

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Policy Development Process (PDP)
Work Team (WT)
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 27 May 2010 at 13:30 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 27 May 2010 at 13:30 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-20100527.mp3>

On page:
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may> <<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>>
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Avri Doria - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group
Alex Gakuru - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group
Gabriel Pineiro - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group
Tatiana Khramtsova - Registrar Stakeholder Group
James Bladel – Registrar Stakeholder Group
Paul Diaz - Registrar Stakeholder Group
Wolf Ulrich_Knoben – ISCP

ICANN Staff:
Margie Milam
Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery
Liz Gasster

Absent apologies:
Jeff Neuman - Registry Stakeholder Group - Work Team Chair
David Maher – Registry Stakeholder Group

Glen de Saint G ry: Thank you. Has the recording, (unintelligible)?

On the call today which is the 27th of May, the PDP Work Team Call, we have Alex Gakuru, Gabriel Pineiro, James Bladel, Paul Diaz, Tatiana Khramtsova, Avri Doria, Alan Greenberg. And for staff we have Marika Konings, Liz Gasster, Margie Milam, and Glen de Saint G ry, myself.

May I remind everyone to say their name before talking for the transcription.
Thank you very much, and over to you, Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. And just a note. We have apologies from Jeff Neuman who had an unscheduled last minute emergency and won't be able to make this call. So, he's asked me to step in and just ask before the recording started if there are any volunteers to lead the meeting? I'm happy to hand over the Chairmanship.

As I don't see anyone jumping up in the Adobe Connect Room, I'll...

Alan Greenberg: I thought he announced it at the last meeting, and we appointed James.

Marika Konings: Oh, well he sent an email and it seemed that he - well, I'm happy to give it to James.

Alan Greenberg: I seem to remember (unintelligible) James wasn't at the call, so it was reasonable to give him the Chair.

Avri Doria: Oh, yes. Of course. I remember that.

Marika Konings: Maybe he forgot about it, because he sent an email earlier this morning, so maybe he still thought he was going to make the meeting.

Alan Greenberg: I could've imagined it, but it's very...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: It's very vivid in my recollection.

James Bladel: While I haven't in the past, I don't - that doesn't stick out in my memory, Alan. I think it would.

Alan Greenberg: That was the proof that you could do it.

Marika Konings: James, do you want to take over, or...

James Bladel: I would Marika, except I really have fallen behind on this particular group, so I don't think I would be doing justice to everyone who's trying. So - and since we are closing in on the deadline, I think that while I'm normally not comfortable having staff kind of set the agenda, I think in this particular case you know better than anyone exactly what remains to be done for our report.

Alan Greenberg: I support that.

Marika Konings: Okay. So, this is Marika. I guess just maybe then to take a step back and go over where we are. I sent out an email I think yesterday, and as we all know, we're approaching the deadline and I apologize for you know, the short timelines that we had for people to review the document. So, I found an updated document is posted on the Wiki that basically - the main changes there are for Chapter 1, the Executive Summary, where I inserted proposed language for the different recommendation.

I did something we discussed on the call last week, and there were still a number of areas where we had TBC and no concrete language included. So we agreed on the last call that I would basically go away and then try to come up with some language that would reflect the discussions we've had, but leave enough flexibility in there to make sure that people understand that these are really draft recommendations. And you know, that the group really is looking for input on those draft recommendations. That's one of the major changes.

And then Chapter 9, I've added some additional flow charts for the remaining stages that weren't included yet, noting that it still needs some further work based on the recommendations.

And, I didn't want to create more work for myself in going back and forth. I'm hoping that we can focus on the recommendations in this session, and based on that I'll be able to update the flowchart, adding in the relevant recommendations for the relevant stages. And also, updating those recommendations throughout the document, because there's also some empty holes in the different sections.

So, I don't know. I guess my first question would be whether people had a chance to review, especially Chapter 1, the Executive Summary, the recommendations? Wolf-Ulrich sent earlier today his comments to the mailing list. I don't know if people had a chance to look at those.

I quickly went through them and you know, some of them are style issues which I think are not very controversial. I think I can pull up his document in a second. I think there was only one substantial change, which seemed to be logical in relation to where we talk about meetings, that it should be GNSO Council meetings.

So maybe, the first question is did people have a chance to look at those recommendations? And do they - would you like to go through them one by one, just noting you know, if there are no comments we just move on to the next one. And, do people need more time to provide comments on the mailing list?

So, I see Avri. Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes. I did have a chance to review them. Unfortunately, I finished at about 9:27, and I did send them to you, Marika. I think walking through them is a good idea. I did have some stylistic, but I also had some either lack of understanding and then some perhaps outright disagreements.

So, I think walking through them, given the time - and they're short enough that anybody that didn't have a chance to review would have a chance to

read them while we were talking. I think that's probably worth our time, given the lack of time.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Avri, I actually didn't - I didn't get an email from you with your comments. I got them on the Working Group Work Team, but not...

Avri Doria: No. I sent this one -- as I say -- four minutes ago - ten minutes ago now.

Marika Konings: Okay. Okay. Then it's probably still on the way.

Avri Doria: Right. As I said, I sent it at like 9:27, my time.

Marika Konings: Yes. It's 3:39 here, so - no, I'm just noting that because I wasn't sure which time zone you had sent them at 9:29. So...

Avri Doria: I sent them three minutes before this meeting began.

Marika Konings: Great. Okay. Then, I guess they should be on their way.

Avri Doria: And, it's only ten minutes to you, because I didn't want to fill up mailboxes. Whatever.

Marika Konings: Okay. Do others agree that we just run through the Executive Summary and focus on the recommendations?

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Marika Konings: Right. The document is up in Adobe Connect. I see that not everyone that's on the call there, but it's the same document that was - that's posted on the Wiki, so you can look there as well.

So, looking at Stage 1, Planning and Request for an Issue Report, Recommendation 1. Anyone have any...

Avri Doria: Yes. I had - and this was one of my stylistic ones that run throughout, and I'll just make the recommendation. I know these recommendations are provisional. I think I understand what you're trying to do in considering recommending. I would recommend sort of a - you know, one of those lovely (chapeau) paragraphs that says, "In this section, all of these recommendations are provisional and are subject to change, given further discussions or the results of the comment period." And then, just use the recommends language would be a general recommendation. I know it's stylistic, but it's massive stylistic.

Marika Konings: Would you like me just to add a disclaimer then, like before - basically before the Stage 1, and just put like a box there - disclaimer. Like...

