

GNSO
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference
2 September, 2008 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference on 2 September 2008. 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-irtp-a-pdp-wg-20080902.mp3>
<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#sep>

Participants present:

Paul Diaz - Working Group Chair - Networksolutions Registrar c.
James M. Bladel - Godaddy Registrar c.
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC Council Liaison
Mike O'Connor - CBUC
Michael Collins - CBUC
Kevin R. Erdman - IPC

Staff:

Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination
Marika Konings - Policy Director
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent - apologies:

Sebastien Bachollet - ALAC representative
Adam Eisner - Tucows
Barbara Steele - Verisign Registry c.

Coordinator: The recordings have started sir.

(Paul): Thank you very much. All right, welcome back everyone. It's the 2nd of September, hope you all had a good week and a nice long weekend if you were fortunate enough to celebrate it. Let's agenda please. Glen, if you would please, can you run through our roll call?

Glen DeSaintgery: Certainly (Paul). I have on the call (Paul), yourself here, the leader of the group, (James Bladel, Mike O'Connor), (Kevin Erdman). And for staff, Marika Koningsand Olof Nordling. Have I left off anybody? That's all. Thanks (Paul).

(Paul): Thank you Glen. Okay again, good morning everyone. For today's agenda please let's - our goal was to wrap up the questions we have for our template, to also make sure that the language we settle on will work for the public call for comments. We'd like to get that out as well and to concurrently review the timeline to make sure that we're all comfortable with the dates that we've penciled in, dates that we would like to try and hold ourselves to.

We did a lot of great work last week. We had to cut our discussion of issue Number 3 a little short. And so I would ask for if everybody can if you're on the Wiki, go to the draft statement.

We'll at the end I think go back, look at 1 and 2. but let's just focus on 3. If everybody recalls I think the agreement, the rough consensus last time was to put it in the construct that we have currently on the screen

leaving out particular use cases, the idea being to try and give as much latitude to constituencies or public comments, let them address their particular use cases and their responses.

What we do want to make sure though is that the language we do settle on is not too loose and therefore opens it up to things that we consider beyond the scope or confusing for folks.

Unfortunately (Sebastian), sorry Glen, one more for the regrets. (Sebastian) has also expressed his regrets, couldn't be with us.

So but being a non native English speaker, you know, (Sebastian) was of great help and others.

Let's look at all of these from the view to hey, we have an international constituency here in terms of comments. We want to make sure, you know, be careful with acronyms that we use and phrases that could lead to confusion for non-native speakers.

With all that as background, please I open it up to everyone. We're looking at Issue Number 3, any concerns with the way we currently have it structured and if so, how would you like to see it changed?

Michael Collins: This is Michael Collins. I apologize for coming in late.

(Paul): Oh good morning (Michael). And if you - actually you're just on time. I just did a little background. We're looking at the constituency template and focused on Issue 3, trying to get some final consensus on the language.

Again, I think what we discussed last week with you was to leave the particular use cases out rather leave that for individuals responses, constituency responses, et cetera. So we're just looking at the language as we've currently got it constructed, open the floor to any comments and suggested edits.

Mike Rodenbaugh: (Paul) hi. It's Mike Rodenbaugh, also a couple minutes late.

(Paul): Good morning (Mike).

Mike Rodenbaugh: I want to make sure I'm in the right spot here. I'm at the Wiki page and I'm clicking on the attachment on the right that's the registrar - that's the template. And it pops up a Word document. Is that correct?

(Paul): Actually I was working directly off of the -rather than the attachments (Mike), we had the hyperlink right from the top, the second one template. Because it will be easier for us to make any changes since we can go in and directly edit this one. We'll all be looking at the same document that way.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Got it. So template for constituency. Okay, I'm there now. Thanks.

Olof Nordling: This is (Olaf). I believe that maybe we should delete the links to the attachment because that hasn't been following suit when we had made the changes.

Man: Yes that's and old draft.

(Paul): I think you're absolutely right (Olaf). Yes.

Michael Collins: Thanks (Olaf).

(Paul): Okay so again, looking at the text we currently have for Issue 3, are people comfortable with this?

