Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Policy Development Process (PDP) Work Team (WT)
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 11 November 2010 14:30 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee Policy Development Process (PDP) Work Team (WT) meeting on Thursday 11 November 2010, at 14:30 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-ppsc-pdp-20101111-en.mp3

On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#oct

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
Jeff Neuman - Registry Stakeholder Group - Work Team Chair
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISCPC
Paul Diaz - Registrar Stakeholder Group
James Bladel – Registrar Stakeholder Group
Tatiana Khramtsova - Registrar Stakeholder Group
Avri Doria - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group
David Maher - gTLD Registry Stakeholder Group

ICANN Staff:
Glen de Saint Gery
Marika Konings
Gisella Gruber-White
Margie Milam
Liz Gasster

Absent apologies:
Alex Gakuru - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's PPSD PDP call

on Thursday the 11th of November we have Jeff Neuman, Avri Doria, James

Bladel, Tatyana Khramtsova, Paul Diaz. From staff we have Marika Konings,

Margie Milam and Gisella Gruber-White. And we have apologies today from

Alex Gakuru. If I could please just remind everyone to state their names when

speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Hey thank you very much. Welcome to the weekly call of the work team. This is Jeff Neuman, the Chair of the PDP work team. And on the list earlier this week you will have seen that Marika has sent around the - what we'll call the draft final report and recommendations which basically takes all the public comments that we've received along with the discussion that we've had the last couple months on the public comments and incorporates it into one report.

Also adds some things about - some details about bylaws and the manual that are some really good stuff. It's smaller than - thankfully it's smaller than the initial report and organizes things I believe a lot better than the way we had done the initial report; makes it more readable.

And so I think what we're going to spend the day doing is going through - Marika is going to go through kind of the structure and highlight some areas that were added that everyone should really pay particular attention to. And then we'll start deep-diving into some of the substantive issues that are highlighted that still require a good deal - amount of discussion.

On schedule we're not going to publish this obviously before the deadline which is the 15th; that's not going to be published for review. We currently have - I believe the schedule and maybe I'll let Marika talk a little bit more about this but the schedule for the Cartagena meeting is supposed to come out on Monday or so or somewhere early next week.

So that we do currently have a timeslot on the Wednesday - either Wednesday or Thursday - I'm forgetting now and Marika will correct me. But we do have an hour and half timeslot that was put on there - or will be put on there.

One of the things we wanted to discuss is whether - is how to use that timeslot and that will in part depend on how much progress we make. But it

could be used in one of several ways. The first way we can use it is if we do feel like we have some things to present to the community just to get some input we can use it as an open session to do some slides and maybe solicit some input on some of the open items.

Or we could just do a - the work team working session meaning that we could use it - it's not going to be a closed meeting, anybody could listen in, but really just use it to continue to - continue the discussion of where we left off. And Marika has put the time on there, it's 9:30 to 11:00 local Cartagena time.

So just FYI I believe that may be - there may be other meetings - well there are definitely other meetings going on that may affect some of you at that timeslot. I believe that it's - and things can change so I believe that's the current timeslot also for the Whois Review team session and the Security and - sorry the Security, Stability and Resiliency work team session. So keep that in mind.

And why don't we - let's start with a discussion of that just to see how - actually, you know what, I'm going to save that, let's save that for the last 10 minutes after we talk through the report. This way we'll get a better idea of where we are but I just wanted to introduce that for now.

Any - Alan just wrote that it's worth remembering that Cartagena time is the same as Eastern Time for remote participation. And with that said any questions on going forward?

Again really just to emphasize this was, you know, staff has done a great job on this - on pulling this together but really your review is crucial for this. I know there's going to be a lot of documents that are going to be posted next week so maybe this could be some incentive to actually do the reading now on this so that we can get some comments in because this is really - after new gTLDs are - the process is launched and we're no longer thinking about

new gTLDs this is really - this work is of the utmost importance for the GNSO and for our ongoing activities.

So with that said, Marika, you want to start walking us through the report?

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika, I'm happy to do so. So you see it up on the Adobe Connect. And as you'll recall from the email there are actually two different documents. There's this, the draft final report and there's a separate document in which I've basically pulled out the different items that, you know, even working, needs some further discussion because there was no clear conclusion from the deliberations to date or where staff has proposed a number of approaches that the work team might want to take into consideration.

Those issues are also highlighted throughout the report but probably for discussion going forward it might be easier to work off of that table. I'll follow up with the draft final report and a lot of the changes just mark, you know, the change from the initial report to the final report.

A number of chapters have been added, some of them have been taken out so I'll just walk you through it. And the Executive Summary we've just made some changes really highlighting the approach we've taken on coming to this draft final report and the public comments received, how we've addressed them through the public - to the public comment review team.

Just a number of items that still need to be added as well, (unintelligible) notes that have been changed here. So basically what I've done as well here you can really see the change in the different recommendations. For most of these we should (unintelligible) forward discussions and try to, you know, basically review the notes I've taken from the discussions also looking at the comments we've made in relation to the public comments received.

And from there try to, you know, finalize the different recommendations especially those where we said we wanted further input or where we had different options. And several of those we have come to conclusion. But again we really encourage everyone to review those to make sure that reflects what the work team agreed upon.

You know, just moving down the list there are a number, as I said, that are highlighted where the work team didn't discuss yet a final approach. One example is Recommendation 10 on the timeframes for the issues report. You know, we did propose a couple of approaches; there were some public comment on this issue. But in terms of why we didn't firmly decide on one over the other or a hybrid approach of the ones proposed here so that's one of the items where the work team will need to do further discussion to come to a conclusion.

Another one is that the fast track approach in Recommendation 14, that one's highlighted as well. In the document staff has made two different proposals that the work team might take into consideration as a recommendation in this area. Again this is based on the discussions we've had.

Part of our own thinking of what might be a way forward here and again this is an item that we would like you to review and explore the different options or think of other approaches that might be appropriate here. And as we discussed this is a draft final report there's still opportunity for the work team as well to put out different options and get specific input on those.

So another question for the work team will be - I've taken it out now from the Executive Summary but in the initial report we also included the flow chart as a way of showing how the new process would work. (Unintelligible) decide that it was helpful to include that here again as well and of course would need to be updated then reflecting the final - of the draft final recommendations that have changed from the initial report to this report.

So then basically moving onto Chapter 2 here we just outlined basically sort of the approach taken that would work on the basis of the different stages. But instead of including that whole chapter that took up a lot of pages in the initial report my proposal would be just to include a reference here and a link to the initial report so people can see there the details of those discussions instead of, you know, repeating that same section here.

