

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Policy Development Process (PDP)  
Work Team (WT)  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Thursday 26 May 2011 at 13:30 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee Policy Development Process (PDP) Work Team (WT) meeting on Thursday 26 May 2011, at 13:30 UTC Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-pdp-26may11-en.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

**Participants on the Call:**

Jeff Neuman - Registry Stakeholder Group - Work Team Chair  
Paul Diaz - Registrar Stakeholder Group  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISP  
Avri Doria - Non Commercial Stakeholder  
Tatiana Khramtsova - Registrar Stakeholder Group  
James Bladel – Registrar Stakeholder Group  
Alan Greenberg – ALAC

**ICANN Staff:**

Glen de Saint Gery  
Marika Konings  
Margie Milam  
Gisella Gruber-White

**Absent apologies:**

David Maher - gTLD Registry Stakeholder Group  
Alex Gakuru - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone on today's PPSB PDP call on Thursday the 26th of May. We have Jeff Neuman, Tatiana Khramtsova, James Bladel, Paul Diaz, Alan Greenberg.

From Staff we have Margie Milam, Marika Konings, Glen de Saint Gery and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. Apologies now to - from David Maher and Alex

Gakuru, and if I could please also just remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thank you very much. So welcome everyone to the call. I'm hoping that this is - well not I'm hoping but this will be our last call before we release the final report.

We had asked for some issues to - Alan has just said that he's still getting - are you on Alan? Are you still getting...?

Alan Greenberg: No I'm on.

Jeff Neuman: Oh okay. I just saw the pleasant piano music. Anyway so...

Alan Greenberg: It went on for a while but finally ended.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so we - the goal is to get the final report out early next week, so by - I think Marika it's got to be out by Tuesday, possibly Wednesday I think, but certainly early enough to get on the agenda for the GNSO Council meeting on the 9th.

So - and Marika and I are preparing a motion so that we could have it to the Council and put it out for public comment, a last final public comment beginning around the 9th and ending in early July so that we could have a vote or at least a next steps of what to do at the Council meeting in mid- to end July. I think July 21st is the date.

So with that said we had asked for comments by the end of yesterday to - on the report if anyone had any comments. And if - we didn't get any so I - we can either assume that, A, the report is perfect and nobody had any changes or that we, you know, people just caught up with them.

I'm going to assume the latter, so what I want to do is there's two issues that Marika has outlined in the notes and then maybe just walk through the report so that people can at least eyeball it during this meeting.

And Marika, before I call on you just when you speak if you could just let us know when the absolute drop dead date would be to get this report out for any last comments, so Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. That all depends on when you want to publish, you know, if you want to publish on Tuesday I would need to get anything in, you know, by Monday close of business basically, you know, provided that there are no issues for - that need further discussion.

If you want to publish on Monday, well then Sunday would be the cutoff date so I think in that sense, you know, it's possible to turn around quite quickly unless there are any issues that would require further discussion by the Work Team.

Jeff Neuman: Right, and so the other thing we're going to do is we're supposed to operate by consensus here, so we kind of need to take a poll of the group to make sure everyone agrees with this, and we're kind of running out of time here so...

Marika Konings: Jeff, something we've done with other groups and it's basically conformed like the Working Group guidelines is, you know, making sure that those that are on the call, you know, are okay with it and basically when we push out the document again maybe after this call and say, "Look, you know, we're going to put in the report that all these recommendations were, you know, adopted by full consensus unless, you know, you speak up now and if so identify, you know, why you don't agree and submit your minority viewpoint."

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I think we're going to need to do that and we're also going to need to put that on email when we send it out. So we probably should do that right after the call.

We'll resend it out and just - and say that we're assuming this has full consensus and, you know, and if they want to file a minority statement to it they need to get that in by Tuesday or - we got to figure out what the actual deadline is. Marika is it Tuesday or Wednesday?

Marika Konings: I think the deadline for submitting is - I think it's eight days in advance. That would be the Wednesday but, you know, to be on the safe side and, you know, if there are any issues that need to go back and forth on the mailing list I would, you know, rather have as a cutoff date maybe, you know, Monday or even Sunday...

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Marika Konings: ...for, you know, any issues or comments that people still want to raise.

Jeff Neuman: Right. Okay I think that's good. Alan, you have a comment?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I guess I would suggest that we schedule a meeting for Tuesday and cancel if there were no comments of things that needed to be discussed. But on the chance that someone does do a read through and finds a point that is not, you know, clearly a typo, if we have a meeting scheduled for Tuesday morning then - or Monday; it was Monday morning, I'm sorry.

Monday's our - Monday's when we normally have a meeting if we have one, right?

Marika Konings: Right.

Jeff Neuman: Yes and it is a holiday here in the United States.

Alan Greenberg: Oh right. Right. Sorry, I forgot about that. We - they're normally in sync with Canada but ours was last Monday. Okay sorry.

Marika Konings: And Tuesday is a challenge because there's several other Working Groups that already have meetings.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. No, no. I - sorry I'm...

Jeff Neuman: Yes, we're going to have to do this online. We're going to have to do it online.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: All right, so let's start going through it and then let's go through this first two issues that are on the side there. And so let's see, there's Issue 20 or Recommendation 22.

Marika Konings: Jeff if I can first, you know, maybe point out something else as well in addition to the two issues.

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

Marika Konings: Because the version I sent out yesterday as well and I noted in the email also contains the language in relation to the Board vote issue and like, you know, the Board may act, and also the proposed transition language.

So maybe that's something we can, you know, go to after, you know, going through two issues. I didn't call them out here but I did do it in the email so those were new items that were added, you know, that differ from the previous version of the report.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so let's do the 22 and 30 and then we'll go back to those.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: To that area, so in 22 which is on Page - why is this slowing down here? Okay, clarification of in scope. That is Page 16 and it talks about, "This recommendation originally said that this information would be required and the request for an issue report which is no longer consistent with the Recommendation 4, so the suggestion being changed to this information should be included in a request for an issue report."

And it says, "Also as a point of clarification we would suggest adding a footnote to clarify the Office of General Council will formally opine on the issue of scope as part of the issue report."

Does anybody have any questions or issues with that suggestion or those suggestions? Okay, sounds like good suggestions. Sounds like we'll put that in.

