

**Policy & Implementation Working Group Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION**

Wednesday 14 May at 1900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Wednesday 14 May 2014 at 1900 UTC. 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. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-policy-implementation-20140514-en.mp3>

On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#may>

Attendees:

Greg Shatan – IPC
Chuck Gomes – RySG
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Olevie Kouami – NPOC
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – At-Large
Avri Doria – NCSG
Phil Kanofsky – IPC
Seun Ojedeji - NCUC

Apologies:

Anne Aikman- Scalese - IPC
Nic Steinbach - RrSG

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Mary Wong
Amy Bivins
Steve Chan
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: And I would like to remind all parties the call is now being recorded. If you have any objections please disconnect at this time.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much, (Elan). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. This is the Policy and Implementation Working Group call on the 14th of May, 2014.

On the call today we have Phil Karnofsky, Greg Shatan, Olevie Kouami, Avri Doria, Chuck Gomes, Alan Greenberg and we're currently trying to dial out to Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

We have apologies from Anne Aikman-Scalese and Nic Steinbach. From staff we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Amy Bivins, Steve Chan and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Nathalie. And welcome, everyone, to today's call. Does anyone have a Statement of Interest update? Okay, not hearing or seeing anything there let's move on.

Now I want to - I'd like to call everyone's attention that the last item on the agenda is the next steps to confirm our next meeting. A poll was taken and 10 people responded and we kind of have split results. So we want to spend some time talking about that and we need to, before our meeting ends today, decide whether we're going to go with hourly meetings once a week or 90 minute meetings every other week.

And we'll give a chance for those who didn't respond to the survey to speak up and we'll discuss it briefly. So maybe about 15 minutes or no less than 10 before the end of our call and our call today is 90 minutes, we will turn over that discussion.

Now a question I have in that regard is this: Is anybody going to have to leave the call early because I'd really like to have maximum participation when we

have that discussion. If you could let me know; if so we'll move the agenda item up a little bit earlier. We put it at the end hoping that people who come late will still be able to participate. Okay, I'm not hearing or seeing anything so if for some reason you find you can't stay until the end let me know please.

Olevie, did you want to say something?

Olevie Kouami: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Whoever that was I couldn't understand what they were saying. It's Alan.

Chuck Gomes: That was Olevie I believe. And I could not understand either. Do you have to leave early?

Olevie Kouami: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Anybody help me out on that.

Alan Greenberg: Something about calendar but that's the only word I got.

Chuck Gomes: Olevie, are you in the - if you're in the Adobe could you type that in to Adobe?

((Crosstalk))

Olevie Kouami: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Looks like you're in there. If you could type that in I'd sure appreciate it. All right, let's go ahead and move forward on this. The first agenda item after roll call and SOIs is the - an overview of the review chart.

Now I expect all of you to be able to read that clearly on the Adobe screen because I can't so you can - no, I have a printed copy of this. By the way, on this particular chart because it has so many columns and a lot of text what I

did for myself was to print it off three columns at a time so that I can - so it's more readable even in a printed copy.

I don't know if there's some way we can format this to make it easier for our members to make use of it and even to display on - in Adobe Connect. But maybe staff can think about that going forward as long as we're working on this.

So I'm going to turn it over to Marika and ask her to kind of just do an overview. Keep in mind for those that were on the call last week you'll recall we did - didn't expect to be able to go over this chart in detail this week but we want to make sure for anyone who was not on the call last week that you understand what we're doing here.

So, Marika, let me turn it over to you.

Marika Konings: Thanks Chuck. So this is Marika. So as Chuck said this chart basically comes out of the conversations we had last week on trying to find a way to review some of the recent initiatives or actions the Council has taken that weren't PDPs but which may serve as models or examples of how the Council has undertaken action and being able to provide input or advice or guidance or whatever way we may want to call it.

We thought a bit about how indeed to best do that. And as indeed in order to actually compare it and see it in the linear fashion the easiest was to do it in an Excel sheet. But as Chuck noted that does mean that there are a lot of columns and indeed printing may not be the best way to review the information.

On the Adobe Connect screen you can actually zoom in by using the plus and minus buttons at the bottom of the screen so hopefully that should help you actually review the information and have it in a readable format. But

again you won't be able to see everything at the same time as there are quite a number of columns there.

So basically in the columns - or the chart is basically built up on, you know, the top level you have all the different efforts that we identified as part of our conversation last week. And then on the left hand side we included the different categories that we had identified. I think I only made very minor changes to some of the wordings but most of those were actually developed as part of our conversation last week.

So we basically then, you know, did some digging and tried to find all the relevant information in relation to all of these efforts. I mean, a lot of that information is, for example, available on the GNSO Website. We also went back to, you know, the Board resolutions or Board letters that triggered some of these activities, you know, worked our way through the different - the elements here.

And I think that a key part that we really would like you now to focus on the part at the end which talks about the strong points and weak points. Several of you volunteered to have a closer look and many of these projects, as I think many of you have been directly involved in one or more of these.

So really would like to encourage you what, you know, Alan and Chuck have already been doing and you see that in red and green on the screen here, to basically start listing what were the strong points and what were the weak points of some of those initiatives because I think we're really hoping that by capturing that information we may at the end of the day, you know, be able to say okay these are some of the really - examples which were perceived as a very well or good process.

And these were some of the lesser ones for these and these reasons. And hopefully that will help inform the conversation on what kind of process or

processes the working group may want to recommend to develop in relation to the specific deliverable.

Having just briefly, you know, looked through this again just before the call, you know, one thing occurred to me, and it may be a column we may need to add is actually capturing whether the input or response or feedback sought from the Council specifically related to GNSO Council or GNSO recommendations or whether those were kind of new items.

Because at least looking through, you know, several of these I think there is maybe a bit of a trend I think for, you know, some of the items where, for example, the Board came back and say GNSO Council, can you just confirm that this is in line with what you recommended?

Or, you know, do you have anything to add to the recommendations you already sent? I think in those cases you'll see that most of the efforts took more of a kind, you know, a few members writing up a response, Council to review it and writing back to the Board, you know, without any further public comment or big consultations.

Well, on some of the other items that were really kind of new topics, you know, for example, I think looking at some of the inputs sought on the IGO INGO recommendations or, you know, trademark clearinghouse, I think those were more efforts where indeed a whole working group was formed and a more lengthier process were put in place.