You'll see as well this is just a copy of the page of the recommendations because one approach might be as well that the full recommendations are actually here in the Chapter 2 in the body of the report and that a kind of abbreviated version is included in the Executive Summary.

That's something that, you know, the work team can discuss once we've actually finalized the main content and then decide on how much detail should be in the Executive Summary, how much detail should be in the body of the report maybe taking into account as well that, you know, it's likely that only the Executive Summary is translated so do we need to have the full detail of the recommendations there or would a detailed summary be sufficient?

Then moving onto the next chapter which basically addresses the overarching issues. As you'll see here on a number of items I've tried to distill from the notes that we had from the previous discussions a kind of draft conclusion. And again this is an area where the work team is encouraged to review those draft conclusions to make sure that they are in line with what the work team discussed.

On the timing, it's something we discussed before together the different durations that we've discussed so that this would provide a kind of overview of the overall timing a PDP would take. But if there's a lot of flexibility in our proposals you'll see as well that it's very difficult to have a concrete, you know, exact timing at the end of the process. But at least this should give an indication of the different variations and the margins there are for flexibility.

There's some items that still need to be filled in here based on decisions on - in other parts of the document. But this should give an idea of the overall timing of a PDP and the different stages involved.

There are still a number of items as well where further discussion is required. These have also been highlighted. And again these are also pulled out in the (unintelligible) document that we'll move to next. Especially I think on the voting thresholds, voting thresholds - they have quite some discussion on a number of these items but no real conclusions so I think there the work team needs to deliberate a bit further to come to conclusions that it would like include here.

As similarly before decision making methodology, what I've done here is actually I've put in the latest version from the GNSO working group guidelines.

So this is something else the work team will need to review to see if that should also apply to PDP working groups or whether a different approach should be used for PDP working groups. Another item that still needs to be discussed is transition but that's not an item that's highlighted in the overarching issues.

Then in Chapter 4 you'll see the basis for the new Annex A. So basically we've worked with ICANN legal in developing which is basically the skeleton for the new Annex A in following the discussions the work team has had to really bring that down to a very basic level just including the main elements and basically leaving the details of the different items for the PDP procedure manual that, you know, can be found in the next chapter.

So again, you know, I strongly recommend everyone to read through this to see if it can be (unintelligible) what the work team had in mind. I think from a staff perspective it, you know, it follows very well the different elements and

the elements we believe should be in the bylaws versus what should be in the procedure manual where, you know, more descriptive guidance can be given and as well more flexibility on a number of items can be explained.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, can I - if I can jump in there? I just really want to emphasize that sections or parts - Sections 4 and 5 of this - it is 5, right, even though it says 6.1, 6.2 for - the sections that are labeled 4 and 5 that Marika was just going over 4 and then we'll talk about 5.

Those are critical especially for the, you know, just to point out the contracted parties have contracts that talk about following the process set forth in the bylaws. And so to the extent that this may or may not affect your contracts then you may want to take a close look at it and make sure you all - everyone's comfortable with it.

Same with, you know, the non-contracted parties, these are the things that the contracted parties will point to in policies in processes to determine whether this would be something that would be binding or not.

So just, you know, really want to emphasize that this is critical for everyone to review now, get a sense of where you stand, where your groups may stand because I have a feeling this will be a heavily commented on part of the report.

Thanks Marika. You can continue, sorry.

Marika Konings: No problem, thanks. So then moving onto Chapter 5, the policy development process procedure manual. So what we've tried to do here is in all those items in the recommendations where we've said oh well more detail should be provided in the manual, you know, further guidance should be provided in the manual we've tried to really, you know, prepare here a first draft of the different elements this manual should contain.

And again, you know, I think here is all the various elements we've missed and I think the idea as well putting this out for public comments you get, you know, people's input on what other information should be provided here. Is there, you know, too much, too little, detail?

But I think we've tried to capture the different steps, you know, looking at the recommendations and really trying to translate that into a procedure manual that can be used as a guide for how a PDP should be run and also providing, you know, guidance on where there is more flexibility, you know, to do certain things or explore certain options.

So again here are a number of items that are also highlighted where, you know, it still depends on the final decision of the working - on a recommendation going on way or the other. For example the - if you look at 6.5, the creation of the preliminary issues report, there basically there are two options following the - two options I've also put forward in the recommendations so, you know, those are two options the work team can consider or, you know, a different option can be created to address that issue.

Again I think there's a proposal here for how a fast track procedure could be done. And there are a couple of items that we included that we actually didn't discuss that we thought might be useful to put in here. For example how do you end a PDP prematurely? Or let me see, there was another one, a determination - the 6.16, termination of a PDP prior to a final report and also 6.17, amendment on modifications of approved policies.

Those are two items that I think we've come across recently in some of the working groups that are ongoing and where there's actually no procedure in existence at the moment. So those are two items where the work team might want to deliberate further to see if that's agreeable or whether there are other approaches they would like to put forward here.

I see Margie has her hand up so I presume it's in relation to this. Margie go ahead.

Margie Milam: Yes, this is Margie. I just wanted to expand on these additional sections that weren't covered in the prior work from the - or working group. On the expedited PDP procedures the - the origins of that when you take a look at it is the clauses in, for example the RAA that talk about expedited procedures.

So we looked at that and thought maybe that can be adopted or, you know, changed to at least provide the basis for an expedited procedure. So this is merely a suggestion. You guys, you know, are welcome to try a different approach but we just thought it would be better to get something on the table for you to explore and see if it makes sense. And we tried in some sense to align it with some of the contractual obligations.

And then with respect to the other issues like the termination of the PDP, you know, we're obviously exploring that right now as a possibility with the VI working group. And it sure would be nice to have the manual, you know, provide some sort of basis for that. So these are issues that we've kind of come across in other, you know, work in the past and thought it would be useful to highlight.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks Margie. And I want to thank you guys for doing that because these are some issues that we hadn't really thought of in our group before. But now I'll note with termination of a PDP or, you know, we're dealing a little bit with that now in the Vertical Integration working group as to what to do with that. So these are issues that we are really dealing with in some sense.

So Marika, there's more, right?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I, you know, we're basically at the end of the body of the report then we move into the annexes. The proposal would be to actually

have the summary of the public comments in the annex basically now it has just an overview of the different comments received.

And once we finalize it the public comment review tool, you know, would include a link there and so people can review as well how we addressed the different comments and the feedback that the work team gave on those.

