GNSO – ICANN Nairobi Meeting
Working Group Guidelines Consultation
10 March 2010 at 15:00 local time

Note: The following is the output of transcribing at the Working Group Guidelines Consultation Meeting held in Nairobi on Wednesday 10 March at 15:00 Local time. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

J. Scott Evans: Oh. Okay. All righty. We've started the recording. Good evening, good

                    afternoon and good morning everyone. All right. (Unintelligible). Reloading.

                    Okay. My name is J. Scott Evans and I was - or am currently serving as the

                    Chair of the Working Group Work Team. And this is a sub-group of the Policy

                    Steering Committee - Policy Process Steering Committee, the PPSC, which

                    was delegated the task of coming up with some guidelines with regards to the

                    Working Group Model that we have been directed under the Board directive

                    to transition over to in the policy development process under the Generic

                    Names Supporting Organization.

                    So this is part of the GNSO improvement process. Our objective was to

                    improve the structure and the operations including the development of a

                    Working Group Model

                    Basically working groups are intended to be, you know, more open and

                    inclusive to participants and allow them to tackle issues using consensus

                    building approaches.

                    Basically it's getting away from a situation where it's a constituency-based

                    model but a model wherein all members of the ICANN community - Internet

stakeholder community can participate and have a voice in the policy development process.

So what we did was we brought together the Charter Drafting Guidelines and the Working Group Operating Model into one document. In other words we started out with the concept of having two separate documents - one would concentrate on sort of giving a guideline to chartering organizations which for the most part would be the chartering drafting groups designed by the Generic Supporting Organization.

But it could very well be another organization such as the Address Supporting Organization or another advisory group that wanted a informal working group. So it's a charter drafting document that sort of gives a guideline for what you do when you draft a charter for a working group.

And the other was a Working Group Operating Model. We've since after working through the process put both of these into one document because they cross reference to each other and they flow sort of as a living, breathing document of one. So they are now in one document although they are two sections that serve very different though related purposes.

It was developed by volunteers from different parts of the ICANN community. We had ALAC representatives, we had non-commercial constituency representatives, we had registry representatives, we had members from the ICANN Board. So we had a lot of representation on this particular process.

Luckily for us many of the participants had also been involved in other organizations which use a similar style of policy development so they could bring to the table their experience to help us guide as we put together these documents.

We have now published the draft document for public comment. Marika correct me if I'm wrong but I think it was published around February 5 of this

year and it will be open for public comment until March 22, 2010 which is about a week after this meeting ends.

And as you all know you can go to the ICANN Web site and there is a link to the public comment section and you will be able to find this particular section. It has the document in - usually in an Adobe format which you can download and review and then it has a process and method for you to add any public comment you would that will be considered by the group.

So following the close of the comment period on the 22nd, the work team will review all the public comments that are submitted and then we'll take those into conference and discuss them and review them and decide whether there needs to be any updating or revisions to this particular document based on the observations from the community made through the public comment period.

Once this is done and a final draft is put together we will then submit this to the Policy Process Steering Committee which is a diverse group of representatives from the stakeholder community that serve on a Policy Process Steering Committee. And they will review it to ensure that they don't have any questions and feel like that it is headed in the right direction. And should it pass that threshold test the PPSC would then pass it on to the GNSO council for consideration at that particular process.

Now the council can accept it, they can ask questions and send it back down by the Policy Process Steering Committee which could then send it back to the work team or - so those are the things that could happen. It can either be accepted, it can have clarification requested or have specific revisions requested at the GNSO council level.

The Working Group Guidelines, the content of that is that document really sets out the roles and responsibilities for a working group and the members of a working group.

It explains how you form the team, what announcements are going to be given and how are they distributed throughout the community. How a participant or a potential participant would self-identify themselves as wanting to be a member of this particular - a particular working group that's been circulated, how they would file a statement of interest or disclosure statement.

It explains how to plan the first meeting. It explains the team roles and responsibilities of the chair - if you want to have vice chairs or if you want to have co-chairs, if you want to have a secretariat.

What role staff would play. Whether you can and cannot or should or should not have outside experts and how you work with ICANN staff to ensure that you are informed in that process and you get that - that you can use sub-teams. Basically this document doesn't set out a rigid format, it sets out a potpourri of choices that you can do and what those roles and responsibilities or those choices would look like and what they would do if you put them together in a certain particular structure for your work team.

