

WHOIS Task Force Teleconference
Transcription
29 January 2007
15:30 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of WHOIS Task Force teleconference on 29 January 2007. 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.

<http://gnso-audio.icann.org/WHOIS-20070129-tf.mp3>

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jan>

Participants on the call:

Jordyn Buchanan – Chair

Marilyn Cade – CBUC

David Fares – CBUC

Tom Keller – Registrars constituency

Ross Rader - Registrars constituency

David Maher – gTLD Registries constituency

Steve Metalitz - IPC

Avri Doria – Nominating Committee appointee to GNSO Council

ICANN Staff:

Maria Farrell

Glen de Saint Géry – GNSO Secretariat

Glen Desaintgery: ...and we got three constituencies in every - on (unintelligible).

Jordyn: Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Is that right? Registrar's business and registry.

Jordyn: Are there...

Okay, why don't we - are the - Glen, can you just run through - who do we have on our call again real quick and we'll make sure we're not missing anyone?

Glen Desaintgery: (Jordan) on the call. We have (MarilynCade) from the business constituency. Ross Rader though I think he's on mute at the moment from registrar and (Tom Keller). (David Marje) from the registry constituency. (David Fares) from the business constituency and (Avria Doria), from the nominating committee.

Jordyn: Is there anyone on the call that Glen didn't name?

(Maria): Hi, it's Maria. I just joined.

Glen Desaintgery: Hi, Maria.

Jordyn: Okay, great.

So I don't think we have anyone from the... (IPC), the ISP's or the (NTU) (unintelligible).

Glen Desaintgery: That's quite right. Yeah.

Jordyn: I think that would be - that's the way to go.

Operator, if you're listening in, can you start the recording now?

Coordinator: Sir, it will just be a few seconds.

Jordyn: Thanks.

So, if you're working - no I mean, we're about to start being recoded and if you don't like that, you should hang up now.

So, the agenda for today's call, I wanted to make sure that we understand the work remaining before we...

((Crosstalk))

And I want to make sure that - I'm actually hoping that we can have a relatively short call today but identify all the remaining work that we have to do, a bunch of which I'm hoping we can assign to ...

((Crosstalk))

Jordyn: I'm hoping that over the next - hopefully next week, we'll be able to incorporate any offline omissions and talk through any other changes. And then the following week it will be - we will be done.

So with that in mind, specific topics I want to talk about are, number one is a topic that (Ross) had raised before as something that we should include and I agree is success metrics as a new topic. It doesn't yet exist in the report.

I want to talk briefly about access to data. But I think we actually haven't probably gotten a lot further than our last call. And I don't necessarily want to spend a whole lot of time on it on the call itself.

I also want to talk about the way that we're - we probably need to put here some sort of response to the public comments that we received. And then the - or at least - yeah,. I think - I actually think it would be good to make sure that we're being responsive to them.

And then the last thing I want to do is just review the general structure of the report and make sure that we're not - there's no other areas in which we're actually missing content that we need to be adding prior to the - prior to its completion.

So is there any other topics people would like to discuss on this call? Okay. Well then, why don't we dive right in. First topic then is success metrics. And I think (Ross) is on mute but I'm hoping he can un-mute and maybe since he had initially introduced this idea, talk through what he had in mind. Then we can use that as a starting point for a conversation of what we might want to include along these things.

So, (Ross)? Or maybe we won't get him off mute. Okay. Well I will...

Ross Rader: Hi, Jordyn.

Jordyn: Oh, there you are.

Ross Rader: I've got one of those smart phones. It's not too smart it takes me forever to do everything.

Jordyn: Yeah, no problem.

Ross Rader: How's my line quality? Is it okay?

Jordyn: Yeah. It seems fine.

Ross Rader: Okay. I can't talk much louder. I'm on a train so I'll try not to disturb the people around me. Just quickly, one of the things of success metrics was really referring to writing some statements into the policy that allow the task force and these units so as a whole to really measure the success of the implementation after the policies have been implemented.

