

**Policy & Implementation Working Group Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION**

Wednesday 23 April 2014 at 1900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Wednesday 23 April 2014 at 1900 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-20140423-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Chuck Gomes – RySG
J.Scott Evans – BC
Greg Shatan – IPC
Nic Steinbach – RrSG
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – At-Large
Brian Winterfeldt – IPC
James Bladel – RrSG

Apologies:

Wolf-Ullrich Knoblen – ISPCP
Olga Cavalli - GAC
Alan Greenberg - ALAC

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Mary Wong
Amy Bivins
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everybody. And welcome to the Policy and Implementation Working Group Call, on the 23rd April, 2014.

On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Michael Graham, Chuck Gomes, Greg Shatan, J. Scott-Evans, James Bladel, and (Amr Elsadr).

We have apologies from Olga Cavalli, Alan Greenberg and Wolf (INAUDIBLE).

From Staff we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Amy Bivins; and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes.

And Brian Winterfeldt has just joined the call.

Thank you much. Chuck, I hand over to you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Natalie. And welcome to everyone for our Working Group Call today. The agenda is posted on the right of the Adobe Connect screen. Let me, first of all, ask whether anyone who is not in Adobe Connect, and just on the audio. Okay. Hearing no one, then everybody should be able to use the Adobe Connect features. That's helpful to know.

So, any updates to Statements of Interest? Or any suggested changes to the agenda? Not seeing or hearing any, let's move right on.

The first task is to review the revised work plan, which Marika sent around several days ago, and so let's start right there. And Marika, would you like to say anything about that plan? I don't think you need to go through it in detail, but say anything about that plan, I don't think you need to go through it in detail, but if you'd like to make any introductory comments, and then we'll see if there are any questions or comments and response.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Chuck. So this is Marika. And I actually just realized that what you see on the screen is only the first sheet of the work plan, I actually hadn't printed everything. So I'm going to try and do now to share my screen, so you can actually see the full version, which I did send out over email and as of now. Let me zoom in a little bit. So basically, the changes we made is based on the discussions we had last week, to basically move from an approach of having track teams, to actually start working on the different deliverables in sequence.

So basically what we've done is update the different tracks, and for now we've only done it for deliverable one. We are assuming that that's where the Working Group would start, and basically try to anticipate how much time it would need. So basically the idea would be that on the next meeting, which would be scheduled for next week, we would actually review the tasks as outlined in the Mind Map, and also determined the approach to actually delivering on those questions.

And then, basically we mapped out a number of meetings, during which the Working Group would have its deliberations. Anticipating a possible finalization of draft recommendation right before the London Meeting with the idea that those draft recommendations could then be shared with the community for feedback and input during our face-to-face meeting there. Following that the idea would be that the Working Group then would of course review input received and update the draft recommendations appropriate; and based on that, move then into deliverable two and three.

As I've said, we haven't mapped out the timeline for, you'd probably need to see a little bit, indeed, if this timeline is even realistic. Will we actually get to draft the recommendations by London? Or maybe, you know, we are going so fast that we can really start on the next one and before London even. So we've kept it a little bit flexible, but basically the idea is that we'll go through deliverables in sequence and you're starting with deliverable one, and go through two and three, and then number four, and then we'll have as well -- let me move over here -- and number five basically going back to the set of principles, and finalize our work.

I think we -- I did leave it for the last task basically, publishing a final report, we haven't put a firm date on it, I think we are still hoping that maybe by Los Angeles we'll be able to publish an initial report for public comments. But I think over the course of time, we'll probably need to go in regular reviews of our plan to be able to update the timing and have a more realistic assessment of what will be feasible and reasonable in relationship to the progress where we are able to make over the next, coming meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marika. Now a couple things from me, personally, if anybody else wants to jump in, please raise your hand. First of all, good work. With regard to the second and -- or I guess they are deliverable two and three, and four, I think trying to be too detailed on those at this stage is kind of a waste of time, because we'll get a better feel for those once we get into deliverable one. So, I'm personally comfortable with not spending a lot of time trying to estimate dates for that. I think it is a good idea to have a target of the L.A. Meeting for having at least a draft initial report.