It also sets out the norms for participating in a working group such as what participation level is necessary, guide the chair in deciding whether there is an adequate (representativeness) from the community within the working group or do they need to do more publicizing of this and getting help toward the council and/or the chartering organization to get better (representativeness).

It sets out a way to ensure that the process has integrity. Because it is a bottom up process it's very important that the working group process has a considerable amount of integrity around it so that the solutions or draft solutions that are presented there are solid and come from a well grounded, well rounded position.

It also very importantly discusses individual and group behaviors and norms. I mean one of the things we have at ICANN is we have a diverse group of backgrounds, interests and levels of participation. And this sets out how a working group should function and what the civility level should be and what tolerances there should be for different views and different ideas.

And it sort of gives guidelines and norms for how to behave in a world full of such robust ideas and diversity. It talks about the rules of engagement, how we deal with one another.

A lot of these rules of engagement and behavioral norms have existed within ICANN for a long time but they're very difficult to find. And so this sort of drills things that have been in existence for a long time and places them in one document at the forefront for people to be able to find them and understand exactly what the ICANN Board and the ICANN community expects of one another when it's going through the policy development process.

It talks about the standard methodology for making decision which is a consensus-based model and it explains the different types of consensus that have been identified within this process over the last 12 years. And explains the role of the chair in deciding when there has been consensus and what rules and responsibility - depending on the level of consensus that is identified by the chair and the working group what the roles and responsibilities are for informing the community with regards to that.

It also sets out an appeal process with regards to a structure within the working group. So in effect if there is a problem with a behavior or (representativeness) or there is a problem with regards to consensus it sets out a structure of how to deal with conflicts or disagreements on determinations by the chair of the working group so that we can ensure that those are vetted.

It talks about the logistics and requirements such as, you know, how do you plan a session and what are the general meeting logistics like? It talks about communication and how to use the tools, the collaboration tools that are available through ICANN.

It sets out the understanding of what the minimum requirements are for translation so we can ensure that many - we are informing and receiving input in from many corridors and corners of the world that do not speak English so that they are informed and involved.

It talks about the briefings and subject matter experts and how we would use them and do that. And then lastly it talks about what products and output we expect from the working groups as they put their working product out there

One of the most important things I think that this document does is it also has at the end of each process a requirement that a working group do a self-evaluation about how it performed under the working group guidelines.

And how it performed - and this is something that guidelines recommend that the GNSO review on a periodic basis to ensure that this is living, breathing document doesn't need to be adjusted in order to make sure from any, you know, shortfalls or changes within the community that were not foreseen when this was originally drafted.

So then we have the Charter Guidelines document and this is a separate document. Although it's related and it's in the same document it's a separate section with a separate purpose. The purpose of this is to inform chartering organizations about the general format and procedure for drafting a charter that would then been used by the working group to inform it's work in the policy development process.

You get some general implementation guidelines like how you announce the working group, it talks about the transparency and openness, what the role of

the chair is, what other roles are. And most importantly it gives a charter template that sort of can be used by a chartering organization.

And it leads you through a series of questions and bullet points that you then can inform so that we get some standardization within this such as, you know, the mission, the purpose, what the deliverables will be, staffing, organization, rules of engagement, document history - how that is all going to be handled.

And importantly it gives a chair checklist to be used by the working group chair to ensure that they themselves are also making sure that as they launch a working group they are doing so in somewhat of a structure that will hopefully lend while flexibility also some level of consistency to the working group process as we move forward.

You need to know that if you look at this document as it's been posted for public comment there are a number of placeholders that have been placed in the document. Because the Operations Steering Committee - I think that's the - OSC is proper but what they're doing is they're looking at certain particular issues that they have yet to come to a consensus solution to or recommendation for.

And we know that whatever solutions or recommendations they come to if eventually accepted by the PPSC and then the GNSO would need to be put into this document. So what we've done is we've put a placeholder there under a heading knowing that that work has yet to be completed and understanding that when it is completed it will just be slotted in to this particular placeholder.

So once the PDP Work Team finished it's work specifics for that work group need to be incorporated into this document as well. And again there are placeholders in this document that are there waiting for the information

coming from those particular work teams that are continuing to do their work in tandem with the Working Group Work Team.

So right now we're in the public comment period. It has just now been a little over a month since it's been posted. There is another 12 days left in this particular period. And what we're looking for from the community is for a review to see have we touched on all the elements? Have we covered everything that needs to be covered?

