

GNSO
Inter-Registrar Transfer PDP teleconference
29 May, 2008 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer PDP teleconference on 29 May 2008. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ir-transfer-20080529.mp3>

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

Present:

Mike O'Connor (CBUC) chair, Tim Ruiz, Paul Diaz, Margie Milam
(Registrars) Barbara Steele, (Registry constituency)
Christian Curtis (NCUC)

Staff:

OLof Nordling, Robert Hoggarth, Glen de Saint G ery

Coordinator: Okay the conference call is now being recorded.

(Mike): Thanks very much.

Coordinator: You're welcome.

(Mike): Glen, why don't you kick us off with a roll call.

Glen DeSaintgery: We have Mike O'Connor, -- he's the chair business constituency -- Barbara Steel), registry constituency, (Paul Diaz), registrar constituency, (Christian Curtis) NCUC, (TimRuiz), registrar constituency.

And then from staff we have (Olof), (Rob Hoggarth and (unintelligible).

(Mike): Okay well I'm going to call that a quorum and I should have done an agenda. I apologize for that but I think, you know, let's sketch that out right now.

I think our goal today is to go through the page on the wiki that's got our recommendations. Make sure that we've tuned those with any constituency feedback that we've gotten.

And then talk a little bit about how emphatic we want to make our recommendation in terms of a proposed course of action. (Olof) and Glen and I had a bit of a chat before most of you joined the call. And we might want to repeat that conversation.

So really it's tuning the language with any constituency feedback, tuning the recommendations. And then is there anything else that people want to do? Or these are the two things.

I'm not expecting this call to take very long really. But not hearing any other components for the agenda, why don't we just start with - we

have two that I think we can forward to the public comment cycle, Number 8 and Number 9.

Why don't we go through those first and then finish off with the two that we're not going to forward and tune up our recommendation?

Does anybody have any...

(Olof): I have a procedural question whether we should actually go for a partial public comment page with only two or whether we should try to advance matters further.

I mean this is wholly within the context of the earlier discussions we had. I tried to sound a little with (arian check) to hear what possible preference for the counsel could be on - among the two recommendations we made. That either to continue with group, within the scope of this PDP to advance matters.

Or to try to solve unresolved matters into other PDPs. And I got the slight distinct feeling that the preference would rather be for us continuing.

Although the next counsel meeting won't be until Paris. So we may also want to consider how we advance - we try to do some things in the meantime.

Oh well, that's a bit of an open question whether we should recommend from the working group's side that we continue. And also perhaps make an assumption that while waiting for the counselor's verdict on that since the call is theirs.

But to make the assumption that it will be seen as positive if we for example have another call prior to the Paris meeting to try to advance some matters if possible.

So I just put that on the table for you to consider whether we should have a preferred way of action from here.

Rob Hoggarth: All right, I'm sorry (Michael) if I can interject real briefly.

(Mike): Yes go ahead (Rob).

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob Hoggarth to echo (Olof)'s comment that it was (unintelligible) involved in my (unintelligible) the willingness on their part to give this group additional time if this group talked about additional time would result in, you know, being able to wrap up all of the issues in one bundle that (unintelligible).

They would be reluctant to punt any of the issues within this PDP and try to (shoehorn) them into another issue.

So that's just further thought for all your discussion.

(Mike): So the sense, just to clarify one thing (Rob) and (Olof), it's safe to say that they really don't want to have this split of the two going forward to public comment. They'd rather keep them all in a group, take them all to public comment at once.

(Olof): I think it raises procedural, perhaps more procedural problems than it solves to have part of it receiving public comment. And then another packet comes for public comments later on.

And while it's a single PDP, and we need to come out with a single outcome. And I think the going for public comment for two and then punt two to other. That would be one solution.

So to basically restrict the scope of this PDP and say that okay couldn't solve it. But I think that's not the preferred way.

(Mike): All right. What are folks, constituency representatives, have as a sense of this as a preferred approach?