We had a similar statement written into the (transfer set) policy a few years ago. They called for a quarterly - sorry a three, six and 12 months review of the policy. That review is still ongoing.

And I think it's a very useful way for all of us concerned whether or not policies really worked after the facts. And provides a quick and easy means without necessarily substantiate full expediency of doing so.

So that was generally what I kind of put forward there.

Man: Thanks, (unintelligible).

Jordyn: ... anything that makes sense. I wonder (Ross), do you have any initial thoughts about what - of some examples of those might be.

Ross Rader: Well I figured, I think (unintelligible) of the - other than terms of reference to whether or not we've met those goals would be useful for instance. Have we increased as of the total accuracy as a result of the implementation of the quality have increased or decreased registrants. So obviously as a result, these polls include what you think.

Jordyn: Okay. (Marilyn), did I hear you trying to make a comment before? (Marilyn)?
I didn't hear her. Okay.

Yes, so I think, just before we get (Marilyn) back, I think it does probably
make sense to try to put the other - some list of metrics that would be useful
for...

Marilyn Cade: Jordyn?

Jordyn: Yeah?

Marilyn Cade: When (Ross) returned to silent mode he also put me on silent mode. So
hopefully that may have happened to some others as well. Just a heads up to
those...

Jordyn: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: ...listening. Evident a technical issue. I just wanted to say that we did try to
build in feedback as well from the implementation team. And I think that the
success metrics need to be accompanied by feedback from the operational
team on the problems they may encounter or the areas that may not be
completely addressed as they try to implement the policy.

I think on the last call, we had talked about how long it might take to
implement some of the policies and that figure of, you know, maybe 18 to 24
months so maybe something less than that.

It may be that feedback is needed to the council prior to the complete
implementation as well as identification of any concern encountered as the
operational team go to that trying to implement whatever the policy is.

Jordyn: Right. You're suggesting we might even want to have a - before the policy has actually been implemented or during the implementation but before it's fully in place, some sort of reporting back at the - by the operational team at that point.

Marilyn Cade: Well, first of all I think I mentioned last time that we really have to have a feasibility review by the operational team of whatever the policy is that's recommended. So that I think has to take place before even the council votes on this.

You know, we've done that - we're doing that on (PDP 05) for instance. And we've done that previously. That's kind of "Okay, what's it going to take to implement this?"

So that's one step but after that, I think that, you know, if it indeed is going to take - be a very prolonged implementation period, that there should be some feedback mechanisms along the way, too.

Jordyn: Yeah, you know, that might make some sense as well. And what would be - so just as I asked (Ross), like what you might be looking for in this, the best measures. What would you be looking for specifically in that feedback?

Marilyn Cade: So if you take for example the idea that significant changes are suggested and there's going to be awareness raising for registrants, I'd be looking for feedback on what that is, how it's being developed, what the timing is to deploy it. So that clearly will need to be done before the change is implemented.

Jordyn: Right. Okay. I guess that's the - any awareness raising activity.

Okay, so just taking a quick look at each of our, I think, maybe (Ross') suggestion of looking at, in terms of references probably useful, the first two items in the terms of reference relate to the purpose of the - of who is it built and the purpose of the various contacts.

Now I think and beyond defining it, we've had some discussions about making people aware of the policy. So this is where it might make sense to have some feedback or reporting from the staff about.

I would imagine we would want to look at a - just some reporting back on the approach taken. Some of what we ask for as for ICANN in order to set up some awareness, (ages) and so on.

The (unintelligible) for ICANN to complete that and then be what would you'll be looking for some actual metrics, about, you know, whether or not - or you have you actually seen this or you're just looking to get some feedbacks, (Marilyn) on whether ICANN has actually completed whatever awareness campaign had...

Coordinator: Excuse me, (Steve Metalitz) has now joined.