So maybe that's a kind of distinguishing factor that may also influence eventual conversations on, you know, what works, what doesn't work or what works for certain situations and what may not work for certain circumstances.

So again you're all encouraged to have a closer look at this document literally and figuratively to make sure that we have captured the correct information. Again, you know, please if you were involved in any of these efforts also look

at the other columns to really make sure that we captured all of the different steps that took place and all the information there.

But again the specific focus of everyone should hopefully be the strong points and weak points so we can populate that and hopefully at the next meeting or the meeting after that, take a closer look at that and see if we can, you know, distill from that some kind of, you know, lessons learned and, you know, pluses and minuses that any potential process that the working group may want to recommend should have.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. And this is Chuck. So again several people volunteered last week to take a look at particular projects that are listed across the top in the columns; things that they were involved in or particularly interested in.

And to review the information there, make sure it's all accurate. And I'm sure it is but it's good to have some other eyes look at it. And then especially, as Marika said, when you get down if you scroll down to the bottom there's a row for strong points and weak points. If you would insert some text there like for example on the second project that's listed which is Special Trademark Issues Review Team you can see in red there are some input that was put there.

If the others can - if you go to the next two columns I added some stuff on the IGO Red Cross IGO thing. So anyway if you can - if others can do that before our meeting next week, if we have a meeting next week, that would be great so that we can do this now.

Like Marika said, let me say it again, the plan is to go through each of these fairly quickly, we're not going to read them on our working group call so it'd be very helpful if each of you can review them.

Have staff do - one of the staff members give us a quick overview of these and then the objective would be okay is there anything beneficial to the tasks

that we have in front of us that we can glean from this particular effort? And then we'll keep track of those and then we'll be able to capture all of those and then use them as we begin to look at specific recommendations.

Any questions on that? Chuck still speaking. Again, the purpose of agenda item two is mainly to bring people up to date in case they weren't on our call last week or didn't get a chance to listen to the mp3.

Okay not seeing any hands or hearing anyone let's go ahead to Agenda Item 3 which is the brief update on the status draft of working principles. And what I'd like to do on that is to put Greg on the spot. Greg can you give us an update there?

Greg Shatan: Unfortunately not much of an update. I think at least one of my fellow drafters who is at the INTA meeting in Hong Kong this week and has been out of pocket and so we have not really moved forward on that. I think they'll be back by the end of the week and I will, you know, concentrate on that for next week's meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you very much Greg. Understand and we'll go ahead and look for that next week. Okay let's go to Agenda Item 4. And we're going to start deliberation on Section C, Question A. Okay? And hopefully that will be brought up here shortly.

And Mary is going to go over that Question A. And looks like we're up there so...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Oh I guess we can scroll, so scroll down if you would to Section C, is that right?

Marika Konings: Chuck, this is Marika. I actually still had a point on the previous item if I may?

Chuck Gomes: Okay, go ahead. Oh I've got a - I'm sorry, I had my - I had scrolled down too far so I can't see staff hands. Okay, go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: I just wanted to note that the diversion of the working principles that was up on the screen before which has clearly marked that Section D is still under review; it is posted on the wiki as well on the working group documents where we also have the working definitions. But at least it's there and people can refer and review that. And again noting that Section D is still under review by the working group.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Marika. Sorry I missed your hand. Okay Chuck again. Let's go on. Now let's make sure I'm straight. I know it gets a little confusing but we are in - so we're in - Section C which is on the screen now or it is on mine. Each of you can have control over the screen. Unfortunately C scrolls over to the next screen.

For future use is it - I don't know if it's possible to do this in Excel; I know you can do it in Word. Is it possible to format the rows in this document so that they don't go from one page to another? It may not be in Excel. I was trying to find a way to do it and I didn't succeed. In Word you can but anyway so you will just have to - for now I'll turn it over to Mary to go over Question - the Questions for Discussion Question A.

Mary Wong: Thanks Chuck. As you mentioned this is already on the screen for everybody but you can also scroll down and expand or magnify if you wish. Just a reminder that last week the group had agreed that the question before this one, which was B, that would be parked it for now until the group has completed its review of A, which Marika described; C, which we are going to start talking about now and I believe there's also a section D.

So these questions derived from the draft framework paper that had been prepared by ICANN staff a while ago before this working group kicked off. And these are just some questions for discussion.

And so the question that we're going to start off with is right there on the screen. And basically and the PDP process of the GNSO right now there is a discussion of the implementation phase, after a PDP's recommendations have received Board approval.

So that's already there. The question however is whether while doing that PDP, so before the recommendations and so forth, should there be a discussion or detailing of the level of implementation? So that's one part of this question.

And of the second part is something that we've already started to do, as many of you know in some of the more recent efforts which is the convening of a community-based implementation review team.

The task of that sort of IRT is to guide ICANN staff as they develop the implementation plan and provide clarifications which may be necessary in a number of situations. For example if the time lag between the completion of the PDP, Board approval and implementation is such that certain clarifications or reminders are required or if it's a particularly technical or complex PDP in which case then IRT members who participate on that PDP would be particularly helpful.

So the second question for this discussion is whether or not and IRT should be mandatory because at the moment it isn't. Chuck, I hope that provides enough background?

Chuck Gomes: I think it does but let's see if anybody has any questions. This is Chuck speaking. Okay. Now if - okay, Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry I was slow on the draw. I don't have any strong feelings on this. And the reason why is Council is not going to - have it's head completely buried in the sand. If a decision is made not to have an implementation review team it's likely to be because the issue is such that it just doesn't make any sense or doesn't warrant it. So, you know, yes we could make it mandatory but I really don't see the need.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. And actually that was where I wanted to go first, in other words cover the second question first because I think it's easier. Not seeing anybody else's hands up. Chuck speaking again.

There are cases where it's really not needed in my opinion. There are other cases where it's super useful. In fact there may be cases when there may need to be multiple implementation review teams on different issues.

There's some Whois work being implemented right now and expertise from Registries and Registrars is desperately needed so implementation input from - especially the impacted parties is really critical. There have been PDP recommendations where really a formal implementation review team is not needed.

So my vote, as a member of the group not as chair, would be that we should not make the mandatory. But it may be that we want to encourage them if special expertise is needed to do the implementations. And I'll pause there. Other comments on this. Avri please.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thanks. Avri speaking. One of the issues I have with those - and I have no problem seeing the point that both you and Alan are making is that sometimes we may not need it.

