Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Policy Development Process (PDP) Work Team (WT)
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 27 August 2009 14:00 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 27 August 2009, at 14:00 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-20090827.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#august
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
Jeff Neuman - Registry c. - Work Team Chair
Paul Diaz - Registrar c.
James Bladel – Registrar c.
David Maher - gTLD Registry Constituency
Tatiana Khramtsova
Wolf Knoben - ISCPC
Brian Winterfeldt - IPC

Adobe Connect only:
Gabriel Pineiro - Non Commercial Users Constituency

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

Absent apologies:
Liz Gasster – Policy Staff

Coordinator: This conference is now being recorded. Please go ahead.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good Morning, good afternoon everyone. On today's call we have Jeff Neuman, James Bladel, David Maher, Wolf Knoben, Paul Diaz, on Adobe Connect we have Gabriel Pineiro as well as Tatiana Khramtsova, from staff we have Marika Konings, Margie Milam and myself Gisella Gruber-White. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: We miss anybody? Okay. Welcome everyone. It is August 27, 2009. This is the PDP Work Team call and we've had a, about a three week break so I'm hoping everyone has had a wonderful summer and is now ready to jump into the autumn season - and getting close to the Seoul meeting in just a couple months.

So with that said I think the agenda for today is to just do a brief status of where we are on Stage 1, the Stage 1 report and then to - actually before we start Stage 1 report Margie will go over what happened last night at the ICANN Board meeting with respect to the bylaws and then we'll go through stage - a status report on the Stage 1 report and then we'll dive into the remaining questions on Stage 2 and talk about the schedule going forward.

Does anybody have any questions on that?

Brian Winterfeldt: Excuse me, Brian Winterfeldt joining in.

Jeff Neuman: Welcome Brian.

Brian Winterfeldt: Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So we're going to start off with Margie going over the, what happened last night at the ICANN board meeting with the bylaws.

Margie Milam: Sure. Thanks Jeff. Last night the, late last night there was a board meeting and the bylaws amendment package that was proposed by staff was

approved. The areas that affect this working group are that we did include a notation - and you'll see it in the final bylaws when they're posted, basically an introduction to annex A that highlighted, that the provisions in annex A are only temporary until the work of the PDP group is complete and new PDP procedures are proposed.

And that was at the request of the Structural Improvement Committee because they wanted to make sure that it was clear that we weren't assuming that these procedures would be the final procedures that - currently listed in the annex A. They wanted to acknowledge, they wanted to acknowledge that this was an ongoing work process and that the amendments that were made in annex A were just temporary ones until the final work product of this group could be produced.

So that's where we are. You'll see the bylaws as they're posted by legal counsel but they were approved and that'll help facilitate the implementation of all the GNSO procedures in voting, you know, for councilors. Any questions?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes Margie it's Wolf Knoben speaking. I would be interested about just to hear how the Board handled the comments which were posted on the public comment site. Especially the comments regarding the new constituency which I understood should only be part of the non-contractual house in the future. And there have been many comments about that issue and I would like - was there any discussion about that?

Margie Milam: Oh yes definitely. The approach that staff took with the public comments, because there were so many comments received and some of them were fairly substantial was that we elected to defer some of those issues until later. Particularly with the issue on new constituencies. It's actually included in the Board resolution that staff is instructed to evaluate whether there should be limitations on new constituencies going forward because they recognized the concern that was raised during the public comment period. So they didn't

amend the bylaws in the version that got, they did last night. But the direction to staff is to develop appropriate language to address that concern.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Do you want to also talk about, there was one provision that we discussed on the last call that seemed to generate a little bit of discussion which was the, that was currently approved which is the definition of GNSO Super Majority.

Margie Milam: Sure. Sure. With respect to the comments that were more clarifications, that was a clarification that was just an error in the original draft so we made the suggestion that, Jeff, you recommended. We changed the language from GNSO Super Majority to just Super Majority.

Jeff Neuman: Oh I'm sorry. I didn't mean that one, I meant the one that we discussed about Super - how the GNSO Super Majority is defined for purposes of consensus policies.

Margie Milam: The version of the bylaws that was adopted didn't change. So the voting threshold the way it was posted on - in August 3rd is what's in the final version.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So James did you have a question?

James Bladel: No, no question I just, I wanted to make sure I was thinking about the same thing that you were raising Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Is there any other questions on the update on the bylaws?

Okay. And then as far as...

James Bladel: Is there an - I'm sorry this is James, is there a date of effect for those changes or how does that work once they're approved by the Board?

Margie Milam: The approval was effective yesterday but I believe in the transition article there's a reference to the - that they don't, they're not implemented until the effective date that's announced by the Board. So obviously the restructure wasn't effective yesterday it will be, you know, sometime in October when, right around the beginning of the Seoul meeting. I don't have the specific date. But there's a placeholder for the Board to announce basically what the, when the restructure date is to be effective.

James Bladel: Okay. And so until that time is formalized we're operating under the existing bylaws pretty much indefinitely until that announcement is made.

Margie Milam: Yes that's right.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Sure. With respect to the Stage 1 report which we spent a lot of time on the hope is - and I've been a little bit of the reason for the delay so I'll take it upon myself, the hope is to get that out by the end of this week. So by the end of tomorrow to get that Stage 1 initial first draft report out so that the team can review it and discuss it on our next call. And then - so Marika do you want to say anything else about that or it pretty much covers it?

Marika Konings: No I think that covers it. I hope to get it out in the next few days and then I would just like to encourage everyone to really carefully review that report and, you know, share any comments or edits on the mailing list. I mean you're free to use Track Changes in the Document to highlight any comments you have or just post them on the mailing list if you think that's easier. Or I don't know if some people prefer to have the text as well on the Wiki but as it's quite a lengthy document it might make it more difficult to review and discuss it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Any comments or questions on that?

Okay jumping into Stage 2 which is the document that's currently on the Adobe Connect we have a few items to discuss left in Stage 2. The hope is or the goal is to get a survey out within a couple weeks just like we did for Stage 1 to get everyone to respond to the survey which really is based on what we've been discussing in the last few weeks and so what's in this document.

And then take this document plus the survey results and come up with a Stage 2 report sometime early in October so that we can certainly have it both Stage 1 and Stage 2 to discuss in Seoul. And concurrently we'll also be working through Stage 3 on the next couple calls.

So for just a reminder of what the different stages are the Stage 1 is the pre - well everything up to leading to the delivery of an issues report to the council. Stage two is really the, everything from the delivery of the issues report to the council through the council consideration of whether to launch a formal PDP, which also includes things like the approval of a charter and basically everything up to the delivery of the charter to the working groups. And then Stage 3 which is actually, Stage 3 is what do we do once we get the working group report, once that's delivered to the council and everything around that.

