

GNSO
Inter-registrar Transfer Working Group teleconference
5 March, 2008 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-registrar Working Group teleconference on 5 March 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/inter-registrar-transfer-wg-20080305.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#mar>

Mike O'Connor: I would expect some of that happening in just about all of these. And that the exercise, overall, is going to have to be one of negotiation and compromise in getting to a, sort of, best solution.

(Chuck): Okay. Any other discussion on that? Anybody opposed to the move I just made with moving 6 from Individual to Group One? Okay, let's see where we're at, then. Okay. Now, so any other comments on any other recommendations in terms of grouping.

(Tim): Yeah. This is (Tim). This is not requesting a change or anything just probably something that we'll have to discuss and that is Seven and Two, the most typical on the policy aspects being split up. Just trying to figure out, you know, what the timing of those, you know, because they're, kind of, relying on each other.

If we deem policy is unnecessary and the technical aspects are, kind of, irrelevant but if we're going to do a policy, then knowing what's, technically, possible is a question that'd be good to have answered. So I don't know what the answer to that is but I think the timing of those two might be...

(Chuck): Well, a corollary to what you're suggesting is, maybe, should we not separate the policy and the technical and just have seven and two together as an individual PDP?

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, I'd go for that.

(Tim): And then maybe the group in tandem can have the technical aspects being looked at while the policy discussion is going on or something.

Man: Yeah.

(Chuck): Tom, what do you think about that?

(Tim): Sounds good. Makes sense.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Tim): Because we don't need to talk about technical aspects if we don't know what the policy will be so, I agree.

(Chuck): Okay. So if I go down then to the individual ones then we'll just get rid of that and where's the other one? And that, okay, and then that changes my little table so that goes away. That puts Group One then down to four items, one of which, like we said, Six might be a little more complicated so that might be okay and then we get rid of that and that, okay.

So here's what I think I have, and check me if I'm wrong on this, for Group One, we have 5, 6, 15, and 18. For Group Two we have 4, 8, 9,

16, and 19. For Group Three we have 1, 3, and 12 and then for Individual PDPs we just have two which are Seven and Two combined, both technical and policy, and 10. That, actually, looks pretty good to me.

Now, what I will - what I'm going to do on this and we're not done on all of this yes, we'll come back to the comments issue, but I will send out today, a revised document with the changes we made today all highlighted so that everybody can check me, make sure - keep me honest, okay. And so you'll get a chance to look at that. But any other comments on the groupings?

So in essence, we're recommending five PDPs. That's sounding fairly reasonable, a lot better than 19. Five PDPs, two of which are, kind of, individual, one of them, actually, just has two in it so I guess we wouldn't call them individual PDPs any more. So we may just end up calling that group, Group Four since they're not - one of them is not an individual PDP so - but I'll take care of that later.

Any other discussions on groupings? Okay, then, let's - if you have the document in front of you, let's skim through, starting from Group One through the notes and just see if there's any reason to have any of the notes. It doesn't look to me like any of them are really relevant to the Council they were more for our usage but skim through those. It certainly looks like the note on six isn't needed.

(Olaf): The note on Five is, sort of, obsolete because it was a reason for a change we did at an earlier date.

(Chuck): Yeah, so that can go.

(Olaf): But the note on 15 seems to have some relevance because we decided to chop off a piece of the (unintelligible)...

(Chuck): Oh, yeah. So that one we probably - now, does it need to be modified in any - I can take a look at that later if you want rather than taking time on the call. But yeah, that one may need - it probably still has some relevance. How about 18?

Mike O'Connor: Well, that can go.

(Chuck): That can go. Okay.

Mike O'Connor: Here's a suggestion.

(Chuck): Okay.

Mike O'Connor: I would think that the only notes that would need to stay are the ones that support decisions to eliminate either whole sections or chunks of sections because that's really a policy decision. You know, it's an actual decision not to pursue...

(Chuck): That's a good point.

Mike O'Connor: ...(unintelligible). And everything else we can eliminate.

(Chuck): So jumping down to the notes on nine, it could be deleted?

Mike O'Connor: Yeah.

Man: Yeah.

(Chuck): Okay, I just wanted you guys to check my thinking there. Okay. And the - except for 15 I've deleted all the others. Sixteen, probably could be deleted, right?