Marilyn Cade: Jordyn, it has to go beyond just we did, you know, we grasped that language it would need to include what's being done to make that language visible and maybe even, you know, it probably depends on the extent of the change that is taking place. And what the depth of change is required on the part of the registrant or the registrar - what needs to be sampled.

Jordyn: Yeah, I would think in all cases actually now, I'm thinking this more, it might be useful to ask the staff to report back on to - on whether people are aware of

the various definitions, you know, what these things are for especially the contact.

That's an area that I think we've had some discussion in the past that some people or many people might not be familiar with the purpose of the various contacts. If we're going to define them, it seems like then it should be a bit - has an effect on people's consciousness .

But I think for terms of reference items one and two, I would suggest that two items - the two things that we'd want to look at are - to report back on what if anything ICANN did to make people aware of the changes and then two, to what extent people are aware of the purposes.

Is there any other success metrics that people can think of with regards to this first two - the first two terms of reference?

Okay. So the third item in the terms of reference then is the access to data terms of reference which includes, I think, two elements. One is how data is made available to the public and the second is how data that's not made available to the public or that's removed from the public view would be accessed. There's probably slightly different success metrics about that.

(Ross) had suggested something about whether or not we're successfully - privacy that might belong here. But I don't know exactly what that metric would look like.

(Ross), if I can trouble you to get off mute again, do you have any thoughts about what how we might find the metric around the privacy issue?

Or anyone else? Care to - since we may not get (Ross) back.

Ross Rader: I'm back.

Jordyn: Oh, there you are.

Ross Rader: I would count up to 20.

Jordyn: Yeah.

Ross Rader: Generally, you know, it may be that some sort of a, you know, a regular analysis or survey of the specs is on, you know, I'm not sure if you would achieve that through talking directly with registrants to see whether or not they feel it's best.

But their privacy goals are being met or there's a way to do that through media watch list or something along these lines. But I want to think a little bit more of both. That's what I think.

Jordyn: Okay. Maybe we can put an action item here to think more about whether there are sort of obvious metrics that we could use for evaluating the success of the policies with regards to privacy concerns.

So the other obvious sets of metrics I think that would make sense in this area would be - a concern that's been raised in the past is that some areas of the policy changes might affect the possibility to get access to the registrant or to the contact you would need to get in touch with in order to resolve problems.

It seems like perhaps there's another success metric in action - in terms of reference three regarding contactability of the relevant people to resolve issues.

And once again, I think I'm not 100% sure what that is. I know that - does any one have ideas of how you might measure whether or how we've affected contactability?

Ross Rader: I think that one might be a little bit more straight forward Jordyn in that very - we can measure the current situation pretty easily and then compare that to implementation after the policy has been enacted.

You know, compare the performance. So send some messages through the system now, see how long they take on average and then measure that with any future implementation.

Jordyn: Yes, probably - that's probably not a bad idea.

(David): Jordyn, the question is how do we measure contactability?

Jordyn: Yeah, that's exactly right, (David).

(David): It's not just the issue of timing though, isn't it? It's also an issue of the ability to make contact with the different contacts that exist today through his database and publicly available, right?

Jordyn: Well so I guess I've opened suggestions of metrics. But I mean one concern that's been raised I think is the net effect of, you know, like for example the (OPAC) proposal. The net effect is it that you would - it would make it harder to communicate with the right person in order to resolve problems.

So I want to figure - is there a reasonable way to measure it? So one way is, you know, try to get in touch with the information published in whois, and

say, "Okay hey, who would, you know, are you the right person to talk to to resolve a problem and see whether you got a response back or not?" I'm not saying that you'll actually get the problem resolved. But I don't think that not's a problem that (unintelligible) can't fix in any case.

(David): Uh hmm.

Steve Metalitz: This is (Steve). I'm not quite sure how you would measure the base line of that because this is - I mean the reality is there's a lot of different types of problems.

