

**ICANN
Transcription
Policy and Implementation Principles Sub Team
Thursday 6 February 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 6 February 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-20140206-en.mp3>

Attendees:

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

Apologies:

Mary Wong

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: This is the conference coordinator, I just want to remind all parties today's call is being recorded if you have any objections you may disconnect at this time, I'll now turn it over to your host and you may proceed.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Lou), good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Policy and Implementation Principle Sub-Team meeting on the 6 of February 2014.

On the call today we have Cheryl Landon-Orr, Chuck Gomes, (Tom Burt), Avri Doria and (Nick Steinberg). We have an apology from Mary Wong and

from staff we have Marika Konings and myself Nathalie Peregrine. And Greg Shatan has just joined the Adobe Connect room. I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Nathalie and we're going to pick up where we left off last time, this is Chuck speaking and welcome all of you to the call, we have a good group here again today.

And we're going to pick up where we left off last time with regard to the principle we were working on that was core - related to Core Value 4 and Avri sent some suggested language as promised that is shown on the right part of the screen there. And let's see let me scroll down - oops can I scroll down? Yes there we go, okay and so let's just look at that right now - let me scroll down a little bit further on my screen.

Okay so what Avri has proposed is each of the principles in this - in fact Avri why don't you go over to it - I know (you speed) doing that. Avri are you on mute or would you rather I go over what you proposed? Okay not hearing Avri.

Avri Doria: I've not even turned my microphone on, so it wasn't even a question of being mute, I didn't even have the microphone yet - I can be heard now?

Chuck Gomes: Yes you can, thanks Avri - go ahead I'll let you talk to what you proposed there.

Avri Doria: Right, there wasn't much here, it was just trying to capture that notion - as I said I guess I looked at it mostly as the footnote earlier.

But it was either principles in this document must be considered in terms of agree to which they adhere to and further the principles defined in ICANN's core values as documented in Article 2 of the ICANN Bylaws. So that's the

first sentence, pretty bland and obviously Article 2 of ICANN Bylaws would be a URL, you know, cross-reference. And then the second one was particular notes should be made to and then quoting Core Value 4.

Seeking and supporting broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographical and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making. So that seemed to me to sort of like now this could also serve, you know, with maybe a little bit of formatting change possibly in that other point where it is, the C or B or what have you. But, you know, that's pretty much all - not a whole lot.

Chuck Gomes: Oh yes but it's helpful - comments - Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika; I actually just need a clarification as I wasn't on the last call. Is this language supposed to go in Section 2B? Am I at the right page, just want to make sure if you decide that it should go in there?

Chuck Gomes: (Unintelligible).

Marika Konings: Okay and I would replace what it says there now, the (seeking) and support abroad and for participation or it would precede that?

Avri Doria: There was a discussion then, this is Avri again - there was a discussion again of replacing that and then there was another discussion of perhaps removing it all together from there and making it a footnote in - further up in the main principle statement and getting it said as a blanket thing.

And that's something that we didn't resolve and I said I would try to write something that could serve as either in some sense, so that's what this is, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Avri and thank you for the question Marika. What do people think - anybody have a - this is Chuck speaking, does anyone favor one over the other?

I like the - I like what you did personally, so anybody want to comment? It is - it does seem to me, Chuck speaking again that it is an essential principle, so it seems to be okay to include it. But if people think it would be better as a footnote I - we can consider that. Okay then for right now let's go ahead and just replace the text that was there with this and then go to - go on from there.

Now one of the things that I did was to do a - I mean as I was kind of looking ahead at the rest of the principles that we need to - that we need to go over I - it seemed to me that, you know, coming up with some sort of an outline might be helpful for us. Because what I found is we've already moved - our next topic in fact is a principle that we moved into another section. And Marika asked the question - I think it was Marika that, you know, is this, you know, where we should - is this - where in this section should this go?

And then as I went further what I found was there's some others that maybe need to be moved back up and so forth, so for my own sanity it seemed to be helpful. And so what I proposed and what and just a few minutes before the meeting started was a - what looks like an outline that's developing. We don't have to stick to this, this was just my thinking. And so my question to the rest of you right now is, is it helpful? Would you like us to, you know, would you like to talk about this particular outline?

Not that it would have to stay this way - or do you think it's better to come back to that later after we proceed further? And I'm flexible either way. We have a talkative group; this doesn't seem like the group that I've been working with lately.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No it's Cheryl here, it's on 6 or 1/2 dozen of the other. Part of me I think is probably winning out to say let's get on to it and then just come back to the outline later.

Chuck Gomes: I'm fine with that, so - and we can come back to an outline at anytime that we think it becomes helpful. So since you're the only one that's - well here we go, we've got - finally got somebody else speaking up, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika; this is actually already a comment on if we move on looking at the documents, not specifically relating to the outline.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all...

Marika Konings: (Do we need to) go ahead?

Chuck Gomes: Excuse me?

Marika Konings: Did you want me to go ahead with the comment?

Chuck Gomes: Sure, please.

Marika Konings: Yes I have a question on the 2A, right now I mention stakeholder impact analysis and I think I understand what it's trying to say but I'm concerned that we're actually using a term that's currently not defined or used as such in a PDP.

So I don't know if you're creating something new or that we're - that is expected to, you know, be defined and be included in the PDP manual as one of the requirements of a policy development effort. Or are we just trying to describe something that is currently already ongoing and in that case maybe we should just describe it instead of, you know, giving it a label that makes it sound as if it's a kind of set process that's currently being applied. So my question was a bit - I'm a bit confused as to what this means.

Is it a specific recommendation that a stakeholder impact analysis should be formalized and included in the PDP manual? Or is it just a description of ongoing practices and we're sticking a label on it?

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes first the question, Marika where are you seeing this? I'm...

Marika Konings: Two-A, it's just above the blue paragraph we just inserted that basically says, the policy development asset is the responsibility of the ongoing originating SO to do a stakeholder impact analysis as part of its policy process.

And there's a footnote included that says, stakeholder impact analysis means assessment of the effect policy implementation outcome in light of that possible consequence is on ICANN stakeholders.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I - we - I think we discussed that significantly, I think we decided to fix it by having the footnote, although I note the footnote has a capital A and it shouldn't because we're not trying to define it as a term. I think it was just an attempt to not have overly wordy a sentence.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan - Greg?

