

# New gTLDs WG 28-11-2011 Transcript

Avri Doria: Starting now. The first thing I have is the amended check so if any more people roll in during that, they can be included in the roll call. On the agenda I have the roll call, and then the next thing there is the review of the action items from the last meeting. Now the review of the action items they are very instructing there is the JAS issues, status and updates, then there is the working methods. I would actually like to if it is ok with people to start out with the JAS issues and then go into item four at that point and come back to the other action item.

I don't know if anyone would object to doing it that way? Hearing no objections, we will do it that way. I don't know if any of them will show up, but I did invite JAS working group members, and said I would front load the meeting with this particular discussion. So then basically we would go into the Board staff community At-Large team on the implementation of the JAS recommendations. I have some feedback from both Carla and Chris on the doing of that. Then the discussion of the idea and the approach to the implementation needs.

Then I will go back to the two action items, basically objective process and working methods to see where we go from there. And then we will do the ongoing meeting schedule, and then any other business. Does anyone else have any business that should be tacked on at this point? I see people typing; no one is talking, and no hands are up, ok. I guess we will go with that agenda.

Unknown: Olivier's hand is up.

Avri Doria: Yes Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks very much Avri I was going to ask whether there was anything else to discuss in regards to Kurt's request for...

Avri Doria: That's number four.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Ok excellent.

Avri Doria: That is specifically item number four I think, and that's the one where I said I talked to both Carla and Chris to try and understand what is going on there. So I will come in with that. Ok, Sebastien. Are you muted?

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes maybe I am. It's better? Ok thank you. I just wanted to tell you that I am here for that; to participate for the numbers. I can give you some news about numbers and stuff and to imagine where we can go and how the group can go in the right direction, but to go somewhere at least.

Avri Doria: Thanks, so I will get back to calling on you for that as soon as we get there. Is anything else on the agenda? In which case we will roll with this agenda. Can somebody do a roll call?

Natalie: Good morning and good evening this is the At-Large detailing work meeting on the 20<sup>th</sup> of November. On the call today we have; Avri Doria, Evan Leibovitch, Yaovi Atohou, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Cintra Sooknanan, Sebastien Bachollet. We have apologies from: Rudi Vansnick, Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa. And from staff, we have Seth Green, and myself Natalie Pogun. I would like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you, this is Avri Doria again. On this particular issue, and I will give a recap of where I think we are at, and then I will turn it over, Olivier may have further comments, and certainly Sebastien had already confirmed that he has comments to make. At the end of last week I was basically informed that ALAC had been approached by Kurt or staff in general, but at least by Kurt about needed some volunteers for a group to work as had been defined in the JAS report in terms of working with the implementation team, and basically because of one of this group's mandates being JAS working group follow up, that that task was sort of passed on.

That basically we start working on coming up with a small group of people to participate with the Board and staff in these first steps of the implementation discussion. There were a couple questions that I had upon hearing that. Where they approaching the JAS working group? Where they approaching the GNSO also? From following up with Chris and Carla the impression that I get is they are looking for people who were JAS working group members, they have a possible solution that they want to talk about with people that were in that group and basically they are approaching to get this done as fast as possible now with a group of people that can talk to them.

My first approach had been to include the two chairs of the JAS working group, myself and then Evan as the liaison to this group as an initial four. Basically all JAS participants and spread between ALAC and GSNO. There was a bit of conversation going back and forth. "Should these be ALAC people? Should the GSNO take care of themselves?" I am putting it bluntly. My perception after talking to people is; no, we should really recommend a group of people that came out of the JAS working group that include general representation from what was on that group.

We had Carlton defer his spot for Cintra, Evan deferred his spot for Alan, and then we had one person Fal Oouped who volunteered being from the agent, but I do not believe he was a JAS working group member. Or if he was I don't remember him being an active member, so that is one of the things to be considered. We need to keep this a small group; we need to have a set of people purposed by the end of today. I believe that it should include GSNO from JAS working group and ALAC from JAS working group.

