

# New gTLDs WG 21-11-2011 Transcription

Avri Doria: Okay, this is our first meeting and I'm sorry I'm speaking so softly. We got an agenda before the roll call while other people maybe still coming in, I figured we could walk through the agenda and just make sure nothing needs to be added or rearranged. So I stuck that in as the zero item on the agenda. So then there will be a roll call, then the first thing would be what I've been calling the 'roll-out issues', especially the topic of sending a letter whether this group thinks we want to recommend a letter to the ALAC or not.

Then there's a review of the JAS issues, status updates on anybody that has one, I'd be really glad if there's a possible Board member who may be able to add something to our view of the status. And then just look at how we wanted to approach - those issues. Then there is the objection process, where we have a bit of work to do to create a process and so to look at how we're going to go about doing that, perhaps getting someone to volunteer to hold the pen on - on writing it, and so on and so forth. So how did we get about that path, get the milestones.

Then to look at this group's working methods and on-going meeting schedule, you know, especially looking for perhaps two times so that we can alternate between different comfort zones, and then any other business -- anything that needs to be changed or added to this agenda? Okay, great then we will run with that agenda. Who does the roll call? Is that Deidre or Heidi?

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes, as Deidre is usually here I'll do it for you Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you very much.

Gisella Gruber-White: On today's call we have Avri Doria, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Annette Muehlberg, Evan Leibovitch, Yaovi Atohou, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Alan Greenberg, Sebastien Bachollet, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Cintra Sooknanan, Rudi Vansnick, apologies noted today from Hong Sue, from staff we have Heidi Ulrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself Gisella Gruber, if I could also please just remind you all to state your names when speaking for transcript purposes, thank you over to you Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks, this is Avri again. So thank you all for coming I am glad we were able to finally get the first meeting on. On the roll-out issues, basically as I understand this task it, as the program rolls-out as issues come up, the working group was basically to bring up issues to make recommendations to ALAC as they needed.

Now the program hasn't really started yet, we're still in the applicant guide book stage, yet in this last guide-book that came out comparing it to the request that ALAC had made previously, there various of the request that haven't been met. And Evan did a very good email, laying out basically what the request had been what the comments had been and the degree of response. Now one question I had was were these comments sent to just to staff or had these comments been provided as a form of ALAC advice to the Board.

I suspect there were just provided to staff. So at this point and someone can answer that, at this point though the question is do we do anything with this? Do we recommend that the ALAC contact the staff with a restatement of its issues, is it appropriate for to recommend to ALAC that they send a letter to the Board about the pending issues? Is it just recognizing that it's probably too late to do anything and let it go and just prepare ourselves for the roll-out?

I don't see any hands up yet -- anyone wish to speak to this issue? Anyone can answer the question first of all of was this just sent as comments to staff or was it a letter to the Board with your comments, because I wasn't pay close attention, Evan please.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi, Avri, this is Evan for the record. In terms of the status of the statement that we're talking about, at least those that form the core of the letter that I sent out, doing a sort of check list between what we asked for and what's been delivered. The original on that actually constituted the ALAC output from the at large summit, and there was a communiqué that was done at the end of that summit, and there was actually a ceremony at which Wolf gave a copy to Peter Dengate-Thrush.

I gave a copy to Paul Twomey, as far as we were concerned that absolutely constituted advice to the Board as well as to senior staff. So, that was probably as substantive of an at large statement that has been made, so at least those particular comments and the ones that we need to track were definitely sent to Board and to staff.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks there was also mention in there of Direct Six and energies like that which had to have come later, so are you saying this is an amicable of several different --

Evan Leibovitch: No -- we basically went along as far as I recall, we went along and endorsed Direct Six as advice to the Board, and endorsed JAS in terms of advice to the Board.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Oh and I see that Heidi has added the declaration there, that's good. So the question is, is this something we want to do something about at this point, and if so what? Evan's hand is still up but I don't see anyone else.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks very much, Cheryl for the transcript record. Look, I think it's probably a reasonable thing at this point in time when we look at the bend with the people on the ICANN Board have had since, we are talking about here are sequential documentation, a very large number of documents that have gone through as advice from the ALAC. And the fact that some people were not looking at extraordinary small details, but rather the big picture of, 'go or no go.'