I think there's a problem however in two senses is that we don't necessarily know that a priori. And, B, at other times we've talked about other mechanisms that sort of - you know, staff or someone else has to reading the

implementation team's bell; has to alert it of something going on or a possibility or a question. And the lack of it will become a process problem or could become a process problem.

So now I understand not making it a must, not making it mandatory. And, you know, it's one of the nice things about the IETF classifications that we don't have because they differentiate between should and must, the difference being that when you use should you're saying, yeah there may be some reason why people wouldn't want to do it but, you know, they must do it unless they have a really good reason.

And I think that there's - so I'm wondering if there's something in the notion of there being at least a minimal, a point person, and implementation team of one who is the token holder in case something does need to go further so there's a quick address. And any mechanisms we build for alerting the implementation team have an address. That's my thought. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Avri. This is Chuck. Before I go to Marika and then Alan, one way of maybe accomplishing what you're talking about is to make that default having a review team with the understanding that it's not a must so that's some conscious decision is made.

I'll stop there and turn it over to Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And I think my comment goes more to as well like the deliverable we talk later about in more detail how implementation review teams work. One of the commonly triggered I think by a comment that I think that you made, Chuck.

Because well one - in practice now with, you know, having had some implementation review teams as well is that indeed how do you make sure you have the right expertise?

The way it's currently framed or directed call for volunteers go to the working group that was involved in developing the policy recommendations because, you know, their main objective of the implementation review team is really to make sure that the implementation is conformed the intent of the policy recommendations.

But the question is indeed how do you make sure if there are indeed specific expertise is needed or others outside of that circle want to join how to deal with that in practice.

I think, I mean, you know, in the current language nothing is preventing others to join. But again there are certain risks involved of course because you don't either want to have a situation where people join and actually rehash policy conversations that were already held.

So how can you find that balance in making sure that you have indeed the right group of people there that will work through the implementation and at the same time make sure you don't restrict it which may include, you know, exclude certain expertise that is really needed in doing so.

But as said I think it's more something to put on the table as this is as well a topic we'll discuss in further detail when we get to the deliverables specifically focusing on implementation review team.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Marika. Chuck again. Alan, your turn.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I guess I support what Avri was saying, although I'm not quite sure I like the solution. First of all in terms of the IETF, you know, definitions of should and must; yes we don't have those, perhaps we should but we can get around that with a somewhat complex - somewhat more complex sentence structure. You know, those are just shorthand - defined shorthand.

I tend to agree that you want some way to address a problem that no one foresaw. On the other hand the whole concept of the implementation review team is to not only ensure compliance with the recommendation but to try to ensure compliance with the intent of the recommendation. And it's hard to do that with one person who likely has a particular viewpoint.

And, you know, I'm thinking back to the first implementation review team that we had which was on PEDNR. And although the working group for the PDP was quite large and active the implementation review team became two people, you know, the only two who cared enough at that point to look at the emails and respond.

You know, and it turns out, you know, we were sufficiently balanced but I don't think we had a problem there but nevertheless if you get to the point where whoever is the one person point person for the nonexistent IRT and they disagree with staff we have a potential problem here.

So maybe the solution is you have to have an IRT and it simply doesn't meet if it's not needed or something like that. So I'm sort of rethinking.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Avri does have a point, we can't always guess how these things are going to unfold.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Chuck again. So what if we were to require that the question always be - has to be asked whether an implementation review team or implementation review teams are needed to implement the policy recommendations. And if so defining what implementation work needs to be done and what types of expertise are needed.

So in other words I guess what I'm suggesting is that - the question always has to be asked. And if the answer is affirmative that you need one or more

implementation review teams than the first task is to define what their charter is and what levels of expertise are needed.

Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I'm not sure I'm going to answer your question but I'm going to try to make a proposal. Remember we have what goes into the formal policy, in this case becomes essentially Annex A of the bylaws. But then we also have, you know, a PDP manual which can go into more discussion as to how this can be implemented.

I guess I would have no trouble saying that the bylaw says there must be an implementation review team. But the PDP manual goes into more detail and says that may just be one person, you know, if it's not expected to need anything active we may just have one person who can convene an ad hoc group as necessary or something like that.

So, you know, we can perhaps go both ways and cover the unexpected eventualities at the same time not create undue work where it's not likely to be needed. And anytime we convened a group and call for membership and keep the mailing lists for it, you know, there's a significant effort associated with that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan. Chuck again. Marika, it's your turn.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Actually a little bit more a point of order because actually looking - and I apologize for not having done that before but I should have probably looked through the questions before we came to this conversation.

But looking through all the questions that are actually listed here I think what we've - we basically taken all the questions that were in that section from the staff paper into this document. But as you can tell from this discussion as well

several of those may more specifically actually relate to some of the other topics.

Of course it doesn't mean that, you know, the conversation we're having now is not helpful and, you know, it definitely comes back. But maybe we actually need to run through the questions and actually see which of those particularly relate to the deliverable that we're looking now at.

As said, you know, we're capturing the notes and when we get to, you know, the charter questions that specifically relate, for example, to implementation review teams, we can go back to those and maybe already say, look, we've already actually come up with, you know, an answer to one of those questions.

But I'm just realizing that's I think some of these other questions here as well they more specifically relate to some of the other charter questions than the one that we're currently looking at. And again I apologize for not having thought of that before.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck speaking. Marika, then do you think that this question that we're focusing on right now whether a - excuse me, and implementation review team should be required, should be deferred to another deliverable instead of Deliverable 1?

Marika Konings: Yes. So this is Marika. There is a specific question that deals with implementation review teams and indeed as well how could they be - should there be more detail in the bylaws and in the - or in the PDP manual relating to those as (unintelligible) very little.

I think it also may come back indeed to some of the implementation related questions because I think the question we're now really looking at, what kind of other mechanisms, you know, should or may the Council have to develop, you know, policy that's not consensus policy.

And still, I mean, if people think that this is still very relevant to that conversation as well, I mean, I'm not suggesting that we can't talk about it now. But maybe as a priority we may want to actually walk through the list and pick out those questions in which we believe are specific to this topic and maybe first focus on those and take those that we believe are more specifically related to some of the other charter questions and you know take them in that conversation.