It is kind of easy if we include Rafeek, who is interested and willing. You've got the GSNO chair. I am still a hybrid, I am At-Large, and I am still NCSG, so I am GSNO. Alan as the liaison is GSNO. So there is certainly more than enough GNSO but there is also more than enough, perhaps, ALAC. I have Cheryl's hand up and also I have Sebastien who mentioned that he wanted to speak to that. So Cheryl would you like to let Sebastien speak or do you want to address something I said first?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just briefly something you said. This is Cheryl for the transcript records. I whole-heartedly support your approach on everything, and our GSNO liaison [inaudible] and I think it is essential we do get [involved] involved. I think if the group spreads between the two chartering organizations, I just wanted to speak from an agent specific point of view I believe this implementation team, for want of a better word, should be absolutely restricted to being small and those who were in the previous JA work group activities and that would mean I would not be supporting that [inaudible] being included. Going to have to work hard, going to have to work fast, and we don't need to bring anyone up to speed. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Ok thanks. And I see that Olivier agrees with that. Olivier do you want to add anything to the story I told? To fill any of the gaps I glossed over or to correct me in anything

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much Avri. This is Olivier for the transcript. You have done a very good job and you have done it very eloquently, so I shall not be saying any additional things since it is all correct. Hopefully we will be able to reach consensus on who to send.

Avri Doria: Sebastien would this be a good time to sort of add your information and also correct any misinterpretations I may have had?

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you Avri for inviting me to talk now. I think it is important to understand that we have a question of timing on the whole issue. But I don't think you put any wrong message in what you say. I can tell you that we just finished a meeting with some Board member with staff to discuss the issue of the JAS proposal and we had a small working group and this was a call open to all the Board members. What we are trying to do, and that is in the end of Kurt, is to finalize the document. It is almost done, but we need to tweak a little bit, and then what the Board would like to do is have a discussion with people who were involved in the JAS working group to have that feedback.

What was a difficult thing with this issue was how we handle that, if it is something like following some rules, or what we are trying here is to have feedback from some of you. But it is not a commitment either from ALAC or from the GSNO or from the JAS group because if we want that, it will take longer, and we would like to act as a Board as soon as possible. Then I have some questions about the small working group setup.

Is it the right setup? Always one right setup to handle this issue, and we will be happy to have in the next few days a meeting with staff and Board working group involved on that issue. And then to do it in some ways that will get the current thinking of the Board on that issue. And what we hope is to have, I will not say your agreement of 100% or your disappointment of 100%, but more to have your feedback on how we can improve it knowing that we will not be able to come with 100% of what JAS was recommending, but maybe we will go a little bit further and force some issue and not far from some other, and the package will be good enough to be acceptable by you and the applicants.

Because at the end of the day it is important that we get some median with the applicants to join the program in a good faith and for the good of the program and of I can in general. That is my few words on that today, and now if you have any questions, and if I am able to answer I will try. Thank you.

Avri Doria: First after listening to that I have got to personally say that I can't wait to hear what is in your package, but I know that is not today's meeting. The other thing I wanted to bring up in terms of the whole process is... That is one of the reasons I was taking that approach with getting the previous chairs and then people having to sit down farther on, keeping it JAS working group. I had the notion that, and I think this was part of the JAS working group, that is that this implementation working group will work beyond the time when the Board has made its presentation and decision, but will also continue working and tracking with the staff and otherwise as the implementation goes on.

And depending on what is in the board's package, may involve us pulling in other people from the JAS working group at other points when it was dealing with something that was their particular proposal, or a variant of something they were a specialist in. But it also gives the two chartering organizations, you know the ALAC and the GSNO, time to sort of look at it and if they want to make different recommendations for the longer term that is still their options, but it is an immediate response to an immediate need. Any hands, any questions on anything Sebastien said or anything I said before we go back to people? Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, it is Olivier. I was just going to add something to what I said earlier, and after having heard Sebastien there I have a question for him. The first thing, earlier today I have emailed Stephan Vangelder to advise him of what is going on, and I wasn't quite sure of whether he had been advised by his liaison or coach I guess for the JAS working group so I advised him of the progress, but I haven't heard anything back from him. So that was the first thing. The question I have for Sebastien, just to make sure I understand this correctly. So the Board is looking for individuals not specific working groups feeding input into the process, is that correct?