Michael Collins: (Unintelligible)?

(I'm okay).

(Paul): Excellent. Anybody else have concerns?

Man: Looks good here.

(Paul): Okay. If you all are feeling comfortable maybe if we could do a once over for Issues 1 and 2 again. I think they're pretty tight but let's just make sure that we're all comfortable with the language.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Mike Rodenbaugh. Small comments on the, I think the fifth bullet in Issue 2.

(Paul): Okay (Mike).

Mike Rodenbaugh: Out at the end, you know, please drive or please identify data yes or no question.

(Paul): I'm sorry (Mike), this is the one that begins with those other options to be explored?

Mike Rodenbaugh: No, EPP.

(Paul): Okay.

Sure then so we'll cut and paste these saying if so, what are they who offer some?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well it's any data. So if so please identify or - and describe (unintelligible) data.

(Paul): Okay. Is anybody else in there? I'm happy to go in and make the change?

(Mike): (Paul) you want me to be the scribe? I'm happy to do that today.

(Paul): Certainly (Mike). That would be a help.

(Mike): Keep you out of the fray on that.

(Paul): Keep my notes straight and focus on the other issues. Thank you.

(Mike): Yes, yes. But oh, if we were to say something like...

(Paul): Yes (Mike) where - so how would you like to see it say? So if so...

Mike Rodenbaugh: If so, please describe the data or the sources that - source and type of data.

(Paul): Sure.

(Mike): Okay, I just saved it. It should be there now.

Somebody is a really - somebody is a good typer but I'd ask you to put it on mute while we're...

Man: Someone's typing in an echo chamber.

(Mike): Yes that was really cool. That was like a (bloody).

Olof Nordling: Typing in the cathedral. (Olaf) here. I've got a small but perhaps important change on the very first bullet under Issue 1.

We start if you believe change is needed. Now I think we should keep it tighter. And if you believe change in the policy is needed or policy change is needed because (unintelligible).

(Paul): Sure. That's a good point (Olaf). And we don't want any (WAGS) talking about, you know, God knows what.

Can you insert that little clause there (Mike)?

(Mike): Yes. It's in now.

(Paul): Change in the policy.

Okay. Is this looking pretty good to everyone?

Man: Looks fine to me.

(Paul): Okay.

Michael Collins: I think so.

(Paul): Any of the other (Mikes)? (Mike Collins), Mike Rodenbaugh?

Man: Looks good.

Man: Looks good to me.

(Paul): Okay. (Kevin)?

(Kevin Erdman): Looks fine to me.

(Paul): Excellent. All right then. With this text I would ask if you would jump back on page - Marika Konings has provided a draft for the public comment period. If we can go through this now.

It follows the standard format that I can always use this one. It calls for public comment.

And you'll note that a sort of placeholder has been set for the text from the (deficiency) statement.

(Mike): Hey (Paul)...

(Paul): I'm sorry. Yes I as going to say I still have - who's typing?

(Mike): Who's typing?

Michael Collins: Can anyone hear me? Can you hear me?

(Mike): Yes, I can hear you.

Michael Collins: Well I thought I had set it to mute. I apologize. On my microphone it says - it clearly says off. So the switch isn't working too well. Sorry. I apologize.

(Paul): That's fine. We're impressed by your typing skills. But...

Michael Collins: Yes, sorry. I've got (unintelligible) the switch does say off but it's not. Okay, never mind.

(Paul): Very good. So as we're looking at the draft for the public comment period, the announcement, a lot of it is just text lifted from the issues report and the standard fare that ICANN uses when it calls for these public comments.

And you'll notice that of course it has a placeholder now for the language that will be consistent with what we just agreed upon for the template.

And I guess the question I'd have for you (Marika) is that the language for the template is sort of written really for constituencies in mind. I'm just going to take a second look.

I know we tried to be a little broad or have the broader audience in mind when we drafted it. But in any instances where we may say constituency obviously that would have to change to a more generic, you know, what is your view public?

Guess as I jump back and forth I don't - I think we did a good job of drafting the language and as - for as broad an audience as possible. I

don't see any...