Greg Shatan: Hi it's Greg Shatan.

Chuck Gomes: Oh there we go, thanks.

Greg Shatan: Hi, I'm here I'm just moving slowly. I guess the - I'm wondering whether we need to state as a principle before we get to this point in things that something more about impact on stakeholders and it's place in the policy process since this is kind of assuming that there's already a principle.

And maybe there is one and I just, you know, haven't, you know, scrolled up and seen what there is that says that, you know, what it is that - about impact that is being analyzed and why - and I'm not saying we shouldn't care about impact on stakeholders but if we're trying to define principles I think one of the principles, you know, needs to be something about why stake, you know, why stakeholder impact is an issue. And maybe also why it isn't and how we get to this point where we're now saying, okay well we got to do this stakeholder impact analysis.

Chuck Gomes: So Greg this is Chuck, so it sounds to me like that would be a principle that would precede A and maybe be a new A, how might you word that principle? And while you're thinking about that let me go to Avri and then I'll come back to you.

Greg Shatan: Okay.

Avri Doria: Gee I was just about to put down my hand because I was going to go look and see if there was something in the core values that we could leverage off of in - I mean it's true it seems like an obvious principle to me but it is probably good that it be listed as opposed to and so I want to see if there's any of the core values that feed into it. So I'll be back.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks and this is Chuck again so I'll pause a little bit. Greg if you have a suggestion go ahead - Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, I'm still a little bit worried about the terminology as it is and I'm wondering if people object to if we would rephrase it basically to access the impact on stakeholders or access the impact on stakeholders as part of it's policy process.

At least then we describe it's a process, I think - to me the way it sounds now is as it's - as if it's a set kind of thing that happens. Like it's an impact analysis that's well defined, you know, external party carries that out. Well I think - and

that's maybe where we want to go but I think that's not where we currently are. So I'm wondering if we just rephrase it if that, you know, still conveys it but at least doesn't give the impression that there's, you know, a fixed (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: If I'm interpreting Avri's X - red X in the Adobe, I don't think that she agrees with that - Avri can you speak to that?

Avri Doria: Yes I can, I think that it really is something that we should be doing that we should call it by its proper name. That yes we should be developing methods for it.

I think there's good anything in this is, you know, the outcomes of this PNI work that are going to require developing mechanisms to make them happen. So I don't see the fact that we have no notion of what it means to do this. I think it's an appropriate name for what we need to do. I think - and this is one of the things I was also looking for because I thought I had sent email on it, that's it's a term that's used, you know, throughout businesses and throughout regulatory and throughout so many areas.

And whether ICANN is a (nut) business, NGOs do them all the time. If ICANN is not an NGO but is a regulator, well regulators do them all the time. So that really is the proper name, it is something we should be doing and it is something that if we have to develop how we do it then we should do that, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Avri, Greg?

Greg Shatan: I think this goes kind of to the missing Section A, if we set up in Section A that there - that impact on stakeholders is an important part of the policy and implementation process and that there should be an analysis conducted, you know, ("stakeholder impact analysis").

And we can kind of, you know, give some more flavor to it before we get to kind of this point which is almost if you will the, you know, the current A or amount kind of B with an empty A above it is in essence implementation of the missing A of some, you know, unstated policy that impact is important and that it needs to be analyzed. And then, you know, when we get to B we can - talk more about how it might be implemented and at what points. Because I'm not sure, you know, exactly what it's saying, when it's saying it should happen in the process.

Should it be constant, should it be at the beginning? Why isn't the stakeholder organization's responsibility once a working group has been founded or is it the responsibility when they're making a proposal? You know, does it get taken over by the charter drafting team once that's been put together? And so, you know, it seems there's a lot of, you know, implementation issues and that have an impact on the process doesn't make them policy but does make them interesting.

And before we get to that point we kind of have to table set in Section A. I think if Section A does it's job then Section B can refer to a stakeholder impact analysis as at least a recommended process that, you know, would- should be part of a PDP arc at some point. But it certainly I agree it's nothing now, so at this point, you know, I mean obviously it's thought about at different points in different ways but there's nothing regularized.

So if there's going to be something regularized we should talk about why it's an appropriate policy principle in A and then, you know, give some more grounding and reality and logistics in B. That said I don't have A written as you requested.

Chuck Gomes: If you take - that's okay, take a look at what Marika has put in Adobe. And I'll come back to a question on that, this is Chuck again. But let me ask you - let me ask Marika if this is addressing her concern?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika and as you see, indeed I took Greg's language and I added a little bit to it I think to explain. I think this already makes me a lot more comfortable because it talks about indeed that it's not something that's maybe done.

But I think Greg is asking, you know, all the right questions. And the reason why I'm bringing this up because I recall we had the same conversation when we did the revised PDP. There was also this discussion that it's really important to have an impact analysis, but in debate (satters) were like, well who should be responsible for that? Who has the actual expertise to carry that out? Because you were talking about the supporting organization, you know, it does, you know, talking about GNSO.

Does the GNSO have, you know, the resources and capabilities to actually do, you know, what is indeed what Avri's referring to a proper impact assessment? And probably not at this time because it's not defined as such, but working groups do is indeed in their reports they are required to know what they believe is the impact of the recommendations. And to a large extent they rely on feedback received from the community when they put out their recommendations they specifically ask the community, well tell us what you think will be the impact of these?

Are we, you know, achieving, you know, are we addressing the problem that we were set out to do? So I think that's why there's a lot of defining to do in that term and that's why I'm a little bit concerned about if we leave it here vague it may mean something very specific for some and something very different for others and that's why I'm, you know, a little bit hesitant. I think that the first sentence explains that this is, you know, what should be done and then I think the second one, you know, follows on that.

But to me this really sounds like a very defined term the way it's written while I think you could probably ask all of us and we probably have a different

interpretation of what it may mean. So that's where my concern comes from, but.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Marika, now just - this is Chuck again, before going to several others in the queue in the wording that's on there right now it seems to me that it's an essential part of the policy and implementation process, not just important. Would anybody disagree with that? Okay let's go on then - Greg is that a new hand?

Greg Shatan: It's a semi-new hand or a continuing hand perhaps.