Avri Doria: Yes. Something...

Marika Konings: ...all these recommendations are provisional and subject to change.

Avri Doria: Right. Something like that, that every time the word recommends appears in this, it is purely provisional. But otherwise, it really does make it harder to read and scan, and everything else. So, yes. However you did it. Whether it was a (chapeau) paragraph or a box at the front, or anything. Yes. That's what I would recommend.

Marika Konings: Okay. And, do you want me then to change as well the considering recommending, or that's fine? If we have the disclaimer?

Avri Doria: That's just it. Sometimes in considering recommending almost works in a sentence scanning, and sometimes it gets way awkward. Where you end up with three or four gerunds in a row, occasions where there's three gerunds and two infinitives. And, it really makes for difficult reading. That's why I would just sort of say you know, the recommendations that come below are all provisional and subject to change based on community comment and

further deliberations, and no put considering recommending. That's what I would...

Alan Greenberg: Avri for clarity, you were suggesting that disclaimer come before every set of recommendations, or once at the beginning?

Avri Doria: I was thinking once at the beginning. I mean, if we think that it's really important, we could you know put a box in the first 18 pages footer to say all recommendations on this page are provisional. You know, just to make sure that no one forgets. But...

Alan Greenberg: I'd just put it at the beginning and put it in bold letters in a box...

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay.

Alan Greenberg:...so it's hard to miss.

Avri Doria: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yes, and I'll change is considered recommending just to recommends.

Avri Doria: Yes. And, I see you had that before then changed it or something.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yes. That's what we discussed basically on the call last week to make it really explicit that it's not a recommendation yet, but it's considering recommending, so that's why it was changed. But I think with the disclaimer, that should solve that and we can just go back to recommends.

Avri Doria: Because otherwise, it is tough to read.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Marika Konings: Anything on the substance in relation to Recommendation 1?

Recommendation 2?

Avri Doria: It's a duplicate. Two and three seem to be the same. I should've raised my hand. Sorry.

Alan Greenberg: Can you give us page numbers for those of us who are desperately trying to scroll?

Avri Doria: Page 5.

Marika Konings: Yes. Page 4, bottom of Page 4 and top of Page 5.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. So, you're just looking at the end of the Executive Summary?

Marika Konings: Yes. So probably I need to clarify that, because I think it relates to two different parts of the provisions that relate to requesting an issues report. So, the one is on the right to initiate the issues report, and the other one is on the requesting of the issues report.

But, I'll need to cross-reference that with what we actually have in this section to make sure, and I can maybe otherwise add the page numbers so that people see that it's two different items that relate to that. And if not, if I duplicate it it'll just take one of the out.

Avri Doria: And if not, then probably the thing to do is change the wording of them...

Marika Konings: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...of one or the other of them so it's obviously not a repeat.

Marika Konings: Yes. I'll check that.

Recommendation 4.

Recommendation 5.

Alan Greenberg: Four doesn't parse - oh, okay. We have to put back recommends. Got it.

Marika Konings: Yes. I actually - I see that I forgot recommends.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Marika Konings: Are we at Recommendation 5?

Recommendation 6?

Alan Greenberg: Slow down. Slow down. On the tenth like one didn't we say this was a not mandatory, or maybe that's not necessary in the Executive Summary.

Marika Konings: That's basically the last sentence, "Such (unintelligible) should become part of the above mentioned policy development process manual or guidebook," which you know, if it's not in the bylaws - or if it's in the guidebook, it's normally not a mandatory thing. Only in the bylaws...

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Fine. Okay, we can fix that next pass if necessary.

Marika Konings: But, I'm happy to make that more explicit if...

Alan Greenberg: I don't think it matters at this level.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: If anything, it'll solicit more comments this way.

Marika Konings: Recommendation 6?

Recommendation 7?

Avri Doria: Yes. This is Avri.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Avri Doria: At the first line, shocked me. And then as I was reading later, I realized that perhaps this line meant only no changes would relate to the creation of issues reports. But the way that sentence read, no changes to the bylaws are considered for recommendation by the Work Team at this point.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Avri Doria: And then, you see a little later. And so I first read it not paying attention, and it was my fault in this reading. But not paying attention that it was under a header and only applied to the creation of an issues report. So, I would be slightly more specific to say that in creation of an issues report, no changes are recommended, or something like that.

Marika Konings: Okay. Yes.

Alan Greenberg: I have a - it's Alan. I also have a substance question on that one.

Marika Konings: Yes. go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Does the by-law that we're talking about here include the word of how it gets submitted? Because, that particular section of how an advisory committee submits a request for an issues report is exceeding (unintelligible)...

Marika Konings: I think that actually falls under 2, the procedures for requesting an issues report.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: The creation of the issues report, that provision relates more (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I'm sorry. Too close to me waking up. Yes, you're right. Okay.

Marika Konings: So moving on then to Recommendation 8.

Recommendation 9.

Recommendation 10.

11. James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Yes, Marika. James speaking. And I'm just looking over Recommendation 10. Sorry, you're going very quickly.

Marika Konings: Apologize.

James Bladel: You know, we mention here option of an economic impact analysis. And since discussing this, you know, I've been reading a lot of the affirmation of commitments documents, and I'm wondering if rather than saying something to the effect of economic impact analysis or study on the effect of...

Marika Konings: Well, wait a second James. Because, I think you're actually running ahead because you're on...

Avri Doria: On 14.

Marika Konings: ...Item 10, Recommendation 14. No? We're still on...

James Bladel: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Sorry. Go ahead. Go ahead. I'm jumping way ahead. I'm following...

Alan Greenberg: Your looking at Section 10, not Recommendation 10.

James Bladel: Got you.

Avri Doria: And, I'll have bad comments on that one too, when we get there.

James Bladel: Okay. I'll hold for now. Now, we're on the Role of ICANN Staff. Okay.

Marika Konings: No, we're on Recommendation 11.

James Bladel: Now, we're on 11.

Marika Konings: And that - (it partially) - I tried there to brave the discussion that I think was maybe between Avri and Alan on the last call, the two options. So, I want to check with both of you if this reflects what you were trying to explain on the last call.

Avri Doria: Avri.

Marika Konings: Yes. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes for me, it does. I think it's good. It sets the - that there are the two options, and it doesn't even set them in opposition. So, I think that that - I think it's good.

Alan Greenberg: I believe it was - I thought - at least I was arguing for - and maybe I - I don't remember what we said - is that it should be an or, not an and.