(Barbara): This is (Barbara). The registry's constituency is supportive of handling them all together and asking for additional time to be able to address them.

(Mike): Okay perfect. (Tim)? Any sense from the registrars?

Tim Ruiz: About the comment period or how we...

(Mike): Well, you know, it seems like we're sort of at this fork in the road. We can either extend our group and keep all four together and solve them all.

Or we could put forward the two that we can resolve as a group amongst ourselves and take the other two and give them some other destination, either us working on them or move them into a broader

PDP discussion in the subsequent PDPs that are coming behind this one.

Do you have a sense as to which is preferable for the...

Tim Ruiz: Well not really. I mean this just came up now. I mean...

(Mike): Yes, no I'm thinking that you were the one that was pretty eloquent last time about the complexities of those other two clarifications.

Tim Ruiz: Right, right, right. I think the preference would be that, you know, there'd be, you know, an opportunity for more go broader community input on those topics in the PDP.

So I guess I'm maybe a little lost on exactly where we're trying to get to right now. And I'm not sure what, how much we would gain by continuing to work on those issues within this small group.

(Mike): I admit to being a little puzzled about the need or a call between now and Paris. I think that it's conceivable that we could continue as a group and, you know, beyond Paris and finish off these other two.

Tim Ruiz: My concern is that, you know, with the work they've been given is to draft a clarification log. If as a group we decided that we really can't do that in regards to these two.

That they really are, the actual policy issues involved that need to be, you know, discussed as a broader community or in more full fledged PDP fashion.

Then, you know, we, are we really, you know, can we take it on ourselves to kind of create our own little charter to continue on. We'd have to do that as a policy discussion to really be fruitful because we've already pretty much agreed we can't really just clarify it with better language.

(Mike): Yes I think that's the nub of the issue for sure.

(Paul Diaz): Can I add something (Mike)? It's (Paul).

(Mike): Yes go ahead.

(Paul Diaz): And I had very little feedback from other registrars. The questions that I did receive or the comments were usually focused on issues beyond the scope of mandate of this particular drafting team.

And, you know, just having looked at what you and (Olof) have put together. And my sense is that we can put forward, I believe we can put forward these, the four writes ups as we have on the wiki right now for public comment because it's going to be very clear to the public at large that, you know, these issues are, there's more going on here.

And I think it might be beneficial to the counsel to see that, you know, there's a variety of views, more time is needed. More inputs are needed.

You know, the challenge for the counsel in my view is going to be do they want to simply extend the mandate of this particular team to try and address these issues?

Or recognizing that there are deeper policy things going on here. Either merge this group into one of the follow on PDPs, or however they want to handle that one.

The sense that I got from the limited feedback I got from other registrars is that the questions are more around sort of bigger issues that are out there, not necessarily the clarification.

I feel we're good to put out what we have, recognizing two we've very straightforward, two were more complex but the public weigh in.

And then you've got a body of inputs for the counsel to decide how do they go on? Do they simply extend the mandate of this one and ask us to come back and try and deal with it? Or do we get folded into one of the other PDP groups and start dealing with those bigger, broader more complex issues?

(Mike): So let me see if I can summarize what I think the issue is. It seems to me that, interesting conversation here is whether or not to extend this group to have another try at those last two.

Or to move those last two into the broader PDP discussion because they've got policy ramifications. And I want to circle back to (Olof) and (Rob). Can you give me a sense, give us a sense of why (Chuck) and (Ari) wanted to give this group, wanted to keep going on this course that we've started rather than acknowledging the broader issues in those last two and simply folding them into the subsequent PDPs?

(Olof): Well we shouldn't forget that we are in a PDP. So the choice that was made by the counsel was to try to launch drafting group to see if we

could put a very short mandate in time wise to see if we could easily resolve this.

Now that turns out well to be half-possible, half not so possible. So it basically goes back to the counsel for the counsel to decide.

But let's put it like this that if we expel within the PDP. So the question is then do you change the mandate, extend the time line? Or do something completely different?