It's like so many things when you're the drafting team and you're working on this you begin to see only the tree and may lose sight of the forest. And so we're asking for folks who may have a little bit more of a broader landscape because they haven't been focused on the particulars of this particular project to help inform us and let us know if there are things that we need to tweak, have we missed something, is there something else we need to look at?

Did we get it right for the procedures and the guidelines we put out there? Are you comfortable with those? Do they seem like we've struck the correct balance with again some type of structure but a structure loose enough that it allows for individuality with a working group.

So that - because each working group, you know, there's no limit on size. Some could be as big as 60, some could be as small as ten. I mean there's just no formalized absolute hard and fast rule. But there needs to be some general guideline for some type of consistency so that we all have a basic understanding when we talk about a work group how that functions and how it operates. Do we need more detail? Do we need less detail?

These are the kinds of things that we're looking for. And if you'll see here Marika has - Marika, I'm never going to get that name right. Marika has so graciously placed into the slides a link that you will see here to the public comments posting on the ICANN Web site.

Again which would have a PDF copy of the particular guidelines that we've put forth, and the opportunity for you then to post a comment to help inform us about your opinion about the work that we've done and whether you agree, disagree, believe that we need to do more, we need to do less to help us inform our project as we go forward.

So now I'll open it up to the floor, to any questions or comments. Marika is here too. I was hoping Avri Doria and Cheryl Langdon-Orr would be here because they were also very active members of the team. I don't - but Marika if you would help me answer questions so that I'm not sitting in a conference room at 4:00 in the morning alone having to field everything.

So I'm opening it up to the floor. Ask away.

Marika Konings: Steve DelBianco please go ahead.

Steve DelBianco: Marika and J. Scott great work on this. I wonder whether we could add a few flow charts or work flow diagrams at appropriate places to sort of crystallize, give you a break from the text.

And pretty sure you probably drew some things on a white board or back of a piece of paper or a napkin while you were meeting and so it doesn't have to be fancy. But there are a couple sections where either the interaction between parties - we'll call that a context diagram, begs for one of those. And another would be places that call for a workflow and as things flow over time from when the group (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: I think that's an excellent idea. And, you know, there are people who are verbal and people who are visual and you want to make sure that you're reaching people in different modes of expression so that you are as clear as you can be.

Steve it would be wonderful if you could - if it was nothing more than a one or two page public comment where you make suggestions about where you think those workflow diagrams could come in and we'll certainly take that under advisement.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks J. Scott. Mikey O'Connor has a draft one because the BUC is preparing some complimentary comments and that'll include a chart or two.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Great.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: I'm wondering (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Anyone else?

Marika Konings: (Chuck) is in the queue. (Chuck) go ahead.

(Chuck): Thank you. Let me first of all compliment the Working Group Model Work Team because you guys did some great work. And I really appreciate all the time you spent into this. This is one of the very important and critical things going on with regard to GNSO improvements. So my compliments and my thanks.

First a fairly simple comment and question. You use the term chartering organization throughout and that's fine. And I'm curious though as to why you chose that general term. Is it because you see this being used possibly by constituencies and stakeholder groups as well or did you have some other reasons?

And by the way I think a lot of this could apply to us in stakeholder groups or constituencies. So whatever the answer is if you're going to use that term I think it would be helpful to state the reason why you chose that.

J. Scott Evans: Personally I believe the reason was because we believed that the GNSO was not the sole body within the ICANN community that could charter a working group.

As I said before we thought the ASO might do so and other groups supporting organizations and/or advisory committees. And certainly stakeholder groups and/or constituencies could choose to use this model if they felt like it fit within their particular organization.

And that certainly isn't a problem (Chuck) to say that we've used a generic term in order that this might be more broadly applied.

(Chuck):   Thank you J. Scott, that's very helpful. And again I think it might be helpful especially maybe for those of us old timers when you first see that you wonder what's a chartering organization? But I figured it out, it didn't take me too long. Still an explanation might be helpful.

The second point in Section 2.2 the liaison bullet says, "The liaison is expected to play a neutral role." I think it might be better to say something like, "The liaison is expected to play a neutral role in communicating information from the working group to the CO and vice versa."

And my thinking there is, is we have such a challenge finding resources for working groups and in addition in finding liaisons that - it'd be nice if we could have liaisons that all they do is serve that role. But I think more common we're going to have liaisons who serve that role but also may represent their constituency or stakeholder group or advisory committee, whatever the case may be.