Chuck Gomes: Okay go ahead and then we'll go to Alan.

Greg Shatan: Oh okay, I'll be relatively brief since I'm taking advantage of a (staging) hand. My - I agree with what you say, my only concern is, you know, and this will probably, you know, be more apparent when we get to kind of the implementation if you will of the concept of impact.

It - and I echo I think what I said kind of the last time we were on the call together, which is that impact seem to be a proposal at least kind of from the Jeff Neuman version that would allow kind of implementation to be kind of dragged back into policy. Or to be dragged back into kind of a multi, you know, level stakeholder analysis and all that might, you know, slow down implementation.

And, you know, when we get to this a little bit more deeply we're going to have to consider how does one balance the need to move forward in implementation with the need for, you know, appropriate oversight from the SOs and the constituencies and all of that? And I think I just want to watch out for impact being kind of a dog whistle word for if anybody says there's impact then, you know, all of a sudden it's policy and all of a sudden it's well, you know, it can't be implemented until, you know, everybody sits around a fire pit and decides what it means.

Chuck Gomes: So Greg this is Chuck, a question then and follow-up to what you're saying, would it be better to say that it's an essential part of policy and not use the word implementation at this stage? We could always come back and have a similar or somewhat related principle when we're talking just about implementation - thoughts on that?

Greg Shatan: Yes I think so, I think I'd maybe say policy development process as opposed to policy implementation process, especially because we're talking about policy in the community so we haven't really gotten to implementation.

I think that when we get to talking about implementation, you know, that is going to be kind of this, you know, a thornier issue since - well other than being slow I think we do a reasonably good job of developing policy. I think that when we get to the issue of whether implementation gets pushed around and outside the scope of what the policymakers thought it would be and how do you deal with that?

And how do you deal with continuing implementation review and input from SOs? You know, that I think is going to be more challenging, but I think here the change here kind of I think keeps things kind of in the line. And I'll shut up now.

Chuck Gomes: Okay and I see a disagreement on Avri's part, but Alan has been very patient so I'm going to go to Alan now - this is Chuck.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure I remember what I wanted to say.

Chuck Gomes: Hey it worked.

Alan Greenberg: But let me try, I think we are with much of this discussion going into the work of the work group and outside of principles.

I think the principle is that impact on stakeholders must be considered during the process - any part of the process. I think saying do an impact analysis wenders into an area that we have never done before. The practice in ICANN for better or worse has been the stakeholder's need to come to the table to present the issues or comment on it in the public comment periods and related other processes.

And there has been no onus on any part of ICANN to thoroughly analyze all aspects of something, including those that have - that no one has raised. The only attempt we have at having done that was in the thick Whois discussion and we weren't very successful at it because of that very reason that we didn't have people around who could do the work. And I think saying do an impact analysis has the connotation as Marika said of implying that some authority is going to look at all possible aspects and pass judgment.

And that's a new model that we haven't used and if indeed that's what we should be doing in the policy development process, I think that should be a discussion of the group and not a principle. I think the principle is impact must be considered...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...and not go further onto how to do that or use buzz words which will have different connotations and perhaps a very significant impact on how we carry out the process, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan, this is Chuck and I'm going to come back to you to ask you what you might change in the wording of either A or B, but let's go to Avri.

Alan Greenberg: Well I can answer that very quickly, I think using the buzz word or the expression impact analysis pushes us past the limit that I feel comfortable with and I suspect all of B is talking about that process whereas I think A is the principle, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan, Avri?

Avri Doria: It's not a buzz word, it is not a dog whistle - doing an impact analysis is a task, it's a task we already have.

We are already charged to understand what we are doing, to say that oh no a working group doesn't really need to understand the impact of what it's doing. The only thing we're not doing is perhaps doing it in an organized way, doing it in a way. A PDP is responsible, the GNSO should send back a PDP report that doesn't discuss, you know, having considered it. So the only way to consider (unintelligible) is an impact analysis.

I don't understand the feeling about this word and the desire to sort of evade the notion that an analysis - an impact analysis should be done. It is not a dog whistle; it's just I really am baffled and - about the fear an apprehension over a simple term. It's just - I don't know what to say other than that.

Chuck Gomes: Let's - thanks Avri this is Chuck, let's go to Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, I'd like to respond both to Alan and Avri. I agree with Alan, that I think we're trying to construct or instruct that a specific process of impact analysis should be engaged in.

And that does have, you know, a kind of set of meanings in business and in implementations of various things or, you know, creating policy about various things. I don't know that we formalized it nor we necessarily want to say - at least in this group that there should be a formal impact analysis process. That said I actually agree with Avri as well that we have to understand the impact, whatever that - however that is part of the process of creating policy.

You know, impact I think needs to be, you know, front and center. I think each group and constituency that's present tends to think about the impact on their

own constituencies. But there are of course constituencies that are absent for a variety of reasons and I say a GNSO PDP, you know, the technical community may or may not be represented. The disenfranchised and oppressed peoples of the world may or may be represented, etc., etc.

So, you know, it does need to be broader than just everybody, you know, minding their own vine and fig tree. So I'm not trying to say that there shouldn't be impact - that impact shouldn't be looked at, I do think we may be trying to create too much of a structure if we start, you know, capitalizing it and, you know, using terms that sound like they mean a particular process needs to be undertaking that is going to have a structure.

And a - as opposed to just a thing that needs to be investigated and may be investigated differently form working group to working group, but it does need to be front and center. And I apologize in a sense for the dog whistle concept but, you know, I'm kind of harking back as I said to, you know, around last summer when, you know, definitions of policy and implementation were first being discussed at the GNSO Council level.

And there was an attempt to say for, you know, to create a definition that basically said that anything that has an impact on any stakeholder group is policy. And that's what I want to stay away from - I'd rather - I don't want impact to mean anything more than it really means which is, how is this going to affect different types and sectors of people's entity? Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Greg and I think you already see this but notice that impact analysis is not capitalized, that doesn't mean that there may not be some fixes that we can all live with, but I just wanted to point that out.

So this is Chuck again and I'm going to go to Alan and then I'd like to - like us to see if we can adjust the wording. My perception as the default chair of this little sub-team is that we're really not too far apart. So let's be thinking about

how - what are some tweaks we can do that hopefully come close to leaving us all halfway comfortable at least - Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, I think we're all violently agreeing with each other on where we want to go. I think it's the details that we're getting hung up on.