Mike O'Connor: Yep.

(Chuck): And then on 19, deleted, right?

Mike O'Connor: Yep.

Man: Yeah.

(Chuck): And so then we get down into Group Three, do we want that note, maybe so? Is that one, maybe, we want to keep that's a little bit different than your argument, Mike, but look at the one on number - look at number one. Is that note still helpful?

Mike O'Connor: My thought is that a comment like the one on number three is really us trying to steer the policy discussion that's going to follow and that's not really in our brief.

(Chuck): But what about number - recommendation number one?

Mike O'Connor: Where's that one?

(Chuck): (Unintelligible) in Group Three.

Mike O'Connor: Oh.

(Chuck): That one seems to - it appears to me and that's why I'm testing it with you guys, that note may still have some value in leaving it in there.

Mike O'Connor: This is the one that says has a bearing on who (unintelligible)...

(Chuck): Yeah. Right.

Mike O'Connor: Again, I...

(Chuck): It explains why we lumped it alone.

Mike O'Connor: I don't think lumping alone matters. So, I'm certainly not opposed to having it there but...

Man: Is this the one, didn't we put one into Group One (unintelligible)...

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, we moved one up into Group...

Man: Group Three.

(Chuck): No, Group Three.

(Olaf): Yeah. I'm rather inclined to delete the comment in that one.

(Chuck): I'm okay with that I just wanted to - it was a little bit different so anybody object to removing the notes on recommendation one? It just, kind of, explained why we lumped it the way we did. Okay.

(Olaf): Then again, I mean, now, we're grouping it. Previously it was - we had to - this was partly the reason why we brought it up as an individual thing, in one, I'm talking about that one. I hope (unintelligible)...

(Chuck): Yeah. Right.

(Olaf): So it's, well, it almost becomes a bit awkward.

(Chuck): Now, correct me if I'm wrong but are we down to two in Group Three? Did I do something wrong here?

(Olaf): We had 1, 3, and 12 in Group Three.

(Chuck): What happened to 12? On my document, I'm talking about. For some reason 12 has disappeared in my Group Three, so I probably did something wrong. Oh, no, it's there. My mistake. Never mind. I found it so, okay. So that's okay. Is that all right then?

Then we're down to recommendation seven, we don't - I don't have any. Oh, there are comments for seven, are notes for seven and two. The...

(Olaf): Well, (Chuck), I mean, we've just changed the (unintelligible)...

(Chuck): Well, we can delete the notes on Seven and Two, right?

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, because that's describing the (unintelligible)...

(Chuck): All right. Bear with me while I try and keep things straight here so that I don't lose anything that we do so we ended up with just two individual PDPs. There's notes for Ten, those are not needed, right?

Mike O'Connor: (Unintelligible) that one?

(Olaf): Nope. Nope. Nope. Nope. Nope.

(Chuck): Okay, and then Group Five. Now I think your suggestion, Mike, is, is that we may want to leave the notes for the deleted ones, is that correct?

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, and we may want to expand them, in fact.

(Chuck): Okay.

Mike O'Connor: Because we are, indeed, making policy decisions there.

(Chuck): Okay.

Tom: Yeah, I just want to say that I have to go offline. I have another call I have to attempt. I'm sorry for that.

(Chuck): Okay. All right. Well, I'll be sending this out, Tom, so you'll please respond via the list in terms of what we do after you leave especially, okay?

Tom: Absolutely. Thank you.

(Chuck): Okay, thanks, Tom.

Tom: Okay. Take care. Bye.

(Chuck): So let's not try and expand the notes right now, but I'll highlight those as something that we may want to do and I assume that's probably the case of each one of these in the delete category, is that right?

Mike O'Connor: Yeah. I would think we'd want a rationale for each...

(Chuck): Any different thoughts on that. So I'll highlight each one of those just as a means of noting that we may want to expand those. All right. And do we want to add some notes to 17? We probably do, right? I don't have any in there now. We talked about that, I think, earlier, so I'll just highlight it and we can take care of that.

All right that covers that part. Now, let me go back to that little agenda I had. I think we've gone through the groupings now let's come back to the issue of running the PDPs in parallel or serially, we may have covered that as much as we need to but let's see if we want to have more discussion on that.