Avri Doria: Oh, so you want them to be in direct opposition?

Alan Greenberg: No. No. Sorry. In the last line of A. It says it requires the approval of the GNSO Council and the requesting body.

Avri Doria: Oh, I see. Yes.

Marika Konings: But, you want an or?

Alan Greenberg: Well, that was certainly my intent.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Oh again, I - we're saying 30 to 45 days. Obviously in a - in the actual by-law, we will have to put a specific number, so I'm happy with that level. When we come to that discussion, I'll argue for the 30 not 45, but that doesn't have to be today.

Marika Konings: And, I think staff might want to argue for the 45 days.

Alan Greenberg: Well you know, as I said my inclination was...

Marika Konings: No. No. No. I know. I know.

Alan Greenberg: ...the smallest number that could make sense in an optimal case, and then change it as necessary.

Avri Doria: Can I ask a question? I should raise my hand.

Marika Konings: Yes. Please go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Now, I had to put in the Recommendation B, is this something that the staff is even interested in doing? Or, do they see this as an extra burden and they would just as soon go only with Alan and just deal with negotiating a time frame? Because if you all sort of think, "Oh, man. Just doing this analysis is just extra work, and you know, just give us a deadline and we'll live with it," is something you'd prefer to say, then I'll certainly drop my support of the option.

Because if you guys don't want it, it's certainly not reasonable to push it.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'll let Margie go next. From my point of view, I think that we would really appreciate. Because I think you know, it partly depends as well on our workload. Who's you know, the expert in that area you know that might have a certain task they need to complete first.

So, I think it would be really helpful if we maybe could give that indication. Say, "Look. If you really want it well researched, and we see as well some additional activities that might need to take place for us to gather the information, and this is what we propose," and then immediately you know being negotiation and the terms would actually work.

Margie?

Margie Milam: Yes. I agree with Marika, especially because it's an issue where (unintelligible) going to happen faster, you know we might just say you know, we think we can do it two weeks or whatever, you know, if there's a reason that it could be sooner than whatever the time period was. So, I agree. I think B is not a bad option at all.

Marika Konings: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: To different issues. It currently says we're considering the following options, which doesn't mean both, or either. It means either/or or both. And so, I don't think we need to make that decision at this point. That's a discussion we can again have after comments.

I mean, I would object strongly to just B, or even including B because again, it goes back to the GNSO Council as opposed to the requesting body. So you know, I think the Council should not be getting involved until the issues report comes back. That's the design of the bylaws as it stands right now, and I don't think we should be changing that overall intent because of a timing issue.

My specific comment in A is I would put agreement instead of approval, and I would put and/or the - instead of the requesting body, the issues report requestor. The reason I'm saying that is we have gotten some discussion that if it's the Board for instance, the Board is not going to meet to officially as the Board pass a motion to accept 46 days instead or 30 or 60 days, or whatever. It's really a one-on-one between the people putting together the motion which the Board will pass requesting the issues report.

So I would not say the body, I would say agreement and the issues report requestor, unless it be a person-to-person discussion as opposed to body-to-body. I don't think it changes the substance at all.

Marika Konings: Okay. And Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. I guess I was just going to say thank you for the comments on B. And therefore I obviously won't recommend (pulling) it. I actually was listening to Alan, and while I think it's very important that the guidance be gotten from the submitting body, I do think at a certain point, since these are GNSO PDPs,

that it is the GNSO Council in its management role that needs to deal with these issues, because they fit into the whole prioritization of its work and of the staff that works with them.

And of course, I expect the submitting body to scream bloody murder if - you know, if - and stall for some negative reason or other. I consider that the counterbalance is there to prevent any (bad) actions by the GNSO Council. So you know, I think its fine that in this case it is the GNSO Council that is managing this. So, I just wanted to add that. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I really don't want use the time to debate the substantive issue right now. As it's worded, I can live with it. The at large at least will scream bloody murder on commenting on the report pointing that out, that the GNSO Council starts by looking at the current process and the discussion when the issues report gets in. And at that point, it can say we're deferring it for six years because of priorities.

In reality, we look at what, four issues reports a year, or something (like that). We're not talking about an unreasonable amount of workload. So, let's go on. I would like to see the changes in A, but if not then you'll get the comments back afterwards.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I think in A that those changes are easy to make, and I think they...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...don't change the overall...

Alan Greenberg: No. I mean, the requesting body still has to pass a motion to approve the request with N days in it. I - okay, anyway. Go ahead. Let's go ahead.

Marika Konings: Okay. So, I'm moving onto Recommendation 12.

Recommendation 13.

Alan Greenberg: 12 is a delay in the process which I support.

Marika Konings: James, you might be on mute.

James Bladel: I was on mute. I was waiting - I thought you were going to jump to 14 next.

Marika Konings: Oh, okay. So you're in the queue for 14. So, wait...

James Bladel: Yes. So, I'll wait until I get there.

Marika Konings: Okay. Wolf, if you want to comment on 12?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: No. 13.

Marika Konings: 13. Okay, go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Well, it's - I'm not sure whether I understand correctly the first sentence in 13. Isn't there something missing? Like in the policy or open post manual of guidebook should be provided or such thing?

Marika Konings: Yes. You're correct. I think it should be included or something like that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes. Okay.

Marika Konings: Well, I'll add a word there so that it's clear. Thank you for catching that.

So on Item 9, you can see that it'll actually refer to Recommendation 11, which talks as well about the same issue. So, it's a link back to another recommendation that applies - or I think applies to this same issue.

James, Recommendation 14.

James Bladel: Yes. And relative to an economic analysis just using the language of the affirmation of commitment, I was thinking we could incorporate some reference to competition and consumer choice when we say you know, we're being specific about what type of an economic impact. I think that's a little too vague.

So whether this is a readability or a substance change, I'll leave that to the group.

Marika Konings: And would - so, you're suggesting something like (author) of an economic impact analysis that would assess competition and consumer choice? Is that what you were suggesting?

James Bladel: Yes. That's - or an economic study that would study the - that would analyze the impact on competition and consumer choice.

Marika Konings: Does anyone have any objections to adding that?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. My comments will probably deal with that slightly differently.

Marika Konings: Okay. So Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay. One of the things is it concerns me that this has been called economic impact analysis as opposed to just impact analysis. I think one of the points I've made at various parts of the discussion is that I do think the economic analysis is important, and I agree with James on you know, competition and consumer. Several times though, I've brought up the need that there may

also be occasion where other analysis - for example, social impact analysis, rights analysis - impact analysis could also be necessary.