Then the Annex 2 I, you know, there's still the marker for the new PDP flow chart. So again once we've finalized all the recommendations I think then we can decide whether we want to include another flow chart and this should then reflect the final - or the draft final recommendations and map it out so this is just a placeholder for that.

The background section I don't think we need to make any changes there, it's just where, you know, how this process was initiated and then the different steps that have been taken and explores the working group charter. And then we'll need to update the Annex 5, the working group with the meetings attended and a link to the attendance sheet.

So that would basically be the proposal to have the structure of the report like that. And, you know, working through the different recommendations and then leading up to the new bylaws and the proposed procedure manuals. So if any questions, suggestions, comments already at this stage or whether people (push) to have a closer look at the text and provide edits online.

I don't see any hands maybe I'll move on into the other documents.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. This is the document that was sent around - well it's dated I think it was October 28, that's the date you put on top. This was sent around on - let me just double check if that was actually the date.

Marika Konings: I think it was Tuesday.

Jeff Neuman: I think it was - this is November 1, is that the document? No sorry that's a different one.

Paul Diaz: Tuesday the 9th.

Marika Konings: Yeah Tuesday the 9th it was sent around in an email. It's also posted on the wiki.

Jeff Neuman: Oh okay, Tuesday the 9th, sorry. Oh I'm looking at the wrong one. Okay yes so Tuesday the 9th this was sent around. So this is the document that takes - Marika was sort of going through it kind of quickly but these are the issues that are highlighted in the report as things that we still need to discuss, some comments in there and questions and then a - kind of a suggested approach we can choose to take or not choose to take; it's just a straw man put out there so we can get some feedback.

And the first one relates to - excuse me - Recommendation 6 which is where we say that there's no changes in the bylaws that are recommended for the creation of the issues report on the PDP - because - we didn't make any recommendations for changes to the bylaws.

But we do recommend including in the manual a recommendation for the entity requesting the issues report to indicate whether there are any specific items they would like to see addressed in the issues report which could then be taken into consideration by the council when reviewing the request.

In addition guidance could be provided in the policy development and process manual that the council and/or staff could provide advice ahead of a vote on the request for an issues report whether they feel additional research, discussion or outreach should be conducted in order to ensure a balanced and informed issues report.

So the comment and question are - does the work team agree that the elements in the issues report should contain - should be moved to the operating rules instead of the bylaws? And there seemed to be support to not require these elements any longer but instead encourage the use of different elements. And is there a way to pull up those elements?

And so, okay, you'll have to go to a separate one here. Hey Chris, you can do split screen on this stuff, huh?

Marika Konings: Yeah, then we'll need to put up the Annex A because I don't think we actually even have that in the report. If I can quickly...

Alan Greenberg: I have a question on this before we go to that perhaps?

Jeff Neuman: Sure, why don't you do that while we're pulling it up? Okay, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, there's text here that says so the council can review - when council reviews the request. When does council review a request for an issues report if it's made by someone else?

Jeff Neuman: So that's a good point. So let's just deal with the issue of when it comes from the GNSO community as opposed to an advisory group or the board. So let's put that issue aside but come back to it because it is...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: ...a good. If the bylaws - and I'm pulling it up separately because I don't know if we can get it up on the screen or not but...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I just put it in the chat the different elements. And basically the proposed issue raised for consideration be that entity of the party submitting the issue see how the party is affected by the issue, B, support for the issue

to initiate the PDP, E, a recommendation from the staff manager as to whether the council should initiate the PDP for this issue.

Each staff recommendation shall include the opinion of the ICANN General Counsel regarding whether the issue proposed to initiate the PDP is properly within the scope of the ICANN policy process and within the scope of the GNSO, determining whether the issue is in scope.

So those are the main elements and I think missed a small part at the end there. But basically, yeah, those are the elements that are currently in the bylaws but, you know, the question is is it just as well suited to put it in the procedure manual as I think discussions we've had also indicated that, you know, in certain cases we might not need to include all those elements depending on the issue at stake and in others you might want to include others so it shouldn't be too restrictive either.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...a question I had actually before diving into this because many of these elements do require, you know, the context in which a recommendation has been made as developed in the draft final report.

So my question would be have people had enough time to actually review that so we're ready to deep dive into these issues or maybe now it's more useful to actually go through the different items so people can make note of those and, you know, in reviewing the reports, you know, take that into account and formulate an opinion so we discuss that next time?

I don't know, I don't know how much time people have already had and...

Jeff Neuman: Well so what if I - so let me ask the question here to try to make some progress on this issue? What are some arguments - what are the pros and cons of - let me ask it a different way; right now it's in the bylaws. What are

the issues with those five elements - again, what is the proposed issue? Who is the person submitting the issue or party submitting the issue? How is that party affected? And what is the support they have to raise - to initiate the PDP?

And then a recommendation from the staff manager as to - sorry recommendations from the staff manager as to whether the council should initiate the PDP. So I just paraphrased then.

But, I mean, it seems like the reason, I mean, they're pretty basic and I'm not sure what request wouldn't have - with the exception with the last one, the recommendation from the staff manager, the first four elements, you know, what is the issue, who's submitting the issue, how is that party affected by the issue and what support do they have? What is the issue with - are there any issues with keeping that in the bylaws? In other words is that a hindrance?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. If I can comment, I mean, instead of looking at making the bylaws more, you know, leaving the basic main elements because there's nothing preventing the work team requiring those elements as part of the procedure manual.

So it's more of taking out all those details and, you know, providing the basic elements in the bylaws and providing the more detailed issues like these. And I think there are other elements you might want to see in an issues report and you can add onto. Which again might not apply to all but maybe some in the scenarios sort of a guidance - additional guidance can be provided in the procedure manual.

I think from a staff perspective, you know, it may make sense to move that to the procedure manual. But there's nothing preventing the work team requiring that as a mandatory element of an issues report just because it's in the procedure manual.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, and again I think people should consider that changes to the procedural manual could be made easier than changes to the bylaws. So if there are certain things that - certain protections from either side things that - certain protections from either side whether it be contracted parties or non-contracted parties that they want to see hard-coded that only the board could change that's something they should consider.

So I don't know if anyone's got a view on that?

Margie Milam: Jeff, it's Margie. I have a view on that.

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

Margie Milam: Yeah, in terms of looking back at some of the past PDPs and seeing, you know, the requests that came in I'm not so sure that some of the answers to those questions are obvious. Like let's talk about Fast-Flux or even, you know, vertical integration.

When the original request came from I think the NCUC it's - sometimes it becomes almost like the filling, basically checking the box but it doesn't really necessarily make sense. And I think that's why we tended towards putting in the procedural manual because it wasn't obvious right up front, you know, how some of this would affect the party making the request.