Mike O'Connor: Well, one option would be to have a technical track and a policy track that way we could run two in parallel.

(Chuck): One - that's a good thought but like for the - some of them involve both technical and policy.

Mike O'Connor: Right. And so what that would mean is maybe clump number one and clump number two could go in parallel but then the rest of them might not lend themselves to that. But that - you know, clumps one and two

are the hugeiferous (sic) ones. So maybe that's as much - maybe it's a hybrid. Maybe there're some parallel and then some that can't be done in parallel.

(Olaf): So what you're saying is, basically, to have Group One that will be the, sort of, the technical clump and Group Two would be the policy clump, for example.

Mike O'Connor: Right.

(Olaf): And possibly running parallel, (unintelligible) for example, individual ones like seven plus two would, since they were regrouped, the technical and policy aspects will really call for being run separate track and not in parallel with anything else, perhaps.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah. You know, if we presume that we've got, sort of, a finite number of folks who are likely to participate, they could split and divide their efforts on those first two but then for some of the ones that have pretty strong technical and policy components we could bring those groups back together.

(Chuck): So what would the recommendation look like that, assuming there are different people that are available for Group One and Group Two, consider doing those in parallel?

Mike O'Connor: Yeah.

(Chuck): Thoughts on that?

(Olaf): (Chuck), you mentioned something which I thought was very wise in the very beginning here, that, maybe, before any such decision is taken for real that a bit of founding of the interest of doing - proceeding like that among the constituency would be helpful almost decisive, I would say.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, I think especially the registrar constituency since I agree, (Chuck), that you point they need to be recognized as, sort of, driving the staffing of this.

(Tim): Could there be - well, maybe we want to reconstitute every time but it seems like, you know, there could be a group or a PDP group that's dealing with enhancement issues, another one that's dealing with new issues. They'd have now one group doing (unintelligible) Group One while the new issues group are dealing with Group Three and when they're done we can move on to Group Two and then a new issues group would start looking at the individual PDPs in Group Four.

(Chuck): Okay, now let me get back - I was typing. Sorry, (Tim), but let's see. So - run that by me again.

(Tim): Well, if we constitute two working groups, the first working group would deal with enhancements starting with Group One and then move on to Group Two...

(Chuck): Oh, the same group. In other words your suggesting doing One and Two serially with the same group and then doing Three with a separate group of people, stay in parallel to One and Two.

(Tim): Right. Right. Right. Well, maybe that group could carry on with Group Four. Now, if that makes sense or if we need to reconstitute every time I'm not sure what...

(Chuck): Um-hum. That would be...

(Tim): I think, ultimately, you're going to end up, probably, with a lot of the same, you know, it's unfortunate, maybe, but that's pretty much, you know, people active in each constituency seem to be same from PDP to PDP.

Mike O'Connor: From the business constituency I know who's going to be the rep. You know, I think that...

(Olaf): Could you replicate yourself, Mike.

Mike O'Connor: I'm retired so I have lots of time. I can do both. Not a problem. But, you know, I think that it really, kind of, hinges on the number of people who, kind of, belly up to the bar and the nature of their interests to a certain extent.

If, for example, the registrar community came up with, in a perfect world, let's say four people and two of them were really interested in the technical/operational stuff and two of them were really interested in the policy stuff, that would help us determine how to track these things.

(Unintelligible) I think what I'm talking myself into is that it's pretty hard to make a recommendation until we know what kind of people resources we've got. If it turns out we've got one from every constituency, we have a different process in front of us than if we have

a bunch. Or, maybe, we'd defer this decision until we got a sense of what kind of participation we're going to get.

(Chuck): Well, I'm sensing that we're in agreement, and correct me if I'm wrong, that the first thing that needs to happen is that we give out these - the suggested PDP groupings and that we recommend that - or that council does that and then recommend that there be an assessment of the availability of different people to work on the PDPs and then the decision be made with regard to prioritization or if there needs to be prioritization.

Mike O'Connor: Well, or at least sequence them.

(Chuck): Sequencing.

Mike O'Connor: I think that's right. I'd go with that.