So, it actually - sort of agree with James, but going further would expand the type of impact analysis that could be requested based upon circumstances.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: So, are you proposing then that we take out the economic?

Avri Doria: I'm suggesting that economic be part of a set. So yes, I would probably take out economic from the title, and I would include economic, competition, consumer, you know rights, et cetera in the body.

James Bladel: Marika, can I respond to that (unintelligible)...

Marika Konings: Yes, James. Go ahead.

James Bladel: Okay, with apologies to Alex. I see he's in the queue.

I guess I can support what Avri is saying, but I would recommend that we change it to impact analyses for the section title, and then have a separate bullet point for those things that are different from the pure impact analysis. I'm - one of the things that we were trying to accomplish, if I'm remembering my history on this section correctly, was that we were trying to get into some quantifiable data so that we could measure the success of whatever policy outcome or PDP outcome. And, I'm thinking that would be a - you know, that it'd be a fact of chasing where it was very clear that we could measure that we could measure that that was a successful outcome.

So, I think that when we start to get into other types of analyses, we start to get into what I would consider more the soft sciences and more of a

subjective interpretation on what the impacts could be. So, I would like to see that perhaps separated from the economic impact.

Avri Doria: Okay. My hand was still up, but I'm disagreeing.

Marika Konings: So Avri - let's maybe finish on this point to Avri, and go ahead. And (unintelligible) try and disagree.

Avri Doria: I personally think - first of all, the example you mentioned is quantifiable, and yet it's not economic so much as occurrences of some social event having happened. I think that the other issues - you know, economic is no harder a science than the rest of the social sciences. Totally open to subjective interpretations of what various numbers mean, and what's normative, and what's descriptive.

I think in the other areas, whether it's rights, whether it's consumer, whether it's competition, those things have a quantifiable element. So, I think that you can insist upon a quantifiable analysis - a proper analysis without getting into the sort of deprecative, this is hard and this is soft language. Thanks.

And my hand - I have a hand up for another point that I want to make later after Alex and all the rest of them.

James Bladel: Okay. I just wanted to respond to that. Avri, my only point there, and maybe I used some academically inflammatory language. I apologize for that. But, my only point there was that they could be separate bullet points.

Avri Doria: Sure thing. I agree.

Marika Konings: And so, if I can add some of what I think we agree on. It's to change the title, and to impact analyses, and then maybe have at the end something like such analyses may include economic impact studies, studies that assess the impact on competition and consumer choice. Maybe et cetera, so that it's

obvious as well that it's open and that more guidance might be provided.
That's on the second part. Would that be agreeable?

Avri Doria: As long as we get the word rights in the list (sometime).

Marika Konings: Yes. I hope to put this out later today or early tomorrow, so people still have the weekend to look at it and to correct my wording if it's not right.

And Alex, please go ahead. And sorry for waiting.

Alex Gakuru: No problem. I think looking at ICANN as a regulator, that regulators have only two roles in deciding (unintelligible). One is boosting competition, and two consumer protection. So even consumer choice is a subset of (unintelligible) consumer protection.

So perhaps in the sub-bullet, it seems - we seem to agree in that direction.
We should highlight competition and consumer protection. That's the contribution I wanted to make on that one. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Okay. So, I'll add consumer choice, protection, et cetera. So again, I think it will - what we want to try to show here is that this is still as well on the discussion and open for other items that might need to be added.

And Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes. And this is more a reference to a back reference that's made to this one. I forget what number it is, and we'll get there. At one point, I think where we're talking about budget analysis of a project, you point back to this Recommendation 14. And, I think just wanted to make sure that we're talking about -- and I think we are -- the impact analysis. And, that this has nothing to do with the budgeting of a particular product or effort.

And later, I think there is a place where there's a reference - a back reference to Recommendation 14. So, I just wanted to basically raise a sign on that.

Thanks.

Marika Konings: So Avri, I'm quickly looking and I actually - I haven't found it yet. So, if...

Avri Doria: Okay. We'll get there.

Marika Konings: Okay. And so then moving on to Recommendation 15.

Recommendation 16.

Alan Greenberg: 16 - it's Alan. 16. I would like to put an example in there if that's not inappropriate, in terms of how we're formulating these things. The letter that Jeff sent to GNSO Council a week or so ago on the IDN motion, and the fact that proper process had not been followed. I took that as perhaps one of the - a classic example of where we needed a fast pass PDP.

The other example - the other typical one is if you look at the domain (tasting) one where the result of the PDP recommended periodic reports, and we want to change the recommendation. Now, we have absolutely no (unintelligible) - there's absolutely no way of changing a recommendation, other than starting initiating a full blown PDP.

And, I would like to highlight we need to - why fast track may be necessary, because otherwise people think of it as what kind of emergency could be so bad that we have to bypass all of the processes. And, I think it's typically - this is not going to be emergencies, but things that are generally agreed upon but that we need a new method for.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think some of them might already be in the bulk of the report.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: And where we highlight as well the discussions that the group had. But, I'm happy to add maybe those examples there, as more of the discussion around you know, why the group feels this sort of recommendation applied...

Alan Greenberg: Okay. That's...

Marika Konings: ...is also found in the different chapters in the report.

Alan Greenberg: That's fine, then. I'll look at that more carefully. But...

Marika Konings: I'll check if...

Alan Greenberg: ...if I need more. Okay.

Marika Konings: ...the (IDNG) one is (unintelligible) recent one, so I'm sure that one is not there. So, I can maybe highlight that one. And, I'll have a look if the domain (tasting) issue is mentioned there, and then otherwise include that as an example.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. That one may be a bit too trivial, but you know, we need a process where everyone probably agrees but we have no process. Maybe that's not the fast track PDP. Maybe that's - we need yet another process of how to modify a PDP result after the fact.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: But...

Marika Konings: James. Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

James Bladel: Well, I just want to put something out there, and hopefully it's compatible with what Alan is suggesting, but - or maybe not. But, I was thinking in the - Recommendations 15 and 16 could possibly be folded together in that we acknowledge that this work is the - underway with the Council prioritization activity, and we don't make a recommendation except to then recommend that that work is examined - a fast track method, and then we can cite the examples that Alan raised.

Marika Konings: James, just a clarifying question. You would suggest that the prioritization effort of the GNSO Council would investigate the fast track option?