And then stage, you know, the rest of the stages are pretty much what happens after the working group is done. And not only when council approves it, or if they approve it and it gets delivered to the Board but also what happens after everything goes through the Board and, you know, basically monitoring the policy development process and monitoring each specific issue. So that's kind of the road ahead that we will need to deal with.

Any questions on that general time line and stages?

Okay. So let's jump into this document. Where we left off was - and actually if you scroll up I'm intentionally leaving out number five for now because five talks about emergency procedures and what should be done in the case of if there's urgency. I'm going to leave that to the end because it really would

help to actually have talked about what to do in the normal case first and then figure out what could be done if there's some urgent situation.

So I see James has his hand raised.

James Bladel: Yes thanks Jeff. And I apologize if I'm being superfluous here or over thinking this but there are several PDPs that are currently underway, and it sounds like the changes of this with the bylaw changes are probably going to be adopted - whatever comes out of this group and the working group work team are going to be adopted prior to the completion of those PDPs.

And I'm just thinking do we need to formally think about how to grandfather in existing PDPs under the old process or, I don't know again I don't want to take the group off track but I was just, it just popped into my head that we're kind of fixing a plane when it's already in flight so I just wanted to put that out on the table.

Jeff Neuman: Yes that's a good point. You know, what I was thinking is, you know, I don't know how long this is going to take us. I'm not sure there is, you know, there's a few PDPs that are underway and some that are still in the pre-PDP stage even though they have working groups - like the registration abuse is really not even a PDP it's just a kind of development of the issues. But I think, you know, I think that's an issue for the council to discuss once we propose our recommendations. And maybe at the end if there are still that are going on we could maybe think about how to transition those to the new, to the new PDP graph that we've come up with. The voting thresholds will be in place but everything else won't be at that point.

James Bladel: Okay thanks and I don't want to take us off track so I just wanted to get that into the record I guess.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Margie you have a comment?

Margie Milam: Yes I do. I think maybe we might consider having a transition section. You know how we're dealing with the PDP process in chunks maybe at the end we should think about that because I don't know that we've given it any thought and that's certainly a good question that James raises about, you know, what do you do with existing PDPs? So that might be something that this group explores.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Do you guys want to add that to whatever our last stage was to talk about?

Margie Milam: Yes. Yes that would be fine.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Okay so if we jump ahead to number seven which is I think, there we go so this is basically a - and this topic has actually come up a lot even with - so I sent a note around to a bunch of the, you know, the chairs of the constituencies in the council because we've been having a difficult time getting, you know, a number of people to participate. And most of the discussion rather than focusing on this group focused really on, you know, "ICANN's asking us to do too much and the ICANN..." everyone's overwhelmed.

So this next question basically says, okay once the, once the council decides to initiate a formal PDP then should there be some sort of evaluation of staff costs and resources needed to conduct the PDP and prioritize existing policy work and revisit their existing deadlines and deliverables?

Right now there is no such process. There's nothing at the council level. Once they get the issues report their basic next job is to immediately vote on whether to initiate a formal PDP but there's really no consideration or no formal process for considering whether they should old off or how long they may hold off, you know, if that's even permissible or whether they just have to vote at that point on an issue in a PDP or to drop it.

Is there any thoughts on that or anything that you think that we could or should formalize? I see Wolf has his hand up.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Thank you Jeff. I have a question do we understand this point. What should be the reason to bring up this question, you know, what should be the goal or the consequence of doing such a study, a cost study? And why should it be then if in case should it be limited only to staff? Because if you look to the PDP evaluation and we think so - the council itself is also heavily involved in that so there are costs on the council side as well. So I would like to understand really what could be because a cost let me say, estimation or cost investigation could also be a big thing don't you think? For example if you need external knowledge for that for example. So it's not very clear to me.

Jeff Neuman: Yes so I think that's a good question. Let me ask the ICANN staff that's on this call, I've seen some work come out of the GNSO Operations Work Team. They've talked about an administrative body of the - now I don't know if this will ever get wings but some sort of administrative body of the GNSO to talk about prioritizing PDPs.

I think this element really deals with, you know, things like I don't know maybe it's something like, you know, what's going on with the WHOIS studies where, you know, the community had wanted certain studies or does want certain studies to be done and whether there should be part of the process of ICANN staff to come back and say, "Hey look if you want these studies to be done by these experts just realize it's going to cost this amount of money and I'm not sure we have the budget for it," or you know, "We don't have that planned in our budget."

Something like that. Is that Marika and Margie something you guys thought this meant?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think priority means as well - and then looking more at the, you know, revisiting existing deadlines and deliverables this priority with time as well if we need the council would somebody decide, "Well this is priority number one and all the resources need to be dedicated to this particular task."

It might mean of course as well that certain policy development processes might slow down and they have of course specific time lines that are, you know, currently prescribed by the bylaws and we need to see if, you know, they stay the same or they're getting more margin. But anyway I guess it's the expectation that at least in charter certain deadlines will be written in that are expected to be adhered to. So how do you deal with that?

Jeff Neuman: Okay does that overlap with what the GNSO Operations Work Team is working on?

Marika Konings: To be honest I don't know. I would need to check with the colleagues that are working on that what they are exactly discussing. I mean part of what my personal thinking behind this was as well like should there be any kind of like - how many PDPs can go on at the same time? Should there be any kind of threshold whereby you say, "Okay, this one stays in the dock until, you know, one is completed because we just cannot take on so many at the same time." Should there be, you know, some kind of system?

And of course it can be overruled maybe in case of priority or - but should there be some kind of baseline where you say well if we have already five policy development process working groups ongoing on top of, you know, six other working groups, you know, any new issues that is being raised now we can go through the stage of the issues report but as soon as it comes up to a council decision it basically needs to wait until I don't know one of the working group completes.

Or - and who makes that assessment or how do you go about that? I guess that's maybe part as well in this, part of this question. At least that's how, what I read into it.

Jeff Neuman: Well I think that last, the last two issues you're talking about I think are, that I know the GNSO Operations Committee is looking into. So we need to - what I thought this one really meant was on, you know, work that needs to be done within the actual, once the PDP is launched or the GNSO council votes to initiate the PDP. And that implies that they've already set the right priorities. Then the costs that are involved to actually do the work both on the ICANN staff side but also externally for resources that may be needed like expert opinion and others.