I think that's probably good to have on there as a tentative target. Now, with regard to the London Meeting, have you calculated when the deadline is to have something to the community for review; whether that's some complete recommendations for deliverable one or not? What is the deadline for -- oh, there it is. That's June 2nd then. Okay. Yeah, the screen is not revealing.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. So basically, the London publication deadline is for documents that are intended for public consultation, so basically there are two ways that the Working Group can approach it. If by the 2nd of June, you actually have something that is ready for public consultation, we can publish it at that date, and then ask the community to provide input during the London Meeting itself.

However, if we are not able to meet that deadline which, you know, is relatively soon, another approach the Working Group may take is actually in London, just present the draft recommendations, and clearly know that these are not intended to be finalized at that stage, or there's not going to be any other opportunity to provide input, but still use the London Meeting to get input on the draft recommendations as such, and that means you don't actually have to meet that 2nd June, because basically what we are doing is just presenting it there and encouraging people to provide input.

And again, the Working Group may consider, depending on how firm the recommendations are, or what day the Working Group believe there are, whether there is a need to already put those out for public comment, or maybe just share them with stakeholders and constituencies for input on the mailing list, and determine what would be the best way to obtain feedback.

Whether it makes sense to do that on a deliverable-by-deliverable basis, or whether it makes more sense to just move through everything, just provide a status update in London, and then actually have the initial report as the first formal stats by which everyone can provide input on

whether the Working Group has given -- whether the Working Group has come to a conclusion on.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. Chuck again. Let me share a personal recommendation here, and then, again, I welcome reaction to it. I really like the principle of posting things in advance. We went through many, many meetings when all of us were struggling because we'd get stuff last minute, and then talk about it in the meetings, and had no time to prepare. So my recommendation would be, even if we don't have anything that we would call close to final, that we post on June 2nd what we have with the notation that, we are continuing, this isn't a final recommendation but we do want to consult with the community on what we have so far in London.

So my recommendation is that we meet that deadline, at whatever state we are at, not to rush to get something final, if it's not final, that's okay, but still post it on June 2nd. Now let me be quiet and see if there are any reactions to that.

J. Scott-Evans: I think that sounds like a great idea. This is J. Scott.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, J Scott. Is there anybody opposed to that? Speak up, or use the Adobe features there. Okay.

So, does that make sense then, Marika, in terms of --? So we'll plan on posting what we have on June 2nd, and we'll continue working up -- you know, after that posting, so we may have -- likely we'll have a little more done by the time we get to London, and we can communicate that as there's time in London, but certainly we can get public consultation on the work that we've completed at that time for deliverable one.

Marika Konings: Yeah. And this is Marika. We can do like we've done for the Singapore Meeting, is basically create a Wiki page linked through the meeting agenda, on which we will then post that version on the 2nd of June, but then we can also use that same page to post updates to that, and we can then use that link to share with the community on where they can find the documents that are linked or related to that meeting. So it gives us, as well, flexibility to provide updates or add additional information as we see fit after that 2nd June deadline.

Chuck Gomes: That's excellent. This is Chuck again. So, yeah, that's very good and I think that works. Now, let me just open it up for any questions or comments in terms of the work plan that we are looking at right now.

So, not hearing anyone; so is the -- can you scroll down for me, Marika, to the L.A. Meeting, down to that area. Do we have a posting deadline for that meeting on there?

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. We do have a posting, but I actually didn't include it here, I believe. It's, yeah, 15 working days before the 12th, so it will take us somewhere towards the end of September.

Chuck Gomes: I would just -- let's have that, just so that we have in mind going forward. Again, whatever state we are at, at that time we are going to want to post

something. Hopefully we are at -- we have a draft initial report at that point, but it would be good to have that on the work plan I think.

Okay. Any other comments, questions about the work plan? Okay. Very good; then let's go -- Marika, do you need anything else from the group?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No. Not at this stage. I'll add the date and post it as well on the Wiki where we have now the previous version of the work plan.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Excellent. So you'll send us all a revised version of the work plan, based on those changes. Thank you. Going then to agenda item three, which is the working principles, and if I am correct on this, I think we are on section B of the principles. Is that correct? Does anyone have any questions or comments on the previous portion of the principles? Not seeing or hearing any, let's take off with principle-B which is up on your Adobe screen right now.

