

**ICANN
Transcription
Policy and Implementation Principles Sub Team
Thursday 23 January 2014 at 21:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Policy and Implementation Principles Sub Team call on the Thursday 23 January 2014 at 21:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-policy-implementation-20140123-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Chuck Gomes- RySG
Nic Steinbach- RrSG
Michael Graham – IPC
Alan Greenberg – At-Large
Avri Doria – NCSG
Tom Barrett – RrSG

Apologies:

none

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Mary Wong
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: Thank you. And today's conference is now being recorded.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you (Sara). Welcome to the policy and implementation principles sub-team call on Thursday, January 23, 2014.

On the call today we have Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Chuck Gomes, Nic Steinbach, Tom Barrett and Avri Doria. We have no apologies so far. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong and myself, Julia Charvolen.

Please remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Julia. The - and our plan is to go for 90 minutes, as discussed last time. Appreciate all of you joining. Is there any - it looks like everybody is in Adobe Connect. Is anybody not? Is anybody on the call and not in Adobe Connect? Okay good.

All right, so let's jump right in. Thanks for the input from set several. Cheryl provided some things and Tom Barrett provided a lot. And so we're going to start right off at the overarching principle.

And I'm going to go to Alan first because he was not - he had told us two meetings ago that he wanted to read it and comments. And he is now prepared. So Alan, jump in.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you for highlighting my lack of fulfilling commitments prior to this.

Chuck Gomes: You're welcome.

Alan Greenberg: I have no problem with anything except for that last sentence where it focuses just on the capitalized policy development process as opposed to a more generalized statement.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck. Alan, how would you change that then?

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: No, I would change it to the GNSO policy development - the GNSO policy development processes. And the capitalized policy development process in particular enshrine is what I would say.

Chuck Gomes: So read the sentence to me as you would change it with of the...

Alan Greenberg: GNSO policy development process is lowercase, prior to the capitalized.
Don't erase them. Just put in plain - in front of it, okay. Whoever is doing it is erasing them. Is it Marika that is doing the changes?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, Marika undo what you just did.

Marika Konings: So you don't want a small?

Alan Greenberg: I don't want the small there.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Okay prior to - between GNSO and uppercase policy, put policy development processes, lowercase. And the - and after policy development process, PDP - at PDP in parentheses because I think it's the first time were using it. And I think the S comes off of enshrine.

Chuck Gomes: So that now says the GNSO policy developments processes is lowercase. And the policy development process, uppercase, parenthesis PDP can enshrine this concept of a robust bottom-up consensus field MSM. And to that end, the following principles apply.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I would - yes, I would remove the first the, which I don't think is needed there.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: And I would put and - following and the, I would say and in particular the policy - the capitalized, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Just focusing on the changes suggested by Alan. I'm going to raise another question later. But we'll get to that later on that. So is any - does anybody object to those changes?

Tom Barrett: Hi, this is Tom. I think you need to explain why you're distinguishing between the lower cap and upper cap policy development process. So I assume the upper cap policy development process is defined elsewhere. We should at least reference to that.

Chuck Gomes: It's defined, and this is Chuck, it's defined of course in the definitions from the definitions working group. I don't think it's - we're not trying to state all the definitions from the definitions working group here, although we did up above use the multi-stakeholder definition.

Alan Greenberg: Yes we could reference NXA or the bylaws Tom. And maybe in a footnote if someone feels more comfortable with it.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Thanks Alan. I would think Tom that we could - that the fact that the definitions will be eventually provided with all of this, then I think that it's fair to say that's covered.

But again, if some of you think that we need to specifically call it here or put a footnote here, we can do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here Chuck. Took me too long to try and put my head up in the room. I hope you don't mind.

Chuck Gomes: We're fairly small. So as long as people are comfortable with that, I am.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Terrific. I actually would, even at this stage reference (any of) the bylaws and put - let me try that once more. And then I'll have another sip of coffee. I would like to suggest that we do, in fact, in this text footnote it and reference NXA. Thank you. Boy that was hard to get out.

Chuck Gomes: Any - I don't think anybody would really object to that. So let's do it. So you're talking about the capital PDP, putting a footnote that references NXA of the bylaws?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. And unless - Cheryl here again. Unless (password) is actually (tethered) immediately with that capital, remembering that of course the - NXA does talk about other mechanisms of policy, but yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So the footnote technically would go with both. Okay. Are you okay with that Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes. I am adding it in.

Chuck Gomes: Okay good. Yes thanks. I always want to make sure that I give you an opportunity to do that. Going back, while she's working on that. Going back up to the first paragraph, the word organizational is highlighted in yellow. Is there a reason for that? I don't - I have no idea who did that but.

(Michael): Chuck it's (Michael). As I recall, it is a sign where there was a revision. Originally it had been self-hyphen-governance. And then we changed that to organizational governance to be a bit clearer.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you (Michael). This is Chuck again. Are there - so any objections to removing the yellow highlighting in that case? I'm not seeing any or hearing any. We can just - that's good. Thank you very much Marika. You do a great job with that.

Okay, now let's try, and I don't want to spend too much time in overarching principle again today, except to the extent that some - a couple of people suggested some other overarching principles. As we move down the document, we'll come back to those.

But I had one question. And I'm trying to find out where that is. I'm looking at - okay. The word bottom-up in that sentence that Alan just changed. As I was rereading that today, I realized that down - keeping in mind that the principles that follow cover both implementation and policy.

And, although we may change it, but right now we have a principal down below that says that implementation processes do not have to be bottom-up as long as they're still multi-stakeholder. And we'll get to that later.

But if we continue along that line, I'm wondering whether we should delete bottom-up in that sentence that we just changed. And I - hopefully were able to follow what I was saying on that. Does that make sense to people?

Anybody doesn't think - should we leave bottom-up there because there - we later then go on if we keep it and say that implementation processes don't have to be bottom-up in the same way that policy development process does. So is that okay? Any objections to removing bottom-up there?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I'm not sure I see the need really because we are talking about the policy development processes in this thing, and not to the implementation aspect.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan. This is Chuck. I thought of that. And I get what you're saying there. And I guess in my mind, the policy development processes are going to include the implementation too. But that may be - that may not work to assume that like I did. So anybody else? Tom, go ahead.