And then Recommendation 30, which actually some of you may have heard when you were coming on, Marika and I were kind of talking about it, which is the implementation, impact and feasibility.

And there seems to be a little bit of a conflict between what's in 30 - Recommendation 30 which is on Page 19 and then Section 5.10 is a PDP manual, the thing that we drafted which is on Page - I don't why Marika, on this Adobe it's actually a different page than in my Word document.

In my Word document it's around Page - it's Page 64. I don't know if it's on the same page on - in this one.

Marika Konings: I think it's 58, the - I think the problem is when you convert to PDF because it sometimes, you know, it leaves it either a strike or out or deleted items to the side and I think that changes the page number.

That's why I've only done the line numbers in the PDF version just to make sure this - it doesn't, you know, people are not looking at different things so...

Jeff Neuman: Got you. Okay so that's actually - it's on Page, you're right, 57. It starts on...

Marika Konings: Right or 58 I think.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, where the actual - where that part is.

Marika Konings: Right.

Jeff Neuman: So it's - and 5.10 talks about the publication of the initial report and it talks - it says that, "The initial report should include the following elements, and the last element is the impact analysis, both positive and negative on all issues related to implementation, including but not limited to economic, competition, operations, privacy and other rights, scalability and feasibility."

That's what we talked about the last time, and I think the only part of it that may be a little bit of a conflict is that it doesn't really provide the flexibility where the previous provision said, "If applicable provide input on issues related to implementation," and then it talks about some of the different kinds.

I think the solution there is to just make it have the same flexibility, so if applicable input on issues related to - sorry. If applicable input related to impact or something like that so it's more flexible, that it doesn't have to be in every single preliminary report where you're really putting it out for comments to find out more from other people as to what they believe the impact will be.

Marika, let me turn it back to you. Is that something that would solve the problem? Is that not clear enough?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I think that would give more flexibility. I still do have a concern if you look at Recommendation 30, because, you know, we talk

about Working Groups should be required to provide input in issues related to implementation on all policy recommendations which, you know, I think it's fine that most Working Groups already do so or I guess an accepted response would be as well if the Working Group says, "Well we don't have any specific input in relation to the implementation."

The concern I have is that the linkage made here between implementation and impact analysis, because if you then move to the next sentence it basically talks about this input could include an analysis of the impacts of the policy, both positive and negative, da, da, da, economic, competition, operations, privacy and other rights.

I mean, that's such a huge area and I'm concerned that if Working Groups are provided with, you know, this is one of the things you have to look at, that it would include a whole can of worms.

I mean, we don't provide a lot of detail on, you know, operations. What kind of operations? You know, scalability. Scalability of what, you know? And as well, you know, the Working Groups might not necessarily have, you know, the expertise to carry out such impact analysis what I think we might be envisioning here.

So I was just wondering looking at this and looking as well at what we have in relation to implementation review teams, but that it would make more sense to put this language, you know, really relating to impact assessment as a task that an implementation review team could undertake as part of the implementation, you know, in close cooperation with ICANN Staff.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I guess one of the concerns I have on that, and this is what we're - started to talk about before, is that by the time it gets to an implementation review team, the policy recommendations are already made and already approved, and I think that's too late.

I think the implementation or impact - I should say impact should be considered even before there are recommendations or at the same time there are recommendations, so you don't get to a point where the community makes a recommendation and then only finds out later when dealing with ICANN Staff and others that it's not feasible or it's got too big of an impact.

I think that will frustrate to no end those that volunteer their time to the policy process, and I think that that's - I do believe that the - that that stuff should be looked at while the recommendations are being developed.

It doesn't have to be comprehensive. It doesn't have to be like this is the only impacts. This is it. This is the be all end all of impact analysis, and it doesn't even have to be full.

But if you're making your recommendation that people on the team know or comes out through public comment that people know will have a significant issue on - to the Contracted Party as an example, then it's going to impact or have such a huge cost. That should come out before the policy recommendation.

Marika Konings: Right but - this is Marika. Isn't that part of the Working Group deliberations, because I think, you know, any Working Group that comes to consensus recommendations only makes those recommendations because if things, you know, it's in the best interest?

It, you know, doesn't have any negative impact. It only has positive impacts and that's based partly as well on the feedback they receive through public comment, but as well the feedback that Working Group members give as part of the deliberations.

I mean, having seen Working Groups, you know, developing recommendations in the different initiatives that are going on, people say,

"Well this doesn't work. This is just not implementable and, you know, this would be a huge cost or this would be more effective."

So I think that it's part of the discussions but I think that the difficulty is by calling it out as a separate kind of analysis, basically asking the same group that is recommending these things because they think this is the best thing, to also do an impact analysis.

I don't really see how that is feasible and I gave the example to Jeff before. I don't know if I would go now to the IRGP Working Group or the PEDNR Working Group and tell them, "Well now you finalized your recommendation. Now you need to go and do an impact assessment that looks at economic, competition, operations, privacy and other rights, scalability and feasibility and, you know, tell us what you think the impact of your recommendations will be."

I think most people would immediately resign and say, "Look, we have the recommendations and we think this is the best thing. This is the kind of work that takes on a, you know, huge life of its own and requires a lot of time to test."

Jeff Neuman: Okay, let me go to Margie and then Alan.

Margie Milam: Hi, it's Margie. Marika actually covered a lot of what I was going to say, but I guess, you know, I hear you Jeff and I do think there's a need for some of this.

Maybe it's more in a different approach as to making it, you know, a requirement in the report for example to just, you know, have it be a call for impact analysis during the Working Group deliberations.

In other words kind of specify what Marika's talking about what already happens, but not have it be some, you know, fixed section that makes it

sound like it's, you know, it's more than what we maybe are intending here, because I think if you have it for example in the guidelines, you know, to make sure to solicit from the, you know, expected stakeholders, how they would be affected by this.

You know, that could be a informal call that takes place when the recommendations are starting to get, you know, concrete if you will and then, you know, and then that way at least everyone's reminded that this is going to be needed to be looked at.

Jeff Neuman: Okay Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I'm - Marika mentioned PEDNR, which we're just in the process of closing down now or finalizing and if the Work Group is moderately well balanced, all of the issues have been considered but they've been considered to the best ability of the people in the Working Group.