The first comment there, as you can see, is from -- it's not showing in the Adobe, I don't know why, but it's showing that it's from Mikey O'Connor on section 1-B there. And he's saying: it may help to define who does this examination, and he would lobby for the Working Group or the Implementation Review Team. So, let me first of all, before commenting more myself, just open it up for any comments or questions on that comment. We will go through the other comments that follow that, but if anybody wants to jump in sooner, feel free.

So Amr, and it looks like Amr is not with us today, but he is agreeing with Mikey regarding the findings, if I'm interpreting it correctly, defining who does the examination. I'm not sure who that would be. Does anybody have any suggestion there?

Speaker: I agree that we should -- there needs to be some indication. That kind of ambiguity just depletes the issue.

Chuck Gomes: Now, my comment which is comment three there, that I made quite a while ago on this, was that this is a principle, and I wondered whether that's something that's identified in our more specific task that we are going to follow up later. I'm okay with putting something in there as who would do that, but if we are going to do that, we are going to have to come up with the recommendation for who that would be.

Michael Graham: Yeah. What I was thinking was, what if we included after it: to be examined. Since as you say, this is a principle and hopefully in the process we might identify who might be the appropriate entity, but perhaps we should simply drop in something to the effect of: by an appropriate entity at this point, and leave it for final report to determine who or what that entity may be.

Chuck Gomes: Any thoughts on that from others? I mean, does that add any more than what we have right now? I guess a little bit, huh, by an appropriate entity, it's still not specific, which I--

J. Scott Evans: I think that -- I mean, again, you're just leaning to something that's going to lead to further negotiation and discussion dispute. It seems to me it will be a far less -- this is J.Scott for the record -- far less controversial, at least when it's in practice, if we just make a recommendation as to who that should be.

Chuck Gomes: So, J. Scott, let me ask you a question, is it enough -- is that an appropriate policy management function that the GNSO Council should do?

J. Scott-Evans: You know, I would think that probably that is the place for it to go.

Chuck Gomes: All right. I would be okay with that, because it does seem like a policy management function, and if necessary the Council, of course, can always go back to its constituency and stakeholders if they need to, but it does seem like a policy management function.

James? You are agreeing. Thank you. Okay. Does anybody disagree with that?

Marika Konings: Chuck, this is Marika.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Marika Konings: I have my hand up as well. I actually want you to know that I actually agree with your approach to this, because I think this is actually an area that will become clear, or needs to be worked out as part of the discussions or the deliberations under the deliverables. As one of the questions is, indeed what is the exact role and functioning of Implementation Review Teams? It may come out that, you know, they are the ones that actually examine the changes, and then make recommendations to the Council, for example.

Or, maybe the outcome of that is that they just flag it, and then the Council, so, I think they need to maybe adding by an appropriate entity, flagged already that that needs to be worked out. But I think if we are already trying to define here who should be doing it, and they may already preempt our discussions on the other Charter questions. Basically I'm just saying I think I agree with your suggestion that this is, indeed a high-level principle, and the details of this are exactly needs to be worked out in our discussions on the different charter questions.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again. J. Scott, would you be comfortable with that? Or are you more comfortable with putting the GNSO Council as they are now? By the way, just to add, I mean, this will come again later. One of the problems of suggesting an Implementation Review Team in any of the things we do, is that there may not always be an Implementation Review Team.

J. Scott-Evans: Well, if what we are trying to do is preserve this for the record, for the Working Group, I would be -- I think it would better to say; needs to be examined by the GNSO Council, (INAUDIBLE) or any other appropriate entity that may be determined during deliberations, or something like that, in brackets

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, J. Scott. I'm okay with that. Marika, coming back to you; does that work for you?

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. I'm trying to write it off, so basically it would be close to GNSO policy recommendation, needs to be examined by the GNSO Council, or another appropriate entity as may be determined following the Working Group deliberations?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's right.