Marika Konings: I think it's only in the introduction there that it mentioned constituency.

(Paul): Yes.

Marika Konings: So I think we should be probably okay.

(Paul): That's the only place. So yes, makes our life much easier. Excellent.

So for the draft announcement are there any changes folks would like to see made?

Olof Nordling: It's (Olaf) here. I think we're home free if we just copy what goes under Issue 1, 2 and 3 and transfer to the public comments document.

(Paul): Agreed. It - nice job drafting. And we can just cut and paste.

So again, with that in mind where it begins the note, the following section, et cetera, et cetera, all of that will just simply be replaced with the Issues 1, 2, 3 from our - from the document we just agreed upon.

Olof Nordling: And (Olaf) again. I think (Marika) can possibly - I if needed can do that update following this call and get it launched for the Web site if agreed upon.

(Paul): Yes. I had one request from (Barbara) and that since she's away she's going to make an effort - every effort to log into the Wiki to see. And since she is the registry rep we wanted - I told her I'd give her the chance. So maybe if we can hold off launching the public comment

period until tomorrow morning.

Olof Nordling: Right.

(Paul): That will give her the hours of that day today. I don't think that anything we've - the final tweaks we just did will be controversial anyway. I think there'll be full support. But I did offer that I'd give her a little extra time.

Olof Nordling: Is any of the (Mikes) in editing mode under Wiki or could I use it and just modify it?

(Mike): Go ahead (Olaf). I'll jump right out.

(Paul): And also (Marika) you guys will create once you've established a form, et cetera, put in those hyperlinks of course right?

Marika Konings: Yes.

(Paul): Great.

So again, understanding that Issues 1, 2 and 3 will just be cut and paste into this, does anybody else have any concerns with the language for the call for public comment?

Were you making any changes now (Olaf) or is - do you have to work on something else?

Olof Nordling: I'm doing it right now so...

(Paul): Okay.

In the background documents and links section we of course have the issues report, our charter, the Wiki.

Is their interest in making available the email archive as a direct link? I guess we can always get through it through the Wiki right?

Folks want to leave it the way it is or should we insert a direct link to the email list this working group is using?

(Mike): It might be a good convenience for people to be able to get to it right from here.

(Paul): That was my thought for convenience. Again, you can get to it from the Wiki but...

(Mike): Yes. It's always good to sort of make that stuff fit in one place so that people can find it without having to drive around.

(Paul): Are you still editing (Olaf)?

Olof Nordling: Yes I am. I'm still editing.

(Paul): No problem.

Olof Nordling: But I'm saving right now.

(Paul): Okay.

Olof Nordling: And I think it's - it still needs some bulleting and such. But it's there if

you refresh.

So some...

(Paul): Right. Understood. Now I see.

Marika Konings: I'll try to clean it a bit up after the call.

(Paul): Sure.

Olof Nordling: At least it's - the substance is there.

Marika Konings: Yes. And I'll add then as well the link to the email archive.

(Paul): Very good. You'll take care of that. Thank you (Marika).

Marika Konings: Yes.

(Paul): Okay everyone, so again, understanding that the formatting will make it look just as it does for the constituency statement request. And we will add a direct link to our mailing list archive.

Beyond that, are there any issues? Everybody good with this?

(Mike): Looks fine to me.

Man: Looks great.

(Paul): Okay. All right. Then if we would, if we can look at the timetable document.

Okay. This has not been updated but we - I had thrown out on the mailing list proposed dates.

Marika Konings: This is (Marika). It should be updated following your email.

(Paul): Okay. Yes my bad. It was. Thank you (Marika).

Okay. So these dates I literally just penciled in to get a discussion going so that we'd have something to work with. While I think they're achievable, some may feel that, you know, we're either spending too much time in certain sections or perhaps not enough.

So as you look at them if you have the benefit of a calendar in front of you as well, you'll see that we have - here we are today the 2nd of September finalizing the template great. All that's on schedule suggesting that we start the public comment period tomorrow.

Of course concurrent with that would be pushing the constituency statement requests out to our respective constituencies.