Tom Barrett: Yes, I think this sentence refers to the two paragraphs above it, which only mentions MSM. So I would favor removing robust bottom-up consensus built. And just say (we try) this concept of MSM.

And if you want to somehow qualify MSM or explain how it bottom up consensus driven, then that should have been explained earlier.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Tom. How would you react to that Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I can live with that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So we delete bottom-up consensus built. Okay, thanks Marika for doing that. And Tom did you - is your - is that your previous hand or a new hand? Okay.

Tom Barrett: No it's an old hand. But I think we continue to refer to bottom-up elsewhere in this document. So at some point we've got to decide, you know, is that just a throwaway cliché or do you want to take a stab at trying to define what it is.

Chuck Gomes: And I think there are some - this is Chuck. There are some of us that don't think it's a throwaway cliché. But what happened, and I don't know if you had - you had joined late I know on a call yesterday.

But my - and (Michael) you can comment on this. I think the definition sub team is going to consider coming up with a definition for bottom-up. Is that correct (Michael)?

(Michael): Yes. At the end of the discussion yesterday, that was posed as a new term to take a look at. So either the definition group, or if this group wants to send a message to that sub team, that would be fine as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here Chuck. I'm all for that. But I - it just struck me with the work that the definition sub group is doing, we are going to include a glossary with this document, because that would also help in some of this.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I don't know that we have specifically said that. But it certainly make sense to me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well if we haven't said it, can I propose it because that's going to save a whole lot of heartache later?

Chuck Gomes: You may. So it is proposed. And so let's keep track of that. And as (Michael) has said several times online and in our meeting yesterday that, you know, the definitions may involve some over time. But ultimately we'll have a glossary that defines these terms. Thank you Cheryl.

Okay, anything else in the overarching principles, putting aside any suggestions for other overarching principles that are made later? Okay. Let's move on then to the principles that we discussed last time.

And we have there, so you can scroll down to I guess, do we - okay thank you. Okay. So we discussed this last week. And we have some new comments from Tom here. So let me ask Tom to go over his comments on the three bullets that follow this intro sentence of both GNSO policy and processes must be based on the ICANN multi-(staker) model, to ensure that the following principles are proposed.

Tom do you want to - you've got a few comments in that regard. Why don't you just share those with the group? And then we can have a discussion on that.

Tom Barrett: Okay. Well the first principle there I think applies to both policy and implementation. So I thought it would be appropriate to include a principle that was specific to implementation. The second one...

Chuck Gomes: Tom let me stop you there because I don't think the first bullet refers to both. I think it only refers to policy development, not implementation.

Tom Barrett: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And the reason I say that as we go on later in the next bullet and say implementation processes need not function in a bottom up a manner, but and so on. Do you follow me?

Tom Barrett: Yes, so there is an exception here. So that you're saying there could be a policy that's made in an emergency case. Okay, so I get that. So I guess my point was I wanted to see a principle very specific to what implementation should be.

Chuck Gomes: And you suggested that. This is Chuck. You suggested that in your Comment Number 2 there. And it was showing on the screen just a minute ago.

Tom Barrett: That comment really is just from later in the document. So I did not invent that language.

Chuck Gomes: No, I saw that. So this is Chuck again. So Tom, are you suggesting that we move that up as the second bullet here?

Tom Barrett: I am.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Any objections to that? Does everybody fall - there it is on the screen in Adobe again, in that green box to the right there. And it's - Marika is highlighting it. And we'd move that over to a second bullet there. Okay. And it's going to scroll over to the next page. But any objections to that?

And when we get down below we'll take that out down there if it - as need. Okay, Tom go ahead now. Sorry for interrupting you, but I wanted to clarify that as we're doing it. So go ahead and continue.

Tom Barrett: all right, I actually can't read the rest of my comment. Maybe you can scroll down Marika. Right, so I guess my next comment was on the next principle, which begins with implementation processes need not function in a bottom-up manner.

But in all cases a relevant policy development body must be involved during - I'm proposing adding the word during implementation. To confirm that policies are implemented as intended. So my comment is that if we simply say must be involved, you know, that's up to interpretation on whether or not someone has been involved and when.

I have two points. One is I think obviously it should happen during implementation. But I'm also proposing at some point we suggest, and (I repeat) language later in the document that ALAC suggested, which is we have a methodology for how people are involved, i.e. staff is required to report back during very - during interim milestones on the plan for implementation.

Chuck Gomes: Now ques- this is Chuck. And to Marika I'm going to turn it - in fact, let me turn it over to Marika first. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I actually have a comment about the previous templates. So I got my hand up a bit late (unintelligible) comment. That's why am happy to go back to it after you comment this one.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right we'll come back to you. Just leave your hand up there. That's fine. So I got - this is Chuck speaking. Tom, I got the impression that when you start talking about methodologies, we're getting beyond principles. Am I correct there?

Tom Barrett: I believe we are. I think we are. And so that's why it comes up later in the document, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right. So...

Tom Barrett: But I don't want to lose the fact that we should have a principle that then leads us to that - to developing that methodology.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. You want to bring that up later or suggested now?

Tom Barrett: So that's why I just added here is something more than involved. But maybe it's clear that involvement needs to happen during implementation.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So is the during implementation addition, does that cover what you want for now?

Tom Barrett: That's what I'm suggesting. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Any objections to that? Okay then let's back up for Marika now, and go back up to the previous one Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I have a question about the last part of the sentence basically that talks about collaboration between OC and to put policy into effect and those upon whom action depends.

Who is those seeking to put policy into effect? Is that staff that has been tasked to implement customer or are we talking about someone else? Is this the GNSO that has adopted the policy? And that those upon whom action depends, is that basically, you know, contracted parties? I'm just trying to - for me this reads confusing. And I wonder if we can actually clarify or be specific who were talking about?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Let me see if I - I think I see your concern. What if we were to say between those implementing the policy and those upon whom action depends? Is that better? Or does that not cover what your concern is there?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Should it be and those affected by the implementation?

Chuck Gomes: That works for me. Others want to comment on that? This is Chuck again.

Tom Barrett: Well I think there's two parties here. The folks who are we'll call it implementing the policy and those who actually have to fulfill the policy.

Marika Konings: Well but also broader communities that may be impacted.