But we are in the policy development process. So for it can be developed in this, within this framework. Although our drafting team, or drafting group read it, it was seen as pretty limited and suggested indeed to try out whether this was a quick fix.

And so it turned out perhaps not to be. So it goes back to the counsel at any rate. And what I indicated, having heard (Ari) and (Chuck) was that well the preference would be that we could protect within this PDP and developed perhaps in another way.

And the final decision on that would have to be made in Paris. So the question is only can we advance matters in between? And well...

Tim Ruiz: Well I think the bigger question is, you know, should we advance matters...

(Mike): Yes I think that's right. I think the fundamental disagreement is summed up, let me try and sum it up. It seems to me that one view of those last two is that we simply didn't have time to do a good job.

The other view is no those last two are really touching a lot of other policy issues that are already included in the subsequent PDPs and simply aren't appropriately addressed in this context.

And there I'm trying to summarize, (Tim), your point of view. So if I didn't get that quite right, feel free to correct me.

And so I think the choice is how much policy making do we do in this context and how much do we do in the broader PDPs that are scheduled to follow?

And since the charter of this one is drafting...

(Olof): The charter of this work we've, this drafting group is drafting.

Man: Yes.

(Olof): The character of the PDP is clarification, which may indeed mean policy development be clarified.

Man: Yes, okay. Good idea, I see that.

Man: Yes I don't, you see and I'm not sure I agree with that (Olof). I mean clarification to me mean, you know, that we're not changing the policy, we're just clarifying it so that it's understood better.

You know, but I don't see how we can, with what the issues that are raised with these two things that, I mean there is, it's actually in my view potentially changing policy.

It's not clarifying existing policy. So if I misunderstood what clarification means, then (unintelligible). But that's what was indicated to me.

(Olof): Okay, well I think that's a, it clearly shows that we have to put this for the counsel's decision. How to proceed and whether these issues would then go deeper into policy development then well the word clarification would imply.

But I just wish to remind you that we are in the policy development process. And it's, well that means that policy is developed. Even if it's the expression clarification probably limits that to something where I have difficulty seeing the exact borderline.

But and there may be various views on that as well.

(Paul Diaz): (Mike)?

(Mike): Go ahead.

(Paul Diaz): Okay. I, this is (Paul) again. I was just going to say (Olof) I'm starting to see, you know, your distinction here that this is a PDP. But I just think that our particular group would really run into issues if we were to take a more expensive view on policy making now give that the very clear, very, very limited mandate for this group was supposed to just be on clarifications.

You know, if, again if the counsel comes back and says okay, fine and they extend the mandate. They recognize that we're touching on other issues and maybe start those other PDP processes that's fine.

I really feel though that this group would need that clear green light from the counsel. You know, the authority to do those things that we could not take that upon ourselves right now.

Recognizing as we do that some of the issues if we have to continue to move forward on them really do start touching on much deeper policy, policy development work.

(Olof): Okay then we're, I think it's pretty clarified.

(Mike): I was just looking at the wording of our recommendation...

(Olof): Talk about clarification.

(Mike): And I'm thinking that, I think we got it pretty right the first time. It seems like the counsel can expand the mandate and timetable of this working group. And we might want to say expand the mandate into policy formation or something like that.

(Olof): Yes...

((Crosstalk))

(Mike): I don't know, but anyway or move these into the broader bed of PDPs that are to follow. And I guess the question I have to the group is of those two choices, let's not work smith them right now.

Let's just get a sense of the group as to which of those two we prefer. Anyone want to chime in on that?

Tim Ruiz: This is (Tim).

(Mike): Go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Yes I would prefer, I mean I think since that in the other PDPs, all the other transfer issues have been put, in fact, (460) ports been done. I think that both of these issues are touched on to some degree in the other issues that were raised that are scheduled for PDPs.

And then my preference would be to consider that it may be best just from an efficiency point of view to just make these an aspect of these PDPs perhaps because, that way it's, you know, we don't have - it will be cohesive.