And that's a far different cry from asking them to document and develop formal assessments to be published in the report of those impacts. And - which I think is at some level would be nice but I think highly impractical for a whole bunch of reasons.

You can't do it early in the process. You know, assuming the PDP has enough contention between the various people in it, that people are not going to, you know, volunteer to say there's no problem in this, you know, because they're against it and they're fighting, you know, fighting to not have it.

On the other hand once it's finally agreed to, you know, the fact that it is agreed to means the participants have decided it is acceptable or they'd be filing a minority report.

So I think to some extent we're going to have to believe that if the Work Group is working conscientiously and was composed reasonably, that these

kind of things are considered and calling them - calling for them to all be in the final report in detail I think is asking close to the impossible.

Jeff Neuman: I'm playing the devil's advocate here. If you look at the current Bylaws the tasks - all the reports, now they're called task force report or initial report, all of them are required to have an analysis of how - this is what it currently says, an analysis of how the issue would affect each constituency or Stakeholder Group of the task force including any financial impact on the constituency or Stakeholder Group.

That's where we started from and so what we discussed throughout the two years or wherever - however long it took to get here, we broadened that to include an analysis of other types of impacts, not just on Stakeholder Groups and that's why we are here.

I will tell you from a, you know, take off my Chair hat. Since I'm the only registered rep on the call, I will tell you that that - this is very critical to Registries, probably Registrars. I'll let Paul speak out but to make sure that this type - that before recommendations are solidified and voted on by the GNSO Council, that there is consideration of all the impacts on these - of these recommendations and so that is kind of critical.

I know you're saying it's - to call it out in a separate report may be more work, maybe cause people to get frustrated, but if it's being considered all along then that seems to me that that could just be documented and put into the report. It doesn't need to be a formal call for Statements of Impact.

Alan Greenberg: So a follow up - are you saying that simply a statement saying all these things were considered and we believe the impacts are all reasonable is acceptable, because anything more than that you're saying the current Bylaws require it, and I don't really recall that kind of detailed formal analysis or even informal analysis in the actual PDP reports that I recall?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so maybe - hold on.

Marika Konings: Maybe as well what is that information to be provided by Stakeholder Groups and constituencies, because I don't know how the Working Group could assess that?

It sounds more that as part of Stakeholder Group and constituency statements they would say, "Look, we think this has this impact or that has that impact."

Jeff Neuman: Okay so usually I will say the Working Groups are comprised of the Stakeholder Groups and most of them, you know, are able to put that in. Again I think the problem may be with the word analysis, because from what I'm taking from this conversation and Marika you're taking - you're thinking and even Alan to an extent of a full-blown expert analysis on these issues.

I think the point was to make sure that the report documented not only that it was reasonable, but then documented here's how this group - here's what these people or a certain group said - here's what they said the impact would be on them.

Here's what they would have to do to implement some of these recommendations. Here's, you know, Non-Commercial users claim that these recommendations may have an impact on privacy rights, but here's how we've tried to address that. You know, so let me go to Paul and then to Alan. Sorry, Paul.

Paul Diaz: Thanks Jeff. I hear what everybody's saying. I think I largely agree with Alan in this one and use PEDNR is a good example where in this particular Working Group, you have a lot of representation from particular interests.

And granted we're not a monolith the Registrars are hinting at but, you know, I think it may be problematic to get a reasonably fair assessment from within the group.

And therefore I'm kind of leaning towards that. I like what Marika suggested that the requirements be put as part of one of the issues for public comment, because that will give the stakeholders, those who are very motivated and already part of the Working Group opportunity and also gives a broader community opportunity.

And to use PEDNR again like the IPC, they're always very good about providing comments but they don't necessarily have somebody regularly within the Working Group.

And so I think that, you know, we might have a good solution here that yes, Contracted Parties in particular are looking for these sort of assessments or whatever word we want to use if analysis is not the right one, but requiring it within the functioning of the Working Group proper may be too narrow.

Maybe it's better to try and - or to make this requirement as part of the public comment period on the initial report, that way you, you know, basically everybody gets their bite at the apple but we're not unnecessarily limiting the opportunity for people to weigh in.

Jeff Neuman: Okay Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I guess I agree. I mean, again thinking of PEDNR because it's the one that we're focusing on right now, you know, we came out with a planned or proposed final or draft final report.

There were no, you know, ultimately there were no negative comments from the Registrars saying, "This is too expensive to implement." There were no comments made by people on the Working Group.

Does - isn't that as good an analysis as you're going to get from Registrars who are the ones impacted in this particular case, that they believe it is implementable from their perspective, whether it's from a cost issue or a technology issue or something like that?

I mean, it's - in the absence of negative comments they are acquiescing. The Registries in this particular case made one comment that has some financial implications and, you know, the group will look at it or is looking at it, which I just remembered we didn't by the way.

You know, so I - I'm not sure what words we need but I don't think we're going to get a lot more work out than we're doing right now. So the question is how do we put that into a requirement? Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes hi. First of all sorry I was late. I was caught in another emergency elsewhere. I think I'm going to end up disagreeing - hardly surprising I guess.

I actually think it is the responsibility of the Working Group to see to it that it is done. Now if you are getting adequate analysis from all of your constituencies and Stakeholder Groups, well and good.

But to just assume that either they weren't professional enough to see the problem, they didn't do an analysis, they were busy this month, they were lazy this month, they had bad leadership this month, whatever, and therefore they did not get around to doing it does not release the Working Group and the policy development process from the requirement that this analysis needs to be done in order for there to be adequate policy.

So certainly the Working Group can look at it and say, "Yes we are getting the comments," and that's good and that does seem to cover the analysis. But they're the ones that are responsible for making sure that it was there.

And if it didn't come in from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Groups because they were too busy, you know, fighting fires in another corner and they didn't pick up on the importance of this one in the appropriate 30 day time spot or even participate in the group, does not mean that those issues don't need to be covered.

And so that's why I think it has to remain the Working Group's ultimate responsibility even if the constituency comments and Stakeholder Group comments are a way of helping get it done. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Avri. So part of my - and I'm sort of leaning towards - with Avri on this one simply because I don't see anywhere else that it says in the manual that impact - issues or impacts should even be discussed.