James Bladel: That they include that in their work - in their prioritization work.

Marika Konings: Yes. I think - this is Marika again. I think that might be difficult, because they are actually already you know, in the mode of prioritizing, and I think they've developed their methodology. I'm not really sure whether - I mean, if the group feels that we should add it as one of the options, I'm not really sure whether that group would be the appropriate body to look at a fast track PDP option. And perhaps if I - you know, I'm happy to look at the other...

James Bladel: And maybe I misunderstood, but I was thinking that a fast track PDP option would be a way for something to cut to the top of the prioritization queue, unless we're talking about something completely different with its own set of procedures and bylaws. Then, we should leave them separate.

Alan Greenberg: Can I respond?

Marika Konings: Yes, Alan. Please do.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I disagree for two reasons. Number one, we are talking about a different set of procedures perhaps bypassing a large part of the current PDP, or at least significant parts of it. And, we're talking about changing essentially the

by-law process by which consensus policy might be formed. And that's not the work of the Prioritization Committee.

Marika Konings: Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. My comment is - thank you. My comment is on a similar topic. I actually think that that is not a bad idea because it would need to be fit within the prioritization. So yes, it might mean that the GNSO Council would have to go back and think a bit more about how they were going to do the prioritization next year in a (rolling manner), and I think that's probably a really good idea anyway.

I also want to basically voice a word of caution about including examples. I mean, I actually have cautionary feelings about the whole notion of a fast track PDP, and am not ready to sign on to it. If it does become the recommendation of the group, we'll probably file a minority statement on it.

In my time of being part of and watching the Council, I have seen that for almost every PDP, there's someone who believes it's an emergency and must be done now. Quickly. And so, I think that you know, we either have to be really, really careful, or we shouldn't do one.

But in any case, I think at this point, sticking recommendations and examples of what is or what isn't - just opens up the controversy more. And to say that we propose thinking about one - we propose considering one, I think is a fine thing to say. But to go beyond that and show why it is needed is just - it's controversial.

Alan Greenberg: Avri, I support that as a friendly amendment to what I say. I withdraw my comment.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Is anyone still here?

Avri Doria: I'm here.

Man: I'm wondering.

Marika Konings: I'm sorry. I was on mute and talking. Sorry.

So, moving onto Recommendation 17. And, I've actually noted - because I think that was one where Wolf-Ulrich actually had a comment on the one meeting, which probably should read one Council meeting to clarify. And, I think there's some other recommendations where it's the same thing - where I think we all assumed that it was clear, but I think it would indeed clarify that we're talking about one Council meeting delayed. Anyone have any objections to that clarification?

Avri Doria: Nope.

Marika Konings: I'm moving onto Recommendation 18.

Alan Greenberg: I guess on 17 when we get back to - when we talk about the details, I would like language where it says one Council meeting, or up to one Council meeting, but in no case more than N weeks. Not relevant under today's schedule, but might be relevant sometime in the future. But this is fine for current - for the interim report.

Marika Konings: Okay. Great. And 19.

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Marika Konings: Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: I don't suppose a change to it. I mean, I - what I keep thinking - every time I read it, I'd say other than escalating to the Board. Because obviously, any time you know, that the GNSO says, "No. We're not going to do yours," one would expect you know, that it was quite possible that that AT or SO would on its own escalate things. I don't know that we need to change it, but it's just - you know, there's always the formal appeals mechanism of going to the Board, and I don't know whether we have to be up front about admitting that that's what can happen if we don't create a formal appeals mechanism.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. I think we actually cover that in the notes on the discussion that the group had. I think in the report itself we know...

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes. I just...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...that that's the fall back option, and then that is a kind of appeals mechanism if you know, convince the Board, then we'll go ahead whether the GNSO Council likes it or not.

Avri Doria: No specific formal - or no special formal appeal mechanism. And is this the sort of thing that there isn't one in this phrase. And yes, the body of the report says more, but what we're really saying is that no special formal appeal mechanism be developed.

Marika Konings: Okay. I'll add special.

So, in Item 3 there's no specific recommendation...

Alan Greenberg: No. No. Marika, it's still on Item 2.

Marika Konings: Oh, sorry. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: The title says AC or SO. My recollection is, but without scrolling back, is that we decided originally that we're keeping the same bylaws of who can initiate a request for an issues report. And, that's an AC or the Board, not an SO, unless we changed it and I missed that.

Marika Konings: I don't think we did, so I'll correct that there.

So then, on Item 3, that basically just a note where we also had it in the report itself that this is being addressed by another process, and not relevant in relation to our discussions.

Recommendation 20.

21.

Then on the next one, it's again a referral back to Recommendation 16, so no separate one is made on the expedited procedures, because that's related to the discussion we did just have in that recommendation.

Recommendation 22.

We have one referring back to Recommendation 15. Now Avri, was this the one you were...

Avri Doria: Maybe I got confused on numbers. It's possible.

Marika Konings: Do you still have a...

Avri Doria: No, I don't actually.

Yes. Okay. This is where I got confused between the Number 15 and the Number 11. Forgive me.

Marika Konings: No problem.

James, I saw your hand up and then down.

James Bladel: No, I think I will go ahead and withdraw.

Marika Konings: Okay. We'll move on to Recommendation 23.

24.

25.

Alan Greenberg: Hold on one second. 24 is a big one to read.

Marika Konings: Okay. Should've done your homework before the call, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I should have.

Avri Doria: I think there was a school bus on the way to the meeting.

Alan Greenberg: Instead, I was trying to figure out how At Large is going to handle the affirmation reviews, so that seemed to be the higher priority given the timing.

Marika Konings: Let me know when you're ready to go on.

Alan Greenberg: I can live with what it says.

Marika Konings: 25.

Alan Greenberg: Fine.

Marika Konings: 26.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure why that's relevant, but it doesn't hurt. I would've thought every working group before they actually start working should think about how is this supposed to be working according to the rules, but maybe in reality it's good to put it there formally.

Marika Konings: Yes. And this is Marika. I guess this is a kind of reference that that then will be included for example in the Charter, so to make sure that people don't forget where those guidelines are, and - once those are adopted.

So, Recommendation 27.

Recommendation 28. And, this is one where I looked back to our discussion and the notes, but couldn't really come up with anything that we could put forward here as a recommendation. And, I don't know if anyone has any suggestions. I left them now very open, and in one of the items where we went looking for specific input on in order to actually formulate a recommendation.