Chuck Gomes: Tom, was that you speaking?

Tom Barrett: Yes it was. I'm sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That's okay. I'm trying to help where I can. Does affected not cover that? Do you think it needs to be more specific?

Tom Barrett: Will Marika's point is that for example if this was a policy affecting registrants, it's not just an issue between staff and registrants. You're saying that other folks should be involved as well. So I'm comfortable with the current wording.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thank you. Okay, and Marika is your hand still up?

Marika Konings: I'm trying to get it down. But exactly, that was what I...

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'm actually quite happy with it. But already it's an issue that's been raised before. And those affected by implementations may be huge groups of people. And some people read this kind of language to say all of those people must interact. And that's not the case.

So as I said, I'm happy with it. But some people have overreacted and, you know, said that if every user is going to be affected by the policy, then the implementation team must interact with one point or 2.5 billion people. That's not my concern. But people have raised at that who are perhaps more pedantic than I am. That's hard to imagine.

Chuck Gomes: I won't comment on that.

Alan Greenberg: I said about myself. I'm allowed.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Maybe a way of addressing that, because I see where Alan's coming from, maybe would be rewording it. And seen as a process that allows for dialogue and collaboration between those. It basically says like if you want to participate, you can. It doesn't mean that everyone has to participate.

Alan Greenberg: I can live with that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Okay. Any objections to that? All right. Good, good, good edit. Then I'm not seeing any other hands up. Let's scroll down to the next bullet.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. If I can ask for one more clarification on the first edits here at the top, the both. Are we leaving those in or were we taking those out?

Tom Barrett: This is time again. I proposed these changes. I actually - I was just objecting to the use of an ampersand between policy and implementation, as if those were some official phrase.

So I think they are two different processes. I just wanted to make it - make that clear as opposed to one process.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody object to the - I had assumed that we were going to leave those in as is. But we probably should have talked about them specifically. So unless there are any objections, I think it looks fine.

Okay Chuck again, going to the next bullet. And the implementation processes need not function in a bottom-up manner. But in all cases the

relevant policy development body, e.g. probably put a comma after e.g. period.

But the - minor edit. The chartering organization must be involved during implementation to confirm the policies and implementation are implemented as intended. Any - now let me look at the comments. Let me look at my printed copy, which I can read better.

So the comment on that, Tom that was your Comment Number 3. Is that correct?

Tom Barrett: Comment Number 3 is actually - is just saying to Cheryl's alterative text, we should also add (unintelligible) to also say during implementation.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay. So you - your edits covered at your comments. Is that correct?

Tom Barrett: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, anybody else have any comments or an edit or question on that full - the full bullet that's at the top of the screen there under the red? Okay. Yes Cheryl. Oh you agree. Thanks.

Okay, moving to the next bullet, which I think Cheryl you inserted there. So I'll let you talk to it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl, I am on holiday (silly). This is...

Chuck Gomes: I was on holiday on Monday.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: In the leader's meeting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. This is my annual four days (mate). But anyway, well I would have hoped it was fairly self-explanatory. I just thought that it would not be so prescriptive. And the term during implementation I felt was, you know, maybe changing to say that, you know, it shall - it could be interpreted to say it shall be done at all costs. But if I could scroll, which I can't, I can move down in the document.

Chuck Gomes: Let me ask you this Cheryl while we still have that in front of us. This is Chuck. Are you saying that you would rather not have that during implementation added in that - in your comments there, in your edition?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I was proposing my paragraph as an alternative to text to the one above.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, that's helpful.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So the term during implementation, as Tom suggested, goes into my text. And my text replaces the paragraph, the dot point above. So the new dot point would read while implementation processes as such need not all those, blah, blah, blah, including during implementation. To confirm that policies are implemented as intended, okay.

Chuck Gomes: Let me go to Tom and see if you're comfortable with that alternative.

Tom Barrett: Yes, my comment in both. And so I don't have any specific comments. It is more - it was more, you know, I don't know if it's cultural. I mean we don't use the word wilts in the US for example. So I think it has specific meaning perhaps to show that I'm not quite clear on it.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I was going to be a smart aleck and say what is that word. But I decided to be more cultural.

Alan Greenberg: Read it as while.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Listen (you lump). Stop picking on the (LD) all right?

Chuck Gomes: No Tom, Chuck again. Back to you. Forget that word. And I think we need to accept words that are difference and different variations of English. I am okay with that. But are you okay with substituting Cheryl's sentence there with the during implementation added instead of the previous bullet because they do duplicate?

Tom Barrett: You know, again the previous bullet wasn't my contribution. I only contributed two words.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I picked on you inadvertently. Is there anybody that objects to Cheryl's substitution?

Tom Barrett: It would help me certainly to understand the difference between the two with these extra words.

Chuck Gomes: To you Cheryl on holiday.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: More than on holiday, Cheryl for the record. I've got a mouthful of prosciutto is well. Come on guys. Okay, at the risk of me chewing my prosciutto at the same time is answering you Tom, I just thought it was a little more open and soft. And didn't indicate to a reader who may not be as experienced in these issues that it is a mandatory and a - has happened at all times and will happen at all times.

I didn't want to open a loophole that would have someone say oh, but that implementation did not do that. And therefore, it is invalidated, okay.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Cheryl. Does it make sense Tom?

Tom Barrett: Sure, yes. As long as everyone else's comfortable.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So you can - Marika you can delete that previous bullet. And I see Alan's hand up.

Alan Greenberg: Again, I could easily live with it. I don't think however, it does what Cheryl just described because it says must be involved. And therefore, if they weren't involved there is no - it could be considered invalid.

If that's really a concern then I think it needs to be - they must be able to be involved or must have the option of being involved. But as I said, I can live with it. But I - because I can't see somebody raising those issues.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here Chuck. I'm happy with that because remember, we've only just had that conversation which raised those points. So, you know, I'm good. But I can actually foresee potential for future conversations and to get them into my alternatives.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thank you. Okay, going to the next bullet. In cases where new or additional policy issues are introduced during an implementation process, these issues should be referred to the relevant policy development body, e.g. the charter organization prior to the completion of the implementation process. And that addition was - hold on a second. Let me - that was - okay.