Jeff Neuman: Well - well - Paul, do you want to address that?

Paul Diaz: Thanks Jeff, it's Paul. Yes I guess I understand where Margie is coming from. But speaking as a rep from a contracted party, you know, we would like to see more things in the by laws than in the other document just so that there's clarity in the force of the bylaws.

And I'm kind of concerned that if we start pushing too many things over it becomes a catch-all and we've significantly lowered the importance of the process.

Jeff Neuman: So, okay Avri, you have a response to that? Avri you might...

Avri Doria: Yeah, oh sorry.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Avri Doria: I was in the process of transiting to un-muted when you probably called on me.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, sure.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I guess I tend to be somewhat of the opinion that more of it belongs in procedures than in bylaws. I think the bylaws certainly have to call it out and have to say that there has to be procedures that are followed by over the years - and I think, if I understood Margie correctly, this was the point that was being made.

There are so many variations on the way things get done, on the way things get discussed, on what is correct and what makes sense I guess was the phrase she used that anything in the bylaws becomes too stiff and becomes too hard to change as opposed to leaving it up to, you know, the GNSO Council and the GNSO to figure out what the procedures need to be and how they need to work.

So I - while I think the procedures have to be called out and have to be framed by the bylaws I think that they need to be somewhat more mutable of then that. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Well Avri if I could ask you a specific question then? And then we'll allow people to respond. But just to - so these elements that we just read - so I think there's going to be a philosophical debate in this group probably with no agreement by the entire group as to the question of how much should be in the bylaws versus how much should be in the policy manual.

I think we're going to have disagreement there. But on these specific elements that are called out in the bylaws do you have an issue with those - is there any of those elements that you would put...

Avri Doria: No. For example I have no issue with saying that there needs to be, for example, an issues report that discussed A, B and C. But to get more precise, no, that there needs to be a preset timetable that is based on what's in the procedures or previous agreement found in.

So I think general statements for almost all of the things make sense. I think detailed prescriptive things are where we start to run into issues.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Avri - sorry, Alan.

James Bladel: Jeff, if I could get in the queue?

Jeff Neuman: Oh James, yeah, sure, let me get Alan then I'll get you, James.

James Bladel: Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Okay I guess I agree more with Avri than with what Paul said. In the past the GNSO has proved adept at ignoring issues in - ignoring prescriptive statements in the bylaws when they just don't make sense or aren't applicable. So I don't think it provides a lot more guarantee.

The real only difference between bylaws and procedures is that to change the bylaws they're likely to be posted publicly whereas the procedures may not

be. They still have to be approved by council and a vehement objection by some, you know, stakeholder group or a good part of council will not - will likely cause it to be revisited anyway.

And the example that was given for instance of how was the NSCG going to be directly affected by vertical integration or not that stakeholder group will not be; they felt there was a public interest issue. But, you know, we still haven't - in the VI group we still haven't documented what the harms are or haven't done a very good job of it. And I don't think that's something that necessarily can be done at the beginning of a process. That may be why you're going into the process.

So I think we need flexibility and I really don't see the harm of putting more of this in the procedure manual and can evolve over time. I would - as much as we don't want make-do work added we don't want to stop a PDP from going ahead on a technicality either. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: So Avri has - and then I'll get to James. But if I could ask the same question I asked Avri, of the elements here, you know, Avri said A, B and C which is the proposed issue for - raised for consideration, the identity of the party submitting the issue and how that party is affected by the issue would be elements that she would support being in the bylaws where she would move support for it to initiate and the staff recommendation to the manual.

I - you did say before that how a party is affected may not be clear and may take a while.

Alan Greenberg: Well the right answer may be we're not affected but we believe this is something a policy should that ICANN has to look at.

Jeff Neuman: Sure and that could be put into an issues report. Right? I mean, there's nothing stopping that. This isn't saying the criteria on which it would be judged by the council to go forward it's just saying these are things that the

council would like to see from the party submitting the requesting to put into an issues report.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah I also can live with them in the bylaws; I'm not sure I see the need for it but I can certainly live with it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. James.

James Bladel: Thanks Jeff. James speaking and I apologize for the background noise and the fact that I don't have the document in front of me so I'm doing this somewhat from memory.

But I kind of share Avri's reasoning but I come to the opposite conclusion and side more with Paul in what we should do with this. I think that, you know, as a contracted party we'd like to see more of these elements in the bylaws to provide some degree of a consistency over the PDPs because there are so many various ways of doing this work within the GNSO.

I think that, you know, we need, you know, that requires us to have a greater or more solid foundation. And I think that, you know, only the bylaws can provide that.

I'm, you know, to your kind of overarching question I think - I guess I'm happy with these elements being included in the bylaws and would probably like to see more detail for each of these particularly for the ones that ask the person raising the issue or the entity raising the issue how they're affected.

I'd also like to see some sort of a test for, you know, for, you know, this is maybe getting off topic a little bit but some sort of a test for those that are raising an issue and claim to be speaking in the, you know, in the public interest.

I think that, you know, a lot of competing claims could be made, you know, under the auspices of the public interest. And I think that, you know, if that's going to be something that's used to generate an issues report or launch a PDP I think that there probably needs to be, you know, some more specificity provided on how that's determined, how the public interest is determined.

So in summary I guess, you know, I think I'd like to see more of, you know, these items in the bylaws. I'd like to see more details and specifically on those that are shown to be the affected party as the public good. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Anyone have any thoughts on that or questions? James, if you and Paul would...

Margie Milam: Jeff, it's Margie. I have some observations.

Jeff Neuman: Oh yes sorry, I don't know how I missed that. Okay Margie, yeah.

Margie Milam: Okay, yeah, a couple things I just want to remind you guys of how we got to this point. And the whole impetus for the GNSO improvements project was the (CGC) report that was approved by the board.

And in that report it talks about making the PDP process more flexible and having less in the bylaws. So we're - the reason we took the approach that we did in the report - at least in the suggestions for the bylaws was it was trying to keep that in mind to have it be a situation where we're not continuing the practice that we're doing now as Alan indicated where the bylaws simply aren't even followed because they just don't make sense.

And so we're trying to learn from that experience and provide the flexibility, you know, in a different manner. And so certainly as we go through these things we need to be, you know, cognizant of that's what the board resolution calls for but also we need to protect obviously the important parts of the procedure for the contracted parties.

And so there's a balance there that we need to think about as we go through this process. And one of the issues that I hear you guys talking about is, well, let's - we don't want this process changed, you know, willy-nilly. And that's something that can be addressed in the policy and procedure manual in that amendment section that we were talking about before on how the process can be changed.