Chuck Gomes: So taking you up on your suggestion, assuming others agree - Chuck speaking again - is that something that staff could do after the meeting is to go through the questions and move them to the appropriate deliverable where it's most applicable answer so that we don't go through these exercises multiple times. Is that an exercise that staff would be willing to tackle?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes, definitely.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Anybody opposed to that approach? Okay, not hearing or seeing anyone. So then with what we're talking about right now the decision then would be to do for this specific question about whether a review team should be mandatory to a later deliverable and that will be moved to the appropriate place for that - when we get to that deliverable. Okay?

Now let's go back to the first question then and let me put Marika on the spot. Do you think that the first question, since staff hasn't had a - time to do the exercise I just requested - the GNSO PDP process specifically discusses the implementation phase. After that PDP (unintelligible) approved by the Board. Accordingly, should the level of implementation that should be part of the actual PDP be - well, let's see, I'm looking on screen and it's missing on the screen so I'm going to go back down.

So should the level of implementation that should be part of the actual PDP be detailed? In other words I think that's asking whether or not the PDP recommendation should include the detail of what implementation is needed. Did I capture that question correctly? And - go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Yes I think you did but I think your question was does that belong in relation to this conversation? And I don't think it does; I think it relates as well specifically to those conversations that relate to the implementation phase and how...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So that one - unless anybody says differently we'll defer that one and move it. Which means we I think come then to Question B. And let's take - if you can scroll your Adobe screens down to Question B. and I guess the first question we should ask is does this one - does this question need to be answered in order for us to fulfill Deliverable 1?

Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks Chuck. Marika and I were just discussing this. And it seems that this is more in the ballpark of Question A that we've more or less decided to not to discuss at this time because it really focuses on implementation, guidance and proposals.

It seems to us that unless the group would like to take B at least part of it as like the last part where it says that whether or not there should be just general implementation suggestions in any sort of guidance it seems to us that maybe Question C, the next one, has a better fit with this particular deliverable.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody object to deferring B and going to C? Okay let's do that. And so let's pick up on Question C. And, again, this one's probably going to split between two screens in Adobe, although I'm able on my screen to get some of both pages.

So we have on this one then, and just reading the first part of it, "When policy recommendations are started as high level principles ICANN may need more community involvement in reaching the implementation details." That of course is what we experienced with the new gTLD process.

"As part of this work the Board has begun a process of soliciting policy advice on whether specific implementation ideas are in line with the principles stated in policies."

What is that referring to in terms of the Board process? Does anybody know?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think it's, for example, you know, the recent request from the Board on the Specification 13 where they basically wrote a letter. And I think there have been others as well. And I think on the review element we can see as well whether there either was a resolution from the Board asking for input or I think even in one of them they actually used the term I think policy advice.

I don't recall exactly which one that was. But I think it has taken different forms, you know, the form of resolutions or letters that were directly sent by the Board to the GNSO.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marika. Chuck again. So I guess I was misled by the fact that it makes it sound like the Board has started a process of - it's not so much a process as it is a - as started a practice of soliciting policy advice. I think that's what threw me off; it may just be me. So okay I'm okay with that if that's what it means.

This has been an area of confusion for the community. And then it mentions the IOC Red Cross names. "How can such a consultation mechanism proposed above as a policy guidance working group be improved to clarify this advice seeking role?" Let's pause there and see what thoughts people have on that question.

I mean, do we want to get - start talking about policy guidance working groups? And how is that different from an IRT?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. If I can maybe provide a little bit more context because I think the policy guidance working group refers back to the - well I think at the end of the document the draft framework that we included in the paper. So I think the terms here are - and as well you see in the question it refers something as mentioned earlier that refers because this is a, you know, copy paste from that document.

So in that process that we had put forward as a kind of suggestion on how to deal potentially with changes that may occur as part of an implementation of a policy we had suggested that, you know, if input for policy guidance is sought and it's indeed determined that it's a policy issue on the one hand if the Council determines that it's indeed new contractual obligations on parties, if it's a completely new issue that wasn't considered before then that should move into a policy development process.

But in those cases where, you know, it is determined that it is a policy issue it affects parties but for maybe for a limited period of time or there is new information available or the original approach that was identified is not workable or it does not materially change the intent of the policy but still, you know, it is determined that it's not just an administrative change in that case, you know, the Council could consider forming a policy guidance working group.

And as said, you know, we just coined that term; that's a no - not in any, you know, it's completely open for discussion. But that's a different animal, so to speak, as an implementation review team where an implementation review team is intended to work with staff to make sure that the policy recommendations are implemented as intended while a policy guidance working group or anything in that form would actually look at a new issue which is determined that, you know, a policy conversation needs to be held.

And in that framework that we put in the paper we actually even, you know, proposed some steps or some guidance of how such a group could look. And again I think the caveat here is that initially the paper itself focused more on the broader policy implementation conversation across, you know, all SOs ACs and not only GNSO specific so that's why in that chart, which is also at the end of the document that's on the screen you see SO AC but basically says well, the - in this case the GNSO would form a policy guidance working group.

The group would consider the working group recommendations and including a public comment. And then the Board would actually consider the feedback from the policy guidance working group as approved by the GNSO and that's a kind of in the cycle.

And again this is a very rough kind of, you know, these are some of the basic steps such a working group would need to follow which we basically just put out again as a suggestion or a starting point possibly for conversation. So just to make sure that the policy guidance working group that that's taken in the context of the papers and the ideas that were suggested there.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marika. Let's go to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I think there's a parallel we have here. If you look at the cross constituency working group that is being formed to create rules for cross constituency working groups, we - cross constituency working groups have

existed and will continue to exist but in parallel with that we're trying to organize them and formalize them.

And I think we're in the same position here with regard to policy guidance, an as-yet undefined term. If you look at the recent decision of the GNSO Council regarding Specification 13, which basically said it is a change in policy but do it anyway. Under our new regime how would we come up with such a decision?

We used an ad hoc procedure in Council over the last couple of weeks. But how would we address a similar question coming from the Board in the future? And I think a policy guidance working group would be the vehicle, using the terminology we're inventing today, to come up with such a decision regardless of whether the outcome is yes or no. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Avri, you're next.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Yeah, I'm actually supportive of the idea and I think it is actually quite a good one. I think one of the things that we've seen from the Board is that they do want to keep coming back to the GNSO to ask these questions, to deal with the tussle that comes up when they get multiple bits of contradictory advice and such.