So we don't, somebody's not looking at two different pieces of the same puzzle. And you end up with, you know, a potential conflict. Or I don't know.

It just seems like if it's part of these issues that are scheduled for later PDPs or PDPs within that process that we either pull those out and put them together with this and expand this group to deal with them right away. So we can deal with the whole picture, not just a piece of it. And then later we deal with another piece of it.

That would be my preference that, I can see the advantage of this group moving on with it and to tune it, and maybe broaden, given them - making an offer to broaden this participation because I think others might want to participate if they know what we're really going to be doing.

But I think that it's an opportunity to pull a couple of those pieces out of that other list of PDPs, to pull it into these two and then we can look at the whole picture in one shot instead of making it two PDPs on the same issue.

(Mike): Other thoughts from folks?

Tim Ruiz: If that made any sense at all.

(Mike): Yes, it made sense to me.

Man: Yes it makes sense to me to (Tim) and I agree entirely. For what it's worth I fully expect to volunteer for those future PDPs anyway. So sooner or later I'll be contributing to the work I know.

(Barbara): This is (Barbara). I mean I think that what you said (Tim) does make a lot of sense. And I think the registry's constituency was, you know, thinking of it from the standpoint of just expanding to include, you know, to expanding the review if you will in order to allow for the policy development portion has been discussed.

And then, however I think if we want to go ahead and pull them out and include them in another PDP, I think that they would consider that.

But I think what we need to do is we need to be very specific and identify which PDP we think that they do belong in. And then, you know, again I'm supportive of opening it up to people who were included in this PDP to participating in that one. If you feel the broader team and perspective is required to resolve them.

But I see your point on not, I guess looking at this in a vacuum and then, you know, perhaps having, you know, future PDP that would be impacted by this, you know, running into issues or conflicts.

I think that could make a lot of sense.

(Mike): Anybody else want to chime in?

I'm taking my chair hat off and just putting my member hat on. I agree. I have always been a little bit puzzled by the kind of parallel tracks of the - of this PDP and the broader PDP effort.

I went so far as to write a completely mistaken business constituency comment based on that lack of understanding.

And so I think it would be very helpful to remove the two PD - the two sections that really have very broad connections to oth - to policies and put them in the main PDP effort that's being teed up to follow this.

Go forward with the two clarifications that we could agree too and make that recommendation to council.

And I think the mechanics as to the way now go back into chair role. I think that one way we could do this is we could change the recommendation on the wiki so that the fir - the second one, this issue becomes part of a broader transfer policy of the home and effort would be the first in the list.

And that we would then tag that with the, you know, in bold, something like recommended. And then present the other one as an alternative,

but less preferred alternative for the council. And maybe try and capture some of the reasoning behind that (altran).

Do that, I didn't try and do it live on the wiki this time. Does that seem like the right way to capture this sentiment? I'm hearing that as agreement.

The point that (Barbara) raised I think is a good one. And I'm not sure that we can do it on this call. But the notion of recommending what the destination PDP should be seems like a helpful thing that we could do.

And I'm not sure how to go about doing that. Does anybody have an idea?

(Olof): Well this is one, the very first. It was hoped that it would be the easiest one. And then there was the group that tried to package the other issues into five PDPs.

And that has been done. And they have proceeded with that. And I'd be happy to refresh your memory to some degree the proposal for the list it's, well it's on the (gene of so site) of course. On what exactly are the other five PDPs going to address?

And perhaps, well for...

(Mike): What if we took that list in the spirit of continuing to try and move things along. I'm more than willing to do another call. Maybe if we could get our hands on that list, that could be the subject of the next and final call.

To place those last two outstanding issues in the PDP, you know, in the right subsequent PDP. Have a conversation about that.

(Olof): Well it's under our link, perhaps I just put the link into the wiki.

(Mike): Yes, great.

(Olof): Okay, I'll do that.

(Mike): Now that gets us to the question what do we do with the two that we agreed upon? Do we release those to public comment?