(Tim): I think that makes some sense. You know, and like, for example, if Mike's going to, you know, be the sole representative for the DC and he's on the Council I mean, that could - we have that kind of situation with different constituencies it could limit what (unintelligible)...

Mike O'Connor: Well, I'm a different Mike, (Tim). This is Mike O'Connor, not Rodenbaugh. Sorry. I'm not on the Council.

(Tim): Oh.

(Chuck): Now, with regard to - okay, let's assume then, it seems like it might be helpful if we've done some thinking on this just in the last few minutes so it might be helpful for us - let's assume that after evaluating

resources that we see that, you know, you're only going to be able to do one PDP at a time.

It would be helpful if this group then suggested some order of how they should proceed. Now, we can do that based on, you know, on a overall priority that was previously done and I think that's the number of the recommendations, right? If I'm wrong on that, correct me.

(Olaf): No, that's the sequence of that.

(Chuck): Oh, that's the sequence.

(Olaf): But they had also a priority value which comes as spelled out that, for example, 18 has got a priority value of 16 where, well, low priority is a high priority, so to speak, while 4 has got the assessment 7 so - well, those little ones in parenthesis it's at the very end of the (unintelligible)...

(Chuck): Oh, that's what's in the end. Okay. I had totally lost that, as you could tell, in my mind, anyway. It's still in the document. So, for example, recommendation 6 at a priority of 9, is that right?

(Olaf): Let's see now, I'm turning around right, yes, it's seated 9 point, that's it.

(Chuck): So and the highest priority is a 1.0.

(Olaf): That's 1.0 yes. It will be 1.0 but - so - this is, well, there are many that have 9, for example.

(Chuck): Oh, okay.

Mike O'Connor: Now these are arithmetic means of voting.

(Chuck): Yeah, that's right.

(Olaf): Yeah.

(Chuck): Okay.

Mike O'Connor: So nothing got...

(Chuck): Nothing got 1, yeah.

Mike O'Connor: Nothing got anywhere near 1.

(Chuck): Yeah, okay. But a lower number is a higher...

(Olaf): Priority.

(Chuck): Priority. So, okay. All right. Good. That'll bring me up to speed on that. I'd lost that in my thinking so...

Mike O'Connor: And number 15 in this document, in your document, (Chuck), we lost that CT score.

(Olaf): Yeah, but that's (unintelligible) so I think it's - it was chopped off with the end...

(Chuck): Right.

(Olaf): ...and it's the - there, it's 13.0.

(Chuck): So I need - that was on which one, 15?

(Olaf): On 15, yeah. And it's now in Group Five as a little chopped off piece.

(Tim): They don't have it for Seven and Two either.

(Chuck): Oh, I just had...

(Olaf): Oh, well, that's for the same reason, I think.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah.

(Chuck): What was that? Which one?

(Tim): Seven and Two.

(Olaf): Seven, two and those are found in Group Four but, well, that - the parts of Group Two that ended up in Group Four and they have nine and six respectively so...

(Chuck): Yeah, I still have those in my version that I'm looking at right here so, okay. Okay.

(Olaf): Yeah.

(Chuck): All right well, any of them that are missing we'll fill in as we find that. Okay.

Mike O'Connor: And I think the one question is, you know, that ranking could be used by the teams that are working on the PDPs to determine the sequence within their clump but then the other question is what sequence to pick the clumps in?

(Chuck): Yeah, and that's the question - you're leading right into my next question for this group is if we - is it - let's assume that, you know, we can't do more than one PDP at a time. Does this group - it would be helpful, probably, for the Council, if this group actually made a recommendation on sequencing.

Now, if you want, we could do that in a call next week, rather than trying to do that now after we get a chance to look at the total thing or we can try and talk about that right now.

Mike O'Connor: Now, I have a question as a new kid to ICANN and that is if I was still a big kid in a big corporation, if I knew the team, the question I would ask is if this team has worked together before then give them the hardest one first, while they're fresh. If, on the other hand, this team hasn't worked together before, I'd give them a relatively easy one to start on for them to get to know each other to figure out how they do stuff, to get trained, etcetera, etcetera.

And given the - what I think is going to happen this is going - likely to be a new team and so my suggestion would be that we give them a fairly easy one to cut their teeth on to, sort of, get to know each other and test each other and so on but steer away from some of the harder ones.

