

**Policy & Implementation Working Group Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 07 May at 1900 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Wednesday 07 May 2014 at 1900 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-policy-implementation-20140507-en.mp3>

On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#may>

Attendees:

Greg Shatan – IPC
Wolf Knoblen - ISPCP
Chuck Gomes – RySG
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Klaus Stoll - NPOC
Michael Graham – IPC
Olevie Kouami – NPOC
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – At-Large
Avri Doria – NCSG
Anne Aikman- Scalsese - IPC

Apologies:

James Bladel – RrSG
J. Scott Evans – BC

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Mary Wong
Amy Bivins
Steve Chan
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Thank you for standing by for today's conference call. At this time I need to remind all participants today's conference call is being recorded. Thank you so much you can begin your call. Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Jean). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody and welcome to the Policy and Implementation Working Group call on the 7th of May, 2014.

On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Klaus Stoll, Greg Shatan, Alan Greenberg, Wolf Knoblen, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Chuck Gomes, Michael Graham and Avri Doria.

We have apologies from J. Scott Evans and James Bladel. From staff we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Amy Bivins, Steve Chan and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Nathalie, appreciate that. And sorry for a little bit of a late start for everyone but thanks for being on the call. Does anyone have an update to your Statement of Interest? Not seeing any hands or hearing anyone.

We'll go ahead and start the main part of our meeting. Let me ask though, whether or not anyone is not in Adobe Connect?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Chuck, it's Anne Aikman-Scalese, I'm not in yet but should be soon.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So, Anne, just speak up you want to say something before you get in...

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay? Just so I know.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yeah, just working from home and that's a little more complicated so thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right. Okay well I don't want to miss you and so just make sure you speak out and let us know.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay well we - our agenda is primarily to go over the - to start Deliverable 1 discussion. And I see that on the screen in Adobe. So we will start right there in our discussions today.

Now I didn't see anything with regard to the principles, in particular Section D of the Principles document from the subgroup that's working on that. So I'm assuming that we will postpone Item 3 on the agenda until next week. Is that correct?

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan, one of the sub committee, and I regrettably must say that, correct. I'm not sure that Michael Graham's correct email was used when it was communicated to him. But I'm not sure that it wasn't; it just looks a little hinky and the third member of the group was Tom Barrett. We will - we'll do better.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg, appreciate the update. No - that's really not going to cause us any delays. I just wanted to make sure that we would postpone that item until next week which will be fine; that shouldn't hinder our work today at all. So thanks again for volunteering with that along with the others. And if you can get that to the group with a little bit of lead time before next Wednesday's meeting that would be much appreciated.

Okay I see a hand by Marika; go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks Chuck. So this is Marika just a question on the working principles just like to know whether it would be helpful if actually I post the latest version with brackets between the D section with a note that that's being worked on but at least I can may be posted on the wiki so we have therefore reference, you know, if the sub team wants to refer to it or other members as we start the deliberations on this topic. So just want to make sure if that's okay with everyone.

Chuck Gomes: That sounds good Marika, thank you. Okay so deliverable one, we have on the screen the deliverable itself to propose a process for developing gTLD and other ICANN policy in the form of GNSO...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Hi, Olevie. And...

Olevie Kouami: Yeah, it's Olevie on line thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Let me start that again. Deliverable one, propose the process for developing gTLD and other ICANN policy in the form of GNSO policy development process guidance and propose criteria for determining when each would be appropriate. And that came out of charter question two.

So let's - Item A there has to do with reviewing the mechanisms of the GNSO that the GNSO used today for developing policy and advice outside of the PDP. A couple examples are given, the STI and the SCI. STI is the - I forget what those initials stand for, that was the (unintelligible), right?

((Foreign Language Spoken 5:36))

Chuck Gomes: Okay, if you're not speaking please put your phone on mute. Hopefully we'll have fewer interruptions. And the SCI is that Standing Committee on Improvements I believe. Somebody help me out with the STI - what does that stand for?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Standing Committee on Improvement Implementation.

Chuck Gomes: No, I'm talking about STI.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh STI.

Alan Greenberg: Chuck, it's Alan. It had several different definitions over its lifetime. The one that was on the final report was Special Trademark Issues or something like that.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay that's fine. I knew it was related to trademark issues for new gTLDs, it was one of the implementation actions that happened there so those are given as examples.

And then last of all A says, "And what lessons can be learned from those?" now you can see on the right the charters for both or at least a link for the STI and a link for the SCI charter.

The - And then there are some links there for those. Marika or Mary, would either of you be willing to discuss that - those particular links and how they might relate and maybe do a quick overview - very quick overview of those.

But before I do that - and I see your hand Marika, let me call on Alan whose hand was at first I think.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah just a question. In the title line or just below the title line we have Policy Development Process in caps which implies it is the formally defined process in the bulk of Annex A.

And I thought it was within our scope to potentially propose other mechanisms, obviously not for consensus policy, but other mechanisms for setting policy here not necessarily restricted to the formal policy development process but having more weight than guidance still being a formal policy process.

You know, it's not clear whether we want to end up doing that but there some indication when we were talking about, you know, in both the definitions discussion and the principles discussion that we might want to some other processes in some cases other than those formal full-blown PDP.

And I'm just - I guess I'm asking despite the use of the caps in that sentence is that still within scope?

Chuck Gomes: I think it definitely is, Alan. I think it needs to be. If you look at the parenthetical below the title it even gets into that a little bit - I think it makes a little clearer maybe still not ideally clear. But if anybody disagrees with my assessment on that please speak up. Marika.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. And maybe first of all to Alan's question because in the I think that deliverable is really a bit more shorthand is what the expected

outcome is that the real scope is indeed in the charter question which talks about indeed a process for developing gTLD the policy perhaps in the form of policy guidance including criteria for when it would be appropriate to use of such a process for developing policy other than consensus policy instead of eight GNSO policy development process. So I think that goes exactly to what you were referring to.