Which relates to question number eight which, you know, leads into question number eight which is what option should the GNSO council have at it's disposal to make sure that it can make an informed decision? Which means that, you know, maybe an expert needs to be retained or other interested parties. So...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf speaking.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So I wonder whether, you know, if the number seven is really clear enough. I understand, you know, right now. So I have served - so from my thinking I also would be happy if in advance we would have an overview or really a kind of table, you know, what does it mean, what kind of resources we need, what kind of costs are people would face and all these things in the future with regards to conducting a PDP. But to turn out such a study and then to come back with such a table is not that easy. So I wonder whether this already gives, could give a let me say a reasons for discussions and rejections and objections, you know, which are not based with very good arguments.

In case if we - if you could find out a way, you know, in advance how to find out a rough, you know, a rough overview regarding the resources we need comparing it, compared to other PDP which are in the pipeline then that would be nice. So for example if you find out okay this kind of PDP you guess the council is getting - okay we need external input for that for example which may cause costs and then time and so on. So that's one item. But to find out how much that work group costs I think it goes too far.

And it's, I wonder whether it's, this is something which is to be done within the business, you know, the business plan of ICANN is made. And of course they're our experts and they have in mind okay what could be the future, what kind of PDP could come up for the next year coming from the different discussions? And they may have some input for that. But I wouldn't - I would like to avoid a situation that the council is faced with okay just to turn out a study for cost estimations for these things.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Does anyone else have any thoughts? So Wolf just to summarize you're talking about doing in-depth study would probably be overkill, would be too much. But to do some sort of rough estimate of costs that would be incurred in this PDP and maybe in comparison to other PDPs would be helpful but you're afraid that something that's too in-depth would provide a basis for objection where otherwise there may not be such a basis?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. James.

James Bladel: Yes I think, I just wanted to lend support to Wolf's statements that perhaps we don't need to - we could even create a template of estimating or projecting out and what the burden will be and then comparing it to what's already in process.

But that raises just two quick questions and I'm thinking of this from a process management perspective. One is that there needs to be some sort of mechanism by which to handle the situation where a brand new PDP comes out of council that is inserted into the PDP docket maybe at a higher priority than PDPs that are already underway. And we talked a little bit about an urgent and that's, you know, having an urgent PDP process. It's kind of a binary right? So you have it's either urgent or it's not. But once we start qualitatively comparing, you know, costs and then queuing up accordingly then it's possible that some could be, that that priority could be shuffled on a continuous basis.

And then, the other thing that I wanted to put out there was the idea that PDPs are not necessarily commoditized work units. They will affect different SOs and ACs differently. Some may be registrar intensive, some may be registry intensive, some may be ITC intensive for example. And I'm wondering if there's any merit to exploring the idea of doing a bit of load balancing on PDP based upon where staff projects or the council projects that it will have the most impact? But that could again unnecessarily complicate the whole situation. But I did want to mention that we should be careful not to treat these as interchangeable units.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I think those are all good points and I think again we're in a weird position here because I know the GNSO Operations Committee may be looking at some of these issues. So Marika is Ken Bauer the staff person for that?

Marika Konings: No I think it's Rob Hoggarth together with Julie Hedlund. So I can check in with them on this issue and see what they're doing so maybe we can, maybe defer to the next meeting before discussing this further to make sure that we know what they're thinking in that area?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: May I just intervene? -- it's Wolf speaking -- since I am a member of that team as well.

Jeff Neuman: Okay good. Great. Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So actually we didn't reach that stage if are talking about anything with regard to the PDP since we are looking to this team, what the PDP team is doing because we have something to do with regards to seating of the council that's the first priority. But maybe later on. I will pick up that question as well to the team because we have something to do with regard to the PDP and I can pick up that question and to discuss whether we should take over that question there and - but at the time being there's nothing.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So the issue is prioritizing of PDPs, how that's done, what goes into that analysis? And so Wolf you're saying that the Operations Team has not done any work on that yet.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: So if that's the case then it should be for us to consider at this point since they're not doing that yet.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. I would say, you know, from the - if I look to the composition of the Council Operations Team which is even smaller than this team here right now so I would say okay, let's do it here in that team, in the PDP working team and give some ideas and some - they could put it then into something rules of procedure.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. James did you have your hand up or is that an old one?

James Bladel: Sorry Jeff I stepped away from my keyboard there for a moment. I will lower it as soon as I get back please disregard.

Jeff Neuman: Oh okay. I - okay. So then let's take on some other questions. So one of the questions that came up from the one of the discussions was is there a

maximum number of PDPs that could happen at once? Anyone have a thought on that one?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: What was the question? Is there a maximum number of PDP?

Jeff Neuman: Well yes. I mean that's and I'm expecting the answer is probably we can't really define a number. But is there something that, I'm just trying to think of questions to ask to get us to discuss how the GNSO council could go about saying at some point, "Look we just have too many PDPs going on we're not going to have the resources to do another one."

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes but isn't that a question of how the council is going to organize themselves in putting priorities let me say on this question?

Jeff Neuman: Is there any - and I agree with that is there any guidance we can give to how the council on how to prioritize?

Marika Konings: Because of course - this is Marika but of course there would be, you know, of course opportunity for gaming the system if you just keep on raising issues and, you know, left the machine going there's hardly any time to do any actual work. So I mean I don't know either what the magic number would be but it does seem to make sense to say, you know, would the current, you know, bandwidth and role of volunteers, you know, the group sees that maximum is between X and Y and anymore, you know, should be given serious consideration especially looking at volunteer capacity.

Because I don't think it's as much as question of staff being able to support but, you know, we've seen over the past that it's become difficult for volunteers to commit their time to so many different initiatives and, you know, we've gone with many groups from weekly calls to biweekly calls which of course makes the overall process much longer.

So you would need to ask the question as well like if you would limit it you might get things quicker done so the overall time frame gets shorter for everything. While if you take on a lot at the same time everything takes much, much longer. So, you know, you might be taking on a lot of issues but you don't necessarily resolve them quicker.

James Bladel: Yes Jeff this is - oh I see Paul has his hand up. Sorry.

Jeff Neuman: Okay Paul.

Paul Diaz: Thanks guys. Yes it's Paul. You know, Marika I totally respect what you're saying but at the same time I wouldn't be so humble as you always are in terms of staff resources. And Jeff I would offer that if this group is going to try and present any sort of guidance for council in the decision-making about PDPs that it's really critical - one of the few things that they can look at in terms of a hard number is the availability of staff.

And, you know, staff could determine amongst itself realistically what is their maximum threshold for support of PDPs? The challenge you'll have with volunteers is that it's always going to be a moving target and it's only going to be somebody's best guess.