Tom Barrett: It's Tom again. I think I did this Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think that may potentially be problematic in cases where new policy issues are found. And it's decided that a new PDP needs to be started. And it's not affecting the implementation of the other parts.

So, because basically here you're saying that everything needs to hold up even if the issue is quite separate from what you're actually trying to implement. So we may consider some wording there to avoid that we're in a situation where implementation has been put on hold just because the GNSO, as part of the implementation a whole new issue was found that needs to be dealt with, but doesn't necessarily need to wait for implementation to complete on the other parts. So that's...

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks. Let's go to Tom on that.

Tom Barrett: Yes. I think that's a fair point. I guess I wonder if the word referred could be replaced with communicated?

((Crosstalk))

Tom Barrett: Replace it with the word communicated?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Why did you have a problem with referred?

Tom Barrett: Well I agree that we - we're not trying to hold up the current implementation. But if an issue is known as introducing something new, then that information should be communicated as soon as it's known.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. And I think that addresses my point because as you said, it is communicated. And at that point the chartering organization will decide whether the group can go ahead or staff can go ahead with completing the policy while they look at that issue. Or whether it needs to wait.

I think it allows for the flexibility in saying yes, tell the charter organization at that point. It you know, they indicate how it should be handled and whether it stops or doesn't stop implementation. So I'm comfortable with that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay Tom.

Tom Barrett: And this is Tom again. I think we could even be more flexible and say it's communicated once it becomes known. So it's communicated to the relevant policy development body, e.g. blah, blah once it becomes known to the implementation staff, whatever.

Chuck Gomes: Okay before we make a change there, this is Chuck. Let me raise something because I guess I'm a little more contrarian on this one. I actually like to refer to better than communicated because if it is a new or additional policy issue, I'm not sure it's enough just to communicate it. But I'm curious what others think. Cheryl is that an old agree or is that a new one?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's a new agree. Thank you Chuck. Cheryl here.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. So Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes this is one of the sections I have real problems with because the mind sort of boggles at just how one gets the policy organization involved as you go along, if you're talking about particularly complex implementations.

But I tend to agree that simply filing a note under the - slipping a note under the door is not sufficient. So communicated is probably not a good enough word. The whole area though I think is full of potential problems that I don't think we fully understand. But I guess it's the job of this working group overall to try to understand them.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here Chuck. I would like to discuss that further in with the full working group. But I'm less concerned than Alan is on that point because with the system that indicates that there will be a clear linkage in contribution to the implementation team from the working group that's done in the case of (I capital PDT).

And we might need to ensure that there is a similar nexus for other non-(capital PDT) processes in the future. That's all. I think as long as we sort of take - loop back to that as need be to make sure we catch all in this. I'm less concerned than Alan is about that.

Alan Greenberg: Now I - it's Alan speaking. I'm not concerned in that I don't want the words in now. It's just one of the areas that I see as potential difficulties as we go forward with this overall process. But it's nothing were going to solve today.

Chuck Gomes: Thinks Alan, (Nick).

(Nick): Hey Chuck, I think that, you know, I kind of tend to agree with you on - that referred it seems to make a little bit more sense here. I'd rather lean towards the side of caution then go with communicated, which seems like it would be a little bit more open for abuse I guess.

(Unintelligible) talking about two different issues here. So I'm not sure if it would make sense just to really (unintelligible)...

Chuck Gomes: You're breaking up a little bit there (Nick). There's some interference or something. Did we lose you? Yes go ahead.

(Nick): I was just saying that it might make sense to instead of just having in cases where new policies are introduced to kind of dial in on that a little bit. And try to talk about, you know, when it makes sense for refer and when it makes sense to communicate.

And I think that kind of distinction is going to be a big part of the group, the larger group discussion. But at least acknowledging that there are kind of to situations, one where it actually needs to be referred and maybe one where it's more appropriate to communicate, if that makes sense.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Nick). This is Chuck. I'm going to jump into the queue a little bit here. I've been holding off on his thoughts. One of the things that made me comfortable with the way it was worded was by referring it to the relevance policy development body, it gives that body the freedom to do what they like. They can initiate a new PDP. They can do something else.

But it's not saying what they have to do. Obviously that's something that maybe there needs to be some processes for dealing with. But it's really doesn't - it gives total freedom to the policy development body to deal with it as they see fit. And hopefully eventually will have guidelines for that.

Now having said that, let me go to Marika and then Alan. And for some reason I lost connectivity. So I may not see your hands here. Hopefully it will be restored.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I'm just in there after Alan. That's how I'm in the queue. And the point I want to make is that I think here we may already be jumping ahead. I think we had a similar conversation yesterday where I think this is one of the areas where probably as the working group progresses in makes its recommendations that more clarity will evolve around what is expected to happen in these cases.

I mean whether issues need to be (occurred), whether they need to be communicated, whether they need to be posted or whatever the working group comes up with in that mechanism. And I think it specifically relates to implementation review teams.

You know, what happens if an implementation review team goes back to the Council and says we have discovered an issue? What happens in those cases? So I think here, you know, I know it's important that we convey the principle. But I think, you know, we may have to be a little bit flexible on the wording recognizing that this is probably one of the principles that will be updated to reflect what is actually recommended.

And just to note, I still feel - my point still stands. If we make it referred, then I have some issues with the prior to completion because that I think already creates some restrictions. Communicate allows for more flexibility from my point of view. But if people prefer refer, then maybe consider taking the last part out.

And again, I think many of the details around this will hopefully be developed through the working group in their conversations as we move forward.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Marika. Alan I think you were up. Again, I've lost connectivity to Adobe. So...

Alan Greenberg: Yes there's me and then Tom and Cheryl afterwards. I think we can fix it at this stage by inverting the phrase. And instead of these issues should be communicated, referred, whatever saying the policy - the relevance policy development body or its delegate must be involved.

Chuck Gomes: Thinks Alan.

Alan Greenberg: And involved is the real general word.

Chuck Gomes: So what - I'm curious. This is Chuck, just for some clarification there. What would a delegate of the policy development body be?

Alan Greenberg: If there's an implementation review team or something that's charged with doing that work.

Chuck Gomes: I got you. Thanks. Okay. And you said Tom was next? I still can't get in so.

Alan Greenberg: That's correct.