In relation to the items that you see in the Box A in relation to other review mechanisms that the GNSO has used this basically - these questions that are here in this document they derived from the development of the work plan and as well the mind map some of you may recall where we started out on where we basically were trying to throw out questions and ideas on what we would need to consider or think about in each of these charter questions.

And here's the point was basically made maybe we should look first at some of the mechanisms that GNSO has used to date to develop policy or advice outside of the policy development process noting that none of these are formal processes as such or, you know, they're not in the GNSO operating procedures or anything like that but they have been used, you know, some to a greater success than others, and there may be some valuable lessons learned from that.

And I think that's also, you know, goes to Alan's point seeing that there are many different variations or mechanisms that have been used a potential outcome of course to this question could be as well that there are multiple processes that may be proposed or recommended that the GNSO Council a daily self of depending on what the question is or what the issue is it's trying to deal with.

So as Chuck already referred to, you know, we have the Standing Committee on Improvement Implementation, which is a standing committee; it's a different kind of model as well then working groups that we have.

The SCI's specific activity that was to take in place and we also had several letters that were drafted, you know, by use of a draft and team consisting of community members or Council members that specifically responded to Board requests for input. And several of those are referred here.

That GNSO has also formed little drafting teams on providing input on some other efforts such as the Whois Review Team final report. And most of those have taken the form of correspondence or input either as part of a public comment forum or formal correspondence sent to the Board or another entity within ICANN.

So again we would need to dive maybe a little bit deeper into how those efforts were undertaken to maybe see what lessons can be learned from those, you know, what worked, what didn't work, you know, should any of those be hard coded in any kind of specific recommendation.

And again this is not a gossip list; I think Alan has already in the chat referring as well that we also had a drafting team that develops recommendations in relation to the Red Cross and IOC protections.

And again I think that took the form of a letter but it was quite an extensive process that went into that effort. So again I think that's where we're - Section A comes from. This is just a starting list. There may be other examples that people would like to add or, you know, based on experience indicate which ones may be worth exploring further or going into further detail to derive, you know, best practices from those.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Marika. This is Chuck again. And Alan, you can see that Mary responded to your comment pointing out the second bullet item there talks about the RC IOC drafting team.

So let me first comment, and others are welcome to jump in on this, I don't see how that SCI, the Standing Committee on Improvements for the GNSO, really helps us very much. What that group does is it looks at issues for which there has been policy in the past or actions taken in the past including dealing with the procedures of the GNSO.

And then makes recommendations for GNSO consideration for changes to those procedures or other actions that might be helpful. Does anybody disagree with me on that? Is there some value in spending time looking at that SCI charter? Olevie, did you want to say something? Marika, go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay, go ahead, Olevie.

Olevie Kouami: Okay (unintelligible). Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Olevie Kouami: I want to say that (unintelligible) Adobe chat room.

Chuck Gomes: I didn't hear that fully. Can somebody help me out there?

Olevie Kouami: Okay. (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And I type as well in the chat, I mean, I think the reason why the SCI is there is that may be the standing committee could be at the tensile model through which, you know, certain requests are channeled or for example if we talk about implementation maybe you would have a standing committee, you know, oversee implementation efforts and there would be a kind of channeling mechanism.

I think that's one of the reasons why it may be mentioned here. And, you know, I'm just throwing out examples of how such a model may be applied to some of the questions we're looking at all the recognizing that it's not a process on itself but it may be a mechanism that, you know, which facilitate a certain process for example.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. That makes sense. And I of course was looking at it in terms of the actual committee itself and what it does rather than looking at it as a technique that could be used. And that makes sense. Thanks. Thanks for clarifying that and thanks for showing your agreement there, Anne.

The - so the SCI example is one some sort of a standing committee is an idea that we could keep in our back pockets for consideration as we move forward in terms of recommendations for Deliverable 1. Thanks for that.

Now which of these - are there any of these, let me rephrase that, are there any of these that anyone thinks would be particularly good to dig into in more depth with regard to our work? If so, speak up and let us know.

Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I think certainly the SCI one is an interesting one to look at. There were some really strong points to it and some really negatives to it. And it may be worthwhile spending a bit of time reviewing them.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you. So let's flag that one. Any others as people look through those. And if you have questions about any of those to and one of us on the call hopefully can answer your questions. Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Possibly the correspondence on the trademark clearinghouse straw man proposal because I think that's a, you know, very clear example where, you know, specific input was sought and a very controversial topic where I think the Council tried to work through some of the different points of views and at the end did come to a result so that may be worth exploring how that was managed and handled.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thank you. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Actually in companion to that one the development of the straw man itself I think also bears some review. Again some really strong good things came out of it and some really bad things came out of it and there are lessons to be learned there specifically from the good parts of it. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Alan. Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes thank you Chuck. It's Anne with IPC but not speaking on behalf of IPC. I tend to feel that we've got to look at all of these. I'm trying to understand myself all of the processes that have been used in the past. And, you know, I noticed also here at the bottom we have the Brand Registry issue that's come up for resolution and I think is on Council's agenda for tomorrow.

And I feel as though these are worth studying for what was the process procedure that was followed, what are the strengths and weaknesses and what can we learn about maybe streamlining processes so there are choices of processes versus ad hoc processes being followed.

So, I mean, I guess I would say it's taking a deeper look at all of them because they are processes that have been used. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Anne. Chuck again. So are you suggesting taking time looking at each one...

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Well - a subgroup.

Chuck Gomes: Oh in other words what you are suggesting is having a couple people maybe just take a look or probably could even be one person taking a look at each of these and then coming back with their assessment in terms of how it might help us. Is that what you're suggesting?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. And probably a couple of three people to summarize what actually happened, what occurred and what they think the strengths and weaknesses are in the processes that were followed as Alan was, you know, discussing.

Chuck Gomes: That sounds like a pretty good suggestion. Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And I agree, I think that would be probably a worthwhile effort and from staff side we can definitely help in gathering some of that information and well at least I'm envisioning that maybe that would take the

kind of form off the table where indeed we can list the different steps that were taken.