And, you know, we did have a talk before about, you know, shortcutting PDPs which is something I was very much against, and remain against. But we also need to find a working method that gives an answer quicker than a year and could actually do something in as short as a month if necessary so could be compressed.

I think the idea of calling it policy guidance is actually good. You give it a different name so that it is differentiated from the consensus policy working groups, you know, and such so those are PDP.

And as opposed to the Council spending a lot of time the only place I think I differ with the description that was being given by Marika is that as opposed to the Council going through a long deliberative process on is this PDP, is this not PDP, what do we do, it gets a question like that; it immediately, you know, quick charters, you know, could have a charter template as it were a policy guidance working group on that question. That's the scope of the question. Answer the question.

Now the answer can come back saying oops, sorry this is - this requires a whole issues report and a whole PDP because it could come back with the recommendation. I would probably fight against it but it could come back with the notion, yeah, this goes against our policy but looking at it in the light of three years later and all the argumentation, etcetera, etcetera, we say go for it.

It could come back and say this was not a policy - a PDP policy issue at all. However, we advise this based upon that. And it could do it either very quickly or moderately quickly without - with the whole working group notion of outreach, of openness, of whatever but with abbreviated - without multiple drafts but just one draft with comment, etcetera.

I don't know the mechanics of it but basically to build something that's streamlined to be chartered around a single question that that's (unintelligible) us. So I actually like the idea and think it's worth developing. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Avri. Let's go to Greg.

Greg Shatan: Hi, it's Greg Shatan. Yeah, I support this idea as well. I think the concept - the word that keeps surrounding it is lightweight, you know, a lightweight process that nonetheless, you know, gets the right people in the virtual room, you know, faced with a question and puts together a response to it.

I don't know that I would necessarily use the term working group; even that has kind of fraught with things. You know, so maybe something like a response team, you know, a policy guidance response team since it's generally going to be responding to a question. And that's a term even though it does begin with R it's a little bit different than the other RTs that have been around.

So maybe a PDRT or a PDT or something - or PGT or PYT, although that's a Michael Jackson song, that wouldn't work. So in any case something that kind of distinguishes it. And I think we need to probably delve into some of the questions, you know, such as should it have a charter?

I would think either no or there should be kind of a standard template charter for these things that only needs to be kind of, you know, literally filled in as to what the question and answer should be or, you know, just a framework for how it works without a charter but is kind of understood.

Because, you know, we all shouldn't be reinvented each time. You know, every time I've, you know, been on a working group or a drafting team going through the charter process sometimes it's very, you know, interesting exploration but it can take longer than the policy guidance question itself should take to answer. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. Let's go to Alan and then we'll go to Mary.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. I don't really have anything to add to this discussion but I realized as we were talking that there's something we need to put down as a note for - to look at later on when we get closer to the end. If this policy guidance review team or whatever it's called ends up changing what is essentially a consensus policy, capital C, capital P, we need to make sure we have a super majority voting threshold associated with it. So just something to note to discuss later.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Chuck. I just wanted to clarify or have the group clarify for the sake of the record as well as for absentee or newer members that it seems that some are talking about a working group-like lightweight process, to use Greg's term, that's different from the kind of working groups we have right now.

I should point out that the current working group structure and guidelines that we have are not limited to just PDPs. So non-PDP issues, as I think almost everybody here knows, are normally (unintelligible) by working groups. So I think my first point is a question are we talking about an additional mechanism so that in cases like the ones outlined in this Question C there would be at least two alternative avenues.

One, the existing working group structure with all the (unintelligible) consensus level guidelines, charters and so forth; and, two, this alternative lightweight process we're talking about. That's one question.

The second point is that this particular question speaks to a solicitation from the Board basically asking, as Marika has pointed out the most recent example we have is Spec 13, asking is what we're going to do as part of implementation consistent or not with your high level principles; something like that.

In which case my second point and question is, are we talking about also a process here that could be broader than just a response team as Greg has phrased it. I don't think we've gone to that extent yet but I just wanted to highlight that as well. Thanks, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Mary. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think one of the things you may also want to think about because I think indeed, you know, we probably already have, you know, different processes or models that can be used for certain things. But one thing I think to consider as well is there a kind of basic requirement that every, you know, policy guidance working group or response team, would need to meet in order to, you know, be considered a formal response from the GNSO?

And, you know, are there any add-ons that you could consider? Because for example you could consider if indeed - if such a response is going to be an official Council position maybe you want to make sure that you have at least one representative from each stakeholder group and constituency. That's a minimum requirement.

If it's a completely new issue, again, I think before looking at the - all the different examples in A, you know, there may be a - can maybe distinguish between issues that the GNSO has already considered before or where they made policy recommendations so it's more confirming, you know, what did you say there? Do you agree with the Board that this, you know, is in line with what you recommended?

Or is it a completely new question that is being put forward? And for example if it's a completely new question well then maybe as part of the charter, you know, the Council adds in that it's required to have another comment forum, for example.

And again noting the lightweight and flexibility maybe there's also a mechanism by which there can be exception that the Council can take that noting that if there is a, you know, the Board needs a response for some reason in 30 days that there is a way to say okay this part doesn't need to be done, you know, no public comment for this one as we recognize we wouldn't need it within the timeline but this is the other mechanism we have in place to make sure we have input.

So I'm wondering if you can have a kind of basic process which can have several add-ons that are decided by the GNSO Council depending on the question that is at hand or for what it is being used. So I think as Mary said as well we're talking now about, you know, specifically Board requests or Board input.

But if you look as well at some of the examples we listed for example also things like when there's a, you know, talking about the strategy panels, they put out a report and the Council decided that they wanted to respond to that. Does that require as well a formal process? Or are we just indeed limiting this to response to the Board?

And I think one last element I wanted to add as well is that indeed and Alan already touched upon the voting mechanisms or thresholds is I'm guessing or I don't know if that's implicit in our conversation that whatever comes out of this policy guidance working group would actually go back to the GNSO Council for a vote.

And I guess there then you would need as well to decide how do policy guidance response teams or working groups make decisions? Then what is indeed a voting threshold or requirement on the Council level?

And also is there a requirement then if it is adopted by certain voting thresholds for the Board to respond or similarly to what we have currently with the PDP. So I think those are some of the questions that, you know, we may want to think about as well as we look at this issue.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marika. And of course one of the principles that we've supported that we need to keep in mind as we're talking about these things is that the bottom up multistakeholder process hasn't ended yet; we still want to keep that principle in mind. And of course I think that's some of the things that you

were saying there, Marika, when you talk about voting and things like that.
Let's go to Greg.