Tom Barrett: Hi this is Tom. I actually don't - I think Alan's contribution needs to be thought out more. And again, if we're talking about something brand-new policy that independent from the current implementation.

Like my original comment was going to be if - there seems to - the word referred to seems to carry more weight with the people here on the call than communicate. And I don't think that would be obvious to me. And I've been attending 30, 35 plus ICANN meetings. And I don't necessarily understand the difference.

So if there is a - something more formal than the word referred, we should either capitalize it or use the word formal as a, you know, some of formal communicate.

Chuck Gomes: But let me respond to this. This is Chuck. Let me respond to that Tom why are preferred the word referred because I was one of them that made - took that position. And you guys are going to help me because for some reason I can't to get into Adobe Connect again. And I have connectivity.

So anyway, I think somebody else said it pretty well. And I don't know if it was Alan or somebody else said it's kind of like slipping a note under the door. We're let you know that this happened.

To me referred implies some responsibility on the policy development body. But that's my own interpretation. And clearly you don't read it the same way. So I respect to that. But that's just an explanation from me as to why I prefer the word referred.

Was Cheryl next in the queue or was it somebody else? Again, I can't see the queue anymore.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl was next.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes that's correct.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry guys. It took me a moment to un-mute. Yes, Cheryl here in the queue. And I'm glad I'm after Chuck on this point. (Unintelligible) back to Marika's issue that I think was very valid thing to rise.

And I just wanted to suggest that what we do is somehow put in an annotation in this section, which is something a keen to square records or text, but not exactly square record or text that inda- because it's not the language that were going to be changing. It's a note to come back to concept.

And make some point that this will be a point further deliberated and discussed by the working group. And that any new mechanism and/or process established or proposed by the working group is referenced here. And that kind of takes away some of the concern, in my view at least, between the difference in use of referred and communicate.

I personally think communicate is better. But I do understand that that could be a soft term and that the note under the door type thing would be an issue. But I think if we have standard practices or processes that are established that if the mechanism by which communication is expected could be established.

So we would say this is standard operational procedures at the end of our work group process. That might be another way forward. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Cheryl. Now does anybody else have their hand up? I'm still trying to get back in.

Tom Barrett: Hi Chuck. This is Tom. I feel like this principle is getting as muddy in two different things. One is what the responsibility is of the implementation team if a new or additional policy is introduced.

And second, what the relevant policy development body needs to do in response to that. So my thinking was we should focus on the first point in this principle, not necessarily the second point.

In other words, what is the responsibility of the implementation team if something comes up? And to address that as - in this principle. Again, if we need to, then maybe we need to in the definitions, more formally define the communications that occur between implementation teams and policy bodies so that there is not such a difference between communicate and refer.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm next in the queue.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes because to Tom's point, that is actually precisely one of the points that the working group has been tasked to address or develop. I mean we do have the concept of implementation review teams.

But there is very little guidance in the PDP manual on how these are expected to operate, or especially as well, you know, how they should be able to determine whether a new or additional policy issue has been found.

And I think that's also a conversation that needs to be held in a broader working group. Is that a consensus decision? If one person raises their red flag, does it then go back to the Council? So I think that's something to talk to as well.

And then indeed, when something gets referred or communicated back, what is the Council expected to do? I think those are all the details that are, you know, as part of that charter question tasks for the working group to develop.

And I think, as Cheryl pointed out, this is definitely, you know, one area that will need further explanation once we've gone through that process. So maybe we need to keep it at this stage very minimal.

And I don't know exactly what the wording would be. But to, you know, to translate I think the sentiment that is here that I mean if there are policy issues, they should go back. Or we don't know exactly yet how they should go back or what happens then. So that may be the challenge and actually getting this right I think at this moment in time.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Now I thought Cheryl had a - and I think I'm just now getting back then. So I'm now back then. So sorry about that. This is Chuck speaking. Cheryl had a good suggestion of putting some brackets there that this will be deliberated by the working group going forward.

Can we do that and move on? And I don't know if there is a strong preference? I can live with communicated as long as we're going to deliberate later. Anybody object to that?

Okay, and so at this point we'll be further in. You've got that further deliberated by the working group. Any working group recommendation in this regard will eventually need to be reflected in the final version of this principle. I'm okay with that. Anybody have a problem with that? I don't see any hands or hear anyone.

So let's keep moving. And we didn't have the parenthetical there option to consider explanatory notes. Now my - and Cheryl agreed with that. I'm assuming that the explanatory notes are what we started in Section C

towards the end of this document. Is that correct? Or do I have that wrong?
Or was there anybody's intent to put explanatory notes right here?

Mary Wong: This is Mary. Yes that was the intent. But given some of the changes that are being discussed and maybe that needs to be updated somewhat. But that was certainly the intent as of last week.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Mary. Did you want to, I mean do you think - should we just refer to explanatory notes in Section C below? Or what is your thinking? And I welcome others to contribute to this.

Mary Wong: If (Nick) is on the call, I guess I'm looking at the document now. And I can't quite recall what the overall structure was that he had proposed, whether that would have an impact on Section 3 or Section C because the idea was that there were general principles and proposed principles and explanatory notes. But I'm not sure if that's changed.

(Nick): I'm here.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

(Nick): Oh sorry. Go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: (Nick). Is that (Nick)?

(Nick): Yes this is (Nick). I kind of envisioned the three sections being the overarching, then principles. And then if we wanted to keep the explanatory, that section. Excuse me, I'm not really - feel very strongly about the order between principles and then explanatory or explanatory and then principles. And I think we could go either way. But I think the three kind of sections are kind of the same from earlier.

Chuck Gomes: So hopefully everybody got that. This is Chuck. So the way it would - if we continue with this organization, which seems fine to me, the first section is overarching principle. And then principles. And then the explanatory notes.

Notice the way it's organized right now, and there's a certain value to this the way (Nick) did it in that he grouped principles that we had discussed in our previous meeting. And then so what is now called Section 2 - so we had this (Under B) principles.

Notice there were discussed principles. That will go away. That's for facilitating our meeting today and probably our next meeting. And then Section 2 under B was additional proposed principles. Those we hadn't discussed yet, which we're about to get to.

