gTLD objection process. That was done in two locations and we will get back to looking at what's in it later. Avri to inform the new gTLD Working Group, ALAC chairs and others of the list of the four volunteers, and that was completed and we will talk about where we are with all that in the agenda.

And then Avri to circulate the schedule of the new gTLD Working Group call times from now through January 12 -- that did not get done yet. What we talked about at the last meeting was staying on this alternating weekly schedule through January at which point we can A) review whether we need the weekly meeting, whether we've gotten started now and we can meet less often or whether we still need the weekly and B) to see whether those times are correct, whether we should go to a single time.

We will discuss that at that time. And if we have to go to a single time what that time would be. The other thing we mentioned was that we would review whether we had different people at the meetings and whether it was the same people showing up no matter what time it was, and we can look at that later. I need to get that out. I figure we would meet every Monday on the alternating schedule except for the 26<sup>th</sup> which is during week that ICANN is closed and therefore to not try and ask staff to work a meeting during their holiday period.

We would just take that Monday off. I will get that written up and I just have to clear with Gisella that those times are all fine going forward through January and I haven't done that yet. That's where that one stands. Any questions or issue on that, are there any hands? Okay so that's the review of the action items. Update on the support conversation, we gave the names to Olivier. Olivier sent the names on to Kurt.

A meeting has been scheduled for later today at I believe 2000 UTC. Just to give a few more bits on the update, in addition to the four of us, that's Alan, Cintra, Rafik and myself, in terms of the Board it looks like it's Sebastien and Bertram and George and Mike and Chris Dispain from the Board and I see it included at least in the mailing list, is Carla, Karen Lance, Ben Halloran, Diane Schroeder, Elaina [inaudible 00:07:44], and Wendy Profit at least have been copied on it.

I realize some of those are administrative help as well as participants. In terms of preparation for this meeting, the members of this group were sent a certain number of documents and a process chart. We were asked to keep it confidential at least until after the meeting. I will be requesting during the meeting permission to post it further. I know there is some balance between it going public and the Board seeing it or something like that that needs to be balanced.

So unfortunately at this point I feel bound by that having been given it in confidence specifically marked "Do not pass on" as restricting what I can say. But I am truly hoping that by next week's meeting and especially after today's meeting we would be able to say what is in it. And even if we can't give out the documents perhaps we can describe the process. But I will try to get to the where the documents can be released to this and the JAS Working Group. Any questions or comments on that, anybody wish to ask or add anything?

There is not much I can say other than we did manage to schedule a meeting which took a couple of days. Okay in which case as soon as there is things I can fill in on, I will and I will ask permission to fill in as quickly as possible. That's update on support conversation. If there is no other issue on that move to the ALAC advice on most recently Applicant Guide Book. Just a recap of where we are and where we stopped - we discussed it. Evan wrote a note speaking about his view of what things had been met, what things hadn't.

Now granted I think this had gone in as comments to the ICANN staff and not as specifically a letter of advice to the Board. I don't know that ALAC has ever sent a specific - but they may have though and I don't remember that clearly. I know that all of these points had been made and had been made by ALAC earlier in the process as Evan discussed. We discussed penning a letter with just the things that we thought perhaps might have a chance of being effected at this point.

Never found a volunteer to write that though Evan did volunteer to help somebody write that. But we never had anybody jump in with a either I will write it or actually just produce a draft of that. And I think we had mixed opinion in the group on the value or even perhaps wisdom but certainly the value of sending that letter. There seemed to be stronger support in the group for the longer term project which is documenting the history, the issues, the concern, etc. I'm not sure if we had a author for that.

I believe that Cheryl among others had indicated a willingness to contribute to it. I unfortunately did not write down names of volunteers. If there were any and I would like to ask staff to help me with doing that when we get someone volunteering to do something to get it written down so that we can remember it and add it to the actions. I will open up the floor on that issue. Do we want to do it? As I say there has been the bottom up, "Yes it's important, here is a draft."