It might be timely for a very succinct but well written review document to be created by the ALAC for bringing everyone up to speed, and advice to the ICANN Board. And that will also allow us to capture most recent things and here I'm speaking about what's coming out of the jig wood group and other stuff on field character IBM's. So perhaps suggesting that a simple document or a summary document very brief but just reminding everybody exactly what the status-quo is might be a very good idea.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you -- Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I guess we need to decide what it is we are trying to accomplish, and maybe there are multiple goals here. I mean one can look at a document like that, certainly the historic part, not necessarily the new part Cheryl just mentioned, and say we're doing it just to make it crystal clear, there are so many documents that its confusing to people, we want to make sure history is understood for future generations.

We're flogging a horse that we hope isn't dead yet, and maybe they'll listen this time. Or a third alternative is when things go up in flames we want of said 'we told you so.' I could give you a range of possible outcomes, what are we trying to accomplish with this? Because I think that will frame how we do it and what we're doing. Thank you.

Avri Doria: I have a question, but does anyone else have a question for Alan to answer? While thinking about that also think about whether you're willing to be the first or perhaps second drafter basically since it was built on what Evan had written, if we go ahead with trying to do something like this, whether you're interested in doing it. Does anyone have a question for Alan? Okay, offering my own is that in some sense it would be all three of those –

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I cannot hear you.

Avri Doria: Okay, I'm sorry or you the only one that can't hear me or?

Gisella Gruber-White: No, it's all of us.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I can hear everyone well except you.

Avri Doria: Okay, because I'm yelling into my microphone.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is perfect now.

Avri Doria: Okay, the microphone is half way down my throat, but anyway, I'll keep trying to keep it there. So anyhow, the thought I had is that in essence you're trying to achieve all three. You're trying to basically recommend that where they can still consider that they do consider. Where it's gotten beyond being able to do, and they got a good reason for why they didn't, they explain it as it always should be the case, with taking or not taking someone's advice.

And to record in terms of the second round, not so much in a 'we told you so' idea, but when people start reviewing for the proverbially second round, that these recommendations were made, were reiterate and were responded to. So, I would think that that the purpose would be in essence all three of these things, but that's just what occurs to me. So, anymore comment on that? Does anyone wish to take a chance at drafting such a letter, because I haven't heard anybody say no we shouldn't?

And certainly the letter would have to go through a fair amount of at least another meeting and online worth of talking if we get it. Is there anyone here that feels the urge to actually do the first draft, taking what Evan has written and going beyond it. I see that a couple people are typing, I see no hands.

Alan Greenberg: Avri, this is Alan, I can help with it but I don't have the bandwidth to totally do it myself. I put my hand up not cause I'm volunteering, I'm specially not for this for a number of reason, but I think we want to make sure when we do this that one of the reason was flogging almost a dead horse.

Maybe if we say it again, they'll listen this time. I think we want to make sure the tone does not imply that, yes we're suggesting it for the second round, and all the other reasons, but I don't want it to sound like if we do it one more time they'll listen. So, I think the tone needs to make sure it doesn't sound like that.

Avri Doria: Alan I have a question. Do we believe we've gotten adequate answers from the Board on why things that why things that you've all requested before were not done? And would you include that in the flogging of the horse?

Alan Greenberg: I personally don't feel that we have brought on good answers. A lot of this was done at a time in history when answers never came. No, we probably weren't answered adequately but I'm not sure the Board is going to go back historically and answer at this point, I'm not sure I really expect someone to do that. That doesn't say we can't reiterate it for future rounds, again that's my opinion.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks.

Evan Leibovitch: This is Evan, I was just going to add to what Alan said, by essentially saying were still at the point were adequate answers aren't given. The Board is under no obligation to answer ALAC the way it does the GAC, and in fact to my recollection there has never been a Board letter to ALAC saying here is what we agree with, here is what we disagree with and why.

That has not happened, it has not happened with gTLDs or for anything else for that matter. So, any feedback that we get is unfortunately coming from informal channels, and I agree with Alan about the tone of this. My original email on this is saying well at large is saying that we are against the gTLD program in its current form, but that form has taken many changes, and the approach has to be a bit more nuance, especially since its approved and we can't put that horse back in the barn.

Having said that though I think there still some value in putting this score far forward and at least making sure that if to nobody else to our own constituency that the gaps between the current status and what we consider to be the public interest, thanks.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you - Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you Avri, Olivier for the transcript, with regard to the Board risk responding to ALAC advice. I think we have to have a little bit of nuance on this one. On one said yes we don't appear to have received direct answers to the questions that we have asked or the things we have raised in the past. At the same time though some of the work we have done has greatly influenced the way the things have progressed. So we can't just be looking at it in a negative fashion and say everything that we have ever said in the past has been rejected.