I agree completely with everything that Avri said in her last intervention. I think it is the obligation of the GNSO Council to make sure that impacts are considered, including for the disenfranchised. I just do not think that given that it's not what we're doing now and it's so very far from what we are doing now that putting it as a principle is a bit overreaching.

I think the impassioned plea that Avri made is something that should be brought to the working group as a whole, that's the point I'm making - not that I don't agree with the direction, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Now Marika's put something in the - on the screen there and would you like to talk to that Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, I think that comes a little bit from the chat conversation that has been going on.

So I don't know if this has been actually refers or reflects the compromise that we may have come to that basically would be the new A. And I think that replaces then what is now B and C would be the principle would be an analysis of the impact on stakeholders is an essential part of the policy development process.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry I'm smiling because I'm now looking at the chat, so okay.
(Unintelligible)...

Marika Konings: That would replace basically being...

Chuck Gomes: ...Avri question for you, you say why is what not a principle?

Avri Doria: I'm - that - hi, Avri speaking. That was in response to Alan's indicating that it was an impassioned plea to be taken to the group but it wasn't a principle.

Or that the requirement for an analysis, you know, is not a principle of this is - was the question I was asking, why isn't it a principle? I am fine with what Marika read, the why isn't a principle was written in response to Alan's saying it wasn't, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Avri, so let's look at the word (unintelligible)...

Alan Greenberg: Chuck can I address that?

Chuck Gomes: Just a second Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Let's focus on coming up some wording that we can all live with. Okay now Alan what did you want to add?

Alan Greenberg: Yes I just wanted to say that I wasn't saying that what Marika has in A right now that the analysis of the impact on stakeholders is not a principle, I was saying that was a principle.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Using the phrase impact analysis which is different meanings to different people and in some cases a very different meaning from what we're doing right now is something that I think needs to be debated so that there's clarity in what we come out of.

I don't think we can take impact analysis as a given right now without at the very least defining it and talking a lot more about how that would be carried out and what the responsibilities are, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Yes and I - this is Chuck again and I don't want to go down that path too much further with regard to that. I guess I take a more general meaning of the term impact analysis as long as it's not capitalized.

But regardless, let's look at what Marika has up there as A - an analysis of the impact of - on stakeholders is an essential part of the policy development process. Does anybody have a problem with that? Do you have any edits that you would put to that? And I see Alan agreeing with that of - and I see applause, thank you. And Cheryl agreed - it looks like A is good. Now my question for you then - thanks guys, Greg did you want to comment?

Alan Greenberg: Greg just doesn't like putting down his hand.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay, well you know, it's worked for him. By leaving it up he's preempted you earlier so he learns quickly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: He's huge I think, I think huge (unintelligible) - I'm not sure we should allow this, I think he needs to go to the back of the queue every time he raises his hand.

Chuck Gomes: Okay see what you started Greg. All right so now my question for you is does A then replace - oh no I'm sorry, that other B is gone, okay forgive me. Okay so now are we okay with B as it is, one that we worked on last week so I hope we don't spend too much time on this again, but are we okay with B as it is now that we have A there - Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika, I actually understood from the conversation that we wanted to take out B as well because that actually already talks about how it should be done.

And, you know, I think if we leave it then we should definably reword as well, you know, the stakeholder impact analysis and turn it into analysis of the impact in stakeholders. But we are already taking here about how that should be carried out. So I think the question is, you know, do we already want to provide that direction to the working group that this is how we believe that should be carried or?

Or do we just take that out and just say, you know, this is a principle and maybe as a footnote say this is one of the, you know, key elements that will need to be defined as part of the working group deliberations.

Chuck Gomes: Okay before - don't take it out yet, I'm going to come back but let me turn it over to others first - Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes hi, I don't support taking it out. I support taking the language that's in red about do stakeholder analysis out.

But the other content in this which goes - is other than analysis of impact is the whole part about it's the responsibility of the originating SO, the GNSO in this case to contact everybody else about what's going on and it's there responsibility to get back. Now that may end up being something that dovetails and is complementary to a, you know, an analysis impact I have to get the new phraseology correct, forgive me for saying impact analysis before; the analysis of impact it may dovetail with that.

But this whole - the other content in B which I think is still important is SO's got to contact them and they got to respond timely-like - thanks.

Chuck Gomes: I want - this is Chuck, I want to especially thank you Avri because you said exactly what I was going to come back to, so I appreciate that. And it must be right since I was going to say it too - so Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I generally agree there are parts in B that are important and not already said. I'm not 100% about the wording but it seems to be changing as I speak or as I was thinking.

I would see this one little change however in A and that is impact on all stakeholders. Because the principle says even if you're not at the table, you know, you shouldn't be completely disenfranchised, they must consider it. B talks a bit about the methodology but I don't want to be - I don't want it to be implied that stakeholders is the role to limited version of those who have seats at ICANN - in ICANN bodies and things like that, so that's why I would suggest all there.

But I think B - parts of B must stay and I haven't read thoroughly what is there right now to make sure that I'm comfortable exactly what's there. But I certainly like the way it's going, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So this is Chuck and I think the goal certainly is all stakeholders. By putting that in there do we make it unrealistic in some cases because of - we can't get involvement by some stakeholders and evaluate that? I don't know, I don't feel strongly about that, but I agree that ideally we want to assess the impact of all stakeholders, so I'm not disagreeing with that at all - Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, I got just a question about B because we still have there in the start of a sentence in (unintelligible)...

Chuck Gomes: Yes we're going to come back to that, so...

Marika Konings: All right because I presume that's leftover from what...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...was taken from another part, so I was just wondering if that can go and as well and the former Principle 3 if we can already just get rid of that as well and the quotation marks.

Chuck Gomes: Yes let's - okay let's come back to that. Let me let Avri talk and then let's take a look at B. And by the way does anybody object to having all in there? Everybody's okay with that?

Avri Doria: That's what I was going to speak.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay you're going to speak to that, great Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Great, I agree - here's a case where I'm agreeing with a sentiment and having problem with the words. An perhaps it's only because coming out of any sort of logic or mathematical background all this is impossible.