And that might be an area where the working group can focus its attention on to make sure that you're comfortable with how the manual itself could be changed.

And then I don't know if Marika has covered this before but the manual is meant to be part of the rules and procedures of the GNSO Council which is under the - the board has oversight and approval on that as well. So even though it's not as firm as you will, you know, in the bylaws it can't be changed, you know, willy-nilly, it's a much more serious process.

And if it is changed the board has the oversight to make sure that it's, you know, the procedure processes are fair. So I just wanted to raise those issues.

Jeff Neuman: So I - if I can - I'm going to take off my chair hat for a second just to address that so I'm addressing this as a contracted party. I hear what you're saying, Margie, but I even, you know, we talk a lot about politics and perceptions a lot in this world. And I agree from a legal - purely legal analysis standpoint you're probably right.

But when the board posts something about a bylaw change as opposed to a change to a procedural manual the bylaw change gets a lot of attention. And I know because I've talked to governments and I've talked to a number of people in the community. And they pay attention to bylaw changes but they do not pay attention for the most part a change to a procedural manual.

Even people within the community, forget the government, even people within the GNSO when you talk to - in the stakeholder groups they will pay attention to bylaw change versus a change to the procedural manuals. I mean, look what's going on with the OSC report where a lot of people didn't even recognize that there were changes, you know, even people on the council because it was oh we're just changing kind of some procedures as opposed to a bylaw change.

So I think you're right from a completely legal analysis standpoint that in the end there still is oversight by the board but I think politically and I think from attention from the community it does matter what's in the bylaws versus what's in the procedural manual.

So I think that needs to be taken into account. And to address one other comment I think you're right the Board Governance Committee did make recommendations on taking unrealistic things out of the bylaws and trying to make it more realistic and putting it into a procedural manual. I'm not sure that applies to this section. I think it applies definitely with respect to timelines and some other sections.

Possibly some of the staff input may in the creation of the issues report may apply to procedural manual. But I think as far as the crux of A, B, C and even D I'm not sure that affects unrealistic expectations. But let me put my chair hat on and ask for comments on what I just said.

And also I noticed Alan's in the queue so if Alan wants to go first to address what I said or whatever you were going to address anyway.

James Bladel: If I could get behind Alan as well, thanks Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks James. All right.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I'm going to address what you said and go back to what Margie said. I think you're right unfortunately that people do pay a lot more attention to the bylaws. And that's a reality we're not likely to change completely.

On the other hand the recent - and I'll use the term - a strong term - the recent fiascos with the declaration of interest and the proxy voting on council both of which have not worked very well there's a lesson to be learned that we don't want to put too many details in the bylaws because they are going to be harder to change and we will choose to just ignore them instead of fixing them when we do something really stupid.

And the - both of those rules did not slip in by accident; they were debated and discussed a lot. And they made sense at the time. But they haven't proven to be workable. And I think we're discussing God knows how many hundreds or thousands of details and we're going to make a few mistakes too, probably some big ones somewhere along the way that once we try to use them we'll realize this isn't implementable, this doesn't address the issues we needed to address.

And so we want to be careful. I'm not debating the A, B, C, D points but in general I think we want to be very careful that we not have so much confidence on what we're doing that we believe it should be immutable and unchangeable as it is effectively in the bylaws. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Right. And I think that's a really good point about, you know, ensuring flexibility on some of these to make sure that, you know, we're kind of guessing here on things and we don't want to make something so hard that we can't change it in the future.

But again there's got to be a balance of - I think everyone's agreeing that there needs to be a balance. James.

James Bladel: Yeah, I'm going to go ahead and withdraw. I think that, you know, what you put forward I just support that and sign onto your earlier statement about that, you know, relative to the recommendation of, you know, what should and should not be in the bylaws and where that's appropriately applied. So I support you on that Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so what I want to do is I think the debate is understood and I think we probably need to put some explanation in the report as to - and there is sort of some explanation already in there. But just to review that as to kind of the debate we're having in this group on the philosophical level of why things are important to some to be in the bylaws and why things are important for some to be in the procedural manuals.

                  But from now on when we talk about this - because this is going to come up with a lot of different issues - if we could focus on the specifics of that provision in the bylaws as opposed to getting into the broader discussion that would be helpful.

                  And what I'm hearing now is that certainly the group agrees with - or I've heard no objection from the group for at least the elements that are identified in A, B and C. I've heard with respect to D that, you know, at least Alan said that he could live with it; doesn't understand the need for it.

                  Avri would prefer D to be in the procedural manual. And I don't think we've specifically addressed E. But actually we should address E. So before I get to E though, Marika, you have your hand up.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. This is more on a general note. I think if people look indeed at what is in the draft final report as a proposed element for the bylaws it might be helpful there if people look at that and then indicate which elements they feel are missing or what they would expect to be there. And then you can have then at some point the overall discussion on indeed what

should be in there and what shouldn't based on the feedback within the work team and the overall bylaw proposal basically.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah I think that's good. And I think you made the point better than I did earlier on when we were going through the document that, yeah, I think it's going to be crucial for everyone to review what in the draft is put into the bylaws versus what's put into the manual and the ramifications they think that will have.

So this is - this is drawing it out specifically with respect to one issue. But you're right I think there was some interpretations made based on discussion where we've put things into bylaws versus manual and people should review that.

So with respect to this particular recommendation - with respect to, again, A, B and C I think everyone - there's no objection to having that in the manual. D there's a little bit of objection. And E we haven't gotten to yet. E is the - just to remind everyone and then I'll get back to Avri - E was the - a recommendation from a staff manager as to whether the council should initiate this PDP.

And staff recommendation shall include opinion of the General Counsel as to whether it's in scope. And in determining whether it's in scope there's five elements that are listed - sub-elements that are listed as to whether it's in scope.

And I think to be fair - oh Margie do you want to - do you have something to add?

Margie Milam: Yes on the - this is Margie - on the A, B, C, D so A identity - how that party is affected but support - here's it's D. Support for the issue to initiate the PDP. As someone who's drafted an issues report as staff we don't know what that is. And so I would propose taking out D or maybe put if known.

Because, I mean, you're trying to analyze the issue and present the issues in the issues report. There's - oftentimes this is a problem that Marika and I and others have had is we just don't have the information to be able to answer some of these questions. And so the question is is that one really important?

Jeff Neuman: Well so a couple things. And you could always go back to the party that asked for the issues report and say I need you to tell me what the support was from your group and then how you got here. And you could just put whatever they said.