Sebastien Bachollet: My understanding is that we want to put that as light as possible, and not to engage any group but to allow any group, to allow people to say something so that we will be closer to a solution acceptable by those groups. Because if we ask GNSO and ALAC to make comments it will take more time at the beginning of the program and it is a question of schedule. We have already traveled with the end of the comment myriads the Board meetings, the busy eight; the bariades commented sixteen, and the beginning of some busy days in some part of the world, and then the program starts. And we need to give some time for the applicant to be able to setup their application if they want to apply. We want to leave that as light as possible.

Avri Doria: One of the things, if I can add to that, is by having the people that were chairs or designated replacements for those chairs from JAS and room this group etc., I think it becomes incumbent on us to basically bring this stuff back to our group and collect viewpoints on it as quickly as possible. So I think that we can be including ALAC and At-Large as much as they want to and they are participating twice in two groups and GSNO to the extent that they are interested.

I have talked to Rafik on it and he is certainly interested in participating in this. Hopefully he will be able to time wise. But he is definitely interested in it, and I think it's a solution that he can feel that he could take back to [inaudible]. Olivier hand is still up, anything else?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes Avri, thank you. It is Olivier. Just hearing Sebastien's response I think that whilst we would be sending and we as the ALAC, or we as the JAS working group, be sending a select number of individuals to work with staff and with the Board on the task. I do hope that those individuals will be able to liaison back to the JS and to the new GTLD working group. I am a little uncomfortable about picking four individuals that will not be relating back to their communities.

Avri Doria: My assumption was, and we still have to talk about the approach that we took on that, but that was just said. Is that I would expect us to liaison back.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: As long as this is clear.

Avri Doria: Right. Now of course and the one thing that is an issue and we will find that out in prep, Sebastien can tell us, is once we have the small group and the Board has relayed to us what is in their solution, how much latency do we need to put into the discussion of that with our groups, or can we talk about it as soon as we have heard and understood it?

Sebastien Bachollet: It's Sebastien. That is a difficult question because I am not sure of that anybody will have time to have this in depth discussion with all the groups because in the dream solution today I would prefer to have a decision tech advise the board, and the next meeting of the Board is the 8<sup>th</sup> of December. In the absolute we are supposed to provide the document to the Board for the 1<sup>st</sup> of December. But maybe that is too short for everybody.

And that we need to have some more time and to delay the decision by the board. Maybe it is better to allow some more discussion and to be sure about the program. At the same time as much time as we take now, is less time for people to apply and to be ready to apply, and to have a communication on what we are offering to the needy applicants. And it is a tradeoff we have to make together I guess.

Avri Doria:                    Sebastien thank you. That wasn't quite my question. It was part of it I'm sure. Let's say we had the meeting with you all tomorrow, and you explained the proposal to us, can we then write an email to the JAS working group and to the new GTLZ working group and say. "Ok this is what we are proposing; this is what we think of it."

And even if it was only 24 hours their people would then have a chance to contribute their notions and then more forward. That is why I was asking how much latency, how much delay would we need to put in? As soon as the Board tells us can we start talking about it or does the Board want to keep it under wraps until it is voted on? And that was fully my question.

Sebastien Bachollet:            I really can't answer this question, I am sorry.

Avri Doria:                    So that is part of what I think as liaisons we would have to be within the guides of the Board as far as what questions we could take back etc. But I tend to think we should support the Board on getting this on the books as quickly as possible. I don't know, what do others think?

Sebastien Bachollet:            And as a jockey I will tell you, ask your liaison to the board, it will be easier. But I will try to have an answer to you ASAP. Sorry about that.

Avri Doria:                    That is ok; I can also ask Chris in a chat. I just can't do all that at the moment. Anything else on this? I think that we have to be going back and forth to our groups as much as we can. I think that there may be a period in the beginning where that is difficult to do, but in the long run this is the board's call at this point. They are responding and they are coming to us for a courtesy check, as I kind of understand it. And perhaps it's a sanity check and it's a safety check.