So, you know, and then well yes you can say all known and all, you know, but that's I think that if we have just stakeholders and we've linked the notion of stakeholders right at the beginning with the full range of diversity, etc. and that stakeholders includes the wide concept of not everybody at the table then we don't need a word like all here which, you know, is one of those throw your hands up and say, well I can't do all so I must have done enough.

You know, so I think that if we invest the definition, we invest the definition stakeholder to have the content of all or, you know, have the full diversity, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Avri, it's Chuck again and (Michael)'s saying in the chat that he likes all and Alan as well but excepting Avri's comments he could live without it.

I myself - I'm a little more comfortable without having all in there. I'm not dogmatic about it because I think we do cover that elsewhere when we talk about the diversity - actually the core value and so forth, so I'm okay.

Anybody strongly want all in there - speak up now. Okay and (Michael)'s flexible there, thanks (Michael). Go ahead (Tom) - are you on mute? Not hearing you (Tom) if you're speaking. Don't know what's going on with (Tom) there - oh he's on hold, okay so he's typing so let's take a look at that.

Now as he's typing let's go to - let's shortly go to B and work on the wording there. I don't think it should be too hard but the - okay there we go. (Tom)'s concern is that all will be an excuse to study the impact with no end. Thanks (Tom) and that's kind of where I was going too. Ideally you want all but it - and I think Avri expressed it pretty well too, so thanks that's a good comment. Let's go to B now - it seems to me that the first sentence is covered by A, am I correct in that?

We don't need to say it's the responsibility originating SO to do it, that - is that covered? Can we delete that - is anybody opposed to deleting that first sentence? Okay there's an agreement by Avri, no disagreement so let's take out that first sentence. Now thanks Avri, like I said previously I think there are essential things here that define responsibilities that are essential principles in terms of the process, so let's look at that.

So now we have the SO must provide timely notification to the rest of the community about policy development efforts and so on. That follows I think now from - I mean that's how you - part of assessing impact is making sure you notify everybody that in a timely manner of what's going on - Avri jump in please.

Avri Doria: I didn't have time to push the button that quick so because I keep myself double-muted otherwise I'm afraid. But anyway I think that there's more than just impact as a purpose for this communication.

This communication includes impact but it also includes opinions and viewpoints and all that other stuff that is not impact but it is part of the policy

environment, the policy background that you need in terms of considering things. So that's why I think this is important and it is just the impact.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good point thanks Avri this is Chuck. The - now one of the things with - and I don't know if this leads us into another principle, but one of the things that even in our own group in, you know, we went out - we sent out to the stakeholder groups and the SOs and ACs a large list of fairly heavy questions and it was so much so that I think it lessened our chances of getting feedback that we need.

So what I'm thinking now in response to what Avri just said is that is there a principle that we should consider that input sought from the different groups should be broken down into manageable pieces so that it facilitates responses. And so in other words and why I'm taking off of what you said Avri is is that should we - I mean would it be a good principle to ask for things - something like impact separately from other things so as to make it more manageable on the part of the various groups?

I hope that doesn't complicate everything we're talking about here, but I couldn't help but think of that and particular with regard to what we just asked for. And we haven't received very many responses, I know in just being involved in the registry response it was a huge effort to answer all those questions and to get buy-in from a majority of the registry stakeholder group members for example.

So maybe this is something we come back to later but I do agree with Avri that the communication is more than just impact - Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, I mean Chuck I think your points are very valid.

But I would see them more as kind of use the term implementation guidance when, you know, the working group hopefully completes it's work at some point and provides, you know, its recommendations and says, look indeed

when you reach out to groups, even in the policy or implementation phase we recommend that you may consider doing it in this way or that way.

And I see that more as a more practical kind of approach. I'm not really sure if it's a principle at this stage looking at the other things we have here, but that's just my point of view.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, so now back to the wording of B, is it okay as it is? It doesn't specifically say impact or anything else. Any suggested changes to B? Okay and we've already done C thanks to Avri's work unless anybody else has anything further there, let's move on.

And the next category at least for now is proposed principles relating to implementation. Now the first thing we have we moved last week when we met. And Marika asked a very good question here, where should that go? And I have my own thoughts on that but let me throw it open to others in that regard. Let me get my hard document here, I'm finding where I have my notes.

The - first of all in the principle that's there where it says there should be a methodology to recognize or determine when an implementation decision may substantially or substantially or materially impact the community, my thought that I came up with today is we have to keep in mind that I think we need to say more than that there because there - hopefully in the policy development process the work that's been done already anticipated substantial impacts and so forth.

So just the way it's worded now when an implementation decision may have impact - substantial impact I think we may need to qualify it with something like beyond what was anticipated in the approved policy. Policy likely will have substantial impacts. Now if there's something - if there's a implementation decision that wasn't anticipated in the approved policy that's a

different story. So I think we need to differentiate between those but that's my own thinking there - Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I guess the wording here needs to allow for the - for this being a pipe dream and it may not be possible. Certainly it's an aspirational principle and it would be nice if we could have a, you know, an automatic process where you turn the crank and the SO comes out of it.

I'm not sure that's going to be possible but what the intent here was to try to make sure that we don't just have staff making arbitrary decisions which at the end of the process become too light and cause the kind of uproar that we've seen in the past. So as such I'm not sure it's worded well at the moment but that's certainly what I was - what I think we want to try to convey.

Chuck Gomes: Yes and Cheryl agrees with you and I think I do too, this is Chuck speaking. That kind of leads me into the next note that I wrote myself when I was looking at this in response to the question, which subsection under implementation does this belong in?

And as I looked ahead this one almost seems to me - I mean it does seem to me to fit under limitation of implementation which is later on in the document. There's a category called limitation of implementation and that - at least in my thinking seemed to fit there rather than just as a principle relating to implementation. But I throw that out for comment and am not hardnosed about what we do with it, but thoughts on that in terms of where to put it?

Well while we're thinking - while people think let's see if we can work on the wording here - any suggestions? Is there any disagreement with the first - very first part of the statement that there should be a methodology? Is there any disagreement with that? Obviously we have to choose some words.

Alan Greenberg: I would almost - it's Alan, I would - to reflect what I said before I would say optimally there should.

Woman: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Recognizing that it's a nice dream but it might not be possible, but we should strive to try to find something that works most of the time or whatever.