Alan Greenberg: I don't feel comfortable with the wording, and I'll tell you why. By saying the PDP Work Team has not agreed on possible recommendations, it strengthens the fact that the others are - that we have agreed on those recommendations. It sort of goes against the global all of these are being considered.

Marika Konings: So, what would be a better way...

Avri Doria: Can I comment on that specific point?

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Marika Konings: Yes. Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. I was reading it too, and I was sort of saying we're not even at the point - taking a slightly different tense. We weren't even at the point of discussing should we do it this way or should we do it that way. And, I would sort of say has not arrived at a possible recommendation. You know, has not developed a possible recommendation.

Alan Greenberg: Not fully discussed.

Avri Doria: Well, yes. Or maybe you know, there really is nothing here (here), and you know, is not going to develop a recommendation as part of the implication that I would put - and I put that on several of them, that it's not that we're - because this does make it look like not only does it sense in - as Alan said about the other recommendation, it also makes it look like we're having active discussions at the moment on a possible recommendation where it's really we haven't even developed one.

Marika Konings: Alex.

Alex Gakuru: Yes. Alex speaking. It also gives the impression that has not agreed, like probably we're have a dispute of the issues around it. And maybe you continue to (unintelligible) and give the mistaken impression that we did agreed on the recommendation. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I suspect if we have discussed this at all, it was at a meeting that I missed because I don't recall any such discussion. I know if - you know, if I was given the magic wand and said what would we put there, we would put a recommendation there - I would see it as putting a recommendation there that the GNSO on an annual basis review the strategic plan and look at whether there's anything which seems to warrant PDP action.

You know, and whether that's done by the Chair or by a sub-committee, or something like that. But, I don't remember having that discussion, and certainly I would make this suitably vague. I don't think we could ignore it and say we're going to you know, thumb our noses or whatever at the strategic plans...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: So, this is Marika. And, I like the - I think Avri's wording on another (write) at a possible recommendation.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Marika Konings: As it indeed - I think shows better that you know, we're not even at - you know, it's not a discussion of one recommendation over the other and we can't agree. It's really that we indeed haven't formulated anything. So if everyone agrees, I'll change that here.

Alan Greenberg: That's fine.

Marika Konings: And then as well, I know there are similar other ones, so I'll change that in those as well.

Moving on to Recommendation 29.

30.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: 31.

32. And in 32, I looked back at our notes and tried to work from there at a different option that we considered, and those are highlighted here. So Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Oh, no. Sorry. That was from before, and I haven't finished reading it yet.

Marika Konings: Alex.

Alex Gakuru: Yes. Would be at this point where we had the recommendation that we could have some standing work committee or work team? There's some discussion we had a while back where we could have a committee that remains, in terms of the implementation, where we say they can continue to be the (unintelligible). I don't know why that is where that seems so it's been covered elsewhere.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: It's also covered in Recommendation 43...

Alex Gakuru: Oh, okay.

Marika Konings: ...where we actually talk about implementation. But I think - you know, you're right. It links closely together with what is discussed here. So, maybe I can include a note. Something saying see also Recommendation 43.

Alex Gakuru: Okay. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Maybe show that there's the link with the implementation (unintelligible).

Moving on to Recommendation 33.

Alan Greenberg: Is that really the working group's job or the Council's? I ask because if indeed there are some people think it's the Council, we may want to make this a little vaguer. The Council's doing the management of it.

Marika Konings: Sorry, Alan. You're talking about 33, who's actually...

Alan Greenberg: Yes, 33 is...

Marika Konings: Are you (reading) that, or...

Alan Greenberg: 33 says it recommends that staff resources need or expected to implement should be evaluated as part of the working group recommendation. I'm wondering is that really the working group's job, or is that Council's job. Avri has her hand up.

Avri Doria: Yes. I have my hand up.

Marika Konings: Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: I just want to comment on that. I think it is actually - sufficiently they at the moment, because I think it's kind of indicating that perhaps the working group should think about it. And of course, the Council should think about it when evaluating their recommendations.

So either we could expand it and sort of (disembogue) it and say both of them got to take it into account, or we can just sort of for this recommendation level leave it sufficiently vague and see how comments come in.

Marika Konings: Alan, are you happy with the level of vagueness, or do you want to suggest some specific wording.

Alan Greenberg: I think it's the only section - the only recommendation we have under ICANN Staff Resources, so I think we should either remove working group or put both working group and Council there.

Avri Doria: I'm fine with that. You would have to more I'm afraid.

Marika Konings: He says it should be part of the working group recommendation, so why would you insert Council?

Avri Doria: Working group recommendations and the Council's review of those recommendations. Something like that?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. That's fine with me.

Avri Doria: That defiantly just does disambiguate it to some extent.

Marika Konings: Okay. I've noted that. Avri, is your hand is still up?

Avri Doria: My hand's still up, but it's for the next one.

Marika Konings: Go ahead for the next one then, 35.

Avri Doria: Okay. I just think it needs - the heading on 7 needs to be Stakeholder Groups/Constituency. You have it in the body, but it just needs to be in the heading.

Marika Konings: Yes. You're absolutely right. I'll update that.

So, Recommendation 35.

36.

Alan Greenberg: The change here is the noting part, because the initial and final are already in the bylaws, correct?

Marika Konings: That's correct.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: And as well, I basically continued that at - you know, in the new bylaws we wouldn't make any changes to that.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Got it. Okay.

Marika Konings: 36.

Alan Greenberg: That's fine.

Marika Konings: 37.

38. And again here, I think I need to update the one meeting as one Council meeting to make that clear.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: 39.

Avri Doria: I've got a hand up.

Marika Konings: Yes. Avri, go ahead. On 39 or 38?

Avri Doria: 39.

Marika Konings: Okay. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes. It's 39. I - there seems to be agreement that the GNSO Council should have the flexibility to pick and choose recommendations (among) the working group has indicated. There is a linkage - I think there seems to be agreement is probably strong. I think that's one we need to take a lot of caution with. I think it would be reasonable to say the discussion within the group as to whether.

I know that if we go out with a recommendation saying they can pick and choose, I will probably have to file a minority. So, I just think we need to be a little softer in our there seems to be agreement language. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Okay. I will update that to note that there is discussion within the group as to whether a GNSO Council should the flexibility to pick and choose recommendations. And then I can add a separate phrase that we've discussed it as well in the context of there being linkage between recommendations.

Avri Doria: Yes. Thank you.