But they are not coming to us so much for approval, as to hear what we are counter proposing to your proposal or your recommendations, you know, "how did we do", you know etc. That is the impression I get, we are not really being asked to approve it. Now we talked about four people, we talked about a possibility of five. At the moment we have two North Americans, one sometimes European and I do listen in on two RALOs. But how many hats can I wear at the same time?

One African in terms of Rafik, and one lack in terms of Cintra, and we had no one in terms of distribution to Asia Pacific. So I don't know if four is good, or whether we want to go for the fifth, and if so whom? Any comments on that? I see Sebastien with a hand.

Sebastien Bachollet:            It was to...sorry I forgot because I answered another question on the chat. But what normally you will get is a document, not just what we will talk to you. I think that the goal of your involvement is to, if you as five, or four, or six, you come after reading the document or talking with us saying that all that is bullshit then the Board will not act if you think that it is very good solution then the Board will be more inclined to act. I don't think we are looking for your commitment whether you will support it 100% but more what is your feeling on that. And if we have the feeling that you have enough confidence about the proposal we put on the table then we can act on. That is the idea today.

Avri Doria:                    Ok, that is what I thought, that is kind of what I meant by sanity check. Hopefully my short-hand wasn't too poor. I am looking at the comments here to see what I can hear. I certainly wanted to look at if we have time is certainly to call a possible call. So moving on are the first four people that are purposed ok with this group of people, and that was that it is basically Alan, Rafik, Cintra, Myself and then do we want to talk about a fifth, possibly a sixth. Any hands or comments? And pluses or any minuses?

Evan Leibovitch:                Avri hi, this is Evan. I think this was easier than putting my hand up. I seem to recall although I don't remember if it was on Skype or email, or somewhere else, that Fuodd had mentioned an interest in participating from AP.

Avri Doria:                    That is true, I had talked about that previously, but you are right I shouldn't treat it as a closed issue. One of the things that Hadbeek made clear to me by both Carla and Chris was that they had wanted people that had been active in the JAS working group, and he wasn't, and both Olivier and Cheryl voted for that being an important consideration and therefore eliminating Fouad because he was not part of the JAS working group and so it would be a new viewpoint.

Evan Leibovitch:                Ok.

Avri Doria:                    So anyone else? Do we go with four from now? Do we want to ask someone? Wait a second...Do we want to ask someone else? Carlton is joining. I suppose if we don't have a JAS working group volunteer or nominee [inaudible] said we can just leave it as four and add later as subjects and such require.

Evan Leibovitch:                Cheryl was there anyone besides you from AP that was heavily involved in JAS?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:            Nope.

Avri Doria:                    Nope, so in other words it's you volunteering or you not volunteering, and then...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:            If you did prefer AP rich then yes I can do it.

Avri Doria:                    I personally have no desperation in anything about this at the moment, other than having a group who is ready to talk to the Board by the end of this meeting. It is basically, the only reason I was looking at the distribution is because often in ALAC it seems important. But it seems that you have got the bandwidth to do it but you are usually so bandwidth out, that I wouldn't ask.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:            Put me in, it is alright.

Avri Doria:                    As I say we can leave it open until later if it is needed. I don't think you should feel pressed to volunteer if it is something you want to do. Yes Olivier I see your hand up.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:        Thank you Avri, it is Olivier. You mentioned our people and if we need more we can always add more. I think that for the time being that four is fine. Too many cooks spoil the broth and it is just going to be the case of... we are not in the business in this case of having to find someone from each region at all costs. We are into having a result and to being able to get things done. And it just happened that the people from the JAS, the main players, and the people that did the most work; happen to come from a restricted set of regions. And I don't think at this stage we should be worrying too much.

Avri Doria: Ok thanks. Is that agreeable to others that we go with four for now? I am getting no dissent. I will write an email later to all. Basically the forth solution it is...because Evan in addition to being the liaison to this was the primary author but he has deferred his seat to Alan. Who is a very active participant, and Carlton who was the co-chair of JAS deferred as I understand, and Carlton you can tell me if I misunderstood you, he deferred his seat to Cintra. So basically we have the chairs or their substitutes going into this. Anything else to talk about this at the moment?