Greg Shatan: That's an old hand but I'll agree with everything.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thanks. I put what I was going to say in the chat. At this point we really don't want to use the formal term "working group." It's a defined term. There's some complex processes to establish one. And if you look at this Spec 13 example we didn't have enough time to even set up a working group according to the way we need, you know, the steps we need to follow.

So at this point let's keep a different name. If it ends up being very similar to a working group we can change the name later. But I think at this point let's play it safe and use some other name whether it's response team or XXX.
Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Now I think that Greg agreed and Avri may have disagreed. Is that correct, Avri? Chuck again.

Avri Doria: Yeah, most definitely disagreed.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead - go ahead and disagree verbally please.

Avri Doria: Oh. Well okay. I made the arguments there. I believe that the Working Group Guidelines, especially as guidelines are already sufficient. I think it should be a working group because I don't think we want to give up the multistakeholder bottom up process and the working group is where we've defined that as a guideline.

I think in terms of building a template - I love the idea of building a template where you plug in the question and the form of working group as based on

the guidelines. Remember the guidelines let you define in your charter any permutation of that.

But in terms of reaching consensus I would argue strenuously and at length against getting into voting at working group or any other group level because then it becomes a representative thing and you're no longer working on the consensus of idea, you're working on can I get the votes? How many people do we have in the group? Oh you've only got one; I've got six, ha ha, I'll win the vote.

And getting that Council is where votes happen where it's been (regularized). So I'd be very strongly resistant on the notion of voting. I think we could define a template. I think the working group as the apostle that left us, Mikey, would have said it is our brand. And to give that up in this case I think would be a big loss.

I think that the guidelines we've got can be used to build a template that gives us the spiffy lightweight speedy what have you. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Avri. Chuck again. And you got right into the question that was running through my head and that is using the working group model, which I think I tend to agree with the points you're making there how important that is, how do we keep it lightweight? And yet I think you may have answered that as well in maybe some sort of a template approach could make it more lightweight.

I'll stop there and go to Greg.

Greg Shatan: Hi, thanks. Greg Shatan. I agree with the substance of what Avri said; I don't necessarily agree that we should call it a working group. But I think that whatever it is it absolutely has to be bottom up consensus-driven multistakeholder. It could be based on the PDP working group concept. But I think there would need to be a review. I don't know if the work of this group to

do it or maybe to do it at a lightweight level to look at how it might be similar to the process of a working group and the mechanics and how it would be different.

For instance, there wouldn't be a draft report and public comment; there wouldn't be a final report and a second round of public comment, I don't think because that's already sounding a little bit unlightweight. I think the - some of the traditions of the working group such as only having a call once a week or - actually once every other week in many working groups would also to go to by the Board to be quick and lightweight.

So I think that there are distinctions that are substantial and different from a working group but I absolutely agree that one of the things that cannot be different about it is that it cannot be a voting process and it cannot be anything other than a consensus-driven multistakeholder process which while it's messy, can also be quick. I don't think it has to be slow but I think we need to - our brand is not just the working group per se; our brand is the bottom up consensus-driven multistakeholder thing whether we call it a working group or something else. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Before going to Alan and then to Mary, this is Chuck again, does anybody disagree with this statement that I'm going to make? And that is is that we don't have to call it a working group but we could follow the basic working group principles as Avri was advocating. Anybody disagree with that? Okay. Let's go to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. I agree basically with everything that Greg and Avri said. When I said don't - I said don't call it a working group because that may lock us into some - may lock us into some procedures which we don't want to use.

We may end up with something very close to the working group and in fact by perhaps slightly tweaking the working group rules it may be a working group.

And I don't think I ever suggested do voting within this new mechanism or anything like that.

So I'm - I agree with completely Avri, it needs to be bottom up, it needs to be multistakeholder, it needs to be, you know, not counting votes and trying to, you know, load the group as we have seen in the past. So I'm not disagreeing with any of that, I'm just saying perhaps at this point let's not use that term until we make sure that it fits the needs or can be changed to fit the needs.

And with respect to what Greg said, I don't think reports and public comments or anything are associated with working groups; they're associated with PDPs. Working groups don't have any - I believe any requirement to submit reports and public comments and things like that. I may be wrong but I don't think they do. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Mary, it's your turn.

Mary Wong: Great. And, Alan, in follow up and confirmation, you're right, the non-PDP working groups are not required to produce, you know, reports and public comment periods of a certain time, etcetera. So that's one distinction between a PDP-based working group and a non-PDP working group.

It seems to me that - and this is not the time to go through all the working group guidelines but if speediness is going to be one of the criteria, as we say, and it would seem to me that in this type of situation that we're talking about when the GNSO is asked to respond to a specific question, "Does this or does this not comport with what you recommended?" It would almost always have to be on the basis of speediness.

The two things about the current working group structure that may be a problem in that regard is the chartering process - I think Alan put a note in that in Adobe Connect - and the consensus finding process. There may be nothing that we can or should do about the latter because that does ensure

the inclusiveness, exhaustive discussion and so forth. There may be tweaks, as Alan said you can do with the former. It just seems to me these may be the two parts of the stage where you may retard the speediness.

So one possible suggestion to consider, and it may be a horrible suggestion, is whether in these situations presumably the requests will go to the GNSO Council, whether the Council could decide on what those tweaks might be the necessity of it being speedy and lightweight while maintaining the bottom up stakeholder consensus model.

So would this group consider giving the Council some sense of discretion as to in what ways should this particular group be lightweight even while it's based on the Working Group Guidelines.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Mary. This is a great discussion. Chuck speaking again. I have a couple follow up questions and then after allowing some discussion on that a suggestion as a way forward.

The - first of all what would - does anybody have any thoughts with regard to what the membership would be of this response team or whatever we're going to call it? We can worry about that later maybe after we get more meat around it.

And the second question is, it's not totally clear to me, and I'm probably just slow on this, how this - is differentiated from an implementation review team. So anybody that can respond to either or both or those questions I'd appreciate it. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I think we addressed the implementation review team before. That that's looking at making sure that the working group is kept on track; that the implementation is kept on track whereas this is looking at something, you know, which might conceivably change a policy recommendation.