And I think, you know, the point I was actually in the queue to make was it probably will be important as well to indicate in that, you know, what actually triggered that specific process because I think the point I've made before as well it's not unlikely that potential outcome could be that there are different mechanisms the Council may want to use or can use depending on the request that is received.

So I think that part of the analysis may also be helpful in seeing you know what approaches the Council take based on, you know, the Board request was a specific coming out of another process and basically trying to, you know, take that into the consideration as well as we look through the data that we get from reviewing this information.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. And Anne certainly is showing her agreement with that. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: I would suggest that an additional item or group that could be looked at would be the Implementation Recommendation Team on trademarks that preceded the SCI. And I think it - when historians look back at all this in 100 years, you know, if they ever do, they might look at the IRT, the SCI and the straw man all as being part of a single story arc.

So I think it's worthwhile to throw that into the mix as well.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. Chuck again. And let's add that to our list so we have a couple additions to the list, one from Anne so let's get those on there. Now it seems to

me it would be helpful, and maybe we can use some of the space below the agenda on the right in Adobe Connect to do this.

If we were to just fairly quickly list the things that we would like volunteers to do, if they volunteer for one of these. And I think we start off with, if we can capture these over there, first of all is to review the relevant document, okay?

And then several of you have made some good suggestions so let's just quickly brainstorm. And you can raise your hand if you want to suggest something. What we would like the person to do so there's a clear understanding when people volunteer what we're asking them to do with regard to one of these listed items or more.

So review relevant documents. What do you mean by possible subcommittee? I assume, Marika, is that you typing there?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. That's a possible subcommittee would review these documents and I guess then we would list now what that subcommittee would be doing or did I misunderstand the notes you wanted me to take?

Chuck Gomes: No no this is Chuck. And I think that's what Anne suggested. I'm going to make a comment on that. There's a whole bunch of these and if we form a subcommittee for each one we're going to need a lot of volunteers; we haven't had that great of success getting volunteers.

So my leaning is to have at least one person that would do this and then bring it back to the full group. If there's more than one that's great but if we try to form a subcommittee for one of these how many do we have? That's a lot of subcommittees and I'm not sure that's realistic.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: No, just one sub - sorry I'm butting in Chuck. But I would say just one subcommittee and they could divide up the work.

Chuck Gomes: Well we're back to wear - and this is Chuck again. We're back to where we were when we tried to form subcommittees on the different deliverables. And I mean, I'm not opposed to that if people think that'll work.

I was thinking, you know, since we're functioning as a working group as a whole to do these deliverables if we had one or two people for each one of them come back then the group could decide as a whole and define - identify which areas would be helpful and we document those as part of our work.

But I'm not opposed to forming a subcommittee to do this task but let's see what other people think. Michael.

Michael Graham: Yeah, I think we could go ahead and since really the analysis of these to me seems to be fairly straightforward, although somewhat time-consuming, it's something that's a single person could do in a lot of these cases. I think probably the way to go forward would be to figure out what information we would want that would be useful for us from each of these.

And then I agree, we don't need to form a sub team we just need to get volunteers to work on these and to bring back to the work group as a whole their findings.

But if there's some way that we could sort of digest what information would find most useful from each of these and for each of them to get that same type of information I think that would be the way to go and then comment you know, could send off everybody off into the wild with their particular area that they're looking for.

I counted 10 of these so we have 11 on the call that's already just one person per each unless somebody wants to double up.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michael. And did that include the two add ones?

Michael Graham: Let's see, did that include the two added ones? Yes, well no so that would be 12.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thank you. Greg.

Greg Shatan: I think, you know, following on what Michael suggested sounds like maybe if we had some sort of a template or chart to be filled out that could possibly be turned into rows on a chart that might be helpful rather than people going kind of freehand and trying to summarize what we're getting out of these.

It may be a little bit more work up front but I think it will make the rest of the work even more straightforward and maybe even less time consuming.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. And I wasn't necessarily thinking of a template although that's fine but that's what I thought we would do right now as a group is at least identify the elements of that template so that everybody's working off the same page.

And so - and if we want to do a template that's good. Once we have the elements I think that it would be easy to go from there to a template. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I think you. I may have misheard but I thought I heard a long time ago Marika saying that staff could probably take a stab at starting each of these. And I would suggest that if I didn't misheard - if I didn't mishear that we find one or

two people on this group, preferably ones - people who actually took part in the activity, and work with the designated staff person, Marika or Mary or whoever, to try to identify it.

You know, that way we're not having staff tell, you know, give us what they believe that history was alone but it also has someone who perhaps works better to deadlines than us volunteers do. And, you know, it's a mixed effort, that might work well. If I heard correctly that there was a volunteer to begin with from staff.

Chuck Gomes: Do you want to confirm that, Marika? This is chat.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. That's what I also suggested in the chat. I think indeed we can definitely, you know, have a go at developing a chart and a table and starting to fill in some of the comment you know, the basic information we can glean from the links and then indeed, you know, work with either if it's some individuals or just sending it back to the whole group so people can start looking at it and adding information to it.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, it's Alan. Just one follow-on. Certainly for the groups that I participated in and there were several of them bear, I'd be glad to put my two cents worth in. You know, it may be a biased view and as many of our views will be. But, you know, I'm certainly willing to participate and hopefully others will also.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Michael.

Michael Graham: Maybe where we should start is to go through this list and see who we have online who was on any of these projects. I like that idea because that's certainly would save a lot of time; if you're not on the project you would have

to go through all of the weeds to find it. If you were involved in it you'd pretty quickly be able to get that information, out I like that suggestion from Alan.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Michael. So it sounds like we're leaning towards creating - having staff take a first crack at creating a table and then having the rest of us help fill in the elements of that table where we can. Did I get that correct, before I call on - in fact let me call on Anne first.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes thank you Chuck. My comment was, as we are comment you know, breeding bees into the realm of current events I noticed, you know, we have the Brand Registry on here. Do we need to add to this the IANA transition process? Is that something that is, you know, somehow unaffected by GNSO policy development and initiated in a certain way and being initiated now?