You know...

(Mike): You know (Paul), as long as the constituency statements are going out for 35 days we might want to think about making the public comment period the same length since not much is going to happen until both of those are back.

(Paul): That's certainly a thought. The only reason I had it short was that it was advised that the rules for PDP require a minimum of 20 days.

(Unintelligible) 20.

Olof Nordling: (Olaf) here.

(Paul): Yes (Olaf)?

Olof Nordling: It actually says 20, neither more nor less if we want to be really...

(Paul): That's the actual language? Okay.

(Mike): Oh, that's why it's 20, never mind.

(Paul): For our colleagues I'd say for (Olaf), (Marika), Glen, anybody, you know, given the history of PDPs, we know that that timelines are often not met. Is there any issue with leaving it at 20 or to (Mike)'s suggestion, you know, extending it and synching it up with the amount of time we're giving to the constituencies?

What is your preference?

(Mike): (Olaf), how firm is that neither a penny more nor a penny less rule?

Olof Nordling: Well it has been tampered with earlier without any objections, rather seen as an advantage. For example, when we had a rather extensive public comment periods and repetitive such on the new GTLB to make sure that we got as many comments as possible.

So I think we're at liberty to do something with it but certainly not shorter.

(Mike): Oh no, I think shorter wouldn't be a bad idea. But I know that one of the comments that the folks at the (ALAC) made when we had that joint (ALAC) GNSO meeting is that some of these turnaround periods, especially the 20 day one are awfully tough on some other members.

And I was thinking that if it wasn't a big deal that we might want to make this a little bit longer to give folks like that and others in the public community a little bit more time to react.

Olof Nordling: In particular that has been also rehashed. Actions have been given for translating and making public comment periods for different language versions that we have. So we're just forced to extend it to some extent.

So I think this period of the thinking right now is rather to have it a bit longer.

So well I won't object to it.

(Mike): Okay.

Olof Nordling: And I don't think we will get - we will meet much resistance just by adding - well, say ten days or so if we have that.

But perhaps just for convenience, keep it a bit shorter than the constituency statements in order for to facilitate the processing of that initial report and such from a staff perspective.

Because they need to be summarized and incorporated and become some subset of the government. And the same thing goes for the

constituency statement.

(Mike): Yes. And I - on the other hand, you know, we do have 15 days between the 3rd of October and the 17th for a lot of that summarization to take place.

Olof Nordling: Indeed. So sort of an extended public comment period. I think that was the thinking behind it to start with that it should be some processing opportunity for staff in-between.

(Mike): Yes.

Olof Nordling: From that perspective, don't make it 35 instead of 20 but well 25 or 30.

(Mike): Yes 30 would be good. I can - I think that the longer the better, especially given the translation issue. I hadn't even thought about that which raises another point which is do we need another line in the work plan to get that translation done before we open the public comment period up?

Olof Nordling: I can't recall where we are on making some live translated versions for public comment right now if we launched that process. And but it's - there's been a lot of thinking about it.

(Marie Kernig), do you remember where we are? Did we launch public comment periods in - already in other languages and English?

Marika Konings: I'm not sure. I think we're in the process of implementing a new translation policy. But I don't think it is been fully implemented yet. I don't know Glen, do you know anything more about it?

Glen DeSaintgery: No. I think we're in the process of doing it. And I'm just quickly going to look and see if there any different languages up on the ICANN Web site.

Olof Nordling: Yes, well the other language is up for some stuff but not yet for the public comment period I think. But well, please check.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

(Paul): So where does that leave us all? We can launch in English tomorrow?

Olof Nordling: I think we do launch in English.

(Paul): We do launch. And then...

Olof Nordling: Otherwise...

(Paul): Any translated versions we'll get up as soon as possible?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, sorry. There is, for the (ALAC) review the report is available in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, German and Spanish.

(Paul): Okay.

Olof Nordling: Not for public comment as well.

Marika Konings: For public comment. It's on the public comment page that that is available.

Olof Nordling: Okay.

(Paul): And can you tell Glen?