We haven't even had the bottom up, yes it's important to do it, feel free to bug me about. Where do we go on this? Seeing an absence of hands, my inclination is unless there is a - it was brought up, it was discussed. Unless there is a volunteering, a bottom up process that says "Yes we want to do it and I'm willing to do some work" that we A) don't end up sending the letter because the letter has to be sent soon or its value becomes even more speculative.

But in terms of the longer term thing, if we can find a volunteer or a group of volunteers to start writing it, that's great. Otherwise I'm just not sure where we go on it. I would leave it on the backburner and just assume that we're not sending a letter and close this one that way. Is there any objection to doing that? Again I see no hand. Anybody that's not on the Adobe Connect wish to comment, no? Okay in which case, seeing no comment on that I think we will put that on the backburner.

I think that the idea of capturing all of the concerns is a good one if there is a volunteer to write it and of course it can always be put together later as a historical document by someone with the time, inclination and memory and certainly all of the archival evidence, all of the letters, notes, discussions are available for anybody that wishes to do that once we get to the point we are talking about "Okay next round how does it change?" Anything else to be said on that topic before moving on to the - yes Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Hi there I just wanted to make small reference to something I had written in the Adobe Connect which was maybe it's just a matter of getting these as a set of notes that the people from our group can use within the discussions simply as background information without having to send the letter itself. Given the lack of either time or interest to do this, maybe the issue isn't this stuff doesn't need to be put down so much but the effort in actually drafting it into a letter and going through all the sausage grinder of turning something into official correspondence is something that isn't needed so much as simply having these as background briefing notes for the meeting.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks and certainly I can start yet another Wiki page as long as no one objects to Wiki pages and start accumulating that information there. And I see from the notes that someone else talked about collaborating on a Wiki or as Cheryl said a 'whatever tool' to get the archive put together. Okay and I guess I would start with your note Evan would be one of the first feeds into that space.

Would that satisfy what you're thinking of? Or do you think we should do another effort afterwards to pull out bullet and speaker points and I see Faoud talking about a background material page being a good source for future documentation. I see Cheryl had volunteered in editing such a Wiki page. Sounds good -

Evan Leibovitch: Avri I don't have a problem with this in direct answer to your question. It seems like a reasonable way to work with it. And then the result of whatever is in the Wiki can be used easily by those who are in on the meeting with the Board members. Sorry with the staff.

Avri Doria: Of course that page will not be put together by 3 o'clock today. But then again 3 o'clock today is going to be mostly about sitting and listening to the presentation of their thing. At least I can't get it set up by 3 o'clock today. Anything else on this issue? I think I covered the notes that were in the chat. We are not going with a letter. We are creating a Wiki page to gather the historical evidence and documentation at one point.

And Cheryl will help with editing and organizing that page and looking at creating perhaps an analysis or synopsis at the top that as Faoud says is a background for people working on these particular issues with the implementation. Anything else on that subject? Then we will call - I guess we captured a couple of actions out of that and move on from there. The objection process discussion and blue-sky - can I bring in - I put the blue-sky exercise Wiki page URL in the discussion notes.

I also did a PDF save of what was in there now but is there a place where that could be stuck in this particular Adobe Connect window? I don't see anything unless we replaced discussion notes with it which doesn't seem like a good idea. I'm not sure if there is any advice or people just look at the blue-sky exercise itself. It looks like there has been four of us have been talking about what I started to do is I took as bullet items the discussion that we had at the last meeting, put them down on the page as sort of the growing media that people could build this around.

So the first question had been asked was "Is the At-Large objection process a reviewable application, similar to the reported GAC process or an exception process where only applications that were raised by the community by the At-Large community" was a question there. Cheryl, [inaudible00:19:35], Dev and I all had comments on that. I don't know if anybody wants to speak to those. People can read them.