And not only, you know, it's going to vary from one to the other. So I'm not sure - I mean I think you could probably anecdotally ask people, "Was it better under the old system or worse under the old system?" But I'm not sure exactly how you would do it. How you would get a base line now.

Jordyn: Yes so I don't think you'll probably get anything - I think (Ross') suggestion is you have to figure out some email that would relatively generic I guess. And you wouldn't try to say like, "Hey if I were trying to contact you about like , you know, trademark concern or about a doc after about DNS error." We can probably name a specific issue, "Do I talk to you?" But just, "Hey..."

Steve Metalitz: Well, then it's hard to know whether you've actually contacted the person.

Jordyn: So I think that's probably right. But I think it's probably worth measuring now versus in the future whether or not, you know, you can get in touch with someone who will respond to you.

And it maybe that it's not necessary - it may be that it's not an accurate measure of whether that person would actually resolve your problem or not.

But it may, you know, it maybe that you'll get – you'll less frequently get in touch with someone that's responsive and - or maybe they'll more frequently get in touch with someone responsive.

I would imagine once you start talking with a human, you're far more likely to get some sort of action than if you don't get in touch with a human.

So I think it probably makes sense to you. I think it would probably make sense to maybe take a look at both approaches. One would be sort of the quantitative, you know, look at sort of a sampling of addresses and try to get in touch with someone and see if it works. And second would be to try to survey people and ask.

Steve Metalitz: Sure. Well, I can...

Jordyn: Whether or not they feel like it's better or worse.

Steve Metalitz: I kind of sense several times that it will do a sampling study of the accuracy of whois data which I guess is a contactability issue. But I don't it's ever done it. So if it had done that that might provide a base line. But...

Jordyn: Right. Well, I think we could make a - in a matter of the policy recommendation that they actually do it which hopefully would provide adequate inspiration to actually measure it.

Are there any other thoughts about other things that we would be looking for for success metric in terms of reference item number three?

Okay. And terms of reference number four is the accuracy or the response to complaints about inaccurate data in terms of reference. So for this one I think, I would think this is actually whether the accuracy survey proper probably goes and in here we would probably - I would imagine we would want ICANN to look at each of the fields that's published and see whether or not - are accurate - in what scale are accurate. That would be the sort of - and look at that both before and after the implementation of the policy.

I guess the other - the second metric is to look at if there are complaints whether or not registrars are actually, you know, if the data is inaccurate whether or not registrars are actually following a policy to take down the site.

Ross Rader: Yeah. I think, you know, from that perspective Jordyn you're just looking for feedback from the, you know, the clients, you know, that could be the form of a regular commentary report.

Jordyn: Yeah. So I think that's exactly right with this topic unless I missed things. Are there any other things that we want to be looking at other than looking at individual data field if they're accurate on some sort of both sampling basis and getting some sort of sense from the compliance staff of whether the registrars are actually taking down sites that are - the domains that have inaccurate data?

Okay. So I think we have a tentative set of success measures here. Are there any other - let me just sort of solicit generally. Are there any other things that people would want to get some feedback on as part of the, either success metric or feedback looped for this policy that we haven't talked about so far?

So I'm going to note there's - we flagged one action item here which is for people to think about and maybe (Ross) in particular. Let me volunteer for it

to think about what - how we might measure the impact of the policy on people's privacy.

I don't think we have a very good measurement there but I'll try to write up some - briefly the other things that we talked about today, success metrics. And I'll try to get that sent out to the list today so we can (unintelligible) on it throughout the questions online. Okay.

Coordinator: Your line is on talk mode. To return to silent mode, press star 6.

Jordyn: Okay, any further discussion about success metrics?

Okay. I'm going to move on then to second topic on the agenda which is access to data. We've talked about this briefly two calls ago. I'd promise to work offline with people regarding an approach, sort of contact-based approach to access the data which I started to write something up. But have not actually talked with anyone about yet.