And that being the case, I'd lean towards clumping number one as the starter because it's technical and technical issues are likely to be easier to resolve than policy issues. That's just my weak two cents random.

(Chuck): (Olaf) and (Tim), what do you think about that?

(Tim): I think, you know, One could be pretty short process. I think the only - my opinion is the only item in One if I have it grouped (correct) is number Five could get a little more involved but the others I just don't see as having, you know, huge drawn out...

(Chuck): Well, it may be that group one is - if they have to be done totally serially, Group One might be a starting point.

(Tim): That'd be a good kick off for the group, especially if we're going to reuse the group, which is likely to happen whether we plan it that way or not.

(Chuck): Yeah, okay, and if then would Group Two follow or would one of the other groups?

Mike O'Connor: Group Two, just on my scale is one of the hardest ones just because it's so big and it's got so many complicated things in it so we might want to try one of the individual ones first just to, sort of, ratchet the scale up a little bit.

(Tim): Um-hum. And if you're going to look at priorities then it would be Seven and Two would have higher priority.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah.

(Olaf): Yeah. They would and then we have number Ten then. It's - I mean, another way to chop up a (unintelligible) is, of course, to give them the most focused ones and from that perspective that's the individual ones.

(Chuck): So in other words, probably - so if - we - and we can finalize this next week, but it is helpful I think we have some initial thoughts it would be Group Two and then Seven and Two and...

Mike O'Connor: No, Group One.

(Chuck): I know, Group - I'm sorry Group One. That's what I wrote down. I know you can't see that but - and then Seven and Two and then Ten and then what would we put after that?

Mike O'Connor: Here's just one other thought. If we're trying to bring a tech team and an - or a, sort of, technical operational team and a policy team up to speed, what if we started with Seven and Two with the whole group because those have technical, operational, and policy issues, use it to, sort of, get the whole team spun up and then they split themselves apart and that's an opportunity to inject some parallelism. Split the group then into parallel tracks for the tech folks to do One and the policy folks to do Two and then finish up with the last.

(Chuck): Interesting though.

(Olaf): That's, yeah, that's interesting but it's, sort of, it seems that we will actually be able to run two things in parallel. And well, recalling that as (unintelligible) actually doing, well, it's been slow in the making but we

are doing a PDP on the clarification issues and we'll have some kind of grouping coming out of that which, presumably, will be rather similar for the subsequent groups but well, if it's so that we only can run one at a time.

So maybe we'll have a little team already, that has come up to speed eventually so, well, just a consideration. But I think, like (Chuck) said that, well, to come up with some kind of like a straightforward sequence in case we cannot do more than one PDP at the same time is - and then we had already a proposal for two parallel tracks one with the One followed by Two and then the other one with Three followed by Four. So that may be another option but I think a straightforward sequence would be useful, at least, for a starting point for the Council to consider.

Mike O'Connor: Well, again if I was working for a living...

(Chuck): Hold on one second. You said two parallel tracks, I wanted to catch that. One followed by Two and what was the other one? Three followed by Four?

(Olaf): Yeah, that was what we - what I noticed before and I think it was - wasn't it (Tim)'s idea?

(Chuck): Yeah, now, it was One followed by Two and then what was the other one, other track?

(Olaf): And Three followed by Four.

(Chuck): But then that leaves the individual ones.

(Olaf): Right. Right. Exactly.

Mike O'Connor: And I was going to, sort of, lean into (Tim) on that idea. I never got around to it but it doesn't give us much leverage in terms of teams that want to specialize along operational versus policy line if we do it that way.

Here's the last thought and that is what if we just did one that involved both technical and policy folks, let the team get to know each other and then let the team decide how they wanted to tackle it from there?

(Chuck): Well, again we can't - you know, that may be a viable approach until we know who the participants are it's hard to tell.

Mike O'Connor: Right. But if - turning that around until we know who the participants are it's really hard to put a work plan together for them. I mean, you know as a very large scale project manager type guy if you said, "Put the work plan together," without knowing the make up of your team I would push back on you and say, "Help me out here."

(Chuck): Yeah. Right. Yeah.

Mike O'Connor: So one way they can finesse that would be to pick the first one and say that one of the goals of that first one is to build the team and that one the first things the team got to decide would be the sequence of the work subsequent to that.