But as a - one factor in the decision-making not the only one for sure but a very important one nonetheless. Staff support, you know, you know how many staff are available, you can multiply out how many can they, how many PDPs could they realistically support to the levels, to the standards that they always have that we've all come to expect which is a very high standard. And there you go.

There's one factor and it's a real one that you can generate. Because as far as, you know, volunteers go heck we've had - just as a sidebar the new transfer PDP, you know, wonderfully surprised to see how many people have stepped up in the first meeting. But we'll also see after the first, second even

third meeting do you still continue to have that high level of participation or not? It's hard to say with, you know, volunteers and everyone's busy schedules.

At least with the staff you've got, you know, the professionals, they will be there and you can, you know, just build off whatever the number is of available staff. You know, they can support X number of PDPs. There you go that's the maximum threshold.

Jeff Neuman: Okay I think those are good comments. Any other - anything else that the council can use?

James Bladel: Jeff this is James I just wanted to echo a lot of what Paul said and then just maybe put out there that, you know, staff knows or can readily find out who's, you know, how many PDPs are in process and who's participating on them. And I think that, you know, back in college they used to say for one hour of class time you had X number of hours outside class work and I think that, you know, the same goes for a PDP as well. For every hour on the call there's X number of hours on the list or off the call.

And I think it just becomes really a matter of arithmetic to figure out the, you know, you have a finite number of volunteers and what their threshold for depletion is and I think that, you know, at some point and it gets into fuzzy logic here but you're expecting that a brand new PDP will be populated by people you've never seen before which doesn't really happen in the real world.

So - but I think that, you know, Paul's perspective that, you know, there's some metrics we can put against staff resources but I think that there's also some metrics or capacity metrics that can be inferred from the volunteer folks as well.

Jeff Neuman: Staff do you have a comment on that? Is there anything you guys have done or could do to kind of help us to have those kind of metrics?

Marika Konings: It's a bit of a challenge I mean - this is Marika again because of course, you know, if the community demands more at some point, you know, we just put more resources in the pot. And of course it might take a bit of time because we might need to recruit people but in the end, you know, this is a volunteer driven organization so if more resources are required, you know, we do our best to add those necessary.

So I'm not sure that the staff would be in a position to say to the council, "Oh well, you know." Well we could of course say we've reached our thresholds and we're not doing anything more but the more likely scenario is that we say, "Well we'll try to find the resources if, you know, if you want to push ahead we'll do our best to keep up."

But I said I think for us it becomes more a question, you know, can volunteers keep up and as Paul said I think we've, you know, we've made quite an effort in reaching out and trying to get new volunteers on board and it's very encouraging to see new names and new faces in these groups but the question is will they stay there? And indeed it will be interesting to see if for three or four meetings if we're back to the same group that are already involved in all the other different groups and a real struggle again of getting work done.

Because that's - I think one of the realities that we're currently faced with we have many working groups going on and I think many groups start off saying, "Oh we're going to do a lot of work and we don't need staff to provide a lot of help apart from support." But - and many of the groups at the end of the day, you know, staff is tasked writing documents and providing first drafts because there is no capacity for the community to take those roles on.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Margie and then Paul.

Margie Milam: I think Marika covered it. I agree with what Marika said about the ability of the community to participate. Because even if we can on staff side, can tell you that we can support a certain number of PDPs and we're prepared to do so, we really need the brain power of the community and the input of the volunteers or it's really, you know, no good. Because the document needs to reflect, you know, the consensus of the community and you really don't want it to be a staff driven document because we don't have enough participation from the community.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yes I just wanted to follow up and, you know, again I appreciate Marika and Margie's, you know, being humble about it but I think that this working group has an opportunity, we really should seize the opportunity to sort of reset expectations about PDP processes.

                  You know, we've all noticed for example that, you know, the time lines are just never ever observed. What's in the bylaws is just completely divorced from reality. And I think in the same way we should take advantage and again it's just one factor of hopefully several in decision-making but, you know, having a metric that, you know, staff can kind of determine amongst themselves what is a realistic threshold and offer that as a threshold. Not to keep saying, "Oh okay boss we'll do more with less," or, "We'll look to perhaps hire another person." No have something out there so that there is some sense of a ceiling.

                  Otherwise we have, you know, we'll continue to have a possibility, a very strong possibility in fact that, you know, a single council member who is an advocate for a certain position can finagle the system, ram something through and we wind up having the situation we have today where we're understaffed both in terms of professional ICANN people as well as volunteers working on issues that, you know, squeak through, meet the

minimum thresholds but then don't get, you know, a lot of brain power support - use the term we had earlier. And we might be able to avoid some of that by having a sense of, "Look, there's a ceiling and until we work through the issues that have already been agreed to stop adding to the mix."

Jeff Neuman: Or have some process to reprioritize if it's really that urgent.

Paul Diaz: Exactly and urgency - right and just make sure that there's a well understood process by which you say, "Look this really is important to a lot of people. Bump it to the front of the line."

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I see Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. I would really support all of what was said in this regards. And I think at the end really I have, my principal is have - I prefer to have less with the higher quality, higher level of quality and instead of having more with this lower quality at the end. And then that means really we have to - the council has to take into consideration the staff resources as one part of its discussions and deliberations, it is one part.

I fully understand that this could not be the only argument to check the staff resources against. The question should be, should we come up with a new PDP or not? So that could not be the major question, it's one really important question. Because at the end what we need is we need documents to be written, you know, and we need persons who write these documents and these are staff people, I understand that fully.

But on the other hand we have, there are implications from the community they would like to have, they are waiving their hands because they have some needs with regards maybe to initiate a PDP and that's, that's for me only an item for discussion for the council. And prioritize that into - by taking into account staff resources as well and the urgency of the issues.

And it's then a question of all the quality of the council, of the people, of the members of the council, how are they taking that into consideration? So that's it. So coming to a conclusion for that I think it's very hard to set a number here or a limit rather than to put, to write down as we say all these arguments.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Let's see. James?

James Bladel: Sorry mute button problems there. Yes and I just want to commend Wolf. That was an excellent point relative to the deterioration in quality versus quantity.

And I just wanted to put out for, you know, in a conclusion I could just sum up my concerns with this topic is that the answer to capacity challenge cannot be ICANN grows. Okay? I think that that's something that we are, all of us are maybe very mindful of as we start to bring on more TLDs and get into more and more issues and there's questions of mission creep or where the score begins and ends and I think that, you know, we certainly cannot use this idea of just indefinite and unquestioned growth of the staff and scope and reach of ICANN in response to these types of issues.