So back to my question. Does anyone think we should have a reference at the end of the, this before where it now says additional proposed principles that refers to Section C? If there is any need for that it would be sufficient to have the explanatory notes just occur after the principal section.

Okay, so I'm not hearing anybody suggest. So for right now let's just move on to the principles that we haven't discussed yet. And go to what is called the policy standards, sub-section policy standards.

And we have some comments here. The Item A, and we can worry about the numbering and so forth later and clean it up. Let's just go with it as his right now.

So A says as much as possible within time constraints GNSO policy recommendations should be clear and unambiguous with performance, targets and standards.

And Tom made what may be a very helpful suggestion they are that that maybe all we need in that section. And Cheryl added a comment there. Cheryl do you want me to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No I'm fine. I've dropped out of the Adobe room. But I'm still on the telephone communication. Cheryl for the record. And I'm happy with Tom's proposal just by the way.

The only reason that text is there is to explain why I put either square or scrolled records on that repeating text. I just get very nervous. I know it's going to be deleted. I know it's all going to, you know, disappear as we move things up into deliberated discussion deciders.

But I just didn't want to risk having it - that text, which is sort of a header then on all (sort of) sections not annotated in some way to remind us from an editorial point of view to get rid of it just in case it stays there. That's all. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Cheryl, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I'm just wondering if we can drop the first sentence because I think as you were saying, I think it should be a firmer statement. The GNSO policy recommendations should be (unintelligible) performance targets and standards.

I think by already starting with as much as possible, within time constraints, I think you're already making all kinds of excuses as to, you know, why it doesn't happen or shouldn't happen.

So I don't really know why we needed that first part because I think this should already indicate that that should be the objective. And of course, there may be exceptions to that rule. But that's what we're setting out to do.

Chuck Gomes: And Tom agrees with you, as do I. Anybody object to that? Okay so were going to only have the first sentence. And we're going to eliminate the first part of it which gives lots of excuses. Good catch. Okay.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just to confirm, so all the rest now here we're deleting?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And Avri agrees too. Thank you Avri. Okay, and I think Tom makes the - a similar suggestion on B that says GNSO policy development should be based on principles of fairness, notice and due process as well as predictability.

And then deleting the rest. Now (Nick), you - your comment there was we should move this principle in its entirety into the overarching theme. It is a fundamental and is well worded as is. Are you saying (Nick) that's part of the overarching principle because this is quite different than overarching principle?

(Nick): I didn't mean overarching. Yes, I think when we were first talking about the over - that comment is from quite a while ago. I'd be comfortable ignoring that comment in its entirety if that's okay with you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. That's good. Thanks for clarifying. So you can - and then we go to - so that was B, okay. And now going to C. and we can just restart the numbering on that if that's okay. But anyways, it shows B on the Adobe Connect. If you just do a format of that bullet and put restart or continue numbering, it probably works.

But anyway, regardless it shows B in Adobe. It was Principle C. it says the processes must be designed to be time sensitive. And then unending debates should not be an option. And that came from the ALAC statement. So that's in there just for reference.

Let's just focus on the statement itself, the principle itself. It says the process must be designed to be time sensitive. And then dash, unending debates should not be an option. Any com - we have some comments. Avri please.

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you. Avri speaking. I think we should - we could delete what's after the dash. That's sort of a relative statement. It you know, what's adequate conversation and debate to one is, you know, is unending conversation to another. And so I agree with the first part of the statement. But I think we should drop what's after the dash. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Avri, Tom.

Tom Barrett: I was going to propose deleting the whole thing as I think it's covered under A with performance targets.

Chuck Gomes: So if we go back to A, let's talk about that. Certainly A says as much as possible within time constraints. This is expressing my own opinion. I think that's a little bit different. But let's talk about it, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I don't think the two are related. A is talking about the recommendations that, out of the GNSO policy processes. B is talking about the processes which may be raised during, you know, during the implementation. Which might, depending on how this group goes forward, become GNSO policy processes, but might not.

Tom Barrett: Okay, that helps Alan. So I would propose that during implementation that (in further word processes).

Chuck Gomes: Say that again.

Tom Barrett: I would propose adding the word the implementation.

Chuck Gomes: Well hold on a second, this is Chuck, because this is under a category that's called policy standards.

Alan Greenberg: No. These are policy type decisions. And again, were trying to get ahead of the game. And we haven't decided how we're going to handle policy related things that occur. You know, we haven't looked at the details of just how the GNSO will handle policy related things that happen during implementation.

So that's why I think that we need some generality here. But we're talking - the context is we're talking about processes which occur during the overall implementation process. But it's the ones that are - that we use in the previous one we communicated with or referred to or whatever the policy body.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So Alan are you okay, this is Chuck. Are you okay with adding implementation in front of processes?

Alan Greenberg: Implementation related processes. It's not the implementation. It's - these are going to be situations where we stop the implementation because we found a got you. And our rules now say the policy body needs to be involved in the got you.

So we almost the implementation on hold while we resolve the issue. The original comment was made because there has to be a cognizance that we cannot start a two-year process in the middle of something which was deemed to be, you know, where the policy was already approved, unless of course it is really a, you know, the world is falling apart.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Alan Greenberg: But there shouldn't be a way to unreasonably stall the process just because we've had to revert it back.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And let's go to Avri. This is Chuck.

Avri Doria: Thanks. I definitely see them as two different things. In fact in some ways I see A and this in opposition to each other because I know that if I want to stall something, I can design of very clear and unambiguous plan that will be late.

Chuck Gomes: With the voice of experience talking.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri we don't all have your skill sets. But we probably should have reproofed it. You're right.

Avri Doria: So but when we're saying timely, what we're saying is we need to take into account the reality of the situation we're dealing with while making those plans and such. And make sure that we're going to get it done in time. So thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So Avri I going to - this is Chuck. I'm going to come back to you. So if you were to change that one, C, I guess it's, yes, it's still called...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I'm having issues with the bulleting. So it's B for now.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: That's okay Marika. But Avri, would you be able to suggest a change to the way B is worded?

Avri Doria: I think currently word it as the processes must be designed to be time sensitive period is quite effective.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And coming back Alan because it was the addition there I believe came from the ALAC statement. The unending debate should not be an option. Are you okay with deleting that?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. That was more a rationale then part of the text. I wouldn't mind a footnote essentially elaborating on what the reason for saying this is.