(Olof): I think we should wait for the counsel's decision on exactly how to proceed.

(Mike): Okay.

(Olof): Because otherwise we're jumping to conclusions again. And all right if we all agreed upon well continuing in some, but at some pace with this group.

But since that's not the preferred option, I think we shouldn't jump ahead of the counsel's decision and say that okay, this, we have done our work here. Please comment upon these proposed text.

Since we may have to do that over again with the two remaining ones and it becomes probably a bit confusing.

There is of course what was mentioned earlier, that's okay. Well we can hang them up, all of them for public comment. And that is an

option. But the two new proposed text and just say that all right could you provide some comments to the existing ones, the two which we - were we haven't any proposals for new text but based on the current text.

(Mike): I'm not terribly enthusiastic about that.

(Olof): (Unintelligible) enthusiastic about the cost management. So, well what do people think?

(Mike): Well I think given the, I certainly understand the notion of not trying to jump the gun. And so I guess my thought would be that we don't release those to public comment.

That we simply spend our next call placing those last two issues in the appropriate PDP. And then forward that better conclusion onto the counsel for them to decide what to do next.

In a, you know, when we're not on an official call, I have a lot of thoughts about how this process could be changed in the future so that we don't run into this dilemma in subsequent PDPs.

But I don't want to go into that on this call. And given that where we find ourselves, I think that we've pretty much arrived at the follow conclusion which are we'll recommend bundling those last two PDPs, or last two issues into subsequent PDPs.

Acknowledge too that we've clarified and have proposed language for, which could go to public comment if the counsel want to proceed with those. But that we won't take them there until they've met.

(Olof): Which means that we need to change the recommendations for those two.

(Mike): Yes.

(Olof): (Unintelligible) wording that.

(Mike): Yes I'll spin through the text on the wiki after we're done and I suppose we could change it now.

We could essentially change that recommendation to say forward proposed text counsel for further action.

(Olof): Yes.

(Mike): Do it that way?

All right, that being the case, I do want to circle back to the proposed text that we want to forward to the counsel and see if there are any changes to that text before we do it.

I know that there was conversation in the BC, which really revolved around I think the text in Number 8, which the word registrar somehow got into that text. And I'm looking at this.

This is the text that we agreed on or is this an edited version? Do people remember seeing registrar in that proposed text ever?

Man: I don't (Mike). I always remembered it as registry if we have it there.

(Mike): Yes well that was the thing. There was a comment from one of the BC members that says don't let the word registrar sneak in there now.

Man: Well I think the original working groups, checks that had registry slash registrar who is...

(Barbara): Yes, I believe you're right, I think that is what it said.

(Mike): Okay and so we've changed that already but, okay so we aren't tinkering at all then. That was the only feedback I got on Number 8. Did anybody else get any feedback on that one?

(Barbara): The feedback from the registry's constituency was that they're agreeable to the proposed text.

(Mike): Okay. Same with the registrar gang?

Man: Yes no real feedback.

(Mike): All right so the only change I'm going to make there is that we forward the proposed text to counsel for further action instead of for public.

And then on Number 9 I got no feedback from the business constituency. Do we have any feedback from any of the other constituencies?

Okay so I'll make the same change on that. But the recommendation is to forward the text to counsel for further action.

And then the recommendations on Number 5 is that we'll change the order there and make the first recommendation maybe a little more emphatic. Maybe we should say this issue should become part of the broader transfer policy effort and be added to the one on the five planned PDP sets.

And then behind that in bold say recommended. That captures where we were collectively at?

I mean let me save that so that you can read it.

(Olof): Good, there is something else which perhaps needs changing. We used the expressional working group and I think we should have the - use the main work drafting group.

(Mike): Oh okay. I can fix that.

(Olof): On a few places there.

(Mike): Yes I'll just, I'll note that for later.

(Olof): Yes.

(Mike): Working group goes to draft and then drafting group.