I do think it is important that as we have information we do bring it back to the two working groups, to JAS and that would be Rafik and others to this group. Obviously we have to clear with the Board what we do and don't talk about, but I don't see that as being much of a problem. And certainly we will go in there with I think a notion that we should be able to discuss what we are learning. Anything else on this topic before going back?

We covered the idea, the approach and the people, is there anything else on this that needs to be covered now. I will inform formally all the chairs in the world of this, and this meeting. So Olivier, Stephan, Rafik, Carlton, and I guess Chris and Carla. Yes Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you Avri it is Olivier. Just to confirm that as soon as I receive your list I shall forward it to Kurt and to all concerned. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Ok, thanks. Moving on then. Going back to the list that we have of the action items. We sort of got a start on JAS, I don't know at this point if I want to talk more about JAS unless somebody else has something they want to add to how we go forward. I think one of the things that we still need to work out amongst ourselves is the whole balance between this group and the JAS working group, and so on. But I don't see any point in getting into that at the moment. If there is nothing else to talk about JAS then...

Evan Leibovitch: Avri it is Evan. I just wanted to mention that there was one sort of loose sting from the JAS group which I think had to do with issues about government string reserved, I don't know if we want to get involved with that or Carlton if this is something that you figure the JAS group will reconvene to deal with.

Avri Doria: That is interesting because Alan did send mail into that, and there was a discussion into which a lot of people contributed. But I have not seen anything, so Carlton do you have any idea on where you guys are at on wanting to do this in the JAS group? I see Cintra ; perhaps Cintra has a comment on this?

Cintra Sooknanan: As I recall we have kind of put that topic off to get back to work to find a viable solution to that issue which was something that they actually read and flagged as something that they wanted. And also in a few informal messages. I believe that their interpretation of government support under this program should only be to local government not federal or country leveled government advisees. Thank you. So from my understanding we do have to work closely with the gap from this particular point.

Avri Doria: Thanks. One of the things that came up with the JAS working with in relation to this in just the last couple days, after Alan represented the issue. First I made a comment that whatever we do we have to communicate it as the JAS working group and has to be communicated to the GAC.

Then I think it was Cheryl that recommended that since we seem that there is a strong group that is in the GAC that does not what to change the recommendation on government, and yet there is a strong government pull for perhaps a compromised notion in there that perhaps the JAS working group should arrange for a discussion between some of the people like Michaela and others who are a large part of the GSNO side of the JAS group who want to exclude government completely, and then there is the government nuance of well we don't mean government's national but how about governments local, governments regional, governments otherwise.

And to have that discussion, because it looks like at the moment JAS working group is at an impasse on it. And so either they would have to inform the GAC that they are at an impasse on it or they have to discuss it with the GAC.

Evan Leibovitch: Avri this is Evan again. I am actually a little sorry to have taken the time out to do this because I didn't want to resolve it too deeply now, but just ask the question as to whether or not this was something that the JAS group might be recalled to try and thrash out or if this is something that might be punted to perhaps us together with the GAC to try and resolve since ALAC and the GAC have a decent relationship right now.

Avri Doria: I understand that and appreciate that, that is why I asked Carlton if he could give an indication otherwise I think we just have to wait. Perhaps I will communicate with Rafik and Carlton again on the issue to find out whether they plan to take it up with the working group or not. Carlton do you have an idea? I see an approval from Olivier. With Carlton not being ready to say anything on it, I think I will move on and send a note to Rafik and Carlton and ask them. Yes Olivier I see your hand.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes Avri it is Olivier. I think that Carlton is currently only online on the Adobe; he is not currently on the call. Because I understand he is in a meeting as well, so he is multi-tasking.

Avri Doria: I suppose I could ask. Did anyone else pass him the question online? Nope, well I will come back to this. I will send the question off to Rafik and Carlton and put it on the next meeting. Is that ok with everyone, or do we need to resolve it today? No one objects, and I see an approval. We have only got like fifteen minutes left and I wanted to get the next few things covered, which was the objection process and getting started on that. One of the things we talked about was created a blue sky with eSpace for ideas about requirements.