I guess what I'm trying to say is no one's expecting you to have everything perfect. And if you don't know the answer then you would put that in the issues report if you don't know it or, you know, it's really just to the best of your ability to put it in there.

I don't think anyone is expecting perfection. But let me - Avri, did you want to comment on that or was there something else?

Avri Doria: No I was commenting on the general issue not specifically on that point.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So do you have a comment on - so...

Avri Doria: My - right, my general issue is that I think - and I totally agree we need to go through the bylaws and be very specific. I think that most things need to have a reference in the bylaws. But I think the specificity about what that element is is in the procedures. So...

Jeff Neuman: Can you give me an - yeah, if you can give an example of that? So what would it say here obviously not legalese but, you know, your idea of what you think it would say here and how that reference would look.

Avri Doria: Okay basically, I mean, I would think - and again it's not bylaw legalese so a truck can probably be driven through it.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Avri Doria: But basically it should say that there needs to be comments from - I mean, there needs to be response in an issues report from the staff about the relevant issues and appropriateness of the - of the PDP.

And I think in the procedures you would call out is it in scope? Is it this? Is it that? What if it's financial? What if it's - and list all of the group of things that may or may not be relevant to a specific thing so that in the bylaws you're saying that they've got to respond and take into account all appropriate issues. And in the procedures they say among the appropriate issues including inter alia are A through Zed.

And then there's a pick and choose because not all issues are relevant in everything. So that's what I mean about the bylaws, put the general requirement or issues response but the procedures get into the specifics of what may or may not be required in that response.

Now maybe in scope or out of scope is one of those that belongs in bylaws and not just in procedures, I am, you know, although no one really knows what in scope and out of scope ever really mean so it's a general enough term. But that's the kind of example - that's the kind of point I'm trying to make is that there needs to be a reflection in both bylaws and in procedures of these things.

One is the general case that says it's got to be done and one is the specific case and this is what we mean by it's got to be done. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks Avri. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah I think we need to - I agree with what Avri just said. I think we need to remember that a few years from now none of the people who are writing these documents or participate in this working group are likely to be the ones who are drafting the issues report or making the judgment on them in council.

And the words that we put in are going to stand on their own and people will interpret them in any way that they believe is reasonable if they're not sufficiently constrained by the words itself.

So for us to say well we know something may not be really important but they should have to put it in someone later is going to judge it wouldn't have been put in unless it's really important and therefore, you know, there's a high threshold to get over to judge it reasonable.

So I just caution us to remember that no one is going to listen to these teleconferences again; no one is going to read our final report three years from now when they're using the product that we're creating. And I think we need to remember that.

Jeff Neuman: I think that's a good point. And I hope no one listens to our recordings three years from now. So I think those are good points. I think you're right that we're not going to be around so people need to understand the words we're using.

But I do think at least with respect to anything we see in there I think those are ones where we certainly seem to as a group understand what was meant by those at least to a well enough extent. D I think is certainly subject to interpretation and maybe that's a reason for D to go into the manual.

E I think - I think there's actually a couple different parts with E about a staff recommendation as to whether a PDP should go forward is actually separate from the issue of whether something is in scope or not. Do people agree with - let me ask - let take - pull it apart a little bit.

Do people agree that those are really two different questions? They may depend on each other but they are really two separate questions? Okay well at least Paul agrees, Avri, Joe and Margie agrees. Avri, do you have a comment on that or is it just a left-up hand?

Okay, Margie does have a comment. Yes.

Margie Milam: Yeah I have a comment on E. As someone who's written an issues report and trying to understand what this means and going back to what Alan said about when we put something in the bylaws that, you know, that it stands on its face and basically understand what's intended.

As staff I've struggled with not 1 which was the scope of the mission statement and that makes sense. Two, broadly applicable to multiple situations or organizations; that's sort of a weird one so it'd be great to get clarification on that in the manual.

The one that seems to me to be always difficult to address is the likely to have lasting value or applicability of the need for occasional updates. Honestly I had no idea what that meant. And in drafting, you know, because if you go back and look at the issues report for vertical integration for example it's probably in my view the weakest part of the report because I just don't - didn't understand what that meant.

So to the extent that, you know, we're going to keep some of this in the bylaws I want us to really not just default to what was done in the past just because it was done in the past but really understand why we're doing it and what we mean by it. And to the extent that it's something new or different, you know, has clarification in the manual.

Jeff Neuman: We could always Louis Touton to help us because I think he wrote that.

Margie Milam: Oh I almost felt like calling him up because it really was - I had no idea what was intended by this. And so, you know...

Jeff Neuman: I - yeah, no I understand that. I was kind of making a joke. But, you know when that came out - that language came out when it was a comment when the GNSO at the time wanted to do a policy development process on just the weightless service whether VeriSign could introduce the weightless service.

And there was a big debate going back and forth as to whether you could have a policy development process that only applies to one entity, meaning VeriSign at the time, and whether you could have something that's just directed at a one-time event as opposed to a general principal, right?

So the way that was, from what I remember, it was a recommendation by staff saying a PDP only on the weightless service is not appropriate because it only applied to one organization. And it wasn't appropriate because it was only for one service that wasn't going to set general principals for future services.

And then that's when we all diverted the attention from the one service to let's do a funnel process and come up with some registry services evaluation process so that we, you know, contracted parties or registries could have certainty and also non-contracted parties and registrars could have input into the process as well.

So that's kind of where it came about. But I do agree that the words as used here in the bylaws - certainly the only reason I know that is because is because I was around then.

But, you know, I hopefully won't be around forever on that and so we do need to - I agree with you - even if this language stays in the bylaws we would certainly need to explain it in the procedural manual or maybe some of these - maybe it's just the requirement that the General Counsel does issue a

statement in the issues report as to whether it's within scope or not within scope.

And then in - like kind of using the Avri analogy we basically leave the details to say, you know, for the purposes of determining whether something is in scope or out of scope the following should be considered. And then you, you know, you put all - or you put that in the manual.

So I think that's a way to kind of divide that up but still keep the requirement in the bylaws to have that determination made. And remember the ramification of that determination being made is that there's a higher threshold to initiate the PDP, right?

So it may be important to keep the in scope, out of scope language in the bylaws to trigger that threshold vote but leave the detail to the manual. And that could be a way we could handle it. Anyone have any thoughts on that?

Alan Greenberg: I generally agree.

Jeff Neumann: Okay, (Paul)?

(Paul): Yes, the same thing. I agree with the way you've weighed it out Jeff.