I don't think that that is something that is, you know, coming from my background and I certainly don't mean this as a slight on the staff at all I mean, you know, I think Marika and Margie and everyone will tell you that I am very appreciative of their help. But we cannot just respond to adding headcount to address these types of issues. We need to step back and take a look at where they're coming from, where they're being raised and what the prioritization is. So I just wanted to put that out on the table and say that that's a strong, that's an important concern that we can't just keep ramping up.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Paul Diaz: Yes and this is Paul and I want to 100% concur with what James just said for the record.

Jeff Neuman: Anyone disagree with that? I'm not seeing any disagreement.
Here's another question and it actually brings to if you want to scroll up to, or not a question but we actually did talk a little bit about this if you'll scroll up to number one the last part of it right before number two. If you go right before, "Some suggested it might be helpful to foresee some flexibility for prioritization and scheduling reasons for example to put the initiation of a PDP on hold if there are already too many going on." So we did talk about this earlier. Right now the bylaws are pretty strict as to, you know, once you initiate that PDP then it's X number of days before a working group needs to be constituted or a task force actually in the existing bylaws.

There really isn't an option but we can formalize it that there could be an option to actually vote to initiate the PDP but put it on hold until there's, until the council decides there are sufficient resources or time to do that. Is that something you guys would support putting formally into the bylaws is giving them the option to not immediately constitute a working group but to put it on hold? To say, "Yes this is important enough that we need to initiate a PDP we just need to have the resources to move forward."

And again that could be a mechanism of gaming too, right? So someone that doesn't want a PDP to go forward if they get out voted is there a way that they can game it so that they can prevent a working group from being constituted because they don't agree with the whole PDP in the first place. What can we do to balance that?

You know, for example an option could be that, you know, once a PDP is voted to be initiated by the council a working group needs to be constituted within six months or something to that effect.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It's Wolf speaking here.

Jeff Neuman: Yes please.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: In this respect I have also something to understand because in several parts of the document it's related to voting, voting through the PDP process. That means so once the council has decided to initiate a PDP with the given thresholds, you know, the quorum and the threshold and all these things then there are some questions after the working team has been established or the charter has to be established as well and then the working team has to be established or vice versa. Then the question is every time, you know, at what kind of levels of voting we have at that time, we should have at that time. So that may be comparable to that.

Because I would say the threshold which the council took by voting about the PDP initiation, that must be the master I would say, the highest level. So not any question should be voted beyond, you know, that it means if you are talking about, you know, chartering and all these things these follow up things that should not be for voting from my point of view. There should not be a voting level that is that kind that the council has already taken. So that's my understanding because the council decision to initiate a PDP is for me the highest priority. And afterward it should run as fast as possible so that that's...

Jeff Neuman: Yes but the counter to that right, is to play, to play the other side is that if you have a lower threshold to delay the process or would you say...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Not to delay. You know delaying is something negative. I would say all questions which are regarding, you know, the dispositive development of a PDP these questions shouldn't be voted upon at higher levels. You know, that means vice versa a negative voting against it should not be lower. That's, that would be my conclusion. A potential negative voting against, which could imply or which could kill let me say the process a PDP already initiated that should be of a higher level.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. James.

James Bladel: Yes and once again I apologize I need a faster mute button. Just a question relative to the time frames that are part of the milestone charter where it will say for example T plus Y plus (unintelligible) Are these codified anywhere in the PDP process or in the bylaws? Or are those set on the table when council deliberates the PDP?

Jeff Neuman: Currently there are timing thresholds in there, in the bylaws that says that once there's an issues report then the council only has 15 days to actually vote on it, whether to initiate the formal PDP or not.

James Bladel: And I was think..

Jeff Neuman: That is currently in the bylaws.

James Bladel: ...and I was thinking that perhaps a, you know, rather than trying to project and foresee all the unanticipated scenarios where this could be needed or could gained that, you know, as a and I don't want this to sound like a punt over to the council but perhaps if we, you know, injected some additional flexibility into that process and trusted that they would be mindful of the scheduling and the different time frames and the complexity of the PDP issue at hand and just, you know, had the discretion to set those milestones it might go a long way towards balancing the work load and ensuring and maintaining the quality of the work.

                 So I just wanted to put that out there that instead of modifying the existing bylaws and then making them more and more complex perhaps we just inject some human judgment into this and then give the council the discretion to set those time frames as they feel appropriate.

Jeff Neuman: So you're saying that the bylaws should not have any, that maybe the rules of operation might have some suggested time lines but not the bylaws and that

the council should have some flexibility basically to do what it wants either to delay a vote on it or to vote on it in favor of initiating a PDP but then delaying, or not delaying that's a negative word but putting the PDP in a queue if you will that once another one is completed then there's enough time to actually start that one up.

James Bladel: Right. Giving them the flexibility and the discretion to judge on the individual issues that we can't foresee right now in this exercise and then maybe there can be some maximums in there Jeff so that folks are comfortable that they're not going to be permanently put on the back burner. But, you know, within those maximums they can, the council can exercise discretion.

Jeff Neuman: Okay you have any thoughts on that kind of maximum?

James Bladel: No. Sorry. I grant you that this idea is not fully baked. But, you know, what is, well what is it now I think we could probably do some addition here and figure out where, you know, if they have to vote on it in 15 days and then the working group has to convene its first meeting in, you know, some time frame beyond that. I mean that we could probably set the maximum out at something like even, you know, 90 or 100 days.

I think what the initiators of the PDP want to see is that this, that their particular PDP will not always be on deck and never actually in the game. But I think that, you know, beyond that the council should be able to make that decision on a situational basis and say that, you know, "We feel that, you know, rather than waiting 15 days we think that this particular issue can wait 40 days."

Jeff Neuman: Now remember there's a couple of different phases we're talking about here right? There's the vote to formally initiate the PDP, which is separate than to formally approve the charter, which is also separate from actually getting the working group set up. So which stage or is it any of these stages that you

think the council should have discretion to put in a queue for a certain period of time?

James Bladel: You know Jeff I'd like to say that the entire process or anywhere in the process that's where a specific time lines are identified to submit for consideration of this group that we remove specific time lines, let the council exercise some judgment on those. If we, you know, if we don't feel that that's going to be acceptable to other areas of the community then we open up the possibility of maximums of, you know, 100 days but I'm thinking from the time that the issues report is delivered to the council until the time that the working, PDP working group has it's first meeting I think that should be allowed to float.

Jeff Neuman: Anyone support that or Paul you have a comment?