(Barbara): And again I feel as though if we're going to go ahead and make that the priority, or the recommended approach that we do go ahead and try to identify which PDP it would best fit.

(Mike): Right, and so let me put that in as a blank that we need to fill in at the next meeting. To become part, let's put the blank right in that recommendation. That should become part of the blank, you know, I'll just put a blank there and save that so you can see it.

That will remind us that we're not done. Okay so it's been saved with the blank now. And should be something you can see on your screen.

So that's Number 5. And then I guess if there's no other changes to that, I'd just copy and paste the same thing into Number 7. Does that, and I think our action item for the next call is to take a look at the place, the subsequent PDP list that all of you posted to the wiki to try and find destinations for those two sections.

Fill in those blanks which are now, I've done it to both of them now. So now it should read the same on your screen. And that would be our agenda for next week's call is to, or whenever we can schedule a call. I'm not sure if people are available next week or not.

But to really fill in that blank. And that would be pretty much our final revision before the counsel meets in Paris. Does that look satisfactory to folks?

(Christian Curtis): This is (Christian). I think we used the language and to be added to one of the five planned PDPs that seem redundant once we put the blank in.

(Mike): Okay that's the trouble with speed editing.

Rob Hoggarth: Mr. Chairman this is Rob Hoggarth. I'd also like to make a recommendation when you have a chance.

(Mike): Okay let me just chop off, to be come part of the blank transfer policy development effort and then chop off the rest of that sentence. Doesn't that cure the redundancy?

So it would then read this issue should become part of the blank transfer policy development effort. Go ahead (Rob). And I'll save this version.

All right so Number 5 reads right, Number 7 doesn't read right yet. So (Rob) what was your other thing?

Rob Hoggarth: Well in the latest edit it looks like the last bullet in both denial for Reason 5 and 7 still have language basically saying we think we didn't have enough time to address these.

So I think you need to change that to more fully reflect your discussions. I think one of the reasons that you were getting sort of that feedback that (Olof) passed on from (Ari) and (Chuck) is, well you don't have enough time. You know, just take more time.

(Mike): Give you more time, yes right. And I think that the issue that we're really dealing with, you're right (Rob). That's a good think that we should.

So we'll say we didn't have time to adequately address the - let me think about this. We felt that -- now let's see -- rather feel that these

constitute broader policy issues. That we feel these constitute broader policy issues rather than simply clarifications of existing policy.

(Barbara): Does that need to be actually included under the concerns section? And then we just keep the recommendations as straight recommendations?

(Mike): That's a good idea. Yes, because your second bullet in concerns for Number 5 captures what you're trying to do right now very nicely.

Oh, way to go on. Okay I'll just chop that off. Great, good catch. Thanks for reading folks. I was so deep into editing that I didn't see that. Okay so I've just deleted the third recommendation and it should be on your screens now.

See how that looks. Again, Number 7 doesn't read right. I'll copy the stuff that we've done in Number 5 down there. Is that the golden sound of consensus?

Man: This is kind of minor but the "or" is in the wrong place on the second bullet points under recommendation because now there are only two items rather than the three.

(Mike): Oh, good job. No such thing as too minor a point when one is editing. Come on computer give me back my editing screen. Okay I've taken care of that one. Anything else? Save that. Okay it's up there now.

(Olof): In the meantime I've added the link on the first page to the proposed PDP document, the PDP sentence.

(Mike): Oh okay. Just take a quick...

(Barbara): You're probably going to want to take that second bullet point under reason 5 and copy it over to reason 7 as well so that we make sure that we capture the complexity issue.

(Mike): Okay.

(Barbara): Oh I didn't see it there in 7.

(Mike): Yes let me do that right now. So that's the one, the proposed text raised deeper issues right? Oops.

(Barbara): Correct.

(Mike): Save that. Sometimes DSL in the country when you're 60 miles away from the nearest central office isn't as fast as it could be. Okay I think it's up there now.

Oh I've got the or, well I've got that whole, let me copy the, I think I've got them all material, copy of the recommendations down so that they're really truly correct.