Jeff Neumann: Okay and Avri agrees. Good. Sounds like we've got agreement on that. Marika, did you capture that?

Marika Konings: Not completely but I'm hoping you'll add it to the report. You will capture it.

Jeff Neumann: Okay. Thanks. Good one. I - so I think with E, we're separating the questions right now as to whether there's really two recommendations in E as currently in the bylaws. One is that there's a determination of in scope and the second determination is whether - a recommendation as to whether a P- the council should initiate a PDP. Those are two different ones.

The one we're talking about now is the determination of whether something is in scope or not within scope. And I think the - what was sort of - people were not in their - at - and I guess if they're nodding their heads, but sort of agreeing with was the notion that the determination of whether something's in scope or out of scope should stay in the bylaws but the factors as to what goes into that determination should be something for the manual.

And then a sub point to that is to make sure that we're all comfortable that we understand what those sub points mean. And I've heard from Margie that a couple of those are difficult to interpret at best and we should probably work on making that more concrete in the manual.

So with the second question, the second sub part as to whether the PDP - whether the council should initiate the PDP, I suppose part of that determination or part of the factors that would go in was to whether it can scope, but I think there could be a whole host of other factors that could be considered by ICANN staff, namely resources or other things that would lead to a recommendation as to whether they believe a PDP should be initiated and for that it seems like that kind of detail could logically go into a manual as opposed to the bylaws.

If it really is just an opinion, it doesn't really - it's not like if the council said - I'm sorry, if the staff had said it's in scope but we don't recommend going forward with it, that doesn't change the threshold. But at least in my mind thinking about it, and again I guess I'll take off my chair hat for this although I - it's just kind of logic - in my mind if it doesn't really trigger an increased threshold since the council's free to basically ignore what the staff says as far as whether it thinks the PDP should go forward, you know, at least in my mind it would seem that that kind of determination makes more sense in the manual as opposed to the bylaws.

But I don't have a real strong opinion on it, it just seems logical that that would - using the rationale I had for the in scope, out of scope. (Any) thoughts with that? Agreement? Disagreement? Just plain tired? You love policy development so much you just are speechless?

Alan Greenberg: All of the above.

Jeff Neumann: All right, so why don't we - Margie agrees. Good. So why don't we make those kind of - I think that seems like a way forward with respect to their - at least recommendation six. And at least that's the way we'll dro- again, please comment on the words that we use and the concepts. You certainly will have that ability to do it and we certainly recommend it as Marika reminded me. And Marika, you have a comment?

Marika Konings: (That is in regard) - I actually have a question on how we move forward from here and does (this) department require a change and, you know, a section on the bylaws and a section on the procedure manual probably in the recommendations.

So my question is (do we put) first one to review what is there now, provide added comments and, you know, we integrate them and then we start making, you know, the big changes or (do they) prefer that, you know, based on these questions we - you know, we have today that I already made these changes in the report and then some on another report, you know, a revised version that people can review.

Or does that chronologist say no in this table of the agreed upon approach and once we've, you know, reviewed the current draft then we start incorporating these elements that we've, you know, (we receive average) consensus on. You know, what is the best (move forward) and, you know, (unintelligible) I'll give everyone a chance to reach you and suggest edits and provide comments but also since I'm, you know, working along and having

some discussions and deciding on issues, how can we best manage that process?

Jeff Neumann: Well I'll give you my opinion and everyone else is certainly free to agree, disagree or (revive). But since it sounds like we're moving forward and coming to some sort of conclusion on this issue, I'd like to see you start drafting that and putting that into the report.

I - that doesn't necessarily - necces- sorry, it doesn't necessitate you sending out a new version to everybody. But maybe making one available as soon as you can, as soon as you get it done on the Wiki so that, you know, those that are left that are one the call, at least, can feel comfortable that we need to provide the same comments and edits to this section, some things that we've discussed.

That's my opinion. It's only an opinion but anyone else have thoughts on that? (Fridrich), does that sound manageable. I mean, I - it just seems to save people time so that they don't have to now all do their own edits to reflect what we believe is discussed on the call and then you're faced with ten different versions and I'm being optimistic that ten different will make comments - so that you don't have ten different versions of the same document and then have to grapple between which words and whose you should adopt.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. That's fine. My only concern would be, you know, to make sure that people only review the last version of that there may be a situation where people are reviewing all the versions, you know, before I have a chance to send out the new one and then it becomes very difficult to compare changes on previous versions and trying to find what is (now) on the new version.

And so, yes, it could potentially be very confusing and create a lot of work. So I mean, I think there's now - this is a - this will require a big change (here)

related to specific sections, so if it's here it might not be a big issue but (unintelligible) trying to get a (sense) from the working whether, you know, when they will have a chance to actually review the current draft and provide, you know, comments on that because it's a lot of simple things as wording or it doesn't necessarily mean that, you know, you don't agree with the recommendation but maybe not the way it's written or the wor- choice of words.

So I presume there're a lot of minor things people want to comment on. So it would be good as well if we can agree on a kind of process for that or if people really prefer to wait until the end once we figured out all the recommendations then focus on, you know, the dots and the Is and the T and things like that.

So just want to avoid we're working on different versions and making the whole process very complicated for everyone.

Jim Prendergast: Yes, I think what you could do then is - and then I agree - is what you could do after the call you could basically say, "Okay guys. The report's still good. I'm making changes to recommendation six in line with the call. Please continue on reviewing the other sections and submitting comments."

I think if we wait until we're done to have people submit their comments, when that - it's going to slow things down. But if you send out a note to say, hey, this section - pages whatever, whatever, will - we're in the process of revising based on the call. Don't look any further into that section. Review everything else. Give me comments on everything else.

Jim Predergrast: Hey Jeff. This is James. I'm sorry I have to drop off. So thanks everyone.

Jeff Neumann: Thanks James. Why don't we try Marika and if it becomes too unmanageable then we'll figure out a different way because I want people to start reviewing it now and not to wait if that's possible.

Marika Konings: Yes, that's fine and I think, you know, from the conversation now it's clear which elements we'll be revising so I think that's fine. What I will do as well for next version is to incorporate line numbers of we'll make it easier as well. You know, we're going back and forth on what's in the report, refer to certain sections so indicate which lines we're working on, so - and such (things).

Just a question. Before we, you know, maybe lose more people, can we maybe talk about the session in Cartagena and what to do with it?

Jeff Neumann: Yes, that's exactly where I was going to go. So given that (we're on) Page 1 of 10 of these issues, what I think we've made some good progress. We're going to have a call next week where hopefully we'll get through a few more of them.