Paul Diaz: Yes I wanted to weigh in. You know, I think what James is raising or what he just said a part of it is very appealing to me. Another part is maybe in a minimum when we, you know, start providing drafts of the positions that we really call this one out to try and solicit community input on this idea. Because I mean the one thing we've all recognize is that the times lines that we currently work under are always ignored and there's no real penalty for that.

So, you know, the counter argument if you like what James just said, take them out leave it to discretion. The counter to that is of course is that things could languish forever if there's no sense somewhere that there's a, you know, a time frame to provide. So I don't know if I necessarily want to say let's drop them all right now but at the very least let's try to be very clear as we develop reporting for the work that we're doing that, you know, we're looking for input on this particular issue whether or not we should even bother having time lines since they're never followed.

Jeff Neuman: So in setting up a maximum, so let's say let's make up a number let's say six months from the delivery of an issues report to when a working group, the

first meeting of a working group. Let's say that's our maximum. Who makes that decision? You say council and I know Wolf was talking before was saying that he doesn't want to see more voting or a higher thresholds but who makes the decision and for how long that process is queued up? How is that done? And is that a potential for gaming by parties that just wanted to see it delayed longer and longer?

James Bladel: Well Jeff I think and I'm sorry to jump ahead of Wolf but I felt like that question was directed at me.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

James Bladel: I felt that not only is that not contributing to the possibility of gaming but it's actually a good check against that possibility. Because the council is going to be, they're going to have the queue on the one hand so they're going to know what's on the docket and then they're going to have the issue on the other hand they're going to know exactly how complex in staff and volunteer intensive that's going to be and they're going to be able to discuss the time line as a part of the approval process.

And I think that if anyone were to try to game that, you know, the councilor's individually or as a group would, you know, would be very cognizant of that and would be able to put a stop to that almost as it's occurring. So that's just, you know, I'm thinking the more we insert finite and specific time lines into this process the less, the less discretion or flexibility that we're providing to the council. And it's just always going to be that balance between flexibility and predictability.

So I agree with Paul I think that if we can highlight this area and get some comments from the community, you know, I'd love to for example figure out what my boss thinks of this, you know, I just came up with this last night. But anyway, you know, I think it's worth discussing as a component of our comment period and if we can call attention to that let's do that because it's,

you know, every date, every time frame, every deadline that we put in there is putting the council into a smaller and smaller box and tying their hands a little bit tighter.

And as Paul said right now the response to that is we'll just disregard the time lines. There's no penalty for doing so, it doesn't affect anything else, they're just kind of, they're fiction at this point. So I think we should definitely get some broader feedback from the community on that.

Jeff Neuman: Okay I want to go on to Wolf and then Margie and then we'll try to go on to another question.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sorry I only would like to say I have to leave. I have a (unintelligible) because of another conference we have with a constituency right now. But what I wanted to say is please with regards to time lines and thresholds and all these things is please do not wait and do not expect anything from the other team in that respect because they are expecting something from this team here with regards to all inputs regarding the PDP issues, time lines and all these things. So we should discuss it in this team here and then give them to the other because they would put it into the what is that the rules of procedure then for the council.

Okay I have to leave. Sorry for that. Next time - what will be for next time? We are fixed right now?

Jeff Neuman: Oh okay so the next time is two weeks from today.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Two weeks, okay. Sorry for that.

Jeff Neuman: That's okay. Alright, let's go to Margie.

Margie Milam: Sure. Just a follow-up on the question of who might be involved in the scheduling of the priorities. You might think about allocating that right to the

vice-chairs and the chair of the GNSO. This came up in the Toronto meeting last week and the question was - well what's the roll of the vice-chairs of the counsel?

And so far, I'm not aware of very many responsibilities, but this might be one that might be appropriate, because you would have a vice-chair from each house. So certainly each house would be represented in that decision to prioritize PDPs.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Are there any other comments on the priority? I think we've got some good stuff and I think Paul's suggestion of calling this one out, I think is a good one that we will certainly do in our draft.

If we can jump down to number eight. Are there any options for the GNSO counsel to basically have experts when they're deciding whether to initiate a PDP? And so the questions are should the counsel be allowed to invite experts in or interested parties provided to show information and/or answer question on the issue?

And should the counsel be allowed to differ a vote if it feels there are still questions that need to be answered before it can make an informed decision on whether to initiate a PDP or not?

I think, you know, from the whole theme of flexibility, you know, I think that's probably the answers to both those questions from this group are going to be yes, but I don't want to presuppose the answer. So does anybody want to speak on that?

Margie, you're hand's raised, I can't remember if that's still from the last one.

Margie Milam: Yes, that's the last one. Sorry, I'll take it down.

Jeff Neuman: That's okay. James and then Marika.

James Bladel: Yes, I just wanted to say that I do agree that they should have this option.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, Marika.

Marika Konings: No, I was just wondering if there could be any more encouragement of having - you know, I witness now often when an issue is presented, you know, staff presents the reports.

There might be a little bit of discussion, but I think many as well, because of the short deadlines, I don't really know how much time people have had to review the issues and, you know, above that gone out themselves to talk to people or get opinions on what it is all about.

So my question would be, would it be of interest to actually, you know, for the counsels to invite once they go and deliberate or have their meeting on reviewing the issues report to say "Well are there any interested parties that have a stake in this issue that want to make their case?"

You know, because of course in issues reports, you know, staff presents or aims to present information in a neutral way, but it might be of interest for the counsel to get as well the different views or, you know, groups that have specific views on this to have the opportunity to state that apart from maybe a public comment period that might take place before hand.

It's just a question of having a bit more debate, you know, at the point of taking that decision.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, you are talking about a time period for those proponents or/and opposition of this PDP to come at this stage to present to the counsel, if the counsel so chooses. You think that this is the right stage as opposed to after the PDP?

Marika Konings: I don't know. It's a question. It's more, you know, what I've witnessed so far is that normally when an issues report get there, it's seldom that it doesn't go through, unless, you know, staff really strongly supports more research or more discussion.

And there's not often a whole lot of discussion at that stage. So I'm just wondering if, you know, maybe there's no need.

Maybe as you said, that it happens at a later stage in the process, but I'm wondering if to engage a bit more and get some more information on the table if that kind of process where you say, we put aside an hour, two hours, to a specific issues report.

You know, have a presentation by staff on the issues report. Then, you know, on some issues it's clear who are the stakeholders. They get invited to have a say as well, or if they don't agree with some of the conclusions in the issues report or something to make their cases well.

And then basically the counsel goes away and, you know, makes a decision on whether to move forward or not, or whether more research is needed or whether a pre-PDP should be more appropriate at this stage.