I think that was only remaining action item there. I think it sounded like that that's kind of a contractual based approach. And the - but of continue to allow people to work directly with registrars with the only two that had any significant degree of support based on our last call.

So I'm going to - once again I'll try to get something out to those that expressed interest on working on this later today and probably need to have some discussions on it on the next call. Is there any other - people had any other thoughts? Or is there any discussion needed in the access to data topic today?

Okay. We're on then to the third topic which is public comments. Actually I wanted to ask a quick question before - of (Maria) I guess. Before we go into the rest of the conversation which is - (Maria), have we captured - there were some public comments that were made at the (mic) and probably our last, Sao Paolo. Are those captured anywhere in the current report?

(Maria): No, in fact they're not. And - but I did do a summary of them at that time. So I could certainly put it into the report.

Jordyn: Okay. Yeah that seems like it would be useful because there we are a couple interesting comments there I thought that might be (unintelligible). Just to make sure we get incorporated.

(Maria): Sure. Would you like - will I put them in this part of the Public Comments section?

Jordyn: I think so. I think we sort of invited people to comment in sort of the spirit of providing public comment at the (mic) so I think it is appropriate.

(Maria): Great. Okay thanks.

Jordyn: So that's one thing we need to do is make sure we're capturing those. The second item is - so we've got basically in the report right now a list - a summary of the public comments received.

And some of the ideas are interesting and some of them are probably not so interesting, but I think it would be sad if we issued our report and had all these public comments and we just sort of went about our business.

And we've obviously talked some about them but I haven't actually any substantive changes in the policy come about as a result. And if we essentially - which is fine I think we don't necessarily have to incorporate all of the - anything and particular from the Public Comments other than to make sure that we understand them or we're taking them into consideration.

But I think it is important but we at least acknowledge them or (unintelligible) on to them. What I was going to suggest is that we might solicit a couple of small groups of volunteers, I think the response to the public comments will probably be a little bit different for each of the special circumstances in the (OPAC) proposal.

And some of them addressed one policy or the other in particular so what I was going to suggest is that we might - I might solicit a small group of volunteers like two or three people.

One group supporting the special circumstances proposal or likely to do so. And one perhaps more aligned with the (OPAC) proposal. And each of those groups might want to put together a brief set of responses to the public comments.

And then essentially could figure out, either (Maria) could do it on her own as a first pass or we could figure out as a task force how to get the comments incorporated into - well the responses to the comments that's incorporated in.

Back when we did the first (unintelligible) task force I think - actually (Steve) and (Kathy Kleiman) went through and with the others some sort of, "If they say this, here's our thoughts about it in response." And that seemed to work fairly well. Here I think we've got - since we have couple different model. A little bit more complicated but still seems like a worthy enterprise.

So first let me ask, does that seem like a good approach to everyone? That means yes. So the next question, can I ask, is anyone willing to volunteer to go through the Public Comments and write responses as related to one proposal or the other?

(Maria): Jordyn, sorry it's (Maria here). If it helps I'll be happy to go through them with people and talk to them on the phone and draft up things for them if that would help.

Jordyn: We will even get staff support in this effort.

(Maria): There you go.

Jordyn: Any volunteers? The alternative is (Maria) and I can just do this ourselves. But it may not be - by this satisfying I suppose for advocates of one position on the other.

Steve Metalitz: Jordyn this is Steve just to clarify. I mean I wouldn't think we would go through in response - you know say, "Here's comment number one." We say this about it. Here is comment number two, we respond in this way. Is this more an effort to kind of draw out some of the (unintelligible) and kind of respond to those?

Jordyn: Well yeah, yeah exactly...

Steve Metalitz: So...

Jordyn: So, essentially, (Maria's) summary of the general sort of ideas that came through.

Steve Metalitz: Uh hmm.

Jordyn: I think we'll be working through at that level not at the individual comment level.

Steve Metalitz: Jordyn I can certainly participate in such a, such an activity -- I mean I don't think we should be too ambitious in terms of covering every single thing that's said, but I think we can kind of identify some of the major points that keep coming through and...