I don't think I did that, I don't think anyone else did that. I know we had one volunteer of a person to start coming up with a draft of this. Basically I wanted to bring up and remind people that we wanted to put a space up but it can also be done in email, I know not everyone wants to use email. We started talking about what the requirements that this group wants to set out for such an objection process.

I am sure that the objection process coming out of At-Large and ALAC will be different than the ones coming out of GAC because they are directed differently they have different working methods. So I just want to make sure we are getting that, I wanted to find out if there were more people that thought about it and have something to add at this point or that were interested in working with them, and I don't have it front of me who was it that volunteered to be on that.

I should be better at having that. But I forget who it was the volunteered to work on that. So, nothing to add onto that at this point? Ok well I will get the blue sky wiki up and I will start talking to the people that... Oh now I see Joanne. Yes, Dev and then Olivier.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Ok hi and thank you Avri, this is Dev Anand. It was me, I was the one that volunteered and I do have some ideas on it. What I will do is on the Wikipedia, set it up, or I will send an email to the list putting up a thought through flow chart certainly this week. I would have loved to have done it by now but I was just a bit bandwidth challenged over the weekend.

Avri Doria: I understand thanks a lot. I will put that on next weeks, or the next meeting so that the next topic we have is frequency of meeting. I will make sure that the wiki space gets opened I am not sure how we do that so that everyone can contribute to that, but I will work as fast as I can even though they are busy this week getting that wiki open. People should also use emails to send ideas. So thanks, let's get that started. Anything else on that? I see Olivier yes.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much Avri this is Olivier. Just to let you know I have contacted the GAC in regards to their objection procedures and I am currently in a discussion with them as to what systems they are going to implement on their side. It appears that they are going to put together some kind of web based tool so as to provide GAC members to the opportunity to object or provide an early warning.

They are still at an early stage but my question to them, and I sent that this morning was whether this tool was a purely GAC tool that they were having done outside the realm of ICANN, or whether it was part of ICANN. I have informed my vice-chairs Evan and Carlton of this and I am waiting for their feedback and in the meantime I am waiting for feedback from the GAC to find out if this is an ICANN tool, if it is an ICANN tool I wonder whether or not it might also be worthy of bringing in as a tool that we the ALAC can use.

And the idea being that we wouldn't be using the GAC tool obviously, but a parallel tool with our own set of inputs and parameters. I hope that gives you a little idea of what is going on on this side on my part. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. We haven't gotten so far as to figure out, tool based or not, but I think that is one of the things we will have to figure out. So I guess that is one of the questions that goes into the blue sky wiki is, have a tool that makes it possible to do this. And I think we are still at that stage, and then understand how a tool would be useful in this group. I think that is great. And piggy-backing on what someone else does is always a good idea.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Please may I add something. Are you willing to go through 250 applications by hand? I am not. I think a tool is absolutely something we would need because I have real concern we would be flooded with operation work which as we know with ICANN is always something that has very strict deadlines, and very few volunteers to spend the nights doing this, so I would really hope that we consider a tool ASAP. Thank you.

Avri Doria: I think and this is sort of a side opinion on my side, and Evan you have your hand up. Is that we are not sure I think yet as a process are we like the GAC reviewing every application for something objectionable or, are we on an exception basis going to have a process that when someone brings up from At-Large, brings up an issue that they think there is a problem in a thing ALAC has a way to react and process that on behalf of them. Or is ALAC setting itself up, and I think that is a recommendation that is going to come out of this group one way or another, to review each and every application for acceptability. I don't know which way this group is going to recommend that this process go, but those are certainly two different approaches. So I think that may affect first a need for a tool, and then secondly what kind of tool is needed. Evan did you have your hand up?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes I was just going to say pretty much what you were going to in terms of...I hadn't anticipated that are objection process would At-Large involve looking at every single application that came in. Simply having a way to deal with objections coming from the community that is going to be looking at this. I would also note that the fact that the GAC and the ALAC are going to have objection procedures does not reduce the fact that there is still going to be an independent objector and as far as I know a job posting has gone out for the position.