Chuck Gomes: Avri go ahead. Looks like you only turned off one of your mutes Avri - I don't know we're not hearing you anyway and one of them is showing muted and - there we go.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: Sorry, sorry - so I was paddling on, I don't think you need the word optimally. The word should already includes the notion that it's not must because it's recognized that you might not be able to do it, otherwise it would be a must.

So I think optimally just sort of, you know, says the same thing twice and we can get (innocence). Now the other thing that I was going to mention before that is methodology is - and I didn't quite have another word, I mean we're talking about a method or a way or a something. A methodology I think has gone one step further to (a solution) than we're ready to. Because it is correct, we don't know what the alarm mechanism is, you know, is it a mechanism, is it a process, is it a whatever.

But there should be something and so, you know, optimally there should be a way I think was, you know, mechanism. I like - actually I like mechanism, so thanks that was the thing I was going to mention - methodology felt awkward.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Avri and this is Chuck again and some other words I thought was procedure or guidelines or something like that but what about mechanism...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, mechanism is all right me.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Cheryl, so there should be a mechanism - okay anybody not comfortable with that? All right let's go on then to recognize or determine or some other word - does anybody want to comment on that? Does the - to me determine fits a little bit better than recognize but I could live with recognize if people are more comfortable with that. So a mechanism to determine - (Tom) go ahead.

(Tom Burt): This is (Tom) I'm dialing in, how about just a mechanism to check?

Chuck Gomes: Check - thoughts on that - Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I guess I still like determine or flag - something which acknowledges that this is something which, you know, raises a warning even though you weren't explicitly looking for it.

Now the reality may be you're going to have to explicitly run the test but I - the only - the problem only comes up, the need for this is only there because we know there are cases where staff innocently or deliberately toddle along and choose to take action where, you know, their presumably belief is there is no impact, it's something within their purview. And therefore we're trying to raise flags here and the word that we use should connote that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan, (Tom)?

(Tom Burt): Yes would (unintelligible) use that word. There's two different things here, when I hear mechanism to flag I think of oh well we use email?

That's a mechanism to flag this stuff but it doesn't tell me what the catalyst was for me to look to see if there should be a flag. So I think we first need a mechanism to do the check and then once we find something that's come up because of the check we have to communicate it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Tom), Alan you wanted to respond?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, no I'm saying that's why I was originally using the term recognize. It's - in computer terminology it's an interrupt, it's something you might have been expecting on the long-term but you don't know when it's going to happen and suddenly it's something you can't ignore anymore.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so we still are vacillating between recognize or determine or check - let's not spend too much time wordsmithing this, we can always come back and fix it later - (Tom) go ahead.

(Tom Burt): Yes I just thought of another. How about there should be a checkpoint during the implementation process to determine when an implementation decision may impact the community.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(Tom Burt): So again the idea that we have some checkpoints built into the implementation process to ask this question.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks okay go ahead did you want to - did you have more?

(Tom Burt): No. That's it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Thanks (Tom). Chuck again. Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I'm a bit concerned about the way that was suggested because an implementation will always have an impact.

And usually that impact should already be known at the time of the policy recommendation. So at least what we're talking about before.

And (Tom)'s language seems to suggest that even - that would may already be known we still need to go and flag it again if - even though it's already known that, you know, certain policy recommendations have an impact on registries or registrars because they'll need to adopt their systems or their policy documents and that's usually already communicated.

I thought this was more related to impacts that weren't foreseen or issues that come up that weren't anticipated. So that would be my concern with the wording (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. Unanticipated would be fine with me before the word impact.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan. By the way I was kind of leaning I didn't use that word in my head but I was kind of leaning that too that kind of doubt with the concern I communicated earlier. (Tom) go ahead.

(Tom Burt): Yes, yes I think unanticipated is a good word as well. I mean this is the whole point of our effort is the fact that things do come up during implementation that were not recognized earlier.

Chuck Gomes: Avri please.

Avri Doria: Hi. I'm fine with the way this is worded. The other thing is though there's another reason for having and I'm not positive of our checkpoints because then you have to worry about how far apart they are and when you do a checkpoint which is an implementation detail.

But what I'm also concerned about is the events where the impact to the community may or may not be there but what is there is a possible deviation from the policy recommendation and decision.

And those things need to be recognized, you know, and understood as well. So if it's something that's just defined as impact then you're sort of saying

well yes it doesn't really matter that the policy is it appears to be - or the implementation seems to be doing something different than what the policy mandated.

We don't think there's an impact to the community on it so, you know, we'll move on. So I'm looking for something a little broader or thanks.

Chuck Gomes: So thanks Avri. This is Chuck. So my question to you is does that then get us to a second principle maybe it's better to separate them.

One that deals with - unanticipated significant impact and another one that may involve deviation from what was intended in the policy or are those two separate principles is it easier to deal with them that way?

And I'll let you respond if you want. Okay so you okay so separating them might be a way of dealing with that. Okay thanks.

So what we have now let's go ahead and deal with the word is there strong leaning one way or another whether it's substantial, or material, or some other word? Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I guess I'd prefer substantial because, you know, you can start getting nitpicky. Of course there's a judgment call on substantial.

What I put my hand up for was the deviation from intended policy I think is very much a different issue. So I do want to keep a separate.

Chuck Gomes: Yes okay. So if anybody disagrees with that please speak up. I -- this is Chuck again -- and I think it is simpler and clearer to keep them separate.

So let's still see if we can finish off A. So what about - is there big now I think Alan likes recognized. Several I think a couple people said they like determined.

We have the word check. We could also use the word identified to identify when an implementation decision may substantially impact the community in an unanticipated way.

We obviously have to fix all the order of words but any thoughts there?
Marika please?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just to note that (Tom) had also suggested some language before which he has posted in the chat.

So I don't know if people are happy with the way we're going now or people still want to look at the alternative proposed.

Chuck Gomes: You're talking about the flag language or the checkpoint language?

Marika Konings: Descendent that (Tom) has written that there should be a mechanism to flag unanticipated outcomes that impact the community. So I think it's a rewording of the whole sentence basically.

Chuck Gomes: Thoughts on that? Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Indirectly. I realized as I was talking now or as I was listening now that at the - during the meeting last week it became obvious to me although I don't think I said it that recognize has two different meanings.