Okay, I'm paraphrasing, I'm going to that extreme but I just want to make sure we don't fall into that trap. On the other hand, I think we need to notice that the Board has changed personnel; we have several new Board members. We have a new Chair, which, and I'm ready to put on the record is probably going to be a vast improvement with regards to being ALAC advice friendly, than the previous Chair.

So if its down to having to write something we have already written in the past or perhaps to have a statement that addresses all the loose ends that still have not been addressed, I don't think that its something that is a repeat as such, since a lot of the current Board members were not around when the previous advice was given. So, bear that in mind at the same time, I hope there will not be a 10, or 15 or 20 page document because that's bound not to be read, so it has to be something short.

But with this I don't want to influence the way the group decides whichever way we go, this is just some background material on this. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you Olivier – I have Alan listed, does anyone else want to speak other than Alan because I'd like to close the queue on this one so we can move on to other topics. Does anyone else want to be on the queue at this point? Okay please, go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: A couple of quick points just for the record, when I said we were talking about an era where there weren't responses, I didn't mean explicitly from the Board. I just meant any comments to open comment fields there were no responses, comments to staff there were no responses. So it was a generic thing not so much targeted at the Board. I agree with Olivier, this is a new Board it's not only likely to be ALAC friendly it's more likely to be bottom-up friendly. So I think we are dealing in a new era, on the other hand this Board is going to be up to its ears in alligators, we've already seen a number of them if you read the news.

Lawsuits and who knows other issues that are going to be coming up, if you look at A and A issues and things like that, I don't expect them to look at a retrospective document, and issue a detailed comment with respect to this round. So, I think we should be doing it more for the record and for future rounds then because we expect a response for the new Board no matter how new this Board is, thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you, and Sebastian.

Sebastian Bachollet: Sebastian, not as Board member. Just a few points you made which to consider. The first one is that the 51 days before the opening of the application period. Then your bandwidth, the bandwidth of the staff and the bandwidth of the Board are very small. Then you may wish to consider what are the more important message you want to get through. And I agree that if you can recall the list of topics this will be useful, more I will say after than it needs for immediate action.

At the same time I am interested in knowing what your take is of what needs to be done. Not just the topics you talk about or in the letter sent to the Board or the summary made by Evan, but what are the other points you think are important to take into consideration today. Whether you already acknowledge to say something or you want to answer to mitigate some of the inputs of other people or organizations in this discussions.

And yes I hope that the Board, now talking as Board member, this Board I hope will be more bottom-friendly and user friendly, and therefore at large and ALAC friendly. I agree with Olivier about the Chair, his way of chairing and the way of listening it is very important.

At the same time there are some issue worth taking on, I think we will come to the judge and will not be able to give you too much news but still its on the table and some member of the Board are working on that. But just to let you know something, I try to put the least of the topic I think are still on the table for me to be able to follow what is happening, and I end up with 22 items and 22 sub-items. That means that there is still a lot, not just before the 12<sup>th</sup> of January, but generally speaking to have a more comprehensive and final process for the new gTLD.

And not taking into account the last news request for review and so on, that's something outside and hopefully will not be taking in boom with the new daily problems. So those are my thoughts and I am ready to discuss with you if you wish, thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you Sebastian. What I want to do now is close this topic for this meeting discussion. What I see as, I don't know whether they are actions or next steps, is that one need to have a recommendation. A possible recommendation that if there is a letter it is concise it's to the point and perhaps it does focus on what we think is something that can still be dealt with still be fixed if I understood what I was hearing correctly and two that there is value in perhaps a longer document that is the recap and the last thing I would say on this and then I think we have to move it to the list and we have to find someone who is willing to draft a letter if we're going to have one which we don't quite have yet.

And that is part of bottom up is having someone that says yes I will start the first pen to paper is the fact that the expectations that whether it's the board or the staff or the GNSO or whomever actually responds to point in advice and comments saying this is why we took it this is why we didn't.

While yes mandated as a proper way to deal with the GAC should become sort of a habit and I can be the proper way for anyone to treat for anyone of the group. And of course the old advice that came from Vince includes a note at the bottom saying you expect a response might be a useful reminder until they get into the habit. So I'd like to close this one now but only for the meeting and take it back to the list. If that's okay does anyone object to that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I hate working on this you know this. Cheryl for the record.

Avri Doria: You hate working on this?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I have my issue with working on lists only. It needs to be on...

Avri Doria: Right I wasn't saying we would do it only we would talk about it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry I realize it's a very cultural issue and one while whenever I'm working in the Asia-Pacific you'll hear from me every time.