Do people think those should be read out here or perhaps Cheryl wants to speak to hers. I can speak to mine. I don't know if Bret is on the call. But certainly we could read his comments. And Dev is on the call. Also Dev I wanted to ask we went into this have you had a chance on the document or the process diagram you were going to create?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Hi, I did put some text to the - some wording to how the process should in the blue-sky but the actual diagram no.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks, so your content is all in there, that's great.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes.

Avri Doria: Cheryl do you want to speak to your comment or should I try to read your comments?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I am happy to speak to it but to be honest I think the comments almost need to be read as a set for the record Avri because they're a building conversation.

Avri Doria: Okay I can read it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Coming to - yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. From Cheryl: "My first thought on this choice is the later, a community objection raised by the At-Large and then parenthetical or can it be At-Large, small At-Large, and if not why not- internet user. If it's At-Large 'capital A-L then we should probably consider a minimum (or threshold) of support - it's really hard to read. In other words the number of ALSs or regions, etc in favor of the objection on behalf [inaudible 00:21:35] that sort of thing, but this is a first reaction.

I can see where a parallel [inaudible00:21:41] plan might also work. But then why not let them be proactive from their unique point of view. And we, ALAC and At-Large act as a conduit for genuine community concern that may not fit the GAC filter. Yes, that might be reactive but" - then it stops. You seem to saying that yes it should be an exception process but perhaps doing something parallel to the GAC review of each one, before going on, I don't quite understand that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure, okay it's hard to explain but from my point of view the GAC is going to be doing what it does and running with a particular flavor of influence that may come from more of the politics of the issues and less of the wide scale community concerns of the issues, and that's fine. There is a place for that. I'm just not sure it's the only thing that needs to happen. If ALAC is running a system whereby it is taking the interests of genuine community concern which is obviously where my voice is, I think it should be genuine community concern that we're taking forward.

Then I think we need to have some sort of transparent and measurable process. it may be for example, the GAC has a system that as soon as one member organization, one member country puts forward a concern, the GAC by definition must put it forward. ALAC I think could easily be used for almost fictitious and frivolous activities if we were to have such a low threshold.

I think ALAC needs to be seen as a global, multiregional, agreed gatekeeper on things rather than a small or extreme edge view as held on a action string proposed. I think we should have wide scale and significant support. However, I think ALAC has to establish what those rules are. And we also need to think of does it need to come through what is seen as an official ICANN accredited structure, in other words, an At-Large structure.

Or can your Aunt Mary put in an objection to you Avri and you bring it forward just as an individual member of the two RALOs. Do you get automatic support for those objections, those sort of things, thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. I see no hands asking other questions, I will go on with reading. Then I had commented saying I think that the GAC perspective would be rather different from an At-Large perspective. The GAC perspective will be controlled by national laws and sensitivities. I don't know exactly what will motivate At-Large objections but I don't expect they will map to national law and especially national sensitivities. I don't know if that's true or not but that's my supposition.

Bret responded: "I think it would be really helpful if we thought about the sorts of things that might be objectionable before the application process got underway so prospective applicants could address our concerns. I know some things will only be clear in hindsight but one measure of success would be announcing the source of things that ALAC found objectionable and then having applicants steer clear of our issues." And then from Dev "I suggest" - or am I saying it wrong? Should I always say Dev Anand? I have always been saying Dev and you always say Dev Anand.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: It's Dev.

Avri Doria: I suggest the later - I got confused - "I suggest the later applications raised from the community from a reading of the gTLD Applicant Guide Book. The ALAC has standing to object on limited public interest objection grounds according to Page 154 of the gTLD Applicant Guide Book, 19 September 2011, clean version. Established institutions associated with clearly delineated communities are eligible to file a community objection or the independent objector." And then I noticed in the chat Faoud had asked about the relationship between the independent objector and this process, and I think that's probably a good question and I don't know what the answer is.

I know the independent objector seems to have the ability to independently object based on his or her own perceptions and doesn't actually even need to have something feed in. I know in the REC 6 Group there has sort of been I think a prevalent viewpoint that there should at least be someone making the objection for the independent objector to act. But I don't see it as written that way.