Marika Konings: I mean -- and I think J. Scott suggests to put that in bracket.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Not, parenthesis, in brackets, meaning that it will come out, it's not part of the text, so you would have the hard brackets.

Marika Konings: You mean square brackets?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Marika Konings: Right.

J. Scott-Evans: For instance, to make you think that it's part of the text, where there's a bracket but you know that we are going to remove it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, J. Scott. And I'm -- this is Chuck again -- another question for you? Are the brackets in the right place? Or do they go around -- do they start with -- by the GNSO Council? I'm honestly asking you, I just want to make sure we put the square brackets what you--

J. Scott-Evans: I'd say starting with the "or".

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That's fine. I just wanted to clarify. Chuck again. Okay; any more comments or objections or changes for that? Okay. Now, the -- and I don't see now, the red line -- the red check, it's not showing up in Adobe, is that correct? Is anybody seeing the red? I'm looking at it on a printed copy, so it's showing in the blue as well, I think. And, oh, the red line, deletions are not showing. Is that right, Marika, from Avri?

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. I think the deletions actually come up here at the end of the document. It's the way I think it organizes them, so I think the printed -- I think it's a trade spot, but I think here they actually show somewhere else in the document.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again. Thanks, Marika. Is there anyone who hasn't looked Avri's suggested changes in the red line? Or if we can look at it on the screen, that's fine. I looked at them, and thought that they were all fine, but I just - - I've kind of like to cover those all at once just for efficiency sake. To see if anybody had any problem with the edits that Avri made, but they all seem to be okay to me. I can go over them if somebody needs me to, it's not very hard to do, and there's only five or six. Does anybody--?

Marika Konings: Chuck, this is Marika. I think they actually show up here in blue, with -- yeah, with my name to it, as I made them put the document on top of Avri's.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks. That covers it. So if everyone would just take a look at those, and see if you -- it looks like there's four showing there. See if anyone has any concerns with Avri's edits. And I'll allow a minute just for people to glance through those and look over at the text.

Okay. Chuck again. I'm not seeing any concerns. If somebody does have one as we are going through this, please speak up otherwise we will just accept those edits into the text. Then we go to comment six, I guess it is still six on the -- no it's -- I don't know what comment it is on Adobe, it's comment six on my printed version. Anyway it's the -- next comment from Mikey, the one that says, "Combine with the comment above, I would lobby for proactively approving the change, rather than reactively challenging it."

So this is on part B again. No, excuse me -- it's in part C, paragraph C. "The track record of ICANN challenge of the reconsideration process is pretty bad, and it makes me unwilling to trust that they will work any better here." Now as I commented on in the next comment, the sub-team actually spent a lot of time on this, so let's talk about it now, and see if we come to agreement. Notice that Amr said that it's a pretty good suggestion, and of course, Marika commented that the Working Group is still working on the wording of these two deliverables, that's B and C.

Let's see if we can wrap up C, come to some agreement on the wording there, and let me throw it back to Mikey's suggestion, of being more proactive on this rather than avowing for a challenge. Again, those of you who were on the sub-team -- and I'll be with you in a second Marika -- those that were on the sub-team, you know, we spent a lot of time on this particular one, so please jump in and help. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. My one concern for making such a change would be, exactly, of course we've put in all cases. The things that I'm looking here as well, that, I guess we want to have a balance where I knew there are no concerns that are merely indeed error or corrections, or minor updates. You don't necessarily want to go through a formal approval process, which, of course, adds a lot of time.