The interesting part, however, of what you just asked, is I'll note that on the implementation review team so far we don't have any rigid structure, you know, of representation and, you know, reporting and anything like that. It's much more of an ad hoc process that, you know, maybe that's the direction we're going to go in although I doubt it, on this guidance working team, whatever we're calling it.

But I don't see the overlap at all between the IRT and the guidance groups we're talking about so maybe I'm missing something that you're seeing.

Chuck Gomes: Alan, let me respond. This is Chuck. So you said an implementation review team is to make sure it stays on track. Isn't part of the question that we're asking with regard to policy advice is whether it stays on track? I mean, that's what the Council was doing with Spec 13. And they decided it wasn't but it was okay to proceed. You worded it better than I did.

But so anyway we don't need to belabor that...

Alan Greenberg: Well an IRT - if I may answer - an IRT would not have the discretion to do that.

Chuck Gomes: To do what?

Alan Greenberg: To say go ahead anyway even though it's a violation of the policy.

Chuck Gomes: Oh I agree with that. But...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: The sanity check part...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: The sanity check part does overlap.

Chuck Gomes: ...staying on track.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, the - yes the sanity check part of the IRT - and this - and the first part of what this group might do could overlap from that perspective.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah and that's all I was getting at so - but anyway we can deal with more specifics on that later. I don't want us to get bogged down on that. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Hi, it's Greg Shatan. Couple things. First my response to the question of how does this differ from an IRT is that an IRT is not put together to respond to a question or to provide policy guidance as such; it's put together after a PDP has, you know, generated a policy.

And then it's kind of the extension of that working group into the implementation phase so that there is, as Alan says, you know, a team that's in place. Not put together to respond to a specific question but to kind of be, in essence, kind of a monitor, among other things, of the process.

You know, and a response team or a response working group or whatever we're going to call it, you know, doesn't exist until a question arises for which it needs to be brought together and then would, I would expect, be disbanded after that particular question is answered; it would not be a standing group whereas the IRT would at least be in place so long as implementation was taking place and might even exist as implementation moved into actual - into the work of the thing that's being implemented actually being put into use.

So I think that's the difference. And I think it's also different that, you know, an IRT is not going to be - while it might have many stakeholder groups in it is not, you know, trying to force it to be, you know, fully multistakeholder when there might only be, you know, one, two or three people who want to be involved I think would be a mistake.

But for purposes of making actual policy guidance a, you know, really should be firmly multistakeholder. I think one way to look at it too is that if an IRT sees something that, you know, really requires a policy question to be answered that a policy guidance working group or policy guidance response team would then be formed to answer it. So that's how the two might interact and kind of, you know, kind of compare and contrast with each other.

I would also mention that I kind of speed-read the Working Group Guideline just, you know, you don't look at them - I don't look at them as often as perhaps I should. And I don't think there's anything in there that really - now that I've looked at it - by the guidelines would necessarily make a policy guidance response working group necessarily act slowly other than the chartering - the issue of how long it might take to come up with a charter.

But if there is a lightweight process developed to come up with a charter then, you know, a template that just gets something plugged into it, for instance, then I don't think - there's nothing in the - there are no timelines or guidance. The PDP guidelines are actually quite flexible. They just seem to keep getting implemented in ways that things take a long time. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. And by the way I think Avri in the chat dealt with the charter issue in a possibly very effective way and that is the idea of the template might be a way of handling that so that was a good suggestion.

So okay we need to wrap this up for now. As we go through these things we need to, somehow so that we don't take three years on this and so that we hopefully have something to deliver in London, even if it's still a work in progress, get some closure on some of these things.

There have been some just what I think are great ideas shared by all of you on this particular issue. I'm wondering if there's an individual or maybe a couple people, if you want to work together, the problem is as soon as we

start combining little subteams with multiple people it gets harder and harder for things to happen.

Is there anyone that would like to take a first crack at some of the ideas that were discussed about - discussed about in this discussion here today and just - it can be really rough but put some of these thoughts together for us to consider as a working group and moving forward then maybe and developing it into a recommendation?

Because I sense quite a bit of consensus in terms of the usefulness of a - whatever we call it here, a response team, and advice team or whatever that is different than the IRT. And we can eventually clearly state what the differences are, as some of you have done very well.

Is there anybody that would volunteer to just do a real rough draft of something that we could take further? If we try drafting on the working group call it's a very cumbersome but if we have something to work with and then can edit it it's a lot better.

Because I don't want to just - okay we discuss this and then we come back to it later, that takes more time in the long run doing that so is there somebody that would be willing to just come up with some draft capturing of what we've talked about that could be turned into something that starts to approach a recommendation in this regard?

And I see Mary's hand up. Go ahead, Mary.

Mary Wong: Yeah, Chuck, of course what staff will do is the note that we've been taking on the right we will clean them up and put them into the document that's on the screen. That could be a starting point. In the chat Avri also suggested that a few people could work together to then create a sample template charter.

And I don't know if you're referring to one or the other or both but perhaps we could approach it that way. But we can easily and quickly capture these notes and a few people could take those and try to use them to develop a standard template charter.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So I think we have two tasks there. Staff is going to do the notes and maybe that is a good place to start. And then if somebody wants to take that - take that a step or two further in terms of heading towards some sort of a recommendation that I'm sure will be tweaked many times before we finalize it but that would be great.

And then with regard to the - a sample template who would be willing to work on that? That sounds like an idea with a lot of potential on this. So Avri says she'll play for the charter game. Anybody want to join her? I assume, Avri, and I may have missed translated that you would work on the sample template. Thank you, Avri, for that.

Greg, is that a new hand?

Greg Shatan: I'm saying that I would also play the charter game. And also recall that on a recent drafting team I was on, and I can't remember - maybe it was the IGO INGO, that's not that recent - there was kind of a template that the staff had put together, at the least kind of as a boat in the water kind of starting point. So I don't know if any of the staff on the call kind of have a recollection of that.

I mean, if you look at any kind of the charters they do kind of have, you know, a number of stuff - a number of things in common so if there is a good starting point for a template that the staff has in mind that would be helpful too.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And Mary - and keep it brief please because we need to get to the - our scheduling of meetings and so forth in our remaining time.

Mary Wong: Yes, and Chuck, just a note that the current working group charter, the form of it, is prescribed in the current Working Group Guidelines so that may be where Avri and Greg could start and dismantle as the case maybe.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Mary. Okay so unless that's a new hand for Greg I will - is that a new hand, Greg? Okay thank you. So let's switch gears. Thanks for this - what I think was a very productive discussion. We just need to know translate it into some things that we can eventually develop into some recommendations.