That's where we are on the first bullet; does anyone wish to speak to these issues? We need to add in some of the things that Cheryl said. We need to, I think, Bret basically initiates a new bullet point which is okay so what are the kinds of things that we will object to and even accepting Dev's interpretation that it's limited to public interest objections that is still a fairly wide category and what might those things be? So there is both a process defined and a set of issues defined. Anybody else wish to comment on this bullet at this point? No other input into this, okay Dev please?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Avri. Regards to Fouad's question regarding the independent objector, it's described on Page 156-157 under Mandate and Scope of the Independent Objector. I would say it's not [inaudible 00:28:43] to answer Faoud, it's no. The independent objector does not have a super power to object to something put forward by ALAC.

What the independent objector can [inaudible 00:29:01] is on two grounds, the public interest and community. And in fact, it goes on to say that in light of the public interest [inaudible 00:29:13] the independent objector should not object to an application unless at least one comment in opposition to the application is made in the public space. I guess -

Avri Doria: Thank you for correcting me on that.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay.

Avri Doria: Any other comments? Moving on - Dev it's the two cases [inaudible 00:30:00] mentioned were the community and the limited public interest. This is in response to Heidi's question. Okay on the next bullet, is there an estimate of how many applications we expect to be subject to the At-Large objection process or objection process review?

Cheryl, not to my knowledge, but it would have [inaudible 00:30:27] the number reason of [inaudible 00:30:29] and is less than three to five. And obviously that goes along with the notion of it being an exception not a review of each one. And then Dev, given that the typical objection and [inaudible 00:30:43] can range from USD \$70,000 to USD \$122,000, Page 47.

It seems likely that only small number of objections around three that we would be able to file. What is the situation on ALAC and the need to pay for these things? Is it still a case of applying budget that controls the number of objections that ALAC makes? Or is it like GAC free to file as needed? Dev you seem to have the page and number most accessible.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes, if you go to Page 160. Subsection 3.3.2, Objection Filing Fees, it says that ICANN will develop a procedure for application and disbursement of funds. And it just says - they don't put any specific limit on it. They just say that funding will be available for ALAC objection filing and dispute resolution fees contingent on its publication by ALAC on the approved process for considering and meeting objections.

It also goes to say that funding from ICANN for objection filing fees is available for individual national governments in the amount of \$50,000. But a guarantee that a minimum of one objection per government will be fully funded by ICANN where requested.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. That really means that how much there is and how much is available is really very dependent on the process we put forward and how tight it is and how well governed it is. And perhaps the suggestion that thinking that we would get funded for more than five would probably be optimistic but that remains to be seen. Any comments, I see Cheryl has her hand up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank Avri. And also modifying the text in the ether pad as well, as Dev said it's mentioned but it's one of those and the magic happens here sort of cloud. We had conversations that mentioned the amounts as low as three per round up to as high as five or eight I think I heard once at a meeting. Absolutely nothing committed to just the generalities of oh yes we probably shouldn't be budgeting or giving ALAC money to give back to us, that seems silly.

There was also a conversation of having such [inaudible 00:33:58] pretend like a docket or a ticket so we could sort of have the redeem voucher idea for an objection given to us for any particular round. That again wasn't discussed as a mechanism but in theory at least in the room where it was being looked at it didn't get too much in the way of objections as compared to - pardon the pun- compared to the conflict of us having to have regular budgetary allocations which may or may not be used and all the nonsense that goes on with that, having some sort of voucher that we could play should we need to play it. It's something that seemed to have more rather than less support at the time, thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Any other comments on this issue? Any other thoughts on this? Okay one thought on this that occurs to me is that this therefore in whatever process we set up, we may have a requirement of prioritizing and if there are more than whatever the allocated either budget or number of tokens may be then this people handling this objection process whatever mechanism we establish, would need to rank them and would need to decide which were the most important to do.