Jordyn: Yeah let me- I mean for example what the- I mean - you obviously - how we would be more in favor of this special circumstances proposal. And some people would say, "You know we like the special circumstances proposal." And you would not need to write a whole out about that.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah.

Jordyn: Others might say, "You know, we think special circumstances proposal need to be changed in a way X, Y, or Z." And you would even say, "Well we did change it," or "It's actually not necessary because of (what)."

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, other people just say "We hate it." There's not (unintelligible)...

Jordyn: Right.

Steve Metalitz: ...on that.

Jordyn: Yeah, you know I agree with that as well. So the comments that are essentially that either are trying to provide some feedback with regard to (secret) proposal or ask a question or something (unintelligible) some response.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, so we have Steve as a volunteer. Anyone from that (OPAC) side on this call? It could be either (Ross) or (Tom) or (David) or (Aubrey) - up for volunteering? Okay, well - I'll try to actually talk with people off line and if I can't find a volunteer, I'll work with (Maria) and we'll...

Marilyn Cade: Jordan it's (Marilyn), again. I'm not volunteering but I just want to follow up on the clarification. So the purpose of this again is, here are the- here is the feedback we received and here's how the task force has addressed the major clumps of feedback.

Jordyn: Yes, exact- exactly, so basically at the same level that (Maria) has written for summary which is - now here is an idea that was introduced...

Marilyn Cade: Uh hmm.

Jordyn: ...you know maybe this person or a bunch of people supported that idea.

Marilyn Cade: Uh hmm.

Jordyn: Then you know, we've either taken that into consideration or we (unintelligible) it. You know or you misunderstood the proposal and it's not really relevant or whatever.

Marilyn Cade: Or this idea was out of the scope of terms of reference?

Jordyn: Right, exactly. So like this notion that several people suggested actually that we should publish like the registrant's phone number and email address for example.

So the response to that might be "That's an interesting idea but we actually - that data is not collected right now, and we're not in - not in our terms or reference to change the data collected." That might be a reasonable response to that.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, thanks.

Ross): Ross) here.

Jordyn: Yes?

Ross): Actually I was a- I still had the great (unintelligible), so are you looking for an analysis from the submitters of the proposal or from the task force? What time is that part (unintelligible)?

Jordyn: Well sir, I think ultimately we want it to represent through the- well so the problem here in some cases that the comments are either specific to one proposal or the other, or I think the responses from the two- the responses as it would relate to the two proposals might be fairly different.

Ross): Uh hmm.

Jordyn: So what I'm actually suggesting is that at least as a first pass that someone that sort of advocates for one proposal or the other would - or at least one from (unintelligible) will go through and sort of write up a set of comments with (unintelligible) - a comment to the comments.

And then as a task force we can work to incorporate it and figure out exactly how it will fit together and to make sure that we're being generally responsive to them.

Ross): And you're looking for comments to the comments or comments to the summary?

Jordyn: (Unintelligible).

Ross): Because it sounds like...

Jordyn: Yes, comments to the summary

Ross): Oh, okay, okay, okay.

Jordyn: Yeah.

Ross): Yeah, I don't mind helping (OSA).

Jordyn: Okay, that would be great. So why don't we (tag), put Ross's) name next to this for now and if they want to recruit additional volunteers I would (encourage) them to do so? And like - as (Maria) said she's going to provide some staff support for this exercise as well.

I am going to add that just given our time line, we probably need to have this done by the next call in order to make sure that we can discuss it and figure out how it's going to get incorporated into the report before we vote on the report the following week.

Okay any other thoughts with regard to the public comments section?

If not, I'm going to move to our last topic which is just to take a look at the report and I'm just going to open – ask a very open-ended question. Is there

anything missing from the report as it stands right now that should be added, that we haven't incorporated yet?