Chuck Gomes: Marika, do you want to respond to that?

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. I think at this stage what we're really looking at is those processes or efforts the GNSO has used to respond to certain Board requests or deal with implementation questions. I think that NTIA transition debate is probably a much bigger picture.

And even though maybe there's something in there that eventually may serve as a useful model for the GNSO I'm not sure as part of this specific effort reviewing what the GNSO has done to date from which we can learn lessons is - and as well it may be too premature as I think it's just a draft proposal at this stage; there's nothing actually yet been set in motion. So maybe it's too early to even review that.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. And I think you're right Marika, that it's in the very early processes of even starting to come up with a process for it. So there's not - there hopefully will be lots of lessons that can be learnt several months down the road but I think it may be premature as well. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I was just going to say that, you know, I think we should limit ourselves to things which have completed and we can have some ability to say well was it a success or not. Other things are moving targets.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Alan. Okay. And I see and agree down there. Thank you Cheryl.

So did I capture it correctly? Where we're headed now is to ask staff - I guess I could name Marika and Mary - to create a table with each of these items on it and then start to fill in that table. And in terms of what we fill in we'll talk about that in just a moment over on the right of the screen so that they have some input from us in terms of what the table may look like and what information we're looking for.

And then we'll come back to the full group with that and try and complete that. Now is the thinking that we should do that as part of a working group call or just do it on the list and if necessary have a call between particular individuals that have experience in certain items? Anybody want to comment on that in terms of what the thinking is?

Okay. Then let's just go to the - I didn't working over on the right. So what do we want in that table that would be helpful to us? And just going to brainstorm so just raise your hand if you'd like to throw in an element. Don't worry about the order of the elements, just throw them out. Alan, go ahead. What do you think we should have in there?

Alan Greenberg: I think the obvious ones are Marika said what triggered it and that's important. Strong points, things that are in favor that we would want to replicate and things that did not work out as well.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. That's great. Somebody else. What else would be helpful to have in that table?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: One of those points that I'm not sure which category fits in that we may want a separate category is time constraint. If some of these items were very tightly and time constrained now that can be considered a curse or a blessing.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so in other words...

Alan Greenberg: We may want to list it separately and not try to put in which category it was.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan. So in other words were there time constraints so that - because that could be a factor in terms of their success or failure or other issues. That's a good point.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, along with time constraint goes threat. I don't know if you want to include that one.

Chuck Gomes: Well, let's put that there. Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes Chuck. It's Anne. I just would say a basic effects in dealing with after the triggering quite a procedure or process or steps were actually followed?

Chuck Gomes: So thanks Anne. So in other words like what was a drafting team developed or a...

Alan Greenberg: Methodology.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, so...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay that's good. Very good. Somebody else. What else would you like to see in this table that would help us quickly glean from it and see whether we need to dig deeper. Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think following on from Alan's point I think the issue of time constraints I think we should actually look as well at the actual time it took from start to finish to have an idea on how much time a certain process took.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, makes sense thanks. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Selection and composition of the group so selection methodology and composition of the group.

Chuck Gomes: Okay this is Chuck again. So Greg, with regard to composition you're not talking about individual names are you? Or are you talking about what stakeholder interests they represented? What do you mean by composition?

Greg Shatan: I'm primarily thinking about the interests they represented but as long as we're capturing information we could capture the individual. But I'm not sure how important that is to this exercise.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and one of the - this is Chuck again. And one of the problems that comes to my mind with regard to individual names so often, and it's true of this working group that we're on right now, there are lots of names that show up as participants that rarely participated so it can be...

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...kind of misleading in that regard. I think we'd probably be better off looking at the interest areas that were represented.

Greg Shatan: I agree.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks Chuck. Just waiting to see if there were other hands. So one suggestion for the first point suggested by Alan what triggered it, whether it would be useful for - if it's possible to also try to figure out who framed the issue or how the issue is framed.

Four example was a clear issue, a specific issue or a general, can you do something about it like who or how the was framed. And secondly the nature of the outcomes, was it a letter, was a report. I assume there were no public comments that just the nature of the document or outcome.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Let's go to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah the composition is an interesting one not so much the names of the people but how it was composed, was it a you know a free-for-all that any one could join? Was it restricted membership? Was it selected by someone? And that's I think end up actually overlapping with the pluses and minuses. But it may not be a bad thing to have as a separate column to start with.

Chuck Gomes: That's a good suggestion.

Alan Greenberg: Methodology for staffing essentially.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah and I think it is a real simple thing we can say, was it open? Was it closed? Where the members selected by someone and if so who selected them? I think that's a very good suggestion. Thank you. Any other ideas?

I don't think we need to try and put these in any particular order nor do we need to group them so that similar things are closer together. I'm sure that's something that Mary and Marika could do unless somebody thinks differently. Any other...

Anne Aikman-Scalse: I trust Mary and Marika to do that. It's Anne. I trust Mary and Marika to do that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Anne. Okay. All right. Yeah, I do too. And if they need help they can ask us if they have questions so that's no problem at all. Alan, is that a new hand?

Alan Greenberg: That is a very ancient hand.

Chuck Gomes: Is a very ancient one huh?

Alan Greenberg: It is now gone.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks. Okay I think we have a good start here. Let me say to Mary and Marika as you're doing this you may think of some other things, don't hesitate to have those. I'm sure none of us would object to that because when you're working through something like this you often - new ideas or variations of the one - ones we already listed would be good to go feel completely free to make some things, reward them, clarify things, add other variations, whatever you think would be useful for the group I encourage you to take that freedom.

Okay now Mary and Marika's job security has been increased not that it was in jeopardy but they have a pretty good task there.

Let me ask both of them, I mean, is it too much to ask that at first that be done before our next meeting or do you need a couple weeks? What you're thinking? Marika. Marika's ready to tell us. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. I think we can definitely have, you know, the table ready and hopefully already some of the, you know, efforts in there but whether we can do the whole list that will depend a little bit on as well on workload.

But I think we will be able to share probably a first outline and that will hopefully give you something to comment on and see if we're heading down the right direction.