And I guess, you know, part of my issue is if you take it out of a requirement of the preliminary report, I know everyone's saying, "Well normally these issues are discussed, you know, so, you know, the current practice is to discuss those issues."

I'm worried if you take it out of a requirement of the issues report it may be forgotten. So whether it's called out in a completely separate section or whether it is - of the preliminary report or whether it's talked about as this needs to go on in the deliberations of the group, my personal belief and this is personal belief, is that it should be addressed and called out separately, again not necessarily as a separate section of the report but somewhere in the PDP manual it should talk about the fact that these issues, the impact on all of these types of things should be discussed by the Working Group.

And Marika if you can find that elsewhere in this, then maybe my concern's not really a concern.

Marika Konings: So are you asking me - this is Marika. Are you asking me if there's - somewhere else talk about assessment?

Jeff Neuman: Is there somewhere else in the report that talks about in - on our final report that talks about a Working Group should consider these issues?

Marika Konings: I'll need to check. But my question would be and it's more and more to Avri, because if the people that are affected or impacted don't raise the issue, how should the Working Group know?

What kind of research would they need to undertake if those that are - have a stake and are directly affected don't speak up? I mean, I'm still struggling with the fact that a Working Group would basically need to hire, you know, an external agency to carry out such an impact assessment on issues that they might have no expertise in whatsoever.

And if, you know, no one is speaking up I don't still see how a Working Group - you can expect that from a Working Group to look at those issues, because I think as Paul and Alan already alluded to, you know, a Working Group as part of the public comments, that's where people raise issues saying, "Hey, we don't think this is implementable or this will have a huge impact on, you know, our bottom line or affect these and these groups if you go down that route."

And that's I think how Working Groups typically operate and say, "Okay, this is how we think of all the facts," and of course when they discuss recommendations you have common sense as well in saying, "Well, if we go down that route even though this, you know, group is not participating here this is how they might be affected."

And that's maybe not how we want - intend this recommendation to work. So I'm still not seeing how a Working Group in the current way we operate, you know, we have volunteers that all have different expertise, but we already struggle to actually get to a report within, you know, a two year timeframe, to add on top of that a separate analysis of, you know, all kinds of possible impacts that, you know, not even come from comments received but that the Working Group just, you know, just should know about. I still don't see it.

Avri Doria: Okay I have an answer but I'll wait in the queue.

Jeff Neuman: Okay let me go to Alan and then back to Avri.

Alan Greenberg: You know, Jeff you said you agree with Avri but then you went on to say, "These are things the Work Group must consider." And I have no problem with that.

There's a big difference between considering and even documenting the fact that we considered it and we do not believe there are negative impacts in XXX areas to an analysis in the report that confirms that and documents the thought processes and what - and how that result came out.

There's a big, big difference between the two so I don't think you were agreeing with Avri. I think we're talking about two different things here.

Jeff Neuman: Well I, you know, I guess I was partially agreeing with Avri in the sense that - and maybe the issue is the word analysis. Maybe that conjures up images in people's minds that are different depending on the person that's thinking about it. So let me go to Avri and then I'll chime in as well. Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay yes, I think the answer - and first of all I do understand why people wouldn't want to see Jeff and I agreeing too much. And thank you Alan. What - I see it as a two part.

First of all remember within a Working - within the construction of a PDP Working Group there is a requirement to do outreach to make sure you've got certain kinds of issues covered, so that's one part of a Working Group having an obligation to do something is making sure that they go out and find the expertise they need to do it.

And you're right, sometimes it may actually be, you know, going out and getting something external and that was always a considered part, and that's why PDPs did occasionally have financial constraints or financial requirements attached to them because there was a need for expertise that didn't exist.

And now I'm going to go to sort of an example of how it gets forced into being done on such a group. It - and I apologize. I'm going to use an example from the IATF and I know people say there's a great difference between, you know, development of policy and development of protocols, though I admit to seeing less than most people see, is that when they decided that every protocol needed to consider security as an aspect, it became a required section in the document.

So - and very often I think what Alan suggested is true. We would - in the old days, right, security consideration - none. This protocol has no security, and we also had one of those sciatic considerations and one of those for management considerations and read/write - none, none, none.

And then the people that read these reports that were doing the community comment would go, "None? What do you mean? It's got this, this, this and this?"

So making these impact studies, these impact analyses and I think analysis is the right word. You know, analysis can be a page long or it can be 300 pages long.

An analysis means you look at it critically and you look at it, "How does it affect X, Y and Z?" So it goes in and you're right, we do need to learn to do things better than we're doing them now.

And so this forces those of us in Working Groups to know that we've got this section to fill, to be aware of it, to think of it and then to do it and to have it be acceptable as the Working Group sees no impact in this area.

Fine. Make that statement and if it comes back with, "Yes, you're right. There is no impact," well then fine. It's dealt with, so I actually think it is doable.

It is doable by volunteers. I have seen volunteer Working Groups learn to do new things that at first they said, "Oh my God. What do we know about security?"

And then all of a sudden we turned around and said, "Well we got to make sure we have at least one security dude in this Working Group, again all volunteer labor." So I really do think it's doable. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thank you Avri. So we need to come to a - Alan are you back in the queue? Sorry, I wasn't looking to see.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I just wanted to say again I find what Avri said at the end quite fine. To put an affirmation in the report that we do not see any security holes or any other financial holes or whatever, I have no problem with.

You know, and as she pointed out if there are problems the security people reading the report and commenting on it will comment. If they don't then my God, everyone dropped the ball and there's not much we can do about that.

So I have no problem saying that we have considered all of those actions to the extent possible or the practical based on the composition of the Working Group.

I have no problem with that. That's different than publishing the analysis and the kinds of things that we were talking about earlier in this conversation.

Jeff Neuman: Okay Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I'm wondering as well, like listening to the conversation, if indeed a more effective way to get Working Groups actually focusing on this issue, because I think otherwise indeed it will just be an afterthought and people saying, "Oh yes, yes, we considered it," is indeed requiring that as part of the initial report, a specific question is part of the public comment forum that asks for input on, you know, all the issues listed here, the impact that this could have on these different elements.

And then indeed require - and that could be others, Stakeholder Groups, constituencies, it goes out to all the different parts in ICANN and indeed if they're big issues those will comment through there and it forces the Working Group in that manner to look at those issues as a required element as the public comment period.