Marika Konings: I'll adapt that. And - or actually, maybe I should just take that sentence out, because we're actually - I think we discussed that in the bulk of the report, so I can just leave that first sentence a bit more - less agreement level.

Then on the two public comments, it's to refer back to the Recommendation 37.

And, the next one is Recommendation 40. And again here, I guess I should change the has not agreed to has not arrived yet on a possible recommendation in relation to this issue. And, I'll change that here as we discussed before.

Recommendation 42.

Alex Gakuru: Marika, may I comment on that one?

Marika Konings: Yes. Please go ahead, Alex.

((Crosstalk))

Alex Gakuru: Yes. When - we had a discussion also on what staff recommends to the Board. What did we agree on that, because I would have expected to that see there as well. I remember we had an interesting conversation about what staff also gives to the group.

Marika Konings: The issue is that that is not a part of the PDP process. And, I know - I think that the suggestion of Jeff at the time was to actually send a letter to the Board to request for clarification, but - and there - I think staff did point out that the staff report as provided is not a requirement under the PDP process. It's on the request of the Board. So...

Alex Gakuru: Oh. Okay.

Marika Konings: So, I mean if someone has any suggestions on how that can be included here, maybe as a separate recommendation. But as it isn't part as such of the PDP process, it's not listed here as a separate item. It is highlighted in the bulk of the report as part of the discussion.

Alex Gakuru: Okay, then. I'll live with that.

Alan Greenberg: I think you can pretty well guarantee some public comment on it if anyone's awake at all.

Marika Konings: But again - you know, and then I think we said it before. I think it's - you know, if the group wants to discuss this, I think it's - you know, to take it forward you know, with the Board directly or the - I don't know who Jeff was going to write to, and I'm not sure whether that actually happened, but you

know we suggested to take it forward in that way, because I don't think within the PDP context, it's not an issue that is mandated by that or required in that context.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I don't understand 42.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: There may just be a word missing. It says PDP Work Team is considering recommending that provisions in relation to the Board vote in the ICANN bylaws remain broadly as is.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: We're recommending no change.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Except that there was a possible clarification that might be recommended. So, it was being a little wishy-washy, (but maybe a clarification).

Alan Greenberg: Okay, what is 13F, for those who don't have the bylaws in front of them?

Marika Konings: That was the issue on whether the Board can act - I think that was that - and there's what acting would mean.

Alan Greenberg: Oh, okay. Got it.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I would specify for clarity that there shouldn't be an exercise for how quickly people can find the bylaws. I would say noting that clarification might be required to how the Board addresses a GNSO recommendation that has not received super majority from the GNSO, or something like that.

Marika Konings: I can say that, and I'll think of something on the first sentence to make that clearer.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: Is - not recommend any major changes, or is this considering...

Alan Greenberg: Well...

Marika Konings: I'm trying to - the provisions mostly as they are or something like that?

Avri Doria: Remain essentially unchanged.

Marika Konings: Remain essentially unchanged.

Alan Greenberg: Except what we change.

Avri Doria: Well, clarification is not a change.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: Okay. So then, moving on to 43.

Avri Doria: I have a comment on that. And again, this is one that resulted from me misreading it. For the first time I read it, I said, "Well, isn't that what we already did in the working group work team? And then with the discussion you had with Alex, I realized that this was standing for the - an ongoing working group implementation review team. So maybe we need to add a word into that, because as a member of the working group working team, I said, "Isn't that what we just did?"

So you know, you might want to add a word like ongoing, or you know periodic, or something - yearly.

Marika Konings: Okay. And here I will change as well the - you know, agreed on a possible recommendation and make that as well arrive at a - as we said before.

And we're at 44. And here 44, 45, and 46 are in the large sense is the same. I think we've all discussed you know - and these items are important, but I don't recall that we actually arrived at a possible agreement or a possible recommendation on how those items would look.

So if anyone there has any other suggestions on whether we did come to some kind of a agreement, please let me know. And otherwise, you know I think here we made clear that we want public comment on this and hope to clarify it in the next round.

Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I guess this supports - this goes along with what I was saying about the fast track. Maybe we need to qualify that and say recommendations on how to read - on how such re-evaluation gets done - and how such re-evaluation and how implementations - any possible implementation could be carried out or something like that, because it's really two different things.

It's one, what process do we use for the periodic assessment. And then if we decide action is necessary, how do we do it? Maybe it's not necessary to qualify in this summary, but there are really two different things.

Marika Konings: I don't know if that comes back as well in the notes, so you might want to check if that's covered there or if you have any specific suggestions on how to clarify it here.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I'll take a look at them on my own.

Marika Konings: Okay. Thanks. Any further comments on 45 or 46, which are generally the same? So well done. We've made it through all the recommendations, so feel free to cover the rest of this chapter, which is the Executive Summary.

There's a note on the overarching issues, and you might have seen that I've just basically copied and pasted the notes document that we did on those items into the document. Because I don't think we have time to actually - you know, we agreed on some items on like you know, clarifying and things of the super majority or you know, the issue on the Board vote.

But I don't think we'll have time to actually word those recommendations, and you know, people can take that hopefully from the notes that are in there. And, I think we need to leave that for the second round.

Then as well, there's a summary on the Section 9, which is basically - I should change the title here as well, because it's not really an issue we're talking about having there the proposed changes to Annex A, but now it's more the flow chart that will form the basis for the new Annex A. So, I'll reflect that in the title and just provide some overview of the discussion.

In the report itself, I'll incorporate then as well the flow chart, because I think that was the agreement that we would have the flow chart as well in the Executive Summary. Some people suggested that on the last call, if I remember correctly.

Avri Doria: I think so. Avri.

Marika Konings: So, that may be a - you know, as we have a little bit of time left, if we can just briefly scroll to -- oh, I see that the rest of the document hasn't taken, sorry -- to Section 9, the flow charts. I don't know if people had a chance to look at that part, which...

Man: What page would it be?

Marika Konings: That's basically - I'm scrolling there myself now. So basically, starting at Page 124.

Man: 124.

Marika Konings: So basically, that provides just an introduction on what we tried to do here, that is you know, the high level overview in the first chart, and then going in more deeper into each of the phases. Then a little note as well on...

Alan Greenberg: Your pages numbers are different than mine.