(Chuck): Okay. Let's see, so we have - okay, so I captured that very simply as let the first PDP team decide.

Mike O'Connor: Right. And, you know, then I think that the thing to do is to pick one that's - as the lead off one that has both technical and policy in it and I think that's the Seven and Two clump. That's a good one for technical stuff and policy stuff in the same PDP.

(Olaf): And it has got, with all due respect, also, to paying respect to the previous work and prioritization it has got, I think, perhaps, the highest priority assigned from the previous ranking group.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, and I was sort of sneaking that in, too.

(Chuck): Now, let me make a suggestion for moving forward on this. I've jotted down the ideas. Here's what - with regard to this issue, number one, first of all assess availability of different people working on PDPs then decide on a sequencing, if needed, and then I have some ideas there one idea is a priority of Group One followed by Seven and Two, followed by Ten, followed by Two, followed by Three.

Another idea is two parallel tracks, One followed by Two and Three followed by Four and then the other two. Five is let the first PDP team decide and pick a lead PDP, such as Seven and Two, that has technical and policy.

My suggestion for moving this forward is to schedule another meeting for next week, if the same time works for everybody, and I've got to check that myself and then, in that meeting, decide - our objective would be to narrow this down in terms of what we actually want to recommend. In the meantime, in the latest version of my document that I'll send around today, I will include in my little table at the

beginning, maybe, the, at least the priorities, and I'll add another column and show the priorities of maybe the average priority or something.

Mike O'Connor: Oh, don't average and average. Just leave them the way they are. If it's already asking - one of the problems with the priority process is that it masks a huge dispersion in opinion group...

(Chuck): Yeah. Right. Right. Well, all I'm trying to do some measure so...

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, but please don't do that.

(Olaf): Well, it's a...

(Tim): Well, I think that priority system that (Ross) tried to use tried to account for some of that so if you've got a 6 and you've got a 16, then I think, you know, pretty clearly that there's a lot of agreement that 6 have priority and a lot of agreement that the 16 didn't.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah, but the average...

(Tim): There might have been a lot of stuff in the middle...

Mike O'Connor: Yeah.

(Tim): Yeah, I agree that we don't need to average the ones that (unintelligible)...

(Chuck): That's fine. The - so - and then the other thing that we need to do is decide how we begin to finalize our recommendation documents. Do

we wait until next week to talk about that or does it make sense to start working on a document between now and then?

Mike O'Connor: Well, I think a draft would be wonderful so that we're looking at something we can edit rather than something that we have to create on the phone.

(Chuck): Okay. So you're - and I think you're right that it'd be nice, if before our meeting next week, we had a draft.

(Tim): I think - I feel like we should look at this - I think the priority thing is a big concern to me and that we should look at, well, if we just were to look at these in parallel by priority how would it fall out and then once we understand that then we can look at, based on that, you know, whether we do parallel or tandem or technical versus policy or enhancements versus new or whatever. At least then we have an agreed upon priority that we can use as we recommend or thought it should be undertaken.

(Chuck): Right.

(Tim): I think that'd be pretty easy to do just looking at these groups.

(Chuck): Yeah. Yeah. It might be. And we can definitely finalize that next week. In the meantime, you know, I don't know, depending on my time I can - my availability between now and next meeting, I can try to start a draft document based on what we've got right now. I can...

Mike O'Connor: Does it need to differ a lot from the one that you've already prepared, (Chuck)?

(Chuck): Oh it just needs some - no, I don't think so. I think it's just got to be some transition words and stuff like that put in it and overall organization. I - let me ask you this? I don't think we need the letter identifier in there, do we? Is it sufficient to just have, like, for example instead of recommendation 3G, which I just carried forward from other documents, is it sufficient to have recommendation three or what's the best way to identify the recommendations. Obviously, we're going to write them out so...

(Olaf): I think it's still useful...

(Chuck): Okay.

(Olaf): ...because it relates back to an earlier document that may still be called for...

(Chuck): In the document we should explain what those...

(Olaf): Yes.

(Chuck): ...and have links to those.

(Olaf): And maybe, well, I'll (unintelligible) that making some of that...

(Chuck): If you would do that I will...