And then, you know, of course if no one raised any issues, well I think the Working Group assumes then, you know, having had that discussions and having had that deliberations that they probably struck the right note and no major issues are foreseen.

So I don't really see it as what more you can ask from Working Groups in the fashion we're currently operating, and I'm wondering if that might be a way of forcing Working Groups to take it into consideration as a required element of the public comment period and focusing then on those comments that specifically address those issue that relate to impact, so that they are considered and addressed in an appropriate manner.

Jeff Neuman: And then reflecting those in the final report.

Marika Konings: Yes because it's part of the requirement to address public comments and provide a response, so it would be automatically covered by what we have in there that, you know, we use public comment review tools where for each comment the Working Group basically says, "Well, you know, either we don't agree or we agree and this is how we've addressed it in the report or in the recommendation."

So - and that way it would be automatically covered by that other requirement that we have that working groups are you know, responsible for reviewing comments and providing responses on what has been said and how they have addressed those.

Jeff Neuman: So Avri did a quick X and is in the queue. Avri, if you could say what it is about that proposal you find problematic, and then maybe if you could suggest a then maybe if you could suggest a way to fix it in your mind that maybe work - that may work for the rest of the group? So Avri?

You may be on mute Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. There's two parts. One of them is first of all with Alan's statement that you only put we thought about it or we didn't think about it in a statement and don't have to include analysis. I think it's better if there is an analysis even if it's only an initial analysis.

And to Marika's point, I think I agree with half of it. I think that the working group should be under an obligation to do an initial analysis, to look at it, and to try and actually think about it before they say we see no problem or we see no issue here. And for them, at least to say we see a possible issue here in the financial aspects .1.2, in the privacy aspect .1.2. In the - you know expense, et cetera, so that they do take a stab at doing it.

That - true - if they're minds are completely blank, then it is okay to say we can't think of anything. But to say they have no obligation to spend time thinking about and it's just a standard form question to the constituencies and stakeholder groups, I think is an abdication of the working group's responsibility. So that's why I was disagreeing.

And so, I don't see a problem to say every document must have the sections on impact covering - you know, and then a statement that we have (internally) as a following, or including you know, but limited to the following.

And that working groups should be expected to make best effort at the time of initial at putting something those. And if they fail, certainly there's no shame in saying we couldn't think of any, but you have to abort that at first. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: What Avri was saying, that - it makes me think about what's required in the (RSEP) process for a registry to submit a proposal. There are a bunch of form questions that we are required to answer or at least try to answer or take an initial stab at it, which is you know, what do we see at the impact? As a registry, what do we see the impact would be to registrars? What do we see the impact to intellectual property rights and other rights? And so, we're required to answer that in our (RSEP) request.

So kind of similar in that way, we may not know or we may be just taking a guess - we're not required to go out there and do a full analysis in order to answer that question. But, it's still something that people want to see when that actually goes out for public comment.

So what Avri is saying is not totally - is not inconsistent with what's required of registries that make a proposal. So Alan, what would be the - and then you're up next. What would be the issue of just having these in the initial report? The working group taking a stab at that kind of thing.

Alan Greenberg: I have no problem if what we're saying is - if we're allowing you know, a comment saying we do not see any problem or any problem that is you know, not justified by the benefits. I have no problem with that at all.

And as I just said in the chat, in my mind if a working group reports that they don't see a problem; that is not a replacement for having thought about it. That's a confirmation that they thought about it. If they didn't do it diligently, there's nothing we can do about that. But the - my expectation is that if they write, they actually had a conversation about it or put out a call on questions for it or something.

It's not the replacement for doing the analysis, so I don't invalidate it. You know, we're not saying you must spend N hours on this analysis or it's not considered valid. So I have no problem asking the question, and if they come up with an answer, they do.

And like - you know, the - (RSEP) may not be a fair comparison, because that is very much the registry's perspective of the impact on consumers or the impact on registrars, which may be done diligently, but may be done blindly. The working group is supposed to have input on - hopefully on - from more constituencies and communities than that.

So, I'm happy saying put the - put a requirement in that they make as statement on it. I don't want to define the detail to which they must do the analysis, however. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: So the detail that they must do - okay. I mean, I think Avri agrees with that, so it sounds like we kind of have agreement.

Marika, were you able to kind of follow that?

Marika Konings: Yes it was, but my question is so how do we rephrase that then in Recommendation 30 and you know, possibly other parts of the document?

Jeff Neuman: So I think Recommendation 30 - do you know what page was that on again?

Marika Konings: That's Page 19.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. (Unintelligible)...

Alan Greenberg: Replace an analysis by statements.

Jeff Neuman: Well, this is actually - so this is not talking - Recommendation 30 is not necessarily talking about the preliminary report is it? Or, is it talking about in general?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. We don't specify it here, but it's translated in the initial report and should be part of that as well.

Jeff Neuman: Right. So let's handle that separately. I think Recommendation 30 as is, I don't see an issue with that. It says that they're required to provide input on issues related to implementation on all policy recommendations. This input could include an analysis of the impacts on blah-blah-blah, and it goes on. So it's got could and - but we are correct that somewhere throughout the process from beginning to the final report, they're required to provide (input).

Okay, Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes. On Recommendation 30 at Line 552, where you say further guidance to the issue; perhaps you stick in a sentence that says that all reports will - should include -- you know, however you want to put it -- must include a section on impact analysis starting with the initial report. And then if you reflect that statement in a couple other places where it may be applicable, I think you've got it.

I think what we're saying is the forcing function on doing this is including a required section on impact analysis, or whatever we want to call it, impacted feasibility. You know, so that basically all documents starting with the initial report must include a section you know discussing implementation impact and feasibility, and - as explained in this recommendation.

And if you've got that sentence there, what you're saying is - and then the guideline - and then further guidance on this issue will be in the PDP manual. Then the PDP manual comes at a place where we get into all these details about you know, how you do that. And at the time of the initial report, you know, you may have only a partial analysis and then you add to it, et cetera, so there can be more guidance. But, I think that kind of sentence might there just solve it. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I still have a concern I think I shared it with Alan on the term analysis, because I think that does give working groups the feeling that they need to carry out a very extensive analysis. Is it indeed you want a statement that they say, "Well, yes. We've considered the impact and we think its fine." I don't see an issue.