And as well for those that have been involved in those efforts to start thinking about what else needs to be captured. But we can try and get as much information in there before the next call on Wednesday.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Appreciate the quick response on that. So, my next question for the group is this: okay now do you think it would be - and we may be able to - I'm going to share couple ideas. We may be able to do them both, they're not necessarily mutually exclusive.

But one way to approach this is they do the table and then on our next week's call we start going through one by one and people can jump in if they have questions or if they can help add to the contents of the table.

Another way to approach it would be to just work off-line on the table and then bring it together to the full group after that happens for a while. And I'm sure there are other variations of that.

Alan, would you like to respond to that?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, my inclination is to, to the extent that we have people who can comment on these various efforts that we incorporate some of their comments before we bring it back to the whole group. That may well mean that we're not ready for next Wednesday. But I think it's going to be a more productive effort than taking individual comments, you know, serially in front of the whole group.

Chuck Gomes: As you can see Anne agrees with that. I'll scroll down see if there's any others. So Anne agrees with that. Anybody disagree with that? If not that's the way we will go.

So merry and Marika will, I assume, send this to the whole list. And each of us that can add to particular ones need to do that hopefully as quickly as possible so we can make progress on Question A here.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I'd say even - Chuck, it's Alan, if I may interject. Even more than that any of us on the group who knows that we have some specific of these things can simply contribute them to Mary and Marika off-line.

Chuck Gomes: Good suggestion.

Alan Greenberg: If that makes their job easier so much the better.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Just to be clear when you do that and I'm sure everyone would but I'll say it anyway, just be clear which item - you know, what might be helpful if instead of using bullets on the items is if we numbered them then people can easily refer to a number and make it that much easier to clarify which item is being discussed. Okay.

So is there anything else that we should discuss about Question A? if not we'll go to B. Okay. Let's go on to - if we can scroll - oh I have the scrolling capability, sorry about that. I will scroll...

Alan Greenberg: We all do.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, we all do correct. If I can get it to - just there. I got down to C. There we go. Okay so B is to review the draft process outlined in the staff discussion paper. Let's now strategize with regard to an effective way to tackle this action item. And, Anne, is that a new hand?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yeah, thanks Chuck. This is actually left over from A. I'm sorry I did not raise it earlier. But in one point we were talking about possibly making things a bit easier for staff also by identifying in the items in A folks on the call who were involved in the process. I wonder if it's worthwhile having

people say well, yeah, I was involved in that and I have comments just the staff knows, you know.

Chuck Gomes: Okay that's good. Thank you for reminding me of that. Let's just go through them right now and if you can click on the agree button if you were involved in these activities as I go through them please do so.

Let's start with the staff letter suggesting - well let's go back up to the - I don't know that we need that information for the SCI charter because that's just an idea that could be used - the idea that...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Chuck, I presume you mean were involved and want to participate in this space.

Chuck Gomes: Well I'm welcome to have people participate even if they don't want to but yes. That's fine yeah. So...

Alan Greenberg: Chuck, the reason I say that is I and if you - and maybe you and a few others were probably involved in far more of these than we want to remember.

Chuck Gomes: That's correct.

Alan Greenberg: We may want to pick and choose.

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: But you'll all have comments when this gets drafted however so.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, let's start with STI. Raise your hand if you are particularly interested in that one. By the way even if you weren't involved if you're particularly interested in that particular one you can raise your hand. So how about STI? Anybody want to identify themselves as having been associated with that and incriminate yourself...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I was.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody else? Okay. Let's then go down to the staff letter suggesting possibilities for the GAC GNSO collaboration on RC IOC protections. Now I'm kind of thinking that one - it's been a long time since that letter was drafted. Was that mainly a staff effort or was the letter drafted in response to GAC and GNSO input?

Mary Wong: Chuck, this is Mary. I don't recall exactly but it was definitely drafted by staff; I think it was signed by Kurt at the time. I don't recall what triggered it; I'm not sure that's in the letter. A but in many ways your comment does make this a very different animal from the rest of the bullet points. So maybe for this one - I'm looking quickly through a list - it could be something like that SCI charter just like an alternative path but not necessarily something that requires the same sort of documentation that we're suggesting for the rest.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That said does anybody want to be associated with this one for some reason? I don't see any agrees so okay. Thanks Mary, I think you're probably right on that.

Let's go to the second bullet which is our formation and work of RC IOC drafting team. Now I bet you there are several of us that can probably click on

all of - any of the ones on RC IOC. I'm certainly one of those. I guess I'd better follow my own instructions and raised my hand.

So - oops, I didn't want to raise my hands, I wanted to hit Agree. Sorry about that. Okay there we go. So Alan, me, Greg. We have a lot of fun on that one didn't we guys?

Alan Greenberg: Greg, were you on the drafting team?

Chuck Gomes: I don't know if I was on the drafting team...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...but I tracked that one pretty closely. I was on the...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: No, no I was asking Greg.

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Greg absolutely was, yes. Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Greg Shatan: Oh I was, believe me.

Alan Greenberg: You are on the drafting for the charter for the working group; were you also...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: I was on the earlier DT, yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: I go the DTs from that one as well.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, regardless I think that any of us associated with the RC IOC and later the IGOs and INGOs and so forth probably can be assumed to be associated with any of the ones on that particular issue so that would include the next bullet as well, formation and work of the RC IOC drafting team. And does anybody - any new people want to add to that one? I don't see any new ones, okay.

Let's go then to the GNSO Council responses to the Board request concerning IGO protections. I suspect it's the three of us are also included there it's very - they blended together even though the IGO issue came in a little bit later. Anybody - any new hands on that one? Still see Greg's there. Okay.

So let's go down then to the Board requests for GNSO to consider defensive registrations at the second level in the new gTLD the programs. Any agrees on that one that you want to associated with that or would like to or have some experience there? I don't see any on that one.

Alan Greenberg: Chuck, I don't actually remember that the GNSO responded to that one, did we?