And that's why I suggest a little more general language. Because in cases where they are also representing their constituency or stakeholder group we wouldn't want to restrict them from fulfilling that role as well.

J. Scott Evans: I think that's an excellent point. Marika can you make sure that gets notated so that we can consider that when we consider public comments?

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Thank you.

Marika Konings: Another question here from Chris and then Steve.

Chris Chaplow: Chris Chaplow speaking. This looks an incredibly interesting document I must admit. I feel as though I've sort of been wandering around the forest and then suddenly come across a bathing pool or something. And I'm trying to understand how I completely missed out on any of the information or - from this work team.

So, you know, I just want to say that then I'll also go over and read the document and get up to speed and luckily I'm still within the comment period. Because I've just (unintelligible) with the CCC team being on my first working group. So I think a lot of the novice experiences that are sort of still fresh in mind and I should be able to make some comments. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Super.

Marika Konings: Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco. In the section on the chair I want to make sure I did - that if it's in here that may I have missed it. But when a working group first meets in those awkward meetings when you're trying to figure things out, sometimes over the phone it's a really tough time to pick a chair before you know very much. And something I've done in other organizations was to appointment, sometimes by acclimation, an interim chair - a staffer or somebody more senior. Is that in here J. Scott and I missed it?

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I think it says that - I believe it's, it may be the liaison who serves as the chair but we'll look at that. But there is some sort of provision for that.

Steve DelBianco: And if the liaison's not the appropriate person I guess I want to suggest that we do everything possible to make it acceptable practice that when the team first meets the last thing I want them to worry about is jockeying for...

J. Scott Evans: No. We - it specifically states in the document that the lack of a chair should not slow anything down.

Steve DelBianco: Would you go so far as to say that no working group should even elect it's real chair until the second or third meeting?

J. Scott Evans: It just depends. We're not going to be that rigid because some may come in already knowing who they want their chair to be. I meant that's the problem with this you can't - you have to allow I believe and I think the group would agree flexibility that, you know, both of them are okay. One that needed to wait two or three meetings before they elected the chair and one that came in and they were all at consensus on their chair before they even get started.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to imply that it's shall. There's plenty of times in this document where we use the word should in...

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Steve DelBianco: ...a way of being advisory. And if I were to prepare a comment whether it's through the BC or individual along the lines of, "Working groups should appoint interim chairs for the first meeting or two," how would that wash with those of you who worked on it? Is that something you'd reject out of hand or is it a reasonable idea?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Maybe one comment. Because some of the working groups follow a drafting team and there you might have already had people that have

worked together with each other for quite some time. So in that situation there might be a very clear idea in the first working group meeting who would be the appropriate person to chair.

So personally I think it's, you know, I would leave it up to the working group. But make it maybe clearer that they have the option that they don't have to elect a chair at the first meeting. That indeed they can go either with an interim chair or the liaison that normally serves as the interim chair until the working group is formed to make sure that they know what the options are - my personal opinion.

J. Scott Evans: I agree.

Steve DelBianco: As a - when I was a first, a newcomer to working groups at ICANN the first call somebody who really had an agenda, knew how they wanted to drive things would volunteer to be chair or would sort of be chair by the end of the first call.

And having a document I can point to as a newcomer and say, "Well, you know, we don't really have to have a chair first meeting why don't we defer that? In fact it's even a recommendation of our Working Group Guidelines." That sort of takes the air out of that balloon to give us a chance...

J. Scott Evans: Yeah. I mean that's true and I agree. But again all we would do is say that it's not necessary. We're not going to tell you that it's the best practice to wait because as Marika said many times - many times these things come in and everybody's very comfortable with who the chair is going to be.

But I agree with you Steve we need to give a mechanism for a newcomer that wants to raise a point of order to say, "This isn't a requirement in order to continue," have something that they can point to to justify that position.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks J. Scott.

Marika Konings: (Chuck).

(Chuck):   Thank you. I just have a couple more comments. But let me first of all follow up on that. I thought the vertical integration kickoff meeting that occurred just an hour or so ago was a good example of how it can work. I'm not saying it has to work this way I think your point's are well taken in that regard because we need to be flexible.

                    And that is we had selected a council liaison, the council liaison temporarily chaired the meeting and it was actually decided in the kickoff meeting today because the membership isn't complete yet to hold off in selecting a chair until such time that the membership was more complete.