(Olaf): ...that housekeeping kind of thing.

(Chuck): If you will do that, (Olaf), I'll try and take the groupings and the recommendations with notes where we wanted them and so forth and see what - see if I can't come up with a draft there and then we - it'll won't be too hard to combine the two things that we do and, hopefully, get that out before our meeting next week and then see - and then we can actually talk about that next week, too.

Mike O'Connor: Right.

(Chuck): And then, of course, we'll have to - the big issue next week will be to finalize what we want to do on priorities. Does that make sense? Shall we check calendars?

Mike O'Connor: Yeah. That sounds great.

(Chuck): So let me see, so what have we got the 12th, that's - we're talking Wednesday the 12th. Actually, it looks good for me. How about the rest of you?

(Olaf): Yeah, it looks good. It's going to be an early morning. I'll be in California then.

(Chuck): Ah, well, you will join - that's not too early.

(Olaf): Yeah, not too early.

(Chuck): Yeah, that works for me because I will be in California as well, (unintelligible) I have to say. So the plan then would be a meeting same time.

(Olaf): Yeah.

Mike O'Connor: I have to fly that day. I'm just checking (unintelligible). Yeah, I'm okay.

(Chuck): Okay. (Tim)?

(Tim): Yeah, I've got another meeting at that time.

(Chuck): Should we explore other options?

(Tim): I could do an hour later if that...

(Chuck): Hour later is okay with me.

(Olaf): Very okay with me.

(Tim): (Unintelligible).

(Chuck): Keep in mind, you're going to be on European time so...

(Tim): I don't know.

(Chuck): Mike, does that work for you, an hour later?

Mike O'Connor: That's okay. I may have to drop off with him but that's fine.

(Chuck): Okay, so we're going to do - so we'll say an hour later.

Mike O'Connor: Yeah.

(Chuck): Okay, all right. So that's good. Is there anything else we should talk about in this call today before we adjourn?

(Tim): Can we just quickly rattle off the numbers in each group just to make sure I have...

(Chuck): Sure. And again, I'll send this out as soon as I can today. It'll probably be a couple hours before I can get to it because I want to clean it up quite a bit but and I've been going straight since 6:00 my time so...

So we've got - what we have, then, in Group One we've got 5, 6, 15, and 18.

(Olaf): Check.

(Chuck): In Group Two we've got 4, 8, 9, 16, and 19.

(Olaf): Yeah.

(Chuck): In Group Three we've got 1, 3, and 12. I'm sorry. Yeah, that's right.

(Olaf): (Unintelligible).

(Chuck): And then we have Seven and Two as a separate PDP and Ten as a separate PDP.

(Tim): Okay. Good.

(Chuck): So we've got a total of five.

(Tim): Got it. Okay.

(Chuck): Is that okay?

(Tim): Sounds good.

(Chuck): Anything else?

Mike O'Connor: Great job. Thanks for leading, (Chuck).

(Tim): Yeah, thanks (Chuck).

(Olaf): Yes.

(Chuck): Well, (Tim), you know, we, again, had a very productive meeting so my thanks and compliments to all of you and to Tom as well because I think we refined it. I'm real pleased with the way we refined this whole grouping. I think it's much better than what we had before so that's great. Thanks a lot and we'll talk to you again next week.

(Tim): Bye.

(Olaf): (Chuck), just a minute. I'll, well, a question about notes from this meeting. I think that your document will be out before I can make any notes anyway and isn't it so that it will be largely self- (unintelligible) apart from the procedural aspects that is...

(Chuck): I think that's correct. Does anybody disagree with that?

Mike O'Connor: No, that's fine with me.

(Chuck): Okay and if, in fact, it seems useful to add some - any notes, anybody's welcome to do that after I send mind out, okay?

(Olaf): That's right. I'll just send a - well about the agreement to have for the next meeting and what we'll do then and if need be, I mean...

(Chuck): Excellent. No that's good.

(Olaf): ...but that will happen tomorrow, my time.

(Chuck): That's fine.

(Olaf): Okay.

(Chuck): All righty. Okay, thanks guys.

(Tim): Thank you.

Mike O'Connor: Take care.

(Olaf): Bye-bye.

(Chuck): Bye-bye.

END