And you know, I think to be honest, that's going - the statement you're going to get because that's where you already you know discussed. I think there are other ways in which working groups consider the impact and - you know, if - I don't think they're going to say, "Well, the impact will be that everyone loses. It will be really bad for everyone, but we're still putting forward these recommendations."

I think if the working group identifies issues, they'll address them. And you know, they'll only put forward what they think and they can reach a consensus on that is the best thing that they can achieve for all stakeholders involved.

So, I still have a concern. I don't have an - you know, an issue of adding that sentence, but I would still encourage that change to statement instead of analysis, because I think we're giving working groups a different impression of what they're tasked with.

And then again, you know there's still - I don't know if we can provide more details because it's still very vague where we're saying operations. You know, (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Hold on Marika. Let's take one issue at a time if we can. Let's start with the issue of the word analysis and then I'll come back to you on the other stuff.

A question I have for you is I don't think any of us are - or I should say I don't Avri and I are envisioning a - just a statement yes or no. Perhaps, you could change the word analysis to a discussion of the impacts? Because, I - and I don't see impact being - I heard your statement of why people wouldn't make the recommendations if they thought there was a big impact.

Or, the point we're making, I don't think impacts are black and white in the sense of - you know, there may be an impact of - or there may be a statement - you know, I'm thinking of domain tasting, right. The recommendations of domain tasting essentially were to try to eliminate domain tasting, right? And, there were certain recommendations that were in there.

But there could be different ways to implement things that have different types of impacts. So a statement from a group could be we believe these recommendations can be implemented in such a manner as to reduce the potential impact on - potential financial impact on registries. Here are some ways that we think they can do that; 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. It doesn't have to be - or it

shouldn't be just a statement like Alan was saying of, "Well, we think the impacts are outweighed by the benefits."

I mean, I think...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: But I think what you're saying, that makes absolute sense, and I think that's what working groups do consider. It's sort like saying like if you implemented - you know, take into account that this is a way. But as I read this, it's that a working group should say if you impacted - if you implement it in this way, these groups will be effected for these and these reasons. This will be the financial cost to X, Y, and Z. That's how I read analysis and this is how I understand Avri talking about it.

I see you talking about a different way, which I think fits what most working groups do. If they consider implementation, they talk about a need. Re receive the comment where someone in the working group says, "Well, if it's done in this way, there's potential you know, financial implications." So maybe as part of the implementation notes, we say you know, staff take this into consideration when you do it, because we don't want X, Y, Z to happen.

So, I still think we're talking about you know, two different things.

Jeff Neuman: Right. But it's not like - well, two things on that. One - and then I'll go Avri and Alan. It's not only staff that does implementation, right? So it's not staff, take this into consideration. It's community - when you - if it's (unintelligible) for the community, it (unintelligible) - community, you take into consideration these things in the implementation. That's number one.

But two is - so I don't think it should say statement. If people have a problem with analysis because they conjure up images of full-blown, hiring a consultant to do a competition analysis. If just changing the word analysis - I

don't like statement because I think that's just too black or white. We considered it; yes or no. I think it should be a discussion of the impact to the extent that they know it or it's available or feasible you know, to their best ability; whatever it is. But, I think it should be something more like a discussion.

But let me go to Avri and then Alan.

Avri Doria: Yes. Two things again. I seem to be saying two things at the beginning of every discussion this time.

One, we already have discussed the fact that there's going to be both positive and negative components on that in this statement, so I don't think the issue of you know, getting the sort of reductio ad absurdum examples. That we're going to get a statement that says this is good in all cases; this is bad in all cases is really a viable example, because we have to set the positive and negatives.

I do understand the issue that perhaps some people have baggage with the word analysis, and perhaps analysis has in some environments become a - you know, it's almost like asking does it scale? It's an impossible question to answer. "Have you done an analysis," has become such an overloaded word with what people mean by that, that the word is problematic.

And so going back to what an analysis is, which is a process of you know studying, examining, discussing. So - and since a statement is what we're requiring, so perhaps a - something that says a statement of the examination and discussions done on the impacts outlined in this section and what the current understanding is from those discussions.

So take the word analysis, open it up and making something that basically doesn't carry the sort of unexpected baggage that perhaps analysis is getting as a term of art within ICANN. Thanks.

- Jeff Neuman: But can you repeat - for this, input could include a statement on the discussion...
- Avri Doria: Not could include, but should or must include a statement on the examination and discussion of impacts as outlined in this recommendation. And you know, a - what was the last part I had? A statement on the - I think it's actually probably if you put a period there. A statement on the examination and discussion of the impacts as outlined in this recommendation must include...

And then, that statement could be, as Alan said, "We talked about it for while and we really couldn't see anything." You know, it becomes a fine thing. Or, "We talked about it for awhile and we saw the following things that need to be looked at further. So if it's an initial report, you're saying, "You know, we sat around, chewed the fat and said, you know it might do this, might do that, might do the other thing. This needs further study later in the report."

Or, you may be further along and say, "This is a good thing, except perhaps for this one you know, deleterious aspect that needs to be coped with." Whatever came out of a discussion, as I said. And Alan's suggestion that it could be, "Yes. We talked about and hit our heads against the wall and nada." Thanks.

- Jeff Neuman: Okay. Before I go to Alan, Marika do you - did you get that - those changes?
- Marika Konings: Yes, I did get them, but it would take us away from what we currently have if we were going - because now we're saying could, which I think leaves the working group the option of indeed exploring a different element and see what is - you know, relates specifically to the issues they are discussing to going to a must or should, which I think (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Well, then - but (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Now the must is for the statement not what has to be inside the statement.

Marika Konings: Oh, okay.

Jeff Neuman: Correct.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Correct.

Okay, so let me then go to Alan. What do you think of those changes recommended by Avri?

Alan Greenberg: I have two comments. Let me make the comments first and then I'll try to answer that.

I think it's - I'm not sure. I need to see it in writing right now. I'm losing track of where we are.

The two comments I was going to make is a few weeks ago, I - in the middle of a discussion on impacts, I said there's a negative connotation to the word impact, and several people came back and said, "No. No. It could be positive or negative." Our whole discussion here is been focusing on impacts as negatives. So, I just note that.