Glen DeSaintgery: But the actual public comments themselves are not, you know, that introductory but to the public comments has not been translated. It's just that the report is available in.

Olof Nordling: Okay, so the public comment period is launched in English?

Glen DeSaintgery: Is launched in English, yes.

Olof Nordling: Keep it like that.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

Olof Nordling: By (unintelligible).

(Paul): Okay. So then the launch date is fine as is. And based on the discussion (Olaf), (Mike), you guys are having, so we push the public comment period closed out to what, a full week, say end of September, the 30th of September. Is that reasonable? Should we synch it up with the constituency statement deadline of the 3rd of October? Which...

Olof Nordling: I'd rather not. This is (Olaf). That's from a staff perspective. Yes, both would have to be summarized and compiled.

(Paul): How about a full week then? If we make it the 29th of September, that will be Monday. And then the constituency statements are due the end of that week. Does that seem all right?

Olof Nordling: Yes.

(Mike): Yes. That's fine with me. That sounds good.

(Paul): So, (Marika) I'm making notes. And if you will, we'll just change that date to the 29th.

Marika Konings: Okay.

(Paul): And then that will leave staff at least two weeks for the initial report. Is that reasonable? I think I was just going off of something that was originally provided. Is that enough time?

Marika Konings: I think that should be fine. It's fine for now unless we get overwhelming amount of public comment.

(Paul): Sure.

Marika Konings: I guess we can review that otherwise...

(Paul): Yes. It's something to consider. With this PDP, you know, we're PDPA at least 4 A through D are envisioned. So the way we initially lay out our timeline and how we handle translated reports and feedback and all the rest may be very useful to the subsequent PDP.

So keeping that in mind make sure staff in particular we don't shortchange you guys in any way because while these particular issues may not be the most contentious controversial ones, you know, there's always a possibility you'll get a tremendous response. Want to

make sure you have enough time to do the work you need to do.

All right then. So then we've penciled in a line with the final review of the initial report by this working group by the 28th. Again...

(Mike): Now that one seems a little crisp to me.

(Paul): Right.

(Mike): It seems to me that that's probably where the majority of the sort of heavy duty negotiations in (unintelligible) is likely to take place. And we went might want to push that one out a bit.

(Paul): Okay. One thought or I think again, when I was just penciling in dates, my only thinking was that we would have theoretically from the 17th or 18th of October, the initial report's complete.

Constituencies could then, will be commenting on that initial report in the formal constituency statement period. And that would run all the way until what the - or beginning of December.

(Mike): Oh okay. The debate that we have within the working group of course, you know, is extremely important. But at the same time, final constituency comments as well as the second public comment period we'll still be working off of or addressing that initial report.

I think the thinking might've been okay we're just looking at the calendar. When is the first - excuse me, not the first, the second working group meeting after the report is prepared just making sure there was nothing really wacky, things that might have been

mischaracterized, overlooked, what have you.

But again, both the constituency statements, the formal version as well as a second public comment period, they will all be focused on whatever that report is.

(Mike): Okay. So that - yes, that does leave a fair amount of...

(Paul): Yes. Because if we start making changes to the report within the working group you know, we want to make sure that what is posted, what is made available to folks for those second round of comments, the formal round if you will, you know, that everybody is getting a chance to comment on the same document.

(Mike): Yes. Yes. I can understand that. Now one thing we should do on this page, we only have the public comment part. We don't have the second constituency round listed here.

(Paul): Yes and good point. Maybe we should make that, formalize that, that that -because in the back of my mind like I just explained, I was thinking okay, constituencies could get the report for comment as early as 17 or 18 October.

Marika Konings: This is like we basically added it with the little star on the final review finishing report where we basically listed with the possibility for updates to the constituency statement if necessary.

And, but on the line really thinking that, you know, we don't want people to think oh, I'll wait until the second round to do my bids because, you know, anyway I have a second opportunity to do it.

So to make sure as well that people indeed can add to it but don't see, you know, see a second round as a, you know, extended deadline basically.

(Paul): (Unintelligible) until the second round, yes. Thank you Marika Konings. Does that make sense (Mike), everybody else on the call?