If that approval process would require GNSO Council approval, if that requires a motion and to by the deadline that needs, you know, a Council meeting, so I would just advocate here, if that is the direction that the Working Group would like to, that it should be a kind of balance. Where, it's exactly not for all cases, because I think that would -- it would probably add unnecessary delays to implementation of a policy recommendation. I think as well -- this maybe something as well, that of course more details will be worked as we through the actual Charter questions, because I think we are getting quite some good experience as well, working with Implementation Review Team, and then how to, indeed, manage potential changes, it with that group on how to implement a policy recommendation

So hopefully that well -- as well assist us in further considering this. And, again, I think this is probably an area where, once we've gone through all the Charter questions who hope we have a very detailed process that would specify or detail, and in which is indeed formal approval will, or may, or has to required, and in which cases there's no need to do so. So again, I don't know if at this stage we need to bake that in here, or whether that's actually something that will come out at the end of a our process.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. Does anybody have a suggestion for wording in paragraph C that would accommodate Mikey's suggestion, or you can also say, you know, you don't think we should do that, but let's see if we can wrap this one up. So it's a -- he is right that it's a reactive approach that's the way the principles work right now, so the community maintains the right to challenge, or else they have to be communicating something to do a challenge, but that's certainly something that we can do.

Think about that a minute here, and see, I guess first of all, do you think that it should be more proactive instead of reactive? We can certainly change the wording of it that way. Or, are you okay with it the way it is? I'll pause and let you think about that.

Chuck again. Can anybody maybe translate what Mikey is getting at? I think the sentence we are focusing on is the very last sentence. Correct me if you think it's different than that, but is there a way, if we were to do it more proactively, I assume we would have to have something in there that says the -- any changes made must be communicated to the GNSO community. And I'm thinking that Mikey is getting at, that we need an approval of those changes, is that what he's saying? That's, kind of, the way I'm interpreting it. Does anybody see it differently than that? I'm not necessarily advocating that, but trying to get us to think through it carefully.

Michael Graham: Yeah. Chuck, this is Michael. What he seems to be getting at, as I'm reading it, is that anytime that Staff is making transparent changes, those changes would have to be approved before being fully enforced. That's a pretty big supervisory responsibility it seems to me.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michael. And I think you're right. I mean, I wonder if we could soften that a little bit, if we go that direction. And what I'm getting at is, instead of require -- if you require -- the whole idea of this is to make it less bureaucratic on doing things that are administrative, non-controversial, et cetera, and so if we literally, say, approve, we are kind of defeating the whole idea of this paragraph.

At the same time we could have a -- admit changes like this should be communicated to the Council, and if there are any concerns the GNSO has a responsibility to communicate those concerns. It's a little softer than just requiring approval on all those. And I'll stop and let Marika jump in.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. Just repeating the whole sentence from the start again, I think there is an issue here, or at least it's not vetted properly,

because I think at the moment it seems to imply that the GNSO policy recommendations actually come with an implementation plan, and if Staff makes changes to those proposed implementation plan, they can do so as long as it doesn't change the intent of the policy recommendation.

But that's not how the impact has happened. Basically, Staff gets the policy recommendations, we take those, take them into -- the entirety, and then try to translate those into an implementation plan, which may be in the form of a completely new policy, or the form of changes to an existing policy, or changes to existing advisories or rules.

So I think the way it's working currently seems to imply that there actually is an implementation plan that comes with the policy recommendations, to which Staff then may make changes, and those changes may include administrative updates, errors or corrections, and process details, and those then should be communicated. But I think it's -- that's not what the current practice is of how implementation is done. Again, I don't think it's solved either by changing it to make your change to the policy recommendations, because staff would actually never go back to their policy recommendations themselves.

We may just say, look, there is a disconnect between what the recommendation says and what we believe is feasible, or implementable on the implementation side, and there may be a consultation needed and a discussion needs to be held, and I think that carries the mechanism for that. Or at least for the recent PDPs that we are in the process of implementing, it is the Implementation Review Team. And that the Implementation Review Team then talks through the changes and basically makes an assessment that contravenes the Working Group recommendations or is that actually in line.

And based on that feedback, staff will then make changes to their initial draft of the implementation plan. I think that's where it currently reads differently, and I actually don't have any immediate suggestions on how to fix that, actually to (INAUDIBLE).

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. Mary, go ahead.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Chuck. And this really just a follow up to what Marika said as well, because yes, it does seem that the two sentences, or the three sentences, are dealing with two overlapping but not identical things. One is what Marika is talking about, that aid as an assumption that it's an implementation plan, and then to what happens when Staff changes that plan. The way that last sentence is written, it's broader than that as well, and I wonder how this gels with one of the earlier principles, that this group talks quite a lot about, a meeting or two ago, when we talked about the chartering organization I believe it was, that had continue to be involved to provide the policy guidance.