Avri Doria: Yes, a job posting has gone out.

Evan Leibovitch: So there still will be an independent objector whose job will be to have a look at each one and at least give cursor review to see if whether or not there would be objections in what would be considered to be the public interest from the IOs point of view. So there is already within ICANN going to be a vetting process, it is not going to be At-Large, it is going to be the independent objector. But it is my understanding that our role is very close to the one that you foresaw Avri. In that we would simple have a way to deal with objections coming from external parties and at At-Large would not generally be vetting and decided whether or not to object to any string looking at each one.

Avri Doria: Thanks. So I was thinking that this was one of the issues that we had to resolve moving forward I am glad that both issues and I will make sure that those that reflected in this, or perhaps others want to, in the blue sky wiki space. Anything else on the objection process at this point? I would like to get back to meeting. When we were last visiting the notion of meeting we had the notion of the regular alternating on a weekly basis, or the finding an optimal time that was sort of the center of everyone's day.

I tend to think that that is harder to find, and I am basically thinking, although I am curious do we get the same people regardless of what time of day it is. If we are going with the alternating times, then we stick with a weekly and that also fits, at least for now while we are going through the JAS stuff and while we are creating the objection process, especially given that we sort of accepted the notion up front that any idea that is being put forward gets reviewed in essentially two meetings, and having the two meetings that are well scheduled for different geographies means that no one is barred from an attendance.

Whereas we could go for every two weeks, and just find the optimal time but I think that may not enable us to get...we could also certainly go every week at the optimal time, but I don't know what people think. I have given my recommendation for the regular alternating on a weekly basis at least until we get this first level work done, and of course we will call off some of the days that are traditional holidays and say we won't have one there, but what do people think?

Anybody feel extremely strongly that we should only meet every two weeks, or feel extremely strongly that we should have just a single time that is the compromise between the two times that we have got? Well multiple people are typing. What I would suggest doing is that we put out a several month schedule of when the meetings will be so we know which ones aren't happening and we know where the alternations if we take the alternations path. Anybody?

Evan Leibovitch: Avri this is Evan. I can only speak for myself in saying that we can make the meetings as often as infrequently as we want. I will show up when I can but the more meetings there are, the harder it is going to be for me to make each individual one.

Avri Doria: I would expect that would be true of a lot of people, especially with an alternating time. There are people that can make a morning meeting, and there are people that can make an evening meeting, and there are people that can make a middle of the night meeting. Any objection to putting a schedule at least for the rest of this year and perhaps for January as an alternating weekly with some of them cancelled because they hit on a Monday of holiday week or something? I will just put out a schedule before the next meeting for two months and see where that takes us. Yes Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Avri, this is Cheryl. I am a cotcaring supporter of the whole idea of well scheduled in advance and if necessary rotating meetings, but I do think we need to note for the record having gone through several years of these, the same people turn up at the same time, or the same people don't turn up at all. Regardless of what you do, but you have to go through the exercise of that being open and assessable and [inaudible] as possible. So think you are doing the right thing, I am all for it, but you will probably get the same absentees as you are going to get regardless of the time.

Avri Doria: Thanks, so through the end of January I will setup a schedule I will send it out to the list, and people can read up on it, and we will also track who it is that showed up over this next two month period, and we can see if there is any variety and so on. Yes Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks very much Avri it is Olivier. Just to let you know set it up with Gisella she has got an idea of when most of the calls are taking place because obviously there is a technical limitation as to where staff is as well. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. In fact the two that we have, last weeks' time and this time were two that were found by Gisela and my recommendation was that we stick with these two times for the immediate future. Ok, Two minutes to the hour I don't know if we have anybody that is on a half hour time zone. Anything left to ask for the last two minutes? In which case, thank you I will send out the appropriate notes and do any update on the action items, and I thank you all for being turner uppers. And talked too, bye-bye.

~~-End of Recorded Material-~~