                    But anyway just to follow up on that I thought that discussion was very helpful. And now...

J. Scott Evans: Yeah. I agree (Chuck). I think it's also important and one of the things that at least - Marika can correct me if I'm wrong one of the most important things my team felt was they did not want the absence of a - appointment of a chair to slow things down. So they wanted the working group to be able to have some way to interim push things forward until that formality was fulfilled.

(Chuck):   Yeah. Totally agree. That was good insight on your part. Now I have two more comments that I'll share now. Most of the rest I'll just submit in writing because some of them are more trivial and really don't need to be done in a public session like this.

                    The next one really is very similar to the one I made about the liaison. In Section 6.1.3 the second paragraph says, "The chair should not become an advocate for any specific position." Well I agree with you that the - when the person is fulfilling the chair role they should not do that.

Again very similar reasoning as I stated with regard to the liaison. Often times we have to select chairs who are also an advocate - a representative of their particular organization. Now in the ideal world which of course none of us live in it would be nice if we had a totally independent chair that doesn't have to do that. But often I think we will.

So I suggest it would be better to say something like, "The chair should make," excuse me, "The chair should serve neutrally in the capacity of chair." And any times that he or she is not acting in the chair role should identify those instances so everybody's clear.

J. Scott Evans: I think that that is the reality. The one thing that I am not comfortable with is I do not think the chair should vote. I don't care if they say, "I'm the chair and I'm stepping out my role of chair and I'm going to give my opinion for the group I represent or my personal opinion." Because I certainly as Marika will say did that during this group but I don't think the chair should vote.

(Chuck): Well the problem with that J. Scott is that you're eliminating some possibilities for chair. And I think that we're going to have a hard enough time identifying people who will spend the time and people that have the right skill sets to be chair.

So I don't think we should eliminate those possibilities. In fact at the council level right now if we followed that same principle - and I know this is Working Group Guidelines not Council Guidelines, I of course would not be able to serve as chair. So...

J. Scott Evans: Well (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck):   ...as long as they distinguish when they're - when they are performing a representative role of their organization I don't see any problem with that at all.

J. Scott Evans: Well we certainly will take that under advisement. I appreciate that.

(Chuck):   Thank you. And then my last comment in Section 6.2.2.3 my feeling is its really not always possible to set timeframes in the charter in advance. I think there will be situations when probably we're going to have to have a charter and we ask the working group to, you know, develop some timeframes themselves in coming back to us

                           I just think we should have that flexibility and we shouldn't demand that timeframes always be in the charter. If they can be that's great but I don't think that will always be the case. And certainly we've had that experience.

J. Scott Evans: I agree. And we can look at that. I mean I think what we're most wanting is the issue of timeframes to be addressed. Addressing it in my mind to say that we're going to allow the working group to come back and give us a more robust explanation of a realistic timeline is at least addressing it.

(Chuck):   And that's good. I totally support that. And I just think probably the language should be cleared up a little bit in that regard.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Thank you.

Marika Konings: (Alan).

(Alan):   Thank you. I have one short comment. I'd like to support what (Chuck) said about the chair both having positions and voting. I think if the rest of the committee is willing - or rest of the working group is willing to elect someone as chair knowing that they do have a position of their own and will be voting

then I think that should be the discretion of the committee, of the working group to do that.

Otherwise I think we're - as (Chuck) pointed out we're just going to making a difficult situation much more difficult.

Marika Konings: Any other comments or questions in the room? Steve.

Steve DelBianco: One of the things we have to do is get more people to join working groups who are either brand new to ICANN or they've been sort of on the edges. And we want to encourage them to get involved.

And this document is written for people that understand the process. And I wouldn't for a minute suggest that it be all of it changed to apply to a newcomer. It would lose it's effectiveness, it would be too hard to read.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Well I have - Steve I have for years advocated and I've talked to Rod Beckstrom about this, that ICANN needs to have put on - at it's face to face meetings they need to self-identify potential leaders. And they need to put on workshops with regards to the process and leadership skills in order to keep the life blood of leaders new and growing. So hopefully they will do that.

Steve DelBianco: And J. Scott let me agree completely. And that addresses the need I think for good effective leadership as chair. I was speaking more about members where if I worked hard to bring a few first timers or newbies to, you know, ICANN process.