Marika Konings: Oh, I'm sorry. It's 125.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Marika Konings: Sorry. So starting on Page 125. So there, I took a - I have the link to the Board of Governance Committee, and there a little quote from that on - you know, as we talk about the difference between the changes to the bylaws or elements that should be in the bylaws and those that are in rules - are procedure. Just a little note of what the main difference actually is between those which - you know, one needs to be approved by the Board where the other can be adopted by the GNSO Council.

So to put it in context as well so people can actually comment whether they think certain elements should go in one or the other page.

Alan Greenberg: Marika, just a technical point. I would make sure that the colors that you use in this flowchart will be - still be legible if it's printed in black and white.

Marika Konings: Yes. The idea behind the colors is of course is to highlight a different stages.
I'm not sure if black and white (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I understand, but some people will print in black and white, and sometimes you know based on the color, it may be largely illegible. So...

Avri Doria: One thing that is - this is Avri. One thing that is useful in doing that is sometimes combining both color and a very light - and a pattern, which is also provided in these tools. Not letting the pattern get so heavy -- you know, keeping it almost transparent -- not letting the pattern get so heavy that it interferes with the writing.

But then, you don't have to - the other thing you have to worry about with the colors - by having dark color sometimes you'll end up with a very dark grayness and...

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I was worried more about the fact that it's all white print on color...

Marika Konings: I'll give it a go, and...

Alan Greenberg: ...as opposed to black on a light color.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Might see how it comes out and I'll try to adjust the - as best as I can.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Avri Doria: But I know when I do these things, I find those patterns are sometimes quite useful.

Marika Konings: Yes. I think it's a very good suggestion, and I'll defiantly try that if it doesn't come out clearly in black and white.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Marika Konings: So, if you then look at Page (unintelligible) Page 126. The change I made there is I think we agreed on the last call to have in the first box - make an issue identification. Is it an appropriate issue for policy development, instead of just talking about consensus policies.

And, have the arrow basically go back and forth between - to follow all the GNSO processes to clear that if another GNSO process is followed. But at a certain point of time, there's a realization that a PDP is required, you know, there is a way back up and go through the flowchart.

I've also updated the Figure 2 on the next page by adding the initial studies and taking away the question mark after the other.

Then on the next page, 128, nothing has changed there. I just highlighted there that you know, I will include like a - I mean there will have to be a very short sentence on each of these recommendations. And for some it might be very difficult to actually provide a summary, but I promise if I make this too large, it won't fit on the page. And, I guess the purpose of having that together and making it easier for people to refer to a recommendation will fall out.

I mean, one thing - another think I might do if this doesn't work, of having you know, a snapshot of each recommendation at the end, what I can do as well is just take out all the recommendations, list them, and maybe put them in a separate Annex so people can actually print that out and you know, put that next to the flowchart and cross match in that way. That might be an alternative if I cannot get it to fit on the page.

I think the photo on the next page you've already seen as well in the last meeting. So then, the new ones are on Pages 130, which depicts the working group process. On Page 131, which shows the voting on implementation, which is very basic. Because I think there as well, we haven't really made many (sideways) yes, and that might be one that gets more boxes once we get into the second phase and have more discussions and more input on some of those items.

Are there any further comments on the flowcharts?

Avri Doria: Love these flowcharts.

Marika Konings: And again, you'll still have a chance - I mean, my objective is to try to update the report following our discussion today, and cross-reference all the recommendations in the different relevant sections, and update the flowcharts, and hopefully get that out to you sometime tomorrow morning European time, which then would still give you the whole weekend to look at it. And, I would need any comment by basically the end of Sunday so I can get this document posted on Monday.

Will that work for everyone? I know it's very short and it's a long document, but...

Alan Greenberg: We can try. We don't have much choice, do we?

Marika Konings: No.

Man: No, we don't. We have to try.

Marika Konings: And then, Jeff did want to propose to have a call next week so we can actually discuss how to go about the workshop in Brussels. So...

Alan Greenberg: That's fine. I have one more question to ask.

Marika Konings: Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I don't think any of us - I certainly didn't understand at the beginning of this process the massive amount of work we were undertaking and the depth of which we were going to be going into this. And I wondered, do we - should we be highlighting that at the beginning?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I had a similar thought. I mean, I wasn't heavily involved in the group at the beginning when you were slicing and dicing the issue to work on it. And at that point, when I think I was still Chair at that point, I looked sort of the slice and dice with a bit of horror.

But looking at the effect (both), it was a good process and it really has gotten the group into a lot of important details. So, I think - I don't know where it would go, but I do think there's a good point that you know, this is truly a Pandora's Box. And once it was open, there was an immense amount to think about. When I saw the original slice and dice, it scared me.

Marika Konings: Alex.

Alex Gakuru: Yes. I think have - I echo their sentiments, because it looks like there was a lot of work involved (unintelligible) not quite aware when I was getting into it. But, I think I'm also (unintelligible). I was also the most (unintelligible) very good working environment. You know, I think that as a big plus, because we could not go (as fast), if maybe the team wasn't (unintelligible). Thanks.

Marika Konings: And, I think - this is Marika. I think Wolf actually made a very good suggestion, because if you look at the second paragraph in the Executive Summary, I had put there due to the complex nature of the Policy Development Process and subsequent discussion, we have not been able to complete the task yet.

But I think Wolf said we should put that more positive and say despite the complex nature of the Policy Development Process, and maybe that's a way of reflecting that you know, we have come a long way, and you know it's a very complex process.

So - but Alan, if you have anything else to add there you know, please (send some language)...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Let me add that to my to do list to try to come up with a rework of that paragraph or a new paragraph.

Marika Konings: Yes. I'll be sending you soon actually the other report, so you'll have some work to do this weekend.

Alan Greenberg: Oh, good.

Marika Konings: Well, I think everyone basically, because there's so - like a quite a few reports that are out for final comments on Sunday. So - and is there anything else anyone wants to raise or discuss?

I would like to thank you all for all your hard work on the call today, and all the hard work you'll be hopefully doing this weekend looking at the final version before we get it out on Monday. And, hope to speak to all of you next week.

Alan Greenberg: The only saving grace Marika, is I suspect you'll be working as hard this weekend also.

Avri Doria: Probably harder.

Man: Bye everybody.

Alan Greenberg: Her standards are higher than ours, so - thank you all.

Avri Doria: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye, all.

Alan Greenberg: Thanks, guys.

Glen de Saint Géry: (Unintelligible)?

Coordinator: Sorry. I was on mute.

Glen de Saint Géry: Sorry. It's like I was. (Unintelligible), the call is over...

END