I mean, those things might be just suggestions that could be included in any kind of manual or guidebook that might come out of this work as well. But it's some of the options the counsel could consider exploring. I mean, I don't think it's anything that you would like to mandate or, you know, require.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. James you have comments on this?

James Bladel: Yes and I think, you know, providing access to experts to inform counsel deliberations can never be a bad thing. I just wanted to state that.

But Marika raises a very interesting point, which is that the experts can inform if we assume that there's flexibility in the timelines or flexibility in the scheduling or viewings based on the how staff intensive or volunteer intensive the issue will be.

The experts and the stakeholders can inform that process, and perhaps even shed some light on just that an issue may be much more complex than it appears on the surface.

And I wanted to pose a question without seeming like a complete neophyte here. I think I already know the answer, but I wanted to ask it anyways. Are issues reports subject to public comment before they're delivered to counsel?

Marika Konings: No. Currently there's no requirement and no time to actually do it.

James Bladel: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: But one idea might be to preempt or to formalize this process by having the issues reports - by opening them to some form of comment so that the experts and stakeholders can weigh in before, you know, on those comments and can be delivered to the counsel in addition to the issues report.

Because that might then prompt the counsel to ask some different questions or perhaps even reach out to some individual commenters to get field out some of their concerns or some of their ideas.

But I'm thinking as if primarily in the terms of fast (unintelligible), if that's what's working group. It seems like if we had some, you know, some of this going on prior to the PDP being launched it might have had a more productive PDP experience.

Because I think that folks on the counsel would have seen immediately that this was not necessarily as cut and dry as it might have appeared initially. And that once we started to dive into this, you know, it really was a can of worms.

So, I just wanted to put out the idea that Marika raised a really important point and that perhaps suggesting the issues report to some sort of a comment so the counsel can read those comments in conjunction with the issues report.

And then possibly reach out to the individual stakeholders before having to vote on the adoption of the PDP and then using all of that information to determine what the timeframe should be.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so going back to Stage 1, we actually have that and you'll see it in the reports that we talk about that, about members of the group suggested having a public comment period as optional prior to delivering it to the counsel.

And I think it was optional because I think you had people on that call who were talking about it, you know, people like Alan Greenberg and Mike Rodenbach who talked about just delaying the process, because during the initial phase there was supposed to be, you know, there's "birds of a feather," there's other things that are recommended, you know, best practices to get public input.

What they're worried about is delay. We talked about that as an option available to the counsel or the best practice.

James Bladel: Okay. I do remember that now Jeff. Thanks for having a better memory than I have, but I do remember that now. And I remember they were concerned about - there were some that were concerned about delaying the process.

And I think that, you know, from my perspective it's delaying to what? Delaying to getting something adopted just so it can be delayed in the working group? You know, I think, you know, we're racing to the next checkpoint just so it can get stuck in the mud there instead of on the table at the counsel meeting.

That's not really a delay if you can spend and invest a little bit more time on the front end and, you know, cut months off the working group's activities. I think that's not really a delay. So, I'll just stop talking now, but that's how I, you know, in that particular case, that's certainly how I am voicing that now.

Jeff Neuman: Well, right, but I think your point is that look if there is a public comment period before delivery of the issues report to the counsel then that could lessen the need to have the GNSO have some sort of input or presentation or expert advice at this later stage.

James Bladel: Right, and I think that we can't measure timeframes or delays versus what the next stage or gate in the process will be, you know, if we look at it holistically, you know, speeding up one phase or eliminating all the barriers and checks for one phase just so that it can kind of get through to the next stage is not really the perspective that we should be looking at I think. So that's just...

Jeff Neuman: Well, I think that that's good. I think that also gets us to the next question, which is right now in the bylaws, it's interesting -- and I've always kind of found this a little bit weird -- is that right after you initiate a PDP, then an immediate public comment period starts, even before or I guess it's contemporaneously with the setting up of a working group or task force is that there's this public comment period.

Marika Konings: Jeff if I can just comment on that one. I mean, I think from the staff perspective we've interpreted that one a bit more flexible than its written there. We normally use it once a working group is launched.

We do it then and basically say well to announce initiation of the PDP and request a ready input, you know, before the working group really goes into deliberations for members of the community to come forward with information they think might be useful for the working group to consider.

So, but I agree. As it's written there I think it's really just announcing the initiation and that's it. You know, we've used it more broadly because we think there's value in, you know, people providing information at the start of a working group process. But as it's written it's more limited than that.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so the question is though is that still relevant or should the working group have the option to determine when there is a public comment period? In other words, should we even mandate this?

So after the charter's approved and even after the working group, should this be mandated in the bylaws?

Marika Konings: Jeff this is Marika. This is a question for you as you were involved when the bylaws were drafted. Was this put in there out of concern that otherwise, you know, GNSO counsel wouldn't tell anyone that a PDP has started.

And just do things that, you know, within closed doors and then come out suddenly with the results and that the world would go, "Oh we didn't even know that this was going on?" Was that a reason why this was put in or do you recall?

Jeff Neuman: Well from what I recall it was basically, it was not so much that, but it was to make sure that when the working group or the task force or whoever started, everyone knew each other's positions. So everyone knew where the business constituency was coming from, where the registrars were coming from.

Because really it's really for the constituencies for the comment period, mostly. I mean it does say public comment period, but it's mostly for the constituencies to develop statements.

Marika Konings: Okay, because I don't think that has been the practice, no?

Jeff Neuman: No it certainly hasn't been the practice.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: But it's almost like you've gotten a -- it's just seemed to -- it's one of those that we didn't really focus on that was kind of just taken from the PDP that was before it. Is this a good idea to start an immediate public comment period even after the working group is.

Or should we just leave that for the working group work teams to talk about and just say that at this point we don't think at this point it should be mandated by the bylaws that you immediately start a public comment period? That is should be up to the working group to determine?

But that there should be - there needs to be public comment considered in the working group's deliverables.

So I see James you have a comment on that one.

James Bladel: Yes, just real quickly Jeff. I'd like to point out that, you know, by having a public comment either before or shortly after a working group convenes, might take away from participation in the working group itself. If folks think that, you know, I see this issue, "I'll just submit a comment and be done with it."

Or I think that, you know, we want to make sure that folks understand that if they have a stake in a PDP, they should join the working group.

Jeff Neuman: And it should be a time for constituency members if they join to get their thoughts from -- or I should say stakeholder groups or constituencies...

Marika Konings: Can I ask something Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, sure.

Marika Konings: Because, I think I slightly disagree, because what I've seen at least in practice, those people submitting comments at that stage, it's normally not - I don't' think they would otherwise join a working group.