Avri Doria: Okay I'll need to understand while lists are a problem and perhaps we can find other online methods there are more and more methodology for people working together other than just the one hour call but that's for the later part of the meeting if we get there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep on the JAS issue a status update and a strategy I guess. I have not heard much I've had some communication with Chris Disspain I've understood there's a meeting I think it's today of staff and board members to check where they're at on their various proposed solutions solution possibilities one thing that does concern me is that while they're looking at all the stuff simple things like getting together a working group to look at a foundation and bring back advice to the board and how that could be done hasn't even been started yet.

So I have a little bit of concern of them working on the global picture trying to get that right and I think that's good but also some of the easy things they could have done to show that they're actually working and getting things moving perhaps haven't been done.

Avri Doria: I see Alan's hand up, go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, It's Alan Greenburg one issue I should have brought up with the JAS list but I didn't I did it in person with a number of people in Dakar but since there is a large amount of overlap I'll raise it here. In the report the JAS group issued we left unsaid - uninspected the issue of governmental eligibility that is other than national governments.

There seem to be general agreements with it but for reasons I'm not quite sure of the group deferred it to some future time saying were going to continue to talk to the GAC about this. We never went back and revisited it. And I think the JAS group or us if there's enough overlap in it needs to come to some closure on it to say the words in the report stand I think it's something that was left undone.

Avri Doria: Is that something that the JAS group should take a look at?

Alan Greenberg: It should be, since the people on this call are a large part of the JAS group we could certainly decide that yes it should go to the JAS group or we can leave it undone.

Avri Doria: Any comment on that or anyone have any more status on JAS perhaps Jen or someone would be able to comment with more than I've been able to gather from the outside.

Sebastian Bachollet: It's Sebastian if you want me to by the way you have the point. All members we have a call tonight with staff and we will work on that and um hopefully we will advance some discussion.

Avri Doria: Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: We have to do something. If it is not a good direction for the Board you have to stop. You have to push the group to do it. We have to do it now, or else it is too late

Avri Doria: So you are saying that this group should actually take the task one of the requirements of defining those requirements.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I think whether or not the group should do it or make the group should do it, it isn't important but it has to be done now.

Avri Doria: I understand that but although what I don't understand is to what extent and this is a question we will find out later to what extent the Board and its work with the staff is already working on that issue. And that is something that we have to find out.  
Alan

Alan Greenberg: Okay two things. With regard to revitalizing the government issue, how about I suggest I'll send the message we are going to send to JAS raising the issue and proposing a resolution and let's get some dialogue if the chairs of this group, or the chairs of ALAC or if a chair of ALAC wants to send a message to the list saying something relevant to encourage quick action fine. I will kick it off.

There is not protocol involved there I will just kick it off the way I was going to anyways I will do that right after this meeting. With regard with the issue raised to Tijani and Avri and I in terms of getting involved with the Board, the current Board process of taking the JAS report and translating that along with staff into a real action plan what can be implemented and what can't. We talk a lot about work between meetings. In the car I feel there were a couple of questions from a number of Board members of things that were obviously being discussed that day. I am sure I am not the only one.

But once we physically left the car, there seems to be no way to have those informal discussions or getting a bit of feedback or clarification of "What did you mean by?" All I can suggest is for the Board member on this call remind the group that people are available for informal, off the record discussions to do sanity checks on what they are proposing or make sure what they are understanding from the report is indeed what was meant. I don't think there is any formal way of doing that of constituting a joint committee.

You know that will meet bi-weekly but there are plenty of informal ways to make sure that what comes out of the tunnel is what was intended augmented by what is possible. Let's not find out that as to what Tijani said that what was announced on the very last day is completely orthogonal and different from what we intended. Thank you

Avri Doria: Thank you Alan. Sebastian I will give you the last on this topic and then I will recap and then we will move on to the third topic.

Sebastian Bachollet: Just a little, I hope that there are ways even if you are not face to face you can talk to Board members and to staff and my Skype, my mail, my door is open but my main concern about JAS is to date of the end of the comment period. Because I don't know why it was said that for more than two months it's - nobody can act before the end of the comment period and we take on Board the comments. And even the judge is supposed to wait for the end of the comment period and to take these comments to do the final signing of these documents.