Chuck Gomes: And what would that footnote say?

Alan Greenberg: I don't like drafting on-the-fly. But something to the effect of...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Email if you want.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, no just let me think it through and let people tell me I'm wrong. You know, unexpected policy related processes happening during the implementation plan should keep unexpected delays to a minimum or something like that.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. So I don't think you want the word plan in there. But I could be wrong. During implementation, right.

Alan Greenberg: The implementation phase.

Chuck Gomes: Or yes, that's fine.

Alan Greenberg: Or need to be kept to a minimum instead of should be, should, something like that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay any - now Tom and Avri you still have hands up. Are those new hands?

Tom Barrett: Yes, I mean this actually I think addresses my question and answers it. I would propose replacing the word happening with identified.

Alan Greenberg: Yes fine.

Chuck Gomes: In the footnote? Okay.

Tom Barrett: Right. And do you want the proc - do you want these to be - I don't think you want the processes to be kept to a minimum. We want their resolution to be kept to a minimum.

Chuck Gomes: Or their impact or something.

Tom Barrett: But the resolution of unexpected policies should be kept to a minimum.

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Tom Barrett: Or does that help?

Chuck Gomes: What we do without Marika? Thinks Marika for staying with us.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm still not sure if this actually conveys what we're trying to say because I think we're trying to say that to take a minimum time, right? It's not that we're saying that the resolution should be minimum. Maybe I'm missing something.

Chuck Gomes: No, this is Chuck. I think you're right. So let's see if we can fix it. We won't spend too much time on it if - because maybe somebody can come up with some wording after the meeting and send it to the list. But Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes thank you. And hopefully I didn't forget what I was thinking. But basically what we want to say is that identified during the implementation phase need to delay implementation as little as possible.

Chuck Gomes: I like that. This is Chuck.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I like that.

Marika Konings: Can you repeat that Avri?

Avri Doria: Need to delay implementation as little as possible. And there's an extra B before delay. Oh and you should - yes, great. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks Avri. That's helpful. Any more discussion on this? And so we can delete the reference to the ALAC statement, okay. Good.

And now going to what shows as C on the screen. And it starts off Core Value 7, employing open and transparent policy development mechanisms that promote well-informed decisions based on expert advice. And ensure that those entities most affected can assist in the policy development process.

And Tom you ask the question who decides who can participate? This should not be used to exclude interested parties. I'm sure we all agree with you on that. Let's open it up to discussion on this one.

Tom Barrett: Chuck this is Tom again. On the previous point, is it really necessary to have it as a footnote? Why not make it part of the principle, the resolution of unexpected policy, et cetera?

Chuck Gomes: I'll throw it open to the group. Alan I think you suggested it as a footnote. I don't know that you were necessarily...

Alan Greenberg: I don't care.

Chuck Gomes: You don't care. That's I thought.

Alan Greenberg: If you want to move it back up, fine.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody object before Marika moves that? Anybody object to that being made part of the principle? Cheryl you agree with moving it up. Okay. Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: In some sense it's redundant. But I don't really care.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks. And of course we'll have a chance to refine these as we move forward. But okay. Thanks for that. Back to D. The - first of all it probably needs to be reworded. It's just copied as a core value here. And so we probably need to make a sentence out of it. But any comments on D?

(Nick): Hey Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

(Nick): Chuck this is (Nick). I think that there's an unlabeled principle, maybe two or three above where the concept of open and transparent might fit better.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: What are you referring to (Nick)?

(Nick): So in between A and B it says (unintelligible) to be based on all of that kind of stuff. And I think there that might make sense to put in the open and transparent because I think that's a quality that we really haven't touched on before.

And I think that this, the one that's currently labeled as C is a little bit redundant except for that part. A little bit, you know, not necessary except for that kind of piece. Does that make sense?

Chuck Gomes: Okay, now I'm lost because of our trouble with numbering here. So are you talking about the un-numbered - oh there we go. Marika just labeled that B. she's manually doing it. Thanks Marika. That will help us keep it straight.

Okay so (Nick), could you repeat that now that the numbering on the screen is fixed?

(Nick): Yes, I'm not sure that D, as it is really needs to even be a principle. I would almost advocate getting rid of it. But there are some pieces that I would say. And one of the big pieces is that open and transparent piece.

So I was trying to find a way to put the open and transparent qualities into either C. But I think it makes - or even A. but I think that in B or A or C, you could preserve the open and transparent.

And then you could kind of get rid of the rest of it that has the most affected. And I'm not even sure how much we want to go with either I or II as a principle in this context.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So you want to main - this is Chuck. So you - and I'm looking over to the chat too. So I'm not seeing how you would fit it into one of the three above. Can you help me there?

(Nick): Yes. I might put should be based on principles of fairness, notice, transparency and due process as well as predictability. And then I would - and then personally I would feel comfortable enough that was up there and getting rid of D it its entirety. I'm not sure if there's - if everybody else feels that way. But I don't think that in this context D adds a lot.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks. Tom go ahead.

Tom Barrett: I'm sorry. That's not a hand.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right. Anybody object to eliminating D and making the change up in B above, adding transparency there? Okay. Now, all right. So we can delete D. And that brings us down, we still have 10, 15 minutes, to policy and the community.

Let me read it and then we'll let Tom make his comments that's shown there with regard to it. Let's scroll down. Okay, so where there. Okay. And policy development efforts it is a responsibility of the originating SO to provide timely notification to the rest of the community about policy development and/or implementation process.

But it is the responsibility of the other SOs and ACs and stakeholders in general to determine whether or not they are impacted by that activity. And to provide their input in a timely matter. Now let me turn it to Tom to talk about your comment.

Tom Barrett: Well this comment is specific to an SO. And I think it needs to be broader to include people doing implementation, such as ICANN staff and board.

Chuck Gomes: Okay now Tom this is Chuck. A question for you because we have I think later in the document some proc - some principles for staff. Do you think it would be better to do that here or to include that in the proposed principles relating to staff? And anybody can comment on that.

Tom Barrett: Well I think there should be a general principle about whoever is doing implementation needs to be able to communicate it out externally. And I don't think the requirement or the responsibility is any different if it's an SO versus staff.