And it seems to me that the way this sentence is written, it was first back to that, but maybe it's not intended to -- maybe it's intended to refer really to the sort of interplay between the staff and those who are working with the staff to draft the implementation plans. So whatever it is I think it

needs to be clearer on both accounts; the implementation plan, the question that Marika has raised, and the intent of this last sentence in paragraph B here.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Mary. Not seeing other hands let me throw out a couple things. First of all, I'm wondering if the administrative changes really are to the policy and not to an implementation plan. I don't know whether that's true or not. A second comment on a different point is, I mean, we can fix that first sentence by saying, that one fix would be, in cases where the policy included an implementation plan, or an implementation has been approved then Staff can make those changes. So that's one way of dealing with it.

Are they -- I guess the change is, I'm thinking out loud, so forgive me for that -- are the changes that we are talking about here, the error, corrections, and administrative updates and so forth. Couldn't they be both to the policy wording itself, and to -- and/or to an implementation plan, whether it was part of the policy development effort, or subsequent to it. And I'll stop there, and go to Marika, and then James.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. I think it's more in the translation of the policy recommendations into the implementation language, and that's where, I said before, I don't think Staff would actually go back and say, oh, recommendation A you said, you know, two when it should be three, you should go and change that. We will probably say, well, as we implement this, we would suggest that we actually change two to three for these and these reasons. So I think it's more where it comes in, is in the translation of the policy recommendations into implementation language, in whatever form that may take.

It's that implementation may take different forms, and maybe the creation of a whole new policy as such, and maybe modification of an existing policy, and maybe in the form of an advisory. I think there are different ways in which policy recommendations can be implemented, but I don't think that -- I don't recall instances where Staff has back and said, Oh, we actually need to change the policy recommendation, it's more the flow of, oh, actually the policy recommendation may not be implemented as currently written, however, if we write it in the implementation in this way, we believe it does match, and it may just be an administrative update. I think especially in cases, for example, where a certain language may be provided by a group or the general gist of how a certain provision may look in an implementation of the policy.

So again, I think we -- there needs to be -- it needs to probably read in such a way that it talks about how the -- the interpretation of Staff of the policy recommendation, and if in those cases they believe that the administrative updates or error corrections, or policy details need to be fished as part of the translation, realizing that it doesn't match exactly the policy recommendation, but it's a small update or correction basically. And again, in those changes where there bigger implications or the intent is changed, I think that's where we go back, you know, to basically principle B.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. By the way, that seems to make a lot of sense, and if others agree with that, we can probably fix the language in that first sentence to say it that way. But let me go to James.

James Bladel: Hi, Chuck. James speaking for the transcript. Just in time, and I've just joined the telephone bridge, for my audio is still not working. So, I've been reading through this, and listening, you know, with some fresh eyes, perhaps, and listening to a lot of recommendations, a lot of it coming from -- you know, from the Staff side. And thinking a little bit about what Mikey was driving at, and I agree with, I think, one of your earlier statements, that we need to make this a little bit fast, a little more streamlined, a little more of a lightweight process.

And I'm afraid, you know, what I'm about suggest may really throw a wrench into things here, but I wanted to put out on the table the idea that, conceptually, rather than putting it up, and building and trying to engineer a fool-proofed, airtight process by which Staff, you know, checks in with the GNSO or chartering body frequently and then knows that -- unknown and predictable, determine that this type of procedure that is on the GNSO side, I think rather than setting up all those checkpoints in advance, one option might be to simply provide a mechanism for the chartering body of the GNSO to interrupt the implementation of a policy when they feel, or if they feel that Staff has gone outside of the original recommendations.

In other words, you know, not forcing -- not setting up all these instances whereby they would have to ask for permission, but just strictly leaving the door open, or the possibility open for GNSO intervention if things go off the rails. And Marika is saying that that currently exists.