Chuck Gomes: I can't remember either, Alan. I'm with you.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think - and Alan is correct, I think there was indeed the request from the Board. I even recall I think that staff wrote a paper I think framing the issue. And I think that sat for a very long time on the GNSO project list but I don't think anything happened.

But it may be an example as well where there indeed was a specific request that actually nothing happened. And I don't know if we can identify why it didn't happen that nothing happened as far as I know.

Alan Greenberg: We didn't have a process.

Chuck Gomes: Do you think? Yeah, you know...

Marika Konings: Possibly yes.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...all over the place right now including with the IANA transition and now coming up other accountability effort that was just introduced yesterday. And these are all really communitywide issues and we haven't developed a cross community working group guidelines yet so but anyway.

Should we drop that one or do you think it's worth leaving it on there, the Board request on the defensive registrations? Nothing happened; there's not going to be anything to learn from is there?

Greg Shatan: Well maybe there's something to learn from the fact that it didn't go anywhere which in itself was kind of - it seems odd in retrospect.

Chuck Gomes: Good point, Greg.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I think that's absolutely right. I have my hand up but...

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: ...chime in and agree that when a process fails, you know, which it
- well stalls or whatever that we should definitely be studying that.

Chuck Gomes: Good point. Anne, is that why you raised your hand or did you have
something...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: It is. It is.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. That's a good point. We're not dropping it. Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks Chuck. I'm not so much dropping or retaining but, you know, just to
note like I said in the chat that I think there was a public comment forum for
this particular issue so not so much cause and effect but maybe that's one of
the factors to consider that maybe instead of a coordinated GNSO responds
there were individual stakeholder group responses.

Chuck Gomes: Okay good point. Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: You know, I mean, think Mary's point points out something else
that should be in the table. What is public comment taken or not taken? And
hopefully the answer is yes in every case.

Chuck Gomes: Good.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: You know...

Chuck Gomes: And we might even want to - you don't have to add this necessarily - we might even want to qualify was it GNSO comments from stakeholder groups and constituencies or public comment period, whatever, doesn't have to be a lot of detail but sometimes there are different ways to get public comments.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Like constituency statements and stuff like that. So, okay good. Looking around I'm not seeing anything in the chat right now. I haven't been looking at that very closely but let's go on then to GNSO feedback on Whois Review Team final report.

There was a lot of - well no that's specifically the Whois Review Team final report. There's been so many Whois teams it's hard for me to keep them straight. Let me just ask, does anybody want to associate yourself with that? And not seeing anyone there, okay.

Here we have a hand up, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I guess I'll make a political statement first. I would not want to associate myself with the response that...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: There may be some lessons learned from it. It was not a typical working group, it was, you know, sort of one person going off and writing something, then someone going off and read writing it. And it was a haphazard effort and there may be some lessons to learn from it however.

Chuck Gomes: And, you know, one of the - this is Chuck again. One of the techniques that's been used in the GNSO a lot is to form a drafting team that is willing to put some things on the table to just put out for the whole group to review and comment on.

So some of these things - all of them illustrate the fact that we don't have procedures or processes for dealing with the non-PDP issues and there are lots of those that come up.

Let's go on to correspondence on the trademark clearinghouse straw man proposal. Anybody want to click on Agree for that? Okay Avri, thank you.

Let's go on - oh, Alan, is that a new hand?

Alan Greenberg: No that wasn't a support for that one but I had suggested that we include, in addition, the actual straw man process itself. And if we chose to include that I will volunteer for that one.

Chuck Gomes: I think that there was agreement earlier. We didn't really formally agree to include that, that was one of the two items added. So maybe we capture that - and Alan - anybody want to join Alan in that one?

Alan Greenberg: I expect Avri may have some interest in that would also.

Anne Aikman-Scalse: How is that different from what's written here? I'm not understanding why that would not be part of the description of what happened...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: The description here, if I read it correctly, was the correspondence on it, the reaction to the straw man proposal as opposed to how the straw man proposal came about.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh I thought it would definitely mean the whole thing and how it came about and...

Alan Greenberg: Oh I think they were two very different processes.

Chuck Gomes: Alan, Chuck again. I compliment you on getting Avri to click and Agree there. Appreciate that and thanks Avri.

Let's do want to...

Greg Shatan: This is Greg. I've got my hand up for the straw man and not the response to the straw man.

Chuck Gomes: Okay go ahead Greg.

Greg Shatan: I'm just putting my hand up for the straw man.

Chuck Gomes: Put up or an agree? I see an agree.

Greg Shatan: An agree, sorry. And maybe I also responded to the response to the straw man for all I know, I don't know if that's a third concept.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks. And keep in mind, everyone that, you know, we don't have to be too rigid. If some of these things blend together that's okay. What we're trying to - we're trying to pull out of these things ideas, experiences that will

help us, ideas to avoid and so forth so don't need to be too rigid on how we interpret these things.

Some of you, as you're doing this, well think of other experiences where ideas may be useful for us and that's fine.

I think we're on response to Board request on closed generics. That was an interesting one. And we've got Greg, Anne - Greg and Anne, okay thank you. And, Greg, your hand's up. It's down. Okay thanks.

All right let's go to the Board request for GNSO to consider - oh sorry I must have scrolled. What did I do? Okay I need to scroll down. Okay. Closed generics.

And then GNSO Council comments on ATRT 2 recommendations.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, Chuck. We had one above that, the string similarity.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry, say that again please.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. There was actually one above that that says correspondence on string similarity...

Chuck Gomes: Oh I've scrolled too far. Thank you. Let's go back to string similarity. Thank you. Anybody want to raise their hand on string similarity? Okay.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Was this issue of - I'm sorry, I'm forgetting what the correspondence was. It's Anne.

Chuck Gomes: On what Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Was the correspondent on string similarity - the that also involve the issue of plurals like hotel and hotels and - I'm just forgetting what...

Chuck Gomes: You know, it's a good question. I think this - the link there - or the links - can - there was a Council letter and a response to the new gTLD program committee. I think that's - I don't know that that got into plurals or not.