But it seems to me that my own inclination is to have just a work session during that time or during a time there as opposed to a full on stuff to present to the community with a possibility of maybe us preparing some slides that each of the groups can take back to their stake- to their constituency stakeholder group, advisory committee with some just direction as to what we've been talking about and wh- how - you know, where we've gone so that we don't miss all of our chance to get some input.

And, of course, I'll give the council an overview of what we've discussed as well. But my inclination is we have some, you know, good opportunities to meet face to face to get some work done. And so my own recommendation would be to kind of keep it as a working session. And I'd love to hear some input on that.

Alan Greenberg: I support that.

Jeff Neumann: (Paul) supports it.

Alan Greenberg: This is Alan.

Jeff Neumann: Okay so Marika, do you think that's okay? Is there anything you want to add
                 to that?

Marika Konings: Yes, it doesn't mean (work), it just means that basically the time we currently
                 have is - let me check the - current time - the session's called the new GNSO
                 (come) to development process, an update. And the description talks more
                 about that. It's - and the session will provide an update on the status of the
                 (drop down) on a report and propose new GNSO policy process.

                 So basically you would like me to change it and just turn it into a working
                 session of the work (gene).

Jeff Neumann: Right. And we can also send around maybe - keep the assignment and we
                 could always kind of cancel it but we can send around if people would prefer
                 doing a breakfast session because I think there may be some other things
                 that people might want to go through at that time.

Marika Konings: (It doesn't work). I - if we want to change it, it's really better to do it now while
                 the, sche- you know, the schedule is not final. It will be very complicated once
                 the schedule is published and I think there's a - I don't know exactly how -
                 what is a requirement for changing but I know requesting new sessions, you
                 know, requires an active management approval basically so it's - (it's
                 because real) at the time it's allocated that Wednesday from 9:00 until 10:30
                 is unlikely to be workable. I would rather them now try to find a different slot
                 then wait until it's published.

Jeff Neumann: Can we do that then? Are there any open breakfast sessions that we could
                 do? Any days that there - that would be open?

Marika Konings: I mean, Wednesday morning - I'm just looking at a draft schedule - there - I don't see anything there - a large improvements working B meeting. I don't know. Are you involved in that one?

Alan Greenberg: No I'm not.

Marika Konings: And there is 8:30 session starting at the (AUC) promoting some petition consumer (traps) and (troys). I'm not really sure what that sessions about because in the - well, the ATRTs are really presenting it. It's resolved on Monday so I'm not really sure what that session's about.

Jeff Neumann: Well that's - there's supposed to be a (core) work team created under the AOT called the comp- whatever you just said - the competition.

Alan Greenberg: But that's the year after gTLDs, isn't it?

Jeff Neumann: Yes, so maybe...

Marika Konings: Right, so maybe it's a kind of free discussion on what that might be or I don't know but that starts at 8:30. So, I mean, if you really want to do it earlier, you could do it from 7:30 to 8:30 or just 7:30 to 9:00 and then, you know, be flexible if we know the descriptions of the questions. If we, you know, start later of (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Marika, was it the (Pedner) meeting that we were talking about a possible breakfast and...

Marika Konings: That's on Thursday.

Alan Greenberg: Oh that is scheduled already. Okay fine.

Marika Konings: Yes. we have (unintelligible) scheduled for Thursday.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I just remembered that (Cheryl) or someone said that breakfast is starting to get awful filled. I wasn't sure about that. Okay thank you.

Jeff Neumann: Let's get that in there. Let's get it in there for breakfast on Wednesday if we can. If it has to be Tuesday or Monday even, let us know but I think that will (extend) us so that people could be free to go to the other sessions because I think there'll be some people interested in going to those. And I believe you didn't...

Marika Konings: I'm looking at the schedule. I mean, on Monday morning there is - there's at large improvements working A meeting. Are you involved in that Alan?

Alan Greenberg: No, I'm not involved in any of those. I mean, I may sit in on them but I'm not an active participant.

Marika Konings: There's nothing now until 9:00 am (to) the welcome ceremony.

Alan Greenberg: Well that gives us...

Marika Konings: So maybe that will be...

Alan Greenberg: That gives us two full hours.

Marika Konings: If we start at 7:00.

Alan Greenberg: Well.

Jeff Neumann: Why don't we do 7:30?

Alan Greenberg: I'm told we're - are we in the - are the meetings in the conference hotel or is a walk away or whatever away?

Marika Konings: It's - (unintelligible) well it's a conference center (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Everything's a walk.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: Yes, it's - I've been told it's a 15 minute bus ride from the Hilton where most of staff...

Alan Greenberg: Yes, we don't want a 7:00 meeting. Unless we can do it in the hotel. Well, but then we still have to get to the 9:00 meeting, so.

Marika Konings: Yes, and then probably get to go to (an arranged) breakfast so if I - should I go to Monday, 7:30 to 9:00 work (flat) with (unintelligible) and the conference (on you)?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. If it's a in - if it's a breakfast it has to be someplace central because I don't expect we're all in the same hotels either.

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Marika Konings: No, it will be in the conference center.

Avri Doria: Oh, okay.

Alan Greenberg: I told I - I'm told all funded people are in the same hotel.

Avri Doria: Yes, but we're not all funded.

Alan Greenberg: Understood.

Marika Konings: Yes but if breakfast is provided it will be in the conference (venue).

Jeff Neumann: Yes, I think that makes sense so people can go directly to the welcome ceremony so let's do that. And I think that makes sense. I think that's good. I think we're getting towards the end of the hour. I'm not really sure we have enough to start the next recommendations.

So we'll just start with that next week. Yes, I think we made some good progress and I think we'll make some really good progress. I do encourage people to look at and provide comments in advance so if people could think about the next few recommendations that we'll get on at the next call. I would say recommendations, issue 7, 11, 4. At least those three if people could provide some comments on in advance of the call, that would certainly advance our discussions next week. Marika, you have another comment?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. We also still have a number of comments from Mary Wong that we didn't get to last time. I'll just post an updated version on the Wiki. I realize that I've been kind of an (ala mode) shift on the last session and there're still a couple that at some time we need to go back to as well.

Jeff Neumann: Okay. Since they relate to any of these issues that we're going to discuss we could just bring it up in there. To the extent it doesn't then we'll have to go back. You're right. Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you Jeff.

Jeff Neumann: Take care everyone. Talk to you next week.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Alan Greenberg: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Thanks (Eva).

Woman: Thank you. Have a nice evening.

Woman: You too. Bye-bye.

Woman: Bye-bye.

END