And I would have been more comfortable with one month's comments and a second phase if needed but now I don't know if we can push back the date but it is bad day because it is just before the holidays (i.e. Christmas) some holidays from the south hemisphere and it is quite difficult. I don't know if somebody can do something about that but it gives us some trouble. Thank you

Avri Doria: Thanks. I think Sebastian that if anybody can do something about it, it is the Board but I doubt that even the Board can do anything about it. Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes thank you I think you are right but we have to think about something that is very important and was supposed to be done between us, the staff and yourself so this is something to be done we can already achieve it doesn't have anything to do with the comments because it not something which is submitted to tunnel it is something to do that is not already done. Do you understand? If you don't issue it now we will never be able to do it.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you Tijani, so I think to recap where we are at on this and to see if there is any action in it is that we definitely have 2 issues that came up here of concern. I think that there should be consultation with the chairs with of JAS and I think that if anyone can get through has again bottom up contributed writing to sort of say here is something that we should have on the JAS that this group can discuss it and that we can start feeding it into the JAS.

I think Alan was right we don't need a formal panel into the JAS from this group because each of us can contribute into that group and say what needs to be said I think we have to be careful not to get into competition with the JAS get into turf but I see no reason why an idea can't grow from here so if someone has a proposal to start that conversation whether it is on wiki email or some other cooperative work program be careful I am not saying email as a catch word. We should start it and we should also communicate with the people on JAS about it being necessary and support that message. Does that seem?

So I guess there are actions on all of us on JAS to reenergize JAS. There is an action on anyone here that has a proposal of what should be in this recommendation to start writing it in a proposal. And I think from Sebastian's hopefully after tonight's Board meeting it will be possible and hopefully we will know more. Anyways, can I move on to this last issue? I want to make sure we hit everything.

Okay thanks, on the objection process at this point I don't think we are even quite ready to get into the substance of that though I think we have to start that and maybe a new site say in wiki that people can start talking about what the requirements would be for such a process -- for such an objection process. But we need to figure out to how to get there. Again we need to come up with a work plan that you know because the objection process is not a January 12<sup>th</sup> requirement, it's a you know tied up with a ribbon, done and approved and everything probably by the end of April, if not sooner.

So it is not that there is that much time but it is not a January 12<sup>th</sup> thing I don't believe. But we should be well on a draft of what it looks like by January 12<sup>th</sup> and be in a position of going about getting its approval between January 12<sup>th</sup> and the end of application, so my first thoughts on it.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I am definitely looking for volunteer, authors and reporters whatever we want to call it on getting this written and as co-chair of this group I am not volunteering to be a writer. We found that that could be disastrous to have a chair writer. And thus I am looking for people that are willing to start the selfless task of putting words down on paper that people will disagree with and erase and replace. So it is a wonderful task but it is kind of selfless. I see no hands yet on people who want to comment on this yet. Okay I do see one hand.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Alright this is Dev and I do have something for the record. I think I might be willing to give it a try to come up with a procedure and even try to flow chart it as necessary so that people can add comments and then we can see if they agree or disagree with it. I am willing to take a first attempt at that.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks and just checking. Rudy on the list were you volunteering to work on this or the previous thing from JAS?

Rudi Vansnick: I would like to work a bit on, as I mentioned, on the JAS.

Avri Doria: Okay the JAS thing, I just wanted to make sure. Ok, good, is there anyone else that wants to work on JAS on the flow chart and draft of a process? Okay then I guess Alan I see your hand up.

Alan Greenberg: I am willing to work on it and I am willing to draft something in terms of text that comes out of it if Dev doesn't want to do that part. I think it is essential that we get input from other people

Avri Doria: Certainly and I think starting a Wiki page or something where people can blue sky about what they think such a process needs might be a helpful input for you all. Is that reasonable?

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Avri Doria: Okay so I guess we have 10 minutes left and there is not a lot to say on this one. But for the next 10 minutes we have an action that Dave and Alan will start to build the base materials that will create a wiki page or some other cooperate work page where people can input their ideas - and start the blue sky of what process is required and just start collecting that and basically take a look at it in our next meeting. Anything else that should be added to that one at the moment to get it kicked off in proper shape?

Okay, then in the last nine minutes before the hour we had basically working methods and ongoing meeting schedules. On those, on working methods I think we should be as creative and use all the tools we can to get full participation. I've noticed that from working groups that in some calls you get a core of dedicated people but a lot can't make them can't work that way. Email works for some people but as Cheryl email does not work for all people and there may be whole cultures that it doesn't work for.