You know, I can recognize that it is raining meaning I have just become aware of the fact and recognizing I recognize that your Chuck Gomes, you know, there's a similarity which I have now pieced together.

It's the become aware of that I was trying to use the word for. And clearly it's not the best word because it's recognized has multiple meanings. And people have interpreted different meanings in our discussion over the last week.

Chuck Gomes: So Alan this is Chuck. Do you have a preference between determine, or check, or identify, or some other word?

Alan Greenberg: Identify is probably the best of the three of the ones is probably better than the ones there. But again identify it implies, you know, that you are going through a specific test. I'd prefer something to - Avri has alerted. I like that.

Avri Doria: Alerted works yes.

Alan Greenberg: To mechanism to be alerted that...

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I'm not just trying to be difficult but I'm - being alerted is very different because determine for example is an active and being alerted is kind of passive. Somebody else does it.

Alan Greenberg: Well and but that was the connotation I was looking for. And if you go into the chat and look at all of our discussion of traps and interrupts, you know, the designer of a software knows that an interrupt is going to come sometime but it pops up out of the blue and says you can't ignore me. And that was the original connotation I was looking for.

Chuck Gomes: So it would say...

Alan Greenberg: Perhaps unachievable but...

Chuck Gomes: ...that (unintelligible) a mechanism to be alerted when an implementation a decision may substantially impact the community. Is that what's going on?

Alan Greenberg: To alert implementers that a decision how about that?

Chuck Gomes: Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes thanks. So mechanism to alert now there really are two things. Something has to alert. And then once there's alert something has it has to be dealt with.

And I'm not sure that you're going to find one word that says you are alerted and you have reacted. Now first also I don't think it has to alert the implementer it has to be a more general alert than that. It has to, you know, hello?

Chuck Gomes: Yes this is Chuck. And I was thinking the same thing. The policy development body needs to be alerted as well not just the implementer.

Avri Doria: Right. So it could be a mechanism to alert and too - and I would use a neutral word such as handle...

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck taking advantage of my position here I like that alert and handle. Did you have more to say Avri or should I go to Alan?

Avri Doria: Okay no I, you know, I if I could just you would take out implementers that basically. And it would just be too alert and handle an implementation decision that may, you know, and now I'll shut up.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I'm getting lost here. But what we've done or what we haven't done. I thought we already said that if it is recognized that the community is going to be impacted they must be involved.

That's somewhere I thought way up at the top if it isn't it must it should be or it has to be repeated under implementation.

In my mind that's already a principle that should be well-established. This one says there should be - we want to way to understand when the communities going to be impacted.

The follow on to that implicitly is the policy body has to be involved. We - I thought we already decided that and don't need to repeat it here.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan. This is Chuck. Now since nobody else has their hand up I'm going to suggest this. In my opinion it seems like it wouldn't hurt to have it again even if we do have it earlier because...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...but if somebody disagrees with that I'm open to that.

And again if we come back to it later and see that it is duplicative or redundant in a way we could fix that later. I would suggest for now let's go ahead and unless there's any objections and go that route.

So let's see where we're at. (Tom) go ahead.

(Tom Burt): Yes. I'm just suggesting some alternate wording in the chat saying this should be a mechanism to flag an address unanticipated outcomes that may substantially impact blah, blah, blah.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I like that overall. But I in my view unanticipated - I like unanticipated. Unanticipated outcomes doesn't deal with the word implementation because what we're really - that term implementation decision in there probably substitutes for it.

I - in my mind (unintelligible) so that the - it's an implementation decision that has unanticipated outcomes that impact the community that is critical.

So I guess what I need -- and I don't know if everybody else does or not because it's not just about me --- is an implementation decision that we're dealing with here that may cause the unanticipated outcomes that impact the community.

So I think that needs to be in there. Does that make sense? So what if we were to do this one (Tom) since I don't see hand up this is Chuck again.

There should be a mechanism to flag an address - I don't know what's going on here but if - I guess if people could mute for a little bit here maybe we'll get beyond that.

So here again I'm going to try and suggest an edit to (Tom)'s suggested wording. There should be a mechanism to flag an address unanticipated outcomes of implementation decisions that impact the community.

And we probably want in there that significantly impact the community, I don't know maybe not. So does that work? Marika were you able to get that?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I think if this and I think I've got it there should be a mechanism to flag an address unanticipated outcomes of implementation decisions that significantly impact the community.

Chuck Gomes: Yes and this is Chuck again. I would I think Avri made a little a one word suggestion in a comment she made earlier that was helpful that may significantly impact the community.

I think the may is helpful because we may not know for sure but if there is a chance that it would we need to, you know, deal with that.

Now Avri had also suggested something else there that I thought was useful - oh and maybe the address covers it.

I think maybe the word address are you okay with that Avri? Does the word address work for you there in relation to a comment you made earlier?

Avri Doria: Yes flag in - I mean flag and address is just as good as alert and handle as far as I'm concerned so sure.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Okay thanks. Okay so here's what we have. There should be a mechanism to flag and address unanticipated outcomes of implementation decisions that may significantly impact the community, anybody not comfortable with that? Any other edits? All right let's go to B there. And this is - was the separation of a point that Avri made who would like to help finish that principle?

Should it be yes I mean while you're thinking Chuck again let me what if we were to follow the same pattern of A?

There should be a mechanism to flag and address situations where there is a deviation from what was intended in the policy.

I'll just throw that out. And I see an agree by Avri. Anybody not like that or have an improvement on it?

Okay. Go ahead Avri. You can take some time if you need to think about it and respond.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: You have the mic.

Avri Doria: No I just didn't just (unintelligible) messed pushing the wrong button. I think starting it that way is good.

I think you may want if you're going to follow it you want to follow, you know, where there may be a deviation between the, you know, the implementation and the policy.

Chuck Gomes: Yes up there where it says it will change to may yes. Good.

Avri Doria: And there may be a deviation between, you know, the - the implementation and the policy.

Chuck Gomes: And is it okay to leave the intended in the policy?

Avri Doria: I don't know. To say that there's perhaps. You could do the policy as it was originally intended. You want to be careful about investing new policy intentions with that I mean that could be a possibility too but that's a different issue.