Chuck Gomes: Well, this is Chuck. And in looking back at some history and stuff, which you are probably as familiar of as I am. This particular principle is relating to the fact that sometimes certain groups don't respond in a timely manner.

And there's two aspects of it. First of all the policy development body needs to communicate clearly and in a timely manner to those different SOs and ACs and so forth.

But there's also - it's also the responsibility to respond. So to me, staff's role is quite different than what we're trying to get at here. But maybe I'm wrong on that. I'm having trouble fitting staff into these two sentences here.

Somebody help there? Because here were talking about input from stakeholders and did the responsibility of stakeholders to provide that input in a timely manner. So maybe you can help Tom. How would you fit staff into this? I'm having trouble seeing that.

Tom Barrett: Well I guess I'm having trouble understanding what the rest of this document is for. I mean we had - it seems to be a catch all of various things. And I'm not sure what we're trying to achieve with this or the rest of the document.

Chuck Gomes: Well the whole doc, this is Chuck. The whole document is supposed to be a set of principles that underlie both policy and implementation processes. So everything in it is supposed to be principles that provide a basis for policy development and policy implementation. I don't know if that helps. Let me turn it over to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes just to comment quickly. I don't know if this as anything new to what are the principles that we already have.

Chuck Gomes: You're talking about the first one under policy and community?

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right. Let me turn it over - Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Without going through it carefully, I think it does make an important statement. And there have been accusations before that the GNSO has not sufficiently actively or with enough fervor solicited input. And so I think this - that this - the intent is to address that issue.

I put my question - my hand up when we were talking about the involvement of staff. If we go back not all that far, there have been accusations that staff has deliberately not supported the GNSO or deliberately obfuscated things at various points in time.

I don't think we have a lot of accusations of that now. Maybe we need an overriding statement somewhere saying, you know, staff - support staff is in the position of supporting the GNSO. And if it can't in some point, it must raise the issue with the GNSO.

You know, staff works under certain rules. And they cannot do anything we simply tell them. But things can't be - just be dropped inordinately. So we may want to reference there. But I would not want to see staff added explicitly in this particular point.

Chuck Gomes: So this is Chuck. Let me make a suggestion. Marika could you put a little note reminder down under the principles for staff. And we can reorganize and move it around later. But so that we don't lose that suggestion. That we just put a little reminder that staff needs to respond, I don't know, whatever.

Just something so that we remember to come back to this when we get there. Then again, if we want to move it up later we can. But don't want to lose that suggestion from Alan because we're going to cover quite a few other things before we get there.

And then while Marika is putting a little reminder down there under the staff limitations, let's go to Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. Avri speaking. I think not only that this statement, and I forgot the number, but policy related community is critical in terms of blogging there. But I think it's too weak.

I think the GNSO has an absolute responsibility to do what's best to understand the impact on the community of the work it's doing. So that is the GNSO's responsibility.

Part of that responsibility means trying to understand it themselves. Part of that responsibility means reaching out to those they understand may be impacted to get there take on it, to help in that analysis.

And then finally, yes there is a responsibility on the other part of the community, especially when reached out to, to react in a timely manner. So I think that the second part of this statement about the responsibility of others is well said.

But I think the first part skirts the responsibility of the GNSO cannot make policies for which it hasn't done an impact analysis. It hasn't understood the impact on the community. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Avri. And I'm going to ask you to take on a task between now and when we meet again, hopefully sooner in that timeframe. Could you come up

with some proposed changes to this that would make it stronger like you're suggesting? But that would be great if you would do that. Okay?

Avri Doria: No it would be only a couple of words.

Chuck Gomes: For sure. That's fine. And we're just about out of time. So I didn't want to take the time and get into a discussion.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: So if you do that that would be great. And we'll pick up there next time. And then Cheryl your hand went down.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No thank you. My hand went down. It's Cheryl here. But it only went down because (unintelligible) Adobe had to connect and disconnect and reconnect again.

Avri, I'm really - it can either be your fault or mine. Sorry, we shouldn't do these (aside). Avri, I'm very keen and happy to see that strengthening in that first section of that last paragraph that we were just discussing. So I look forward to seeing - and it does only need to be a few words. You're right. But yes, the strengthening the GNSO I think is very important.

I put my hand up however, with reference to what Tom was raising with the document per say. And I just want to respond to Tom following up from your explanation Chuck.

And that is that yes, the rest of the document is in fact a catch all. It's the kitchen sink from which we select the bids that we want to then discuss, agree upon, modify text and then put it up in a gray principle section.

So yes, the rest of the document, as we go through it all, a gray text as I understand it. And (Nick) - this is (Nick)'s design. So he probably should

Speak to this if he needs to. If I've misinterpreted you (Nick), please let me know.

But as I saw it, as we finalize and have agreed to text ready to go to the rest of the working group, it goes to the higher, the Section A or B, sorry the Section A. And obviously we also need to make sure we have our explanatory notes expanded as we go. But Tom, your interpretation is correct. And it was meant to be that way. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, we're going to have to cut it off there for this time. I think we made really good progress. We need to talk about we still have quite a ways to go. And the majority of the work of the working group is dependent on our work.

Is it possible to meet again next week at this time for 90 minutes? Anybody cannot do that? Okay from Avri. I don't see any disagrees. Let me scroll down so I can see everybody. Another agree there. Thanks (Nick). I checked my calendar, and I can do it.

Avri will get us a couple changes on D that we're looking at now. And then - now let me ask one more question for planning for next week. Do we - can we just pick up with this policy and the community part next week? Is there any reason in that meeting to go back over the stuff we've done?

Obviously Marika will send around a revised version. And what I'd like to do is ask people if they see any errors in what we have, to communicate those on the list. And if we need to discuss it next week, we will. But if not, just pick right up on the policy and community item and move forward from there.

Any objections to that? Okay. Well you guys have been great. Some really good progress. Thank you very much. And if anybody else wants to add comments to the ones we haven't covered yet in addition to those that have been added, feel free to do that before our meeting next week.

And I think, unless anybody has anything to add that we can adjourn our call.
Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Chuck. Thanks everyone. Bye. Yay, I'm on holiday.

Chuck Gomes: Enjoy.

Coordinator: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Thank you for your attendance. You may disconnect at this time.

END