The other thing, let's talk about domain tasting. Would we have wanted to for a whole host of reasons put in the report -- and Jeff, you were one of the leaders on that -- impact? We expect this to destroy the business model and put several of our registrars out of business (unintelligible), and hope it will

put it out of business. I'm not sure ICANN would publish a report that said that, even though that was the implied intent; we were trying to destroy a business model of people making obscene profits from using this loophole.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Would we really want it - would we have put that in a report?

Jeff Neuman: No. But the way it would change on the report would be...

Alan Greenberg: But that's what we're saying they must've done now.

Jeff Neuman: No. No. No. The report would be - the report would say, and it did say that we believe that by implementing this, that it will significantly cut down if not eliminate domain name tasting. And then we if fact (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: But, we would be required to put the impact on the community that was using that loophole.

Jeff Neuman: No. No. No. I don't see that. Whether we have to make judgments of whether it's going to put someone out of business or not, right, because it's...

Alan Greenberg: Financial impact on the community. Isn't that exactly what we're asking for?

Marika Konings: I think Alan has a very valid point.

Alan Greenberg: Isn't that what we're asking for?

Jeff Neuman: I don't see it that way, because it's how you word things. I mean, it's not - you know, whether someone's - if - you're basically talking about the impact. Will it raise costs for certain - or a positive or a negative? All right, the positives

would be what it was and what it turned out to be. And the negatives - you know, yes it would eliminate a potential business model, but I guess it's the way you put it Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Well...

Jeff Neuman: You put it a lot different way. The impact would be yes - anyone relying solely on that business model would no longer be able to rely solely on that business model. You wouldn't say it would put them out of business. That may be the reality, and if that's what comes out in their comments, then you'd have to say it anyway. But yes, that's fine.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I thought I'd raise the issue.

Whether what we have now is - I'd like to see a statement be something - you know, what the statements are we're talking about, because I'm getting a little bit lost in the discussion.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I think that's right. So we'll need to send (unintelligible). But I also want everyone to think about as well, that you know we had some stuff in - goes back to the recommendations we did last time, and it was Recommendation 4, and we were basically making - and these were concerns that James had brought up. We were making him comfortable that impacts would be considered.

And, I'm just worried that we're eliminating - if we were to go with something like Avri says, I'm worried about eliminating impacts from issue reports, from preliminary reports, final reports, and then that ultimately we'll be eliminating it completely from everything. That's my concern.

You know, we basically talked James off the ledge last - you know, the last couple of weeks saying, "Don't worry. This stuff is going to be considered." You know, so I just want to make sure that the group actually addresses it.

In fact in the issue reports, you could look back at Recommendation 4 - it says that it recommends that a request ratio for a template should be developed, including items such as - and one of them is economic impact, effects on competition, consumer trust and privacy, and other rights, and rationale for policy development. We came to that conclusion last time that if it's in the issue report, one of things I'm saying is that the group should be required to consider all of that - those issues that are in the issue report and (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yes. Just one correction. That's not in the issue report. That is in the request for an issue report. So someone who requests an issue report might provide that information.

Jeff Neuman: Right. Okay. And so what's in the issue report then? Will we talk about that?

Marika Konings: If it's applicable and information is provided, it probably will. But I don't think in the issue report we've called out those specific items. I think we talked there more in general terms.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Well presumably, things that are in a request for an issue report will be put into the issue report itself and should be addressed.

Marika Konings: Right. Of course. If information is provided, you know evidence of the economic impact of course we would include that. I don't think there's any question of that. I think it's more a question that if no information is provided and no information is available, I don't think it's realistic to expect that it will be included in the issue report.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. That's fine. I - the ultimate point is that we need to have it somewhere reflected in the PDP manual that this stuff will be discussed and addressed

and then documented, right? Everything that's discussed and addressed should be documented in the report as a general kind of statement.

So I want to go back to what Avri's restatement was, which is you know, a statement on - and I was going to ask the question of Avri and she can answer it, as to why we would need both words examination and discussion? I was just trying to cut down words here. And so whether there is a significant enough difference Avri that we have to have both terms in there.

Avri Doria: Yes. I think it helps. I think just getting a bunch of people together to discuss something - you know, you may need to examine it a little further. You may need to have a particular group of two, three people go out and do a thing.

I think working groups are supposed to examine issues and discuss them, and come to - you know, come to consensus if at all possible. So, I think there's always three parts. You don't just discuss; you examine, you discuss, and then you come to some sort of consensus process.

So, I tend to think that it's useful to have both words. If you cut it down to just discussion, you know then is it an informed discussion or is it just a discussion around at the bar? So, I think examined or informed or something is helpful.

I wanted to get to - and the reason I had my hand up was sort of Alan's - you know again, there's a sort of reductio ad absurdum point of yes, anything can knock down by that kind of argument. I've got an article somewhere that shows how you can kill any proposal with an ad absurdum argument.

On the other hand, I'd look at that absurdum and say while you would have to say it diplomatically, I think the transparency of the situation requires that if the impact is that -- as Jeff was saying -- it cuts out that particular revenue making opportunity, that's fine.

But you then get in - and if you're dumb enough to have that as your only revenue making opportunity, then it may put you out of business. I don't know that you need to go there.

But certainly, the transparency about what it would do to something like that, I think has to be in a policy, and I think that's - the real important thing about these impact statements is that they are a response to the requirement for you know, ultra transparency in what we're doing and the implications.

Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: I'm trying to type this out and I just realized I just did the wrong thing, so I'm going to try it again. Sorry. I was trying to type this out, but I realized I missed a part on it. So it's...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Not it must include an examination; it must include a statement on...

Avri Doria: But, that's why I was thinking if the statement was just a - (pen) ultimate statement in Recommendation 30, and it wasn't actually a re-edit of up there.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. I would support it more, because here we're saying that basically a working group needs to look at all the issues.

Jeff Neuman: Hold on. No. No. No.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible) not limited.

Jeff Neuman: Hold on. I told you I was wrong.