It might not even be at a meeting. I might be enlisting one of my member companies who's got an expert on a particular topic that a working group has taken on to be it's charter and I want to throw them into the wolves here to get involved on a team.

Now if I refer them to this document it'll take quite awhile for them to get comfortable with it. And I'm wondering if we had a section in there -- maybe I'll get Chris Chaplow to write it because he just went through this -- a section at the beginning he says, "If this is your first ICANN experience relax, here's what your role is, here's what your responsibilities and right are and you could always turn to staff for help or something." Chris you take that challenge? He's nodding yes, J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I think that if you want to submit something like that we would gladly look at it and maybe put it in as an appendix. I think that's an excellent idea. I mean this whole document is to educate and inform and bring some sort of consistency of understanding to what's expected. And so a newcomer has - we want their experience to be just as consistent and positive as we do the old guard as well.

Marika Konings: Any other comments around the room? (Chuck) you still have your hand up?

(Chuck): Sorry about that. I'll take it down.

Marika Konings: Chris Chaplow go ahead.

Chris Chaplow: I don't know if it's relevant to this work group...

J. Scott Evans: Hello. I've lost all audio. Are you there?

Man: Still here.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I'm here. Can the room hear us? Marika?

(Chuck): J. Scott that happened in earlier meetings today as well. We had a period of about ten minutes where we didn't have audio. Maybe it was a little shorter than that and we could talk to each other, those of us dialing in remotely.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I'm going to send...

Marika Konings: Um...

J. Scott Evans: There they are. We missed his last comment altogether.

Marika Konings: Oh. He was suggesting whether it would be appropriate for this group or maybe outside of this group for the development of some kind of newcomers guide to ICANN meetings. Like, you know, are you allowed to sit at the table and...

J. Scott Evans: Oh absolutely, you know, that's a wonderful idea to put together maybe a little - a packet of information that someone could download about being new and going to working, you know, your meetings.

And I don't know if it's perfect for this group or not. I certainly will take it back to them and ask. If it's not it's certainly something we could inform the PPSC that we believe needs to be done Chris.

Chris Chaplow: Thank you.

Marika Konings: Just a note. That might be something broader because of course it doesn't only apply to GNSO. So it might be something more appropriate for I don't know the ICANN Communications Team or...

J. Scott Evans: Right. Right.

Marika Konings: ...the Meetings team (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Right. Right. I do know that the IPC is starting a very similar effort. So - like a new comers packet of information that explains terms, it explains what's expected, it explains all that kind of stuff. So I think that's a great idea.

Marika Konings: Well if you're already doing it we can just copy and paste that.

J. Scott Evans: We don't share, we're IP people remember? We don't share that. You want to pay a royalty?

Marika Konings: (Greg).

(Greg): Yeah. Just one suggestion I had is I know that (Scott Pinzon) is - there's like a Podcast and so it might be nice to do - I'm a big believer in video and a big believer in audio because - and we can try and do them in different languages to get over the translation barrier.

But that is - a big written document is often really intimidating so maybe we could try and enlistment him. I know he's kind of excited about that stuff so maybe we can try and get an audio Podcast on it or a video or something like that.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah. That's a great idea.

Marika Konings: And we'll definitely take that back to (Scott) because I know he has an agenda and, you know, once we get done with this document we can actually do one on the document.

But then maybe as well a separate one on maybe ahead of the next ICANN meeting like , you know, what does it mean and where can you sit and where can you go.

Man: Super.

Marika Konings: Are there any other comments or questions? Do you want to - J. Scott do you want to - do you have any closing remarks?

J. Scott Evans: I just, you know, personally - I personally want to thank Marika for all her excellent help. She sort of took over this project mid-swim from Ken Bour. She's done an excellent, excellent job. She's been pleasant to work with and extremely proactive and helpful. It's been a wonderful experience.

And I think that, you know, Graham and Cheryl and (Jonus) and Caroline and Subbiah and all the wonderful members of the team who gave so very much of their time I think so many people do not understand how very much and how very committed people are just in the backbone of making sure that this process works in a smooth and efficient manner. And I want to thank each and every one of them for their help.

Marika Konings: I want to thank you as well J. Scott for chairing this effort.

Man: Here. Here.

J. Scott Evans: All right guys. Well I'm going to go to bed. So you all have a great day and enjoy your gala. Okay.

Marika Konings: Sleep well.

Man: Thanks Jay.

J. Scott Evans: All right. Bye bye.

Marika Konings: Bye.

                                END