Again that comes out of the first one that if there's, you know, new and as with the first condition we had in A if there's an unintended consequence and an unintended impact that may not have been handled by the policy and therefore could force whatever comes post that.

In this case you don't want to leave the door open for the intention of the policy not being something that was original intention.

And so I worry there about what, you know, we all do sometimes which is when we look back on something we have more intention for it now than we did when we did it originally and so putting in intention opens up all kinds of doors. So if we put in intention we really should peg it to original attention. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Avri. This is Chuck. And again I - I'm not I was advocating for having intention in there but because it was there before I wanted to make

sure we or because it was talked about before I wanted just wanted to ask the question. Any thoughts?

And so B reads there should be a mechanism to flag an address situations where they may where there may be a deviation between the implementation and the policy as it was originally intended. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: No. I have no worry with the words. It dawned on me as listening to this that certainly B and perhaps even A the mechanism is the implementation review team. And so it may not be as weird as we were originally talking about.

Certainly the reason that we started doing implementation teams was to make sure that if we didn't get the wording exactly right and blatantly clear there's someone could help interpret to the implementers. And that's certainly been the motivation for why the concept was, you know, was invented.

So I'm feeling comfortable with the wording we have right now. And more...

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: ...comfortable than I did originally.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan. This is Chuck again. Now the one issue I see - by the way I agree with you and Avri did too that this - the implementation review team might be the mechanism or at least a structure by which a mechanism could function.

But keep in mind that implementation review teams don't always happen and don't always need to happen.

So we don't need to worry about that now. That's just something as we move forward we can keep that in mind as we look at implementation review teams further. Thanks.

Okay let's go to C a proposed change. So let me get something I can read better here. Okay so a proposed change in policy implementation is treated as an implementation change unless the objective or result creates new obligations on certain parties. I'm not sure why the word objective is there.

Alan Greenberg: Does this -- its Alan speaking -- does this remember we're - at this point we're now taking things that were submitted independently and trying to merge them altogether.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: I would tend to say this one is already covered.

Chuck Gomes: Well this is Chuck again. I mean there is something new there in terms of the new obligations on certain parties. So I don't think that's been covered anywhere.

Alan Greenberg: And that impact the...

Chuck Gomes: Well yes it is impact. But it's Chuck again. It is impact Alan. I fully agree with you on that. But is it it is a very measurable impact for which there may be value in identifying it. And I...

Alan Greenberg: Let's...

Chuck Gomes: ...just throw that out for thought.

Alan Greenberg: ...add a footnote on A then on impacting A.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So the footnote on A then -- this is Chuck -- would be for example if there are new obligations an example of an impact would be when new obligations are imposed on parties. Something like that?

Alan Greenberg: That's certainly one of the options. I think we'd probably want a selection of options there. You know, for example but not limited to and then give three or four.

Chuck Gomes: Okay any objections to that?

Alan Greenberg: I think we're getting tired.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well our time is just about up too. So any other thoughts on where - on this one before we - oh I just one more thing.

I had asked about the word objective in that. But is that gone now I think that's gone now right the way we've dealt with this? So this one actually goes away and we have a footnote that complements that.

Now I didn't go through the comments that were does anybody want to speak up on any of your comments or (Nick) or (Nick) you had some comments there, Avri you had some comments, anything you'd like to add or change in terms of what we've done here?

Okay. So I think for next time then it brings us to proposed principles related to ICANN staff. Is that right? Marika please.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just to confirm that I can also then remove now the concepts not an overarching as well as the comments to just take them out as we've actually completely reworded this. And I guess people have new comments we can just add them back in not to maybe get confused.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. This is Chuck. I think that's true. That's been helpful in the past. But let's listen to Greg before we actually do that.

Greg Shatan: Hi. It's Greg. I think this section has, you know, improved quite a bit. I guess I'm - I want to see how it kind of all shakes out.

I'm still a little concerned about the, you know, concept of how we're doing with the concept of obligations because I feel like that was another perhaps, you know, word that was being used to drag, you know, everything back toward a policy type treatment.

So I think it may be a question of how we look at what sort of, you know, and I think obligations and impact are kind of I mean obligation in the sense is a subset of impact.

So it's all a question of whether, you know, some cases it's hard to imagine there is much of anything that creates that has no impact and that creates no new, you know, absolutely no change in the obligations of any party. But I kind of want to have to digest the whole process or process where we've gotten here.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Greg. And I think that's right. We're going and we're going to have to kind of look at this whole package when we get to the end and when we organize it into some sort of a meaningful outline and so forth.

So please let's make sure that we come back to that. Could I see the footnote that the for example footnote on their real quick Marika that we did.

For example and I think Alan has suggested there that some examples okay you've got add other examples. Okay that's fine. We can fix that later.

I just wanted to make sure we captured that for additional work later and we have. So that's very good. All right well I think our time is up. We will pick up from there next time.

Keep in mind we're meeting weekly through February. There is one time when it may be hard for me to meet but if and when that happens that's the week of the 17th I think.

But if I can't make it and I may be able to if I can't though I will certainly make sure that one of you gets to be the default chair for a week. Okay?

Avri Doria: God you're generous Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: All right guys again we're making, you know, when I looked ahead I don't think we're going to have any trouble wrapping this up.

I always tend to be more optimistic as Avri knows pretty well from when we were on the council together.

But I really think it's realistic for us to get something to the full working group before the end of February. So thanks again for all your efforts.

And I'm assuming that's an old hand Greg. Is that correct?

Greg Shatan: Sorry about that my hand maintenance is deficient.

Chuck Gomes: Yes we noticed. So...

Avri Doria: He'll even jump the queue when there is no queue.

Chuck Gomes: ...okay good job guys. And I appreciate the good work. And we will pick up next week. Certainly if you have thoughts to share on the list in the meantime please do that.

And Marika I assume you will be getting out a latest revision for all of us to use going forward. thanks again. Have a good rest of your...

Woman: Oh sorry.

Man: That's okay just finishing. I mean...

Woman: Oh you have a fax machine.

Chuck Gomes: In fact we finished.

Woman: Can I fax the document to Concordia?

Man: We can...

Chuck Gomes: Good bye.

Man: ...(unintelligible) always work.

Avri Doria: Bye.

Woman: Thank you very much. (Lou) even asked for the recording. Thank you.

END