Marika Konings: Okay. I thought it was on the first. But I still do have a concern about the examination, because I think that still can be interpreted as the same analysis. I don't understand - I mean, I think the working groups are - you know, they're all adults and they know that a discussion in a - having a drink over a bar saying, "Hey, what do you think of the impact? Oh, fine. Yes. Great."

I mean if we have to put in front of everything that it needs to be in a forum discussion or they need to examine the issue, I think we can put that in many more parts of our report here. So you know, I personally - I think discussion should be sufficient.

Jeff Neuman: And so - all right. I'm - I keep trying to rewrite that second sentence, but I'm not sure that second sentence is rewritable with the stored statement in there.

Avri Doria: That's why I thought it was a - as I say, what I had recommended was a (pen) ultimate statement, leaving the top of it alone. We've spent - we've tortured over that and gone over it, and that's why I was suggesting just - there's two parts to this. One is this work has to be done, and then basically a statement must be included in the report starting with the initial.

And as long as you've got that in there, then - you know, and I think examination is important. I think we should say it often. But if everyone hates the word examination because that has baggage, which I do think it did, then fine. Remove it. But, I think it belongs there.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

So Marika has just basically said all reports should contain or include a statement - yes. I think that's fine.

Marika Konings: No. What Avri said before I think was that all reports should include the statement on the discussion of the inputs or impacts as outlined in this

recommendation. So it refers to those elements then, but it doesn't specify that it should cover every single one that is listed there. But they're optional.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So that works.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. And that in my mind, a statement on the discussion does not mean you are recounting the discussion in the report. You are - you may to some extent as necessary, but it doesn't require you to document what the discussion was in that particular section.

Avri Doria: I think if we're assuming they're adults and they're not doing it at the bar, we could also assume that they're not going to put a recording in.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Okay.

Some of my best work has been at a bar by the way.

Jeff Neuman: All right. So then in 5.10, we just need to have that synch with our recommendation. So the last point in Section 5.10 Marika, we could just change to make it consistent.

Marika Konings: Right. I think we can just include a sentence and then basically saying that it should include a statement of the discussion on the impacts which may include you know economic (unintelligible). Something along those lines I think covers then the - you know, that they should - you know, cover impact in their statement and you know, it may relate to these items, or you know whatever else they think is related to the issue.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So now I'm going to throw this out there again. So most of the - I would say the recommendations in this report are - I don't think any of them have substantively changed that much from the previous reports. There've been things that we've reworded to address concerns like this one and others.

What we need to do - our charter requires us to operate by full consensus. And I know Avri you missed the beginning of the call. Our plan is to come out with the final, final report by June 1st - or sorry, Tuesday, May 31st, so that it's available for the GNSO Council call on June 9th.

So, we need to kick this out there - this final report. I think Marika will make the last changes and hopefully be able to send it out today. But we need to have a vote on this, so we need to have everyone say, "Yes. I agree with all these recommendations." And if they don't, they need to specify which ones and then file some sort of statement on it as to why they disagree. They will need to indicate that.

So I'm going to ask everyone to do that by Monday so that we can get this out on Tuesday. I know it's very short timing, but we've had this report for awhile. And I know all of us are anxious to get this done.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible)...

Jeff Neuman: So - yes?

Avri Doria: This vote that you're asking for is an agreement on each and every recommendation, or agreement on the report as written and it does represent the consensus of this group? Or, are you actually asking us to vote on each and every recommendation and what we think about each one and where we may or may not have an issue with it?

Jeff Neuman: I'm asking everyone for the former - the first one.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes. Okay, great. I just wanted to make sure. Because you know, there's lots of things I could argue about all over the place. But what you're asking for, this represents an acceptable consensus for the members of the group.

Jeff Neuman: Correct.

Avri Doria: Okay, great.

Jeff Neuman: Although, Marika's got a statement. Hopefully she won't change that, but Marika?

Marika Konings: No. This is Marika. I just wanted to clarify the process. I need - I can make those changes that we discussed now and basically post a report later today. Will you then send - I can let you know when it's posted on the Wiki. Will you then send out the notice to the whole work team saying you know, you have to speak up or be silent forever by Sunday? Will you send that email?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: I will do that today, or well after you give that.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Then, I'll ask for - you know, we still do (unintelligible), and it's - you know, if people read through it and find grammar, typing, stylistic, verbs don't agree with nouns, whatever it is, as you know, we have some very skilled writers on this - in this group, please get all of those in by Sunday. Monday morning the very, very latest.

And so, I think after that - again, just to remind you, we'll come out with a final report. We will send it to the Council. There'll be a motion on the table for the Council to put it out for public comment. And yes, I know this has been out for God knows how many comments, but it's usually something the Council does before they vote.

And then hopefully, we'll have a - in Singapore, I think this'll be a topic of discussion during the weekend session with the GNSO. Everything's in flux given the Board GAC meeting.

I know there's another meeting that Board members want to do on a - or the team wants to have on a planning session to address developing economies within ICANN, and I may have that not completely accurately stated, but something to that effect, which also conflicts with the GNSO Council meeting. So we're trying to work out all of these conflicts and figure it out. But, the plan is to hopefully go over this report during one of the Council sessions and then everyone should be submitting public comments, and then we should vote.

I'm assuming if the public comment period produces anything substantial, the Council will probably vote to give it back to the working group to finish. But - that's my assumption.

Alan Greenberg: Then I suggest we disband quickly.

Jeff Neuman: Run.

Hey, look. We're getting there. I didn't think we would see this day, but I'm very proud of the work this team has done. Very thankful to Marika for all the writing and help she's provided and Margie and others. So if we could just get outside - or ICANN's General Counsel's office to give us that final piece, we'll...

Marika Konings: That's in there. Jeff, that's what I - the point I made before. The two elements on transition and the Board vote, they're in this version that was circulated yesterday.

Jeff Neuman: Oh, they actually gave their input on it?

Marika Konings: Yes. Yes.

Oh, you mean - well, they have looked at the overall report. So - but they have provided - on those two specific items, they've suggested language and that has been included.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Good. Great. Sorry I missed that.

Okay. Any other questions or comments?

Great. I'm again proud of this team. We're getting there and we're going to come out with our final report and hopefully it's only touch ups after that. So thank you everyone.

Avri Doria: Bye-bye.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks.

Man: Thanks, Jeff.

Avri Doria: Bye.

END