Did we get any new responses to the survey during this call?

Mary Wong: Chuck, this is Mary. Yes Avri updated her response and we got a response also from I think it might have been Wolf. So at the moment - and I don't see anyone on the call now who hasn't participated on the poll, fortunately or unfortunately.

But the preference is pretty clear. There's 10 people who voted for a biweekly 90-minute meeting and some of those also voted for a weekly meeting, I suppose they don't mind so it's 10 to 6. But only two people voted clearly just for the weekly 60 minute meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And I hope all of you saw Marika's comment...

Alan Greenberg: Mary...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...on the weekly...

Alan Greenberg: Mary, you meant 90 minutes there.

Mary Wong: Sorry, Alan.

Chuck Gomes: Ninety minutes on what, the weekly was 60, right?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, no...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Two people voted for the weekly 90-minute meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay so there's only two people that voted for the biweekly 90-minute meeting or the weekly 90-minute meeting? I'm confused.

Mary Wong: Six people voted for the weekly 60-minute, Chuck. But of those six people some also did not mind one or more of the other options.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Mary Wong: And 10 people voted for the biweekly for 90 minutes; that was the - I suppose the majority preferred. And this was also a dual option or triple option for some people.

Chuck Gomes: So let's open it up for any discussion on that. It sounds like the leaning is towards a biweekly 90-minute meeting which if we implemented that effective immediately we would have our meeting two weeks from now.

Any discussion on that? Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, the only negative of that is that, you know, it averages 45 minutes a week instead of 60 a week. On the other hand I suspect a 90 minute meeting, although people get tired towards the end, it's likely to be more productive and has less boilerplate and fluff associated with it so the net amount of actual work that can be accomplished probably a similar. So I'm willing to certainly take the majority.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Alan. And that I think the significance of that is coming from someone who had suggested the shorter meeting so I appreciate that. Mary.

Mary Wong: Chuck, not a preference either way; the staff will be there whichever you guys choose. But just a note, we start the biweekly meetings now given the time coming up to London I think you would only have another two meetings, one on 28 of May and one on 11 of June.

Chuck Gomes: So...

Mary Wong: Which may mean that most of the work will be done by email or the list but I just wanted to note that.

Chuck Gomes: And the reality of the matter is we don't seem to get a lot of work done via email and the list; maybe that'll change but in my observation that's been the case so far. So - and I'm not criticizing I'm just facing reality there. So that is true, Mary, but I guess in reality even if we had four meetings that were 60 minutes we're probably still challenged to come up with very much of any substance between now and London.

Alan Greenberg: Chuck, the differences that gives four staff drafting periods as opposed to two.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's true. But what I'm hearing is is that the majority, a pretty clear majority, favor the biweekly 90-minute meeting; in my reading that incorrectly?

Alan Greenberg: Alternately we could do 60-minute meetings until London and then go to the biweekly 90-minute meetings afterwards which would relieve the pressure.

Chuck Gomes: That's a possibility. Anybody want to respond to that? Avri made a good point; it gives two longer drafting periods if you do every two weeks. That's true. Sometimes what that means is people just put it off longer. But it's a good point.

So Sean made the suggestion that we have - I think it was Alan that just said this - weekly one-hour meetings - I assume you mean a one-hour meetings, Sean - until the face-to-face and then go to the other.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, Chuck. Chuck? That's hard to do in a steady-state because it once people are used to biweekly meetings they schedule other things around them. But right now most of us have the meetings - the weekly meetings in our calendar so we could certainly do that - in my mind we could do that for the next, you know, few weeks before London without any negative impact at all.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Mary.

Mary Wong: Oh actually I didn't have a comment; that was an old hand. Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: An old hand, boy a lot of us have old hands. I know mine are old so...

Mary Wong: Or we are old hands, Chuck.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: What's that?

Mary Wong: We are old hands perhaps.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay. Avri, please.

Avri Doria: Yeah, as one of those that needed a single preference, although albeit only today, for the alternate I do think of course you can decide to keep meeting every week for 60 minutes, you could even decide to meet every week for 90 minutes if we want to ignore the preference.

I actually was quite excited because I have another meeting that this conflicts with which means at least one out of every...

((Foreign Language Spoken))

Chuck Gomes: Can somebody mute, please?

Avri Doria: Well that says it better than I could.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Okay.

((Foreign Language Spoken))

Chuck Gomes: Greg, hopefully you can get some words in before we hear that message again.

Greg Shatan: Sure. I would just say that if we go to the biweekly one I think that should be done with the caveat that we need to do more work on the list and that if it appears that by having meetings every other week rather than every other - sorry, by having meetings every other week rather than every week that we are taking twice as long to do things we'll go back to a weekly meeting.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I think that makes sense. Sorry for cutting you off, go ahead and finish.

Greg Shatan: Yeah, no I think that that's really all I had to say because we're going to have to do a little bit of behavior modification here. This isn't about doing half as much work; it's about doing the same amount of work while meeting somewhat less often.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. Chuck again. And we need to wrap this up. And so let's go - our next meeting will be in two weeks, it'll be a 90 minute meeting. Let's get the word out on that. And like Greg said, between now and London we will evaluate whether that helped our productivity or hurt it. And that will depend on all of us in terms of contributing in between meetings; that's going to be significant.

And if people will produce drafts for us to consider like Avri and Greg volunteered to do today and like staff is going to do with regard to summary for Question C that will greatly facilitate our progress. And I really appreciate it.

And if we can spread that worked out so it's not the same people always volunteering, I know Greg is already involved in one thing he's volunteered to do and now he's doing another one and I appreciate that but if we can - if others will volunteer and spread the work out on that would be very helpful.

Anything else before I adjourn this meeting? Greg. Oh okay, no Greg. Not seeing any hands or hearing anyone speaking up. Thank you very much. Again, I think we - some great ideas were surfaced on Question C. And hopefully we'll be able to head towards some closure on that one in the next meeting or two.

So that said I now adjourn the meeting. Thanks again.

Mary Wong: Thank you, Chuck. Thank you, everyone. Nathalie, Operator, we can stop the recording now.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much for your support today, (Elan). Bye-bye.

Coordinator: Thank you. And this does conclude today's conference. You may disconnect at this time.

END