So that might be one important consideration to add that the process does include a ranking. The process also and this goes back to Fouad's point is or question is if the independent objector is able to object on the same basis as ALAC and of course there is only a limited amount of time that these objections get said, perhaps there will be an interest in if there is a ranking, if there are more objections to be made than can be made, you know, I would hope that that not be the case, and being aware of what the objector is doing and what GAC is doing is probably a reasonable part of the process. Anything else on this bullet before I move onto the next one?

This one is pretty clear; should there be tools and aids in the process? And this came out because Olivier mentioned that tools were being created for GAC and perhaps the process that ALAC did could piggyback on those tools. That may or may not be possible depending on the processes and how different or alike they are. Cheryl basically said "Yep and they need to be accessible, accountable and transparent."

Anybody else want to add something to that. and then the question I had was what were the tools and I read Cheryl's answer as saying "We need to do a lot more work before we know what tools we need. A darn good question and this we must consider much more." Any point, any anything on any of these bullets that were put up? Any other bullets that should be there. I think Bret needs to become a bullet on its own in terms of what sort of things are objectionable, a sublet under that would take what Dev had said and basically talk about the - and I'm so confused about what name I should be using - and basically listing them.

And if we are limited to public interest objection grounds is that reasonable? Is there reason to think about the community objection also given the At-Large structures are perhaps closer to many of the communities and the community locations or is that a mechanism that needs to just refer those to the independent objector getting back again to Fouad's question. I think that one deserves a point on its own. Basically I had one other comment that I stuck in the Wiki, I didn't stick in the thing because it was more a process question and so that's - we continue working on this, this blue-sky.

Let's try and get as much listed as we can. And then we already have one offering and I'm remembering that should the group define the requirements that result from this blue-sky exercise and subsequent discussion as deliverable? Should we set a date for this deliverable? And should once that's done should the RALOs be consulted on that after this draft is created? Those were a couple two process questions and one milestone question. And asking whether week two of 2012 was a reasonable time to have sort of call an end to the blue-sky process and probably a week or two before and then producing a requirements document that can then be passed to the RALOs to see what their viewpoint is just to make sure that they've been brought into the process.

Is that necessary? Is that the right thing to do? Is that too little to do? I just thought that I would stick that in among the questions. Anyone have a comment on any of that? On the process, the blue-sky process, on how long we continue it, on content substance of the issues? Does it seem like a good idea to continue this process and to come up and continue the discussion at the next meeting? We're starting to build sort of a set of thoughts and issues and go on from there, yes Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just on - I did post it to the Wiki just a moment or two ago just to your last point about taking a draft to come up to each RALO processes, and this is just a little bit of Wiki bizarre editing issue because you've got two B's instead of an A, B and C, so I will respond to it as a C.

The Point C, which that is, I think yes it would benefit us all a great deal if we could just coax things out to the RALOs to get discussion and feedback all that before we push things into an ALAC process, if we can say that this working group has already done some of that basic groundwork, it saves that extra loop which is bound to happen if we don't do it anyway. So we may as well do it in the beginning, thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks and I corrected my Point C. Okay so and I just want to make sure, does keeping this blue-sky for another two weeks and then starting to work on producing a coherent census document out of it with a goal of having that done by week two. the point on getting this all done is basically by ICANN 43 certainly have a good idea of where we are going on this. And I basically just wanted to remind people that it's week 11 and so we are looking at week two and doing it.

And I hope people don't mind me doing it as numbered week as opposed to trying to remember what date it was. Hopefully that will work for people. Okay I saw a couple of comments here. Faoud I do think the objection process remains a weak link but at the same time ALAC has the opportunity to build a strong process by building a scoring list. The ALAC process that may be established here will require a great deal of mobilization of ALAC and its outreach on the subject.

And also scoring lists would again be a blind link but I think if we start at this stage we can devise such a list of possible objections. I don't - Faoud I wonder if you want to speak on this a little because I don't quite understand. Are you saying that we - when I was thinking of ranking the objections as things that had come up as objections that somebody had brought forward would then need to be prioritized. Is that what you meant about the ranking or okay I see I will read what you types.