But again if - in looking at this and some of the activity that has happened, and some of it's still happening, with regard to the plurals issue that's fine. If we can benefit from it let's do it.

So anybody on string similarity? Okay. I remember spending a lot of time on that in the new gTLD the policy development process but that's kind of a separate issue. That's actually part of a PDP.

The GNSO Council comments on ATRT 2 recommendations. I spend a lot of time in the Registry Stakeholder Group with...

((Crosstalk))

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I think I should volunteer Kristina Rosette on that one. She's not on the call but.

Chuck Gomes: If you can get her to contribute on that feel free. We'll take it.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I'll let Greg tell her.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Maybe Greg should volunteer. He's on several already. So okay - not seeing any there let's not spend a lot of time making this list.

So then we have the Board request concerning dotBrand - the dotBrand registry agreement and the Spec 13. That's one that's still alive. In fact as I think Anne mentioned earlier that's on the agenda so Council agenda for tomorrow.

So anybody want to associate yourself with that one? Not seeing any. Okay. Now I've scrolled too far again. Okay. And then there was another new - what was the other new one that was added today besides Alan's?

Mary Wong: Chuck, this is Mary. This was for the IRT that preceded the STI.

Chuck Gomes: Oh thank you. Thank you. Anybody want to click on and agree for that? Not seeing anyone. All right so I don't - hopefully that will be helpful but certainly if you...

Alan Greenberg: Chuck, it's Alan. I'll put my name in for that one as...

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Alan.

Alan Greenberg: ...someone who wasn't involved in it but a student of it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay that's good enough for me. Thank you Alan. All right anything else on A before we jump to B and talk about our approach there?

Okay, then let's take a look at B and see if we can talk about how we might approach that. Now this is one that obviously staff draft of that paper and it has a lot of good information in it. Maybe - Marika, I know you were heavily involved in that comment Mary probably was too. Do either of you have any

suggestions about how to go about this? I mean, there's a whole bunch of stuff in that paper. That paper is going to be very useful for our work.

Would it be helpful to particularly pull out the parts of that paper that relate to Deliverable 1 is my first thought but let me let Marika talk.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. So the actual process in there I think could be one of the proposals or processes that the working group may want to review as, you know, possibly a model, there maybe some parts of it that you like or other parts you may not like.

So maybe that's something to hold off on until I think we have, you know, some more information based on A and possibly first look at C which actually goes into some of the questions that I think will help trigger as well, you know, what is the working groups thinking around some of these issues?

And, you know, we can definitely walk you through the draft framework that we included in the paper. But I said I think, you know, potential answer to the question of what kind of process could the Council use and that one was very particularly focused as well in relation to, you know, implementation related question as it was partly inspired as well by the process that's included in the Applicant Guidebook for potential changes to the Applicant Guidebook.

So that was a bit of a basis that we used on mapping out some of the elements there. And you'll see as well it actually has, you know, a specific item in there that talks about policy guidance which is also one of the things we're looking at here on how that potentially would need to be defined if indeed that is the kind of process that could be applied or a framework that could be applied.

So it may be more helpful to first go through the questions and indeed determine which ones are of particular relevance to our conversation on this chart a question and then, you know, possibly come back to the framework once we have I think a clear idea of where the group sits or what may be supported and then dig deeper into that framework and the elements that have been incorporated there. That would be my suggestion.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Marika. I have a question for you. With the same apply to D, what lessons can be learned from past experience? Or would - do you think it'd be sufficient to skip over B, go to C and then come back to B or should we do C and D before going back to B? Thoughts on that? Chuck speaking.

Marika Konings: Yeah, and this is Marika. Looking at D now I think some of the questions in D we may be able to answer having done the analysis on A because I think that, you know, gives an indication or I think some of these examples may apply to that.

So I think we could definitely, you know, start C and D but again I think some of the answers in D may make more sense once we actually have the information available from, you know, some of the past efforts and indeed the lessons learned so that we can draw from that.

Chuck Gomes: So - and I see an agreement there by Anne. This is Chuck speaking again. So I think Marika's recommendation is to postpone B until we do C and D. Now we may flip flop a little bit and that's okay. But does anybody object to that approach? Speak up please. Anne agrees with the approach. Okay, nobody's disagreeing, okay. All right very good.

So I think that makes a lot of sense to me so since no one else seems to be - disagree with that. B will be postponed and we can probably just note that in

the working group discussion column for now until after we work on A, C and D. So that brings us then to C and let's talk about how we might approach that.

The questions for discussion contained in the policy versus implementation draft framework prepared for - by ICANN staff. And Marika or Mary, would one of you explain for the whole group the difference between this document, the questions for discussion on the draft framework that you prepared, and the process outlined in the staff discussion paper and do they overlap? Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I would actually need to look back to really get a precise answer on this. But if I recall well I think these are the questions that basically, you know, came to our minds in looking at the framework and how to be able to, you know, address some of the question marks that are still in there.

And indeed, you know, in order to be able to develop a framework these would be some of the questions that would need to be answered or some clear guidance would need to be given in order to, you know, fill in the details basically.

I think that's a bit - the idea behind it, you know, getting a sense of where the group stands on these items will hopefully help us then as well once we get to the framework to maybe fill in some of the blanks or have a clear sense on, you know, where there would be support or where there may be less support or where alternatives may need to be sought. And I think that's where the questions come in to.

Again I would need to, you know, review the question in closer detail to really make sure that all of these are really specific to this charter question as we go through these, you know, you may believe that some of these are actually

more relevant to some of the other charter questions but I think we just put them all in here as the specific questions that were called out in that document.

I looked for example at A this talking as well about the, you know, implementation review teams and should those be mandatory. Obviously that's also a question that relates to our other charter question on implementation review team.