I think (Maria) has already flagged that there's a couple of things that (Marilyn) suggested that aren't yet in the report, but which are going to be added. Is there anything else that people have seen looking at the report and feel like, you know, we're not addressing or is missing or anything like that?

(Maria): Jordyn, sorry it's (Maria) again and I was going to suggest me doing an executive summary of the report and that would probably maybe two to three pages long. And we could put it – to make it more accessible to people, because it's quite a long report. It's probably going to run to about 130, 140 pages.

Jordyn: Yes, probably a good idea. Just extract the – if this ever gets to like the board level, no one's going to get much further than the executive summary.

(Maria): I'll talk about – so that people can review then see if they're happy with it by next week's call.

Jordyn: Great. Fabulous.

So, okay I added the executive summary. Further thoughts on any additional information that might be missing from report?

Oh, okay. That means we are hopefully getting close to being done in a sort of way that probably I think will - somewhat unsatisfying in the same way that our report on the first release was but then let's be done.

So I think we've got a few several action items from the specifically of the guys (from success) metrics and the public comment. And I'm going to follow up also with the facts of the data.

I think hopefully that will give us several more inputs to the report prior to next weeks call. I'm going to try to get the stuff that I'm – most of the stuff I'm working on out today.

We have some further discussion there in groups that are on the lists. And then I would ask that people have action items that they've taken away to try to get them out in no later than at the end of Friday. So people will have time to review the next call.

And then on the next call we'll try to work to the report we're incorporating everything, talking through any for the final policy tweaks that exist. And then we'll hope to get a final final draft during the course of next week.

Anticipation that will uploading the approved the report as well as the provide some indication of support to the various policy recommendation on – during the following week.

We actually probably - now that I think about it we may need a – one topic I'd like to talk about next week and maybe we can have a little discussion now people point to is.

One thing we've discussed in the past is that the way that PDP structure it is. We probably actually need to submit a majority of report and a minority report.

Right now the way that we submitted the report for the preliminary report that we just sort of they hear a couple of different policy ideas. What we may actually need to do I would think would be to get sort of a cohesive, narrative and maybe two different cohesive narratives one of which is going to be like a majority report and of which is going to be a minority report.

With regards to the motivations and decisions and the policy recommendations that go for that report. And that will have at the other way use the minority report depending on the voting in task force is.

So, (Maria) can I actually ask maybe in order to jump site our process, why don't – can we talk off line and figure out how to maybe put together our first draft of what like a main report a majority or a majority report and then a minority report.

I recognize that – I think the minority report is supposed to actually be drafted by the minority but we can list that together in initial framework that might be, things that we probably won't know what the majority and the minority reports until relatively in this process.

At least put together sort of a general framework that would work of the board of the factual stuff and then a section of a policy recommendations probably that make up - a few section of policy recommendations one of which would be come in majority reports and one of which, you know, minority report.

(Maria): Sure Jordyn I'll be happy to do that.

Jordyn: Great. That sounds like a reasonable (fish) to everyone. I hope that means yes so we'll try to get that out as well as this week. If you want to try to tweak

individual sections or narrative, I think that's probably fine as well over the following week.

Okay so I think we've actually got a fair amount of offline work to do between now and the next call so I just want – sorry was someone - did I hear a comment?

Marilyn Cade: Jordyn this is (Marilyn) I just want to tell you that I need to drop off but I'll catch up with (David) and I know where I...

Jordyn: Okay we're almost going to be finish...

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Jordyn: ...in a few seconds anyway. So since we do have a lot of offline work to do, there's no reason to prolong with call any further, so we will resume next week.

Hope to follow up the action items from this call. And reviewing hopefully what's get starting to look like a relatively final state of work and link together some of the pieces.

(Man): Thanks, Jordyn.

Jordyn: Okay thanks everyone I will see you a week from today.

(Crosstalk)

Glen Desaintgery: Thanks Jordyn. Bye.

Jordyn: Bye.

END