(Mike): I'm not sure if that that is obvious enough.

(Paul): That's clear enough?

(Mike): Yes. It would seem to me that what we might want to do is make a similar distinction to the one we made in the Fast Flux group where the first round is sort of an input round and the second round is the policy haggling round. And then call this out.

Marika Konings: But (Mike) one of the challenges we had - I don't know if there was - the reason because we split it, I mean because in the Fast Flux (one) where we have of course many other challenges but, you know, we didn't - and we only got one form of constituency statement.

I don't know if that was unique. I mean as I said, there were many other challenges. But I don't know if some thought is like oh well, we actually have time because there's going to be a formal round as well.

I don't know of that's - that's the last input then, you know, what we normally see I think in the first round of - or in a (form) amount of statements.

(Mike): Yes. And I think that's the key point which is that in the Fast Flux one, what we were really asking for was ideas not reactions to policy in the first round.

And so the fact that not every constituency came in didn't concern me as much because I was viewing it as essentially ideas, input, brainstorming -- whatever and that the second one is the formal comment on the policy.

If we're following that model here than it would seem to me that just as I'm sort of expecting a higher proportion of constituency statements in Fast Flux or at least some constituency is coming in and saying well we wrote one, please refer to that, I think that it - it's likely that we would see the same split.

I mean there may be confusion here in terms of what the expectations are for these two rounds that we need to clear up.

(Paul): Okay. The - yes. Whereas the experience in Fast Flux is helpful in terms of being a guide in some ways it's helpful, in some ways it's not because it's a, sort of a I think a unique challenge -- a little different.

I think this one is more typical in terms of PDP where, you know, the expectation is okay, provide a request for comments on a series of questions. And then there's an understanding there is a report that will be generated that summarizes everybody's inputs and that there is a second round.

I never was clear when the second round for Fast Flux was coming (Mike). So I think that may have been certainly from the registrar side

part of the difficulty in getting group inputs while we ultimately ended up just some of us individuals putting together comments.

I think with this particular process in front of us and for policy one, it's a little clear we're laying out okay, there will be - here's the template. Please answer the questions and then there will be a staff report and you'll get the opportunity to comment on that.

But folks, you know, ideally we'll have here's what, you know, the positions we take just in our interest. You know, here's what we believe on the questions that are put before them.

And then in the second half of the process the formal constituency, the formal comments, you know, have the benefit of debating, countering the points made by other members of the community.

I'm not sure if that necessarily clarifies but I at least see this is a little different. It's very clear there's, you know, a first round and a second round. I didn't necessarily have the sense what the second round was going to be in the Fast Flux PDP.

Olof Nordling: Yes. This is (Olaf). I think you're right in spotting the Fast Flux as much more exploratory into the unknown and hence the idea of having two constituency statement rounds which is both from a bylaws perspective (critical).

So I think this is more straightforward in the general thinking that indeed there'll be consolidated views on possible solutions and then okay, you open out for public comments once more.

And of course, it happens that constituencies express themselves through that means as well. But otherwise it's more into the elaboration within be it a task force working group or in council deliberations that the fine tuning of the views from the constituencies appear. And well the traditional PDPs, that's great.

(Mike): Yes. And I'm fine with that. I'm persuaded by this argument. Having lived through Fast Flux, I don't think we want to run anybody through that again.

(Paul): But I think it was a good point (Mike) in first raising do others share, do we need to change the language that we have in any way?

For the second, is the asterisks that we provided enough? You know, is this okay? Do you think there will be enough understanding okay, it's just your typical PDP process. Everybody will sort of know the rules?

And of course it goes without saying that all the members of this working group, part of our challenge and part of our mandate is to go back to our constituencies and make sure that they understand how this will precede, that there will be the opportunity to comment on everybody else's inputs that are contained in the initial report, et cetera.

(Mike): I think that puts my comment on the never mind pile.

(Paul): Okay. All right, so with those - with that behind us, how about the number of days that we've sketched out especially the second half, sort of the formal constituency input stage, constituency and comment stage?