So again I think part of these we may already start deliberating and just making sure that we capture notes that and then go into the conversation when we get to the other charter questions.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Marika. Let me ask a follow-up question. Chuck again. Do you, I mean, do you have thoughts of how it might be best for us to approach C, the questions? And while I'm asking Marika to possibly respond to that if she wants to if anybody else has ideas please raise your hand. Go ahead Marika, if you can respond to that.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. I think it's a question of, you know, putting the question on the table and having a discussion around it and see indeed if we get to a common position on those that we've been can put out as well to the mailing list to see if indeed that is a position that is broadly shared.

And, you know, once there is an agreement we can basically list this as a kind of like well on this specific question this is the working group's point of view which we then can hopefully translate into, you know, eventual recommendations or the framework or process that we hope to have at the end of our discussions would be my suggestion.

Chuck Gomes: So a couple ways to make that happen. One way is to take one item at a time, one question at a time and just start off with a fully open working group discussion on that and see if we appear to be leaning towards some clear direction there.

Another way would be to assign to different questions to small sub teams of two or three people to come back with something for whole group consideration. And I'm sure there are lots of other ways we can do this too.

Why do people think as an approach to this at least tentatively for now in approaching that. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. I'm sorry to comment again but one thing you may want to consider as well, and that's something we've seen in some of the other efforts that are ongoing that you may want to start off indeed with a discussion with the whole working group.

And if it's, you know, pretty clear that everyone is leaning towards a certain direction, you know, that may be the end of the conversation. But if it's clear that there are very different views and more work may need to be done maybe that's the moment than when, you know, a group goes off and tries to work out a compromise and comes back to the broader group for inputs.

A little bit similar to what we, you know, did last week that may be a way of not immediately setting people off on sub teams but still having first a general discussion which would at the same time, you know, help inform those that may form that small group to hear the different views and have a clearer idea of where the differences may lie and be able to come up with some helpful common position.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. I mean I personally like that approach. Anybody not like it? So the idea would be we take one question at a time, have an open discussion on one of our working group calls and try and determine whether there's, you know, relatively easy consensus, a clear direction that were leaning toward.

In some cases the principles that we spent quite a bit of time on will guide us. And then if needed we can agree on another tactic if that doesn't fall out easily and possibly form some small sub teams that can do some work and come back to us.

Anybody disagree with that approach? Okay so let's capture that. It doesn't have to be done on the screen now but in the working group discussion column as our agreed to approach for that.

And then when this document is distributed after this meeting those that aren't on the call of course can quickly see what we - how we agreed to approach these various items. Anything else on that before we go to Question D?

Okay so Question D isn't what lessons can be learned from past experience? And there are a lot of sub items their underneath it. Oh there's also an E isn't there? I see, okay, so I'm trying to figure this out because it breaks on the screen. Let me scroll.

Okay so there's an A - E underneath D. Let's - any ideas in terms of at least for now how we want to approach the five items underneath D? Is it - should we use the - I'm not trying to drive this thing too much but just to keep things going should we use a similar approach as to C where we start off as a full working group and then break it down if we need to?

Do I still have everybody on the call? Okay. Anybody opposed to that? Okay, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. Maybe just to note that presumably D can only be commenced once we actually have all the information on A as it really specifically refers to past experience.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And that's - yeah, so A is really critical in a lot of these things. I think we can hopefully next week, if we don't have the work done on A, which would be a pretty challenging accomplishment I think in one week, we'll just - we may be able to start some of the discussions in C on our agenda next week but we'll deal with that when we come to it. Okay?

The last one then is E which is what options are available for policy - consensus policy or other - and implementation efforts? And what are the criteria for determining which should be used?

Now it's this one that really needs to happen after we've done most of our work in A through D? Anne agreed with that. Anybody think differently? Okay. Not seeing anyone. So E would probably be - now again these things may overlap and blend together and that's okay.

But the general approach in E would be to tackle it after we've done a lot of the work on A through D. And we can record that in that third column as well. Alan agrees with that too. Okay.

Well we're within, I don't know, 10 minutes of the end of our call. Our next meeting is a week from now, same time same station. And thanks for keeping the good notes in Adobe, Marika, appreciate that.

And the action item for Mary and Marika is a big one to get the table done and then distribute it. And each of us then should contribute or even before then if we have ideas on any of these things information, input we can send it to Mary and Marika as soon as possible.

Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, before we break I'm not sure this is a politically correct statement to make. I'm finding an hour and a half meeting every week to be really straining so I don't know if others are in the same position or not but my preference would be, despite our desire to get things done quickly, to cut back either on the timing or on the length of the meetings. I may be the only one.

Chuck Gomes: You're not the only one; Anne agrees. Anybody else want to comment?

Alan Greenberg: Doesn't have to be decided today but something to think about perhaps.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I mean, I'm willing to go with what the group suggests. Marika or Mary, would one of you send out a - or maybe Nathalie can do this for us - send out a question to the full working group and ask what their preferences would be.

In fact if you want to do a simple little poll that's okay too, whichever ways easiest. And just let's find out what the sense of the group is not only those on the call today but the full working group see if there's a leaning towards one hour or - and we are meeting weekly, okay, so that's a good point to keep in mind.

So if one of you on the staff team would send that out after this call then we'll get a - try and get a better feel in terms of what people wish on that. Now

again if we got to a point where we were at a critical stage and had a time deadline we could update to an hour and a half if there was real need so it's not as if we have to lock it in forever if we made a change.

Thanks Alan, for bringing that up.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Does anyone else have a - anything to say, any action items was left off for this meeting today? Okay well thanks for the cooperation. I think we have at least a high-level map of how we're going to approach Deliverable 1 and I think that's a good accomplishment. And we have some action items for the next couple weeks for all of us especially after the first version of the table comes out.

So certainly encourage people to participate on the list in the meantime. And we will see - I guess hear all of you - work with all of you next week in our meeting at this time.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Have a good rest of the week.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thanks, Chuck. Thanks, everyone.

Mary Wong: Thank you, Chuck.

Marika Konings: Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: Thanks, all. Bye.

Coordinator: At this time all parties are welcome to go ahead and disconnect from the call.
At this time all parties are welcome to go ahead and disconnect from the conference. Thank you for joining...

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Jean). You may now stop the recordings. Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you.

END