Faoud "Is that what you mean by ranking? Or are you somehow ranking on a greater scale? And do you mean by blind that everybody in ALAC, the ALSs, the RALOs, the individuals that are members of these things participate in this ranking as opposed to what I was thinking of which was the group that was made responsible for the ALAC objection process, assuming there is a group that is responsible or if ALAC itself, based on recommendations from some means or other does the ranking, so I'm not quite clear."

Okay Faoud I think we may to [inaudible00:45:01] a certain number of issues that can be used for objections to our ALSs. Okay that's what we've talked about making part of this requirements process. And then basically so that's the list that would then be ranked? I guess what I would like to ask then - okay multiple attendees are typing, good. Okay to share their concerns or comments on devising and enhancing such a list, okay that's good.

That would be part of that exercise that once we sort of have set down these requirements and send them off to the RALOs and assuming the RALOs use whatever process they each use to reach out to their ALSs. Because I was assuming that we reached the RALOs and the RALOs does the ALS outreach by the methods they always use for those as opposed to us trying to do that. And I got a yep, okay. And another note from Dev saying Page 167, speaks to the limited public interest objection. Yes please Dev, I see your hand is up.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank Avri, yes I just put the Page 167, talks about how the DRSP will review and evaluate the limited public interest objection. So I think trying to come up with a scoring process I think we have to follow how the DRSP is going to evaluate the objection filed by ALAC. I think [inaudible00:46:59] it does what it says - it's about two pages and it goes on to say that the grounds upon which an applied for gTLD may be considered contrary to generally accepted legal norms related to morality and public order that are recognized under the principles of international law are and it gives four points.

[Inaudible00:47:28] violent lawless action and [inaudible00:47:31] to or promotion of discrimination incitement or promotion of child pornography or sexual abuse and termination that an applied for gTLD string will be contrary to specific principles of international law as reflected and relevant international instruments of law. I think we're going to have to when we do try to write our objection and write the objection text we take these into mind.

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you. I think that there still maybe understanding what those may to everyone and there still maybe within those four a ranking or within subissues within those, but I don't know. Yes you make a very good point that that's what we have to stick with. Did you want to comment further, I see your hand is still up.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: No.

Avri Doria: I think we should continue this exercise. We are at 52 on the hour. And I want to leave a little time for any other business. So is there anything else on this before I close it for now. I encourage people whether it's in the Wiki or the ether pad to continue contributing adding comments. I am then I will probably ask staff for some help in terms of doing a census of this and bringing the two together. I think if we get real activity it will take a little bit of work to make sure that the two are remaining in synch with each other. But that's a good thing.

And of course I wanted to make clear I got at least one message saying sort of indicating that Wikis and [inaudible00:49:27] and whatever was going too far and that I just want to say keep using email to keep speaking out at the meetings. These are just any way to get people's comments collected is really what I am working at. And if calling it a blue-sky is too business-y I apologize, it was just the words that came to mind.

Anything else on this before I close it. Okay is there any other business? Of not I will end the meeting a few minutes early if no one else has anything to add.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think we should look at what's happening to the chat. Now we've gone into the murky waters of what may or may not constitute ground for objection and the durrated words morality and public order have come to the floor yet again.

Avri Doria: And I think that -

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That is going to be a huge time whole in our lives. And that is going make any process we come up with very important because some of us are under a few hundred hours and you can imagine once [inaudible 00:50:57] get involved it's only going to get more complicated not less.

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay I would also like to recommend that we all go back before the next meeting and read or reread the pages that relate to all of this so that our knowledge is updated. Mine was certainly a rev or two old on some of these things. I would like to recommend that. And if there are no other any other businesses, I thank you all for the call, talk to you again next week. I hope to lots of activity on the Wiki and ether pad on the email list, on chat, on whatever medium works for you. And we will have the - we are on the alternating schedule so next week's meeting is the one that occurs at 2100 UTC. Thank you all and see you then, bye-bye.

~~End of Recorded Material~~