And we're talking about again, having - being able to push out the initial report to constituencies as early as say the 18th of October with a deadline for comments due back on the 9th of December?

(First) look at that, again, sketchy on the date, I was sensitive to at least the registrar constituency our bylaws require that certain number of days to respond as a constituency.

And so, you know, I was trying to bake in enough time here to make sure that we would cover that.

Of course we're going to have Cairo in-between and there's the Thanksgiving holiday here in the US. So, you know, I've - however many days it ultimately works out to. I still felt that, you know, this would hopefully be enough time.

Do others feel it's adequate where we'd like to add some more time, extend out the backend deadline? What do folks think?

(Mike): I think that's enough time. You know, if you start it 17 October, well probably you should start it 28 October. You know, that's over an elapsed month. I think it's pretty reasonable.

Olof Nordling: (Olaf) here. Another perspective is of course that we have the Cairo meeting coming up. And there will be some discussions about this in Cairo. So of course it's good to have - well some clear steps where we should be prior to that.

(Paul): Yes. In the same way trying to get the start of the - the official start of

the second public comment period a few days before Cairo to make sure that everybody has the initial report and can discuss it. That was certainly an important consideration and concern.

And the same way since constituencies meet in Cairo again, they will have the documents in front of them.

But let's just to play devil's advocate, let's say folks don't start really focusing on this until Cairo, the meetings. If that's the case, then we're looking at as we've currently sketched out, a little less than a month. Is that reasonable or is that perhaps cutting it a little too short?

Again, I ask the GNSO council never even suggested a deadline for this. So we're really not under an obligation to try and get this done in December as we've sketched out here.

It would be nice to have it complete, you know, end the year on a high note, get this one done and have everything prepared for round PDP B, C or D in the new year. But if we need more time, now's the time to speak up.

(Mike): We can always ask for more time later if it looks like it's becoming burdensome. We're comfortable with it now.. Let's just go with it.

(Paul): Okay.

Man: Yes. I like that approach too.

Michael Collins: I agree.

(Paul): Very good. All right. Then we'll stick with the timeline that we have here of course with the one change that we will start the public comment period now on the - what did we say, the 29th?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay sorry (Paul). I'm going to drop off the call.

(Paul): Very good. Thank you (Mike).

Excuse me. The completion of the public comment period will become the 29th of September. We're going to add a full week to that one. Otherwise the dates will remain as we sketched out here.

Marika Konings: All data on the Wiki.

(Paul): Thank you (Marika).

Olof Nordling: Perhaps it would be given that not all participants were on this call that we sent out - we send out a little reminder that this is a public comment. Text has been modified and is now current and if they please could provide their comments by tomorrow.

And tomorrow I would say maybe that's a bit on the short side because we're talking here about (Marika) and me and - well end of business over here in Europe is of course fairly early.

And if we want to get it up and posted, maybe we should modify it to the 4th in order to give sufficient time for people to actually have a look - a close look at it.

So meaning that we can set it for processing and the final version for

adoption and such and to answer it on the Web site it takes a bit of handling to between Brussels and the headquarters. So I would almost suggest that we shift it to the fourth. I don't know, (Marika), what do you think and Glen also? Shouldn't...

Marika Konings: I would agree.

Glen DeSaintgery: I quite agree (Olaf).

(Paul): Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: Because I think it's better having a version up that everyone is satisfied with than having some people come back afterwards and saying but, you know, this should've been changed.

Marika Konings: I can make all the changes after this call and then send out a note to everyone of the updated text following this call is online and that people have till the close of business tomorrow to provide any comments or input or anything that they still would like to see there. And if not, we can indeed get it out then on the 4th if everyone would agree.

Olof Nordling: Yes, and put close of business, well PDD or something. Because we can deal with it in the early morning of the 4th and get up and posted on the 4th US time.

(Paul): Makes perfect sense to me. All right then if you guys will do it that way, that will give (Barbara) and (Mark) and others who - (Adam), who couldn't be on the call today, opportunity to make sure that they're comfortable with the times, gives everybody the time that they need --

perfect.