I don't know the demographic on how useful wikis and other tools are but basically I think using as many of those different tools as we can get as much participation as we can. In terms of the phone calls I tend to think but I am not sure but I don't know the geographical description, distribution on this group that alternating 2 times, 1 that is more awkward for one group and 1 that is more awkward for the other group and as chair I don't really care, if I have to wake up at 3 o'clock in the morning to do a meeting, fine I will make coffee and wake up.

So I don't care when we have the meetings in terms of that part. So do we want to select 2 meetings and also how often do we want to meet? In some respects I think we have work that demands weekly, in some respects some of the work is certainly more of a bi-weekly sort of nature. So comments? Opinions? Is there an objection to an alternating meeting structure where it is uncomfortable for everybody every other week? Or every other meeting that is? Yes Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't mind where everything is cycled, whether they are alternate weeks, whether they are whatever as long as they are consistent. My diary needs to be filled up way in advance, so as it is now it is 2am, so I am very much like you Avri as you know we are rather time zone friendly compared to most people.

So we do need recognized that if we are using the full tool kit or as wide of a tool kit of communications as possible and you and I served on separate if not full work groups where strong contributors may have never made an actual teleconference call at all but they have managed to contribute via vista, via wiki or via other things. I think it is saying as all things being equally important and the other thing I would suggest is that "a decision" should never be made on anyone cycle that could be any one of those things.

So for example in some of city work groups that I function in no even point of giving into a call for consensus or text in it could be agreed upon unless it has gone through 2 cycles, in this case or in that case sorry teleconference work and you can always call for a third, sounds a bit slow, sounds a bit cumbersome but it does allow for global input even if it fails sometimes. I just call for whatever it is to be consistent. So consistent alternation would be ok with you as long as you knew that it was going to be, when it was going to be?

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay. It would be interesting to find out. We know that we have at least one person who cares, the reason I bring up the issue is, Hong specifically mentioned the timing as an impediment or limitation. Okay Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Okay I was just going to refer to that, there are a number of people who are willing to get up at 3 in the morning and there are probably a much larger number who are not willing to. So I have no problem with rotation but we need to make sure that we don't set a time which will effectively disenfranchise or make sure a large number of people don't attend, that is a useless exercise in dogma. So rotation is fine but let's make sure that we can get reasonable contributions, thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay Yaovi?

Yaovi Atochoun:

Sorry about English, in this meeting, my suggestion - alternate meeting, 1pm or 7pm.

Avri Doria:

Okay thank you I am certainly fine with that, I think it really depends on the demographic distribution but if I guess I would ask Heidi a viewpoint on finding a one acceptable time or an alternating double time. The other question is we need to know: Are we meeting next week or are we meeting in two weeks? Yes, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

I will pick up on your last point first because you asked it and I already had my hand up. But you will probably need to call everyone else. At this stage I think that when we have early drafting and text images development in this case what Dev will be contributing to have probably a two week break would work at this stage. That said I also wanted to remind the group of something that recently has been reasonably successful that may assist in parts of Asia provided we get a humane time for parts of Asia to be involved.

At one of the cycle times, and also for parts of Africa to be able to use the Ado connect room as the telephone bridge. Natalie has recently run some very successful work in the DSSA work group and that has come out of Charles we have done in the CCNSO work group now that is something that Actfron asked for and is actionable for the IRX and make sure that does happen perhaps this workgroup would be a good test base for that. I would leave that up to the chairs, the IRX leadership and of course staff to make the magic happen if they want to. But it certainly has worked so far. And that means someone doesn't have to choose between an internet connection and a telephone connection.

Avri Doria:

I see, okay. Definitely will look at that and see if it is something we can do. At this point, I wonder if people would object to having a call next week, but scheduling it for 21. I have gotten some geezils of it looked at some members and timing and 1400 UTC and 2100 UTC are reasonable options for cycle time. And I am wondering if we could try that and that we try a meeting again next week at the 2100 cycle time for the people that weren't here at this meeting have a chance to listen to this meeting and comment on what we talked about to finish getting things going.

It is now 11 o'clock. It is now on the hour. And therefore this meeting is done. Is there any objection to scheduling the next meeting at 2100 and then do a cycle on whatever we are doing we will talk about it again but between 1400 and 2100. But at the moment is there an objection to a meeting next week at 21 UTC? Seeing no objection, I have used up all the time and don't have time for any other business, please bring any other business to the list.

Working with them and others trying to make sure that all the actions and things we have here are reported on the list. Try to get the work going. Thank you very much for being here and taking a one day notice on the meeting and coming. So with that I will close the meeting. Thank you all.

~~-End of Recorded Material-~~