Or I think otherwise, if they provide valid information, it's a way as well to reach out to those individuals and say "hey, instead of just putting in your comment, you might consider joining the working group."

I think there is value in maybe not on announcing the initiation of a PDP, but having a public comment period at the beginning for the working group to have some input in that. So, you know, give the working group one or two or three meetings to formulate which questions they might want to ask of the public.

Because in some of the PDPs we're working on now, there's really the question. So is this really a problem? What kind of evidence is out there? Can we really ask for people to provide some examples of things they would like to see addressed or they think information that is needed for the working group to really make a good decision?

And the problem is that if that information is only provided at the initial report, you know, often the group has already set out its positions and it's more difficult to really bring that back into deliberations.

So I do see some value in providing the opportunity for the community to put out information or submit, you know, statements that they think might help inform the deliberations of the working group going forward.

Jeff Neuman: So maybe it's a recommendation to the working group. What you're saying is that it's almost a recommendation to the working group to initiate a public comment period by shaping the specific questions that they need answered or the topics that they want addressed?

As opposed to just throwing out a general "Okay, we've initiated a PDP on this subject. Here's the charter. Give us some comments," which is pretty open ended.

So should it be a deliverable of a working group and early deliverable as opposed to a counsel mandated comment period?

James Bladel: Jeff, this is James. I think it could be both, but if there's merit into the idea of submitting issues reports for comment and that's an option, and the issues report goes to comments.

And then the issues reports and the comments go over to counsel, which adopts it and then immediately turns around and puts the charter out for comment, I think that's just unnecessarily redundant. But anyway.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I kind of with you James on that one as far as - but then again a working group meeting a couple times, figuring out okay now we're talking about solutions, right? Because the issues report is talking about the appropriate questions and issues as opposed to the solutioning.

If the working group gets together and says, "Okay, let's narrow this down" or "let's figure out the types of solutions that are out there and then seek comments on those before we develop a preliminary report." Maybe that's better use of public comments.

Marika, your thoughts on that?

Marika Konings: Yes. I think I agree. I mean, if there's this public comment period following the issues report, I guess that's the opportunity as well for members of the community to provide information that they think needs to be included.

And I mean working groups have the flexibility now as well that if they want to have another public comment period or ask a specific question, they can do that.

So I agree. As it is currently written, you know, it doesn't make much sense. So I think it would be good to provide a suggestion to working groups and make sure that they know that they have that option and have, you know, the input covered in the earlier public comment period following the issues report. I think that makes sense.

James Bladel: And Jeff, maybe the idea is they have the option to have the issues report commented upon. They have the option of having the workings group's first order of business be to solicit comments. But maybe we remove the option that they can do both.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So let's reflect that in the notes here to do that. Is ten the last one here?

Yes. Okay. I think we actually talked about this issue, so I'm not sure - I'm trying to remember why it's in this Stage 2, which is clarifying end scope.

And I think we talked about this at previous discussions about really end scope means end scope for the GNSO, but perhaps there's notations in the issues report if possible as to whether we may be talking about something that's outside the picket fence, so it may not be in scope of a consensuses policy.

Isn't that where we ended up?

Marika Konings: Yes, I think it's just mentioned here because it's specifically is included in language related to the initiation of the PDP.

Jeff Neuman: Right, so basically...

Marika Konings: We want to be consistent and make sure that we don't forget as well to change the language there in the same way as we discussed in the previous stage.

Jeff Neuman: Right. Okay. Is there any other questions on that one?

Alright, we did not get to the emergency urgency ones, but I think we talked about prioritizing and I think so we did kind of address it. I'm not sure at this point since we're scheduled to end at 11:30 that we -- or in five minutes -- that we have enough time to start that one.

So I just want to go over the schedule and deliverables and some things on timing. My thought is and I'll put a note out to the list -- so we're getting close to Seoul and it would be nice to have some things delivered by that point in time.

And so I want to throw this out there about having in September the biweekly calls which would be the 10th and the 24th and then starting that following week is do weekly calls up until Seoul. That would mean the 1st, 8th and 15th of October.

So I just want to kind of throw that out. Any thoughts on that? Is that overkill? I'm just getting, you know, I'd like to have some good progress before Seoul, but I don't want to start weekly calls immediately, because that would really be overkill.

Paul Diaz: Jeff, it's Paul. I think that fine and you can kind of play it by ear as you get closer to October. If we're making good progress, you might not even need the extra meeting, but put it out there to put people's feet to the fire.

I mean you've had a consistent group of attendees, but obviously the people signed up to the working groups much larger and hopefully more will try and dial in on a regular basis.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, and I think giving a months notice before we do that is hopefully enough time for people to kind of put it on their schedules.

Okay, so why don't we - we'll send around a note that basically talks about the next, you know, five calls and maybe someone from ICANN staff could actually send that note around to the team saying, you know, "here's the schedule of future calls." And they will all be at the same time.

Marika Konings: Gisella could you take care of that? I'll take care of it. I'll make sure someone takes care of it. Gisella?

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so as a reminder, hopefully by tomorrow, the end of tomorrow close of business, we'll send around a draft to members. It's only a rough first draft of our report on Stage 1.

Then we're going to put together a survey for Stage 2 and hopefully have that out within the next ten days, I'm hoping or in ten days to cover these topics and maybe give a two week time period to answer those questions.

And then we will hopefully have a draft rough report in early October on Stage 2 that considers the survey results and what we've talked about now.

And then in the meantime, for the next call, we'll talk about the draft of Stage 1 and then for maybe half the call and then go to a Stage 3, which hopefully

ICANN staff can put it in a chart like this by the next call. Does that sound doable Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Any questions on timing?

Okay, anybody else have any other issues before we hang up?

Gisella Gruber-White: It's just Gisella to say that I did get your comment, Jeff. Sorry I was on mute and it takes ages to unmute. I'll send out the note with the next dates and timings.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Also a last topic is -- that you just reminded me of -- in Seoul. Can we also ask in that note who's going to be there and when they plan on getting there? Because I think the goal is to have both a PPSC meeting and work team meeting in Seoul on that Saturday or Sunday. I'm not sure what the ICANN schedule is.

Marika Konings: As I recall, I think it's more likely on Sunday, because I think Saturday is reserved for a lot of updates I think on the new gTLDs and IDNs and such. So I think it will be similar to Sydney where there will be time on Sunday. But I'll look into that and confirm.

Jeff Neuman: Great. So we'll do that and just to make sure that everyone - or it would be nice to know who from the work team is planning on being there.
Okay. Thank you everyone.

James Bladel: Awesome. Thanks Jeff.

Paul Diaz: Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks guys.

<div align="center">END</div>