All right then, by my watch we only have about 5 or 6 minutes before the top of the hour. And I'm thinking rather than diving into any of the issues and since a number of us - none of our colleagues aren't on the call right now might be easier just to end this here today and then prepare to dig into the issues on our next call next Tuesday.

I guess one question for the group would be do we want to take the issues in order? Does anybody have a preference? Would they prefer to start with 3, 2 or 1? Does it matter to them?

(Mike): I don't - I hadn't thought of pondering that. Right off the bat I don't have any...

(Paul): Sure.

MK: ...sequence so thoughts.

(Paul): We can always also address it next week. I don't - we need to get through all three. I don't think it really matters what order we take them.

So when we're all back on next week it will be understood that we're getting into the meat of the issue now. And at that time, if somebody's got strong feelings about one or the other we can start there.

(James LaDell): (Paul), this is (James).

(Paul): Yes (James)?

(James LaDell): Just an observation that it always seems that Issue 3 would consume the bulk of our conversations and our mailing list discussion. So perhaps we should start there...

(Paul): Sure.

(James LaDell): ...with the -- and it's speculation -- but with the expectation that that would then - that Issue 1 and 2 would follow pretty closely after that one was taken care of.

(Paul): Certainly. And I guess the flip side would be if we believe 1 and 2 are the lower hanging fruit do we want to get those done in quicker fashion?

(James LaDell): Also a good approach.

(Paul): Totally open to either way. Why don't we do this. (Marika), when you're going to send out the notes to everybody referencing the various documents that we've agreed to and telling everybody they have until close of business PDT tomorrow to respond, would you also just throw in a lines saying that - and let's for argument's sake use (James)'s point asking that folks start thinking about and be prepared to begin discussing Issue Number 3 on next week's call?

Marika Konings: Okay.

(Paul): And you know, folks are - can come back on the list and say look, I'd really like to take these in order or do whatever they want to do. But at least that way there's some sense of where we're going, what we're going to try and accomplish on next Tuesday's call.

(Mike): You know (Paul) I'd like to weigh in in favor of the low-hanging fruit partly for low-hanging fruit but also just to get us used to sort of negotiating with each other on perhaps lower stakes topics just to build the sort of comfort level rather than taking the absolutely toughest one first, just a thought.

(Paul): That's a good thought. I'm inclined to just say look, let's keep it simple and go in order. The reality is that we'll be building to what is probably going to be the most difficult one.

But it's kind of hard to argue hey, we're just starting with Number 1, move from there.

So (Marika)...

(James LaDell): Good idea (Mike). And...

(Paul): Oh sorry (James).

(James LaDell): Oh no. Go ahead.

(Paul): Okay. And I was only going to say (Marika) instead of saying we'll start with Issue 3, just say we'll start with Issue 1.

Marika Konings: Okay.

(Paul): Thank you.

Olof Nordling: And (Paul) and others, I promise next meeting I'll be very, very quiet.

(Unintelligible) be on holidays just so you know.

(Paul): Very good. Thank you for the heads up. Enjoy.

Olof Nordling: Thanks.

(Paul): Okay everyone. Then I think that about does it for today, appreciate everybody's attendance and inputs on the call.

We can expect an email from (Marika) in the next couple of hours, day so. If there any issues that come to mind, remember you'll have until close of business Pacific Daylight Time tomorrow to weigh in either on the list or here on the Wiki. And then, you know, we can expect to see the public comment period opened up some time on the fourth.

And of course we will have our next call same time next Tuesday.

Again, thank you all for your participation and talk to you...

Yes?

(Mike): Glen and (Marika), could you guys hang on the call for just a second?

Glen DeSaintgery: Sure.

(Mike): We'll pick up a little bit on Fast Flux before we're...

Marika Konings: Okay.

(Mike): ...before we scoot. That'd be great.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay.

Man: Thanks.

Olof Nordling: Good-bye.

(Paul): Thank you all.

Glen DeSaintgery: Bye.

Man: Bye. Thank you.

(Paul): Oh, and I guess operator if you're there.

Coordinator: Yes, hello?

(Paul): I think you can stop the recording now.

END