Okay now I think 7 is also corrected. So now I think we're looking at pretty close to a final draft. Anything else that people see?

(Barbara): (Mike) you may want to change working group in this, in proposed text 1, 2 drafting group as well.

(Mike): Oh yes, okay. All right, I'm going to do that off line because I think it shows up in several places. So I'll just go through and change all of those at once. But I've got that on my notes to get done. Anything else?

While we're letting that in our minds, (Olof) put the PDP set link up there on the home page. And maybe we, if people are pretty comfortable with the draft, maybe we could take a quick look at these sets.

It's the, oh no, there's no way that we're going to be able to wing that. I remember.

(Olof): I think this needs - it calls for deeper reading.

(Mike): Yes it does. Thanks. Thanks a lot for posting it, but there's no way we can wing it in this last 10 minutes.

Okay so if we are agreed on the draft and agreed on our agenda for the next meeting, I think the only thing that then remains is taking a sense of the group to see, could we meet again in a week? Is this a good time for folks?

(Barbara): It's fine for me.

Man: Yes it should be okay for me.

(Mike): Dreadful for me, but I will break out of what I'm doing. Doing it so (Tim) can you make next week?

Tim Ruiz: I have no problems with this time.

(Mike): Okay. Well then why don't we go ahead and schedule the same time next week a call to place those last two in the appropriate PDP. And with that, I think, unless there's other either corrections to the draft or other business we can wrap this call up.

(Olof): I think we should perhaps, or I would like to just send a little note to the counsel list if they are expecting to have a final piece of paper from us as of today to say that we have extended our work within in the additional meeting. I will send the final report from the group...

((Crosstalk))

Tim Ruiz: This is (Tim) rejoining.

Man: Hi, (Tim). (Tim) I asked you and I bet you weren't there. Is next week at this time okay for you to meet on another call?

Tim Ruiz: No, I'll be in the air about this time, not on my own by the way. Anyway what I can do though is send my comments about the how I think this should, you know, my opinion on where this could blend within the PDP or, you know, how it could be handled. I can send that to the list.

(Mike): Oh that would be great. Now are you...

Tim Ruiz: I don't want to hold up the call just for me but.

(Mike): Well it's a pretty bad time for me as well. I was sort of - how does Friday work for people?

Man: Worse.

(Mike): Worse, okay. And Wednesday.

(Barbara): Wednesday's fine for me.

(Mike): How about for you (Tim)?

Tim Ruiz: Yes I think I could make Wednesday work.

(Mike): Others?

Man: At this same time (Mike)?

(Mike): Yes.

Man: So it's the fourth at noon or whatever?

(Mike): Yes.

Man: Okay.

(Mike): Is that okay for you?

Man: That works for me.

(Olof): That's much better for me too.

(Mike): Oh good, well then let's do that. Let's try it for Wednesday next week, the fourth. That would be way better for me. And...

(Olof): Hold a second. Oh no, it isn't. Sorry, I do have another call which stretches to possibly one hour later. Would it be possible to have it one hour later?

(Mike): That gets into the same conflict for me, but again I could just show up to that late. I'm not leading that. I'm just a participant. How does that work for other folks if we started one hour later then this call?

Man: Yes that would work for me (Mike).

(Barbara): That's workable for me.

Man: Yes it still works for me too.

(Mike): All right, let's do that. Let's shift it one hour later.

Man: Glen will you still send a reminder?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes of course I will.

(Mike): Yes you might...

Man: That would be really helpful.

(Mike): And I think you've been doing this all along, send sort of an early one and then a late one.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes okay.

Man: With the day and the time.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

(Mike): Okay great. All right. Any other business, anything else we need to talk about today? And I'll go ahead and change that one thing, working group to drafting group. And I think with that we can wrap this call up. Thanks all.

Man: Okay thanks (Mike).

Man: Thank you again.

(Barbara): Thanks.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Talk to you later.

Man: Bye bye.

END