Okay. Then that's great, if that currently exists. I think that there have been a couple instances, for example, where it certainly feels like that would have been necessary, so I was not aware that that was already built into the process. But it seems like something that would not have all of the hoops to jump through in terms of implementation. It would be much more desirable than overcomplicating this.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, James. Marika, do you want to respond?

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. Just to clarify my comments, there is actually in the PDP Manual, there is currently a provision which says that, indeed, the GNSO Council believes that the implementation is not aligned with the intent of the policy of recommendations. That they can challenge this, and I don't know the exact language by heart, but I think it basically says that in that case the GNSO Council, you know, writes the Board, or notifies the Board, and until the Board actually had a chance to examine what is going on, I think the policy cannot be implemented as such, although their staff can continue some of the work on it.

So I think there is a -- and I'll look at the exact provision, but there is a provision currently in the PDP Manual that talks about the option for the GNSO to basically pause and say, look, we believe what's going on is actually not in line with the policy recommendations that we've made.

James Bladel: Yes. If you can find that Marika -- sorry, this is James speaking again -- if you could find that, I think that would be good, because I think that's very close to what I'm proposing, although it may be slightly different. So it would be great if you can refresh us on that one, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, James. And would you -- I have a question for you. So, it seems to me, and I may be missing something, that that last sentence kind of says that. Would you change that in some way?

James Bladel: Do you mean item -- restoring item C?

Chuck Gomes: Item C, the last sentence.

James Bladel: The GNSO, yeah -- yeah. I guess what I'm saying, Chuck, is that we can maybe flesh out that and what that right to challenge, what that would look like, and how that would be, you know, initiated, and how that would be -- you know, what the -- what would happen to the implementation plan. Would there simply be a pause, then reconvening the Implementation Review Team, and what's the result from that?

Chuck Gomes: So this is Chuck again. I'm going to come right back at you, with another clarification question.

James Bladel: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: So, it sounds to me like you're getting beyond the principle and getting into the details that we are going to work on, on our deliverables. Now, I may be wrong on that, but I throw that back at you to get your reaction.

James Bladel: It's possible, Chuck. You know, I agree that it's possible, what I was attempting to do, and I think going back to one of your earlier statements is trying to take on board, Mikey's comments, and try to get what he was getting at whilst still maintaining a lightweight kind of process. It doesn't engineer a new, bureaucratic layer into the implementation.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks. It's Chuck again. So, before I go back to Marika, I'd like to ask you to see how you might change that last sentence to accomplish that. Okay. And if you can think about that while we listen to Marika.

James Bladel: Yeah, will do. Thanks, Chuck.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. Just so you know that I actually posted the language from the PDP Manual in the chat, and just to note as well, that I made a small suggestion in the principle Peter drafted, and the point I was making before. I think it's somewhat perfect, but it may be a little bit better, so instead of saying he proposed implementation plan, we may want to say, the proposed implementation of the policy recommendation, that may make the link there that it actually changes to policy recommendation.

That's somewhat perfect, but maybe this is a little bit better, but again, Chuck, I think I agree with your responses as well to James. I think in this

discussion we are probably getting way ahead of ourselves, and trying -- the important point is we would definitely need to take note of them, but indeed the hope and desire is that those details will actually come out when we go into the deliberations on the Charter questions.

And that these are the high-level principles, but eventually on the needs that probably detailed process and procedures will be available, that will provide clarity in, you know, the different scenarios that we may come across when we are talk about, you know, Policy and Implementation related discussions.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. Chuck again. So I mean, again, we can use brackets on some of those too, if it's something we want to come back to after we do get into the detailed works. Let me see if James has had a chance to come up with anything on that last sentence and see.

James Bladel: I have not Chuck. Please proceed. I will put into the chat though.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Very good. Now, Marika, let's come back to that first sentence, I thought your commend made sense a little while ago, that what we are really talking about is the translation of the policy into an implementation plan that's going to -- my own description of what you said there. Is there some way we can change that sentence to better reflect that? And others are willing -- certainly feel free to help in that regard.

Does my question make sense, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. And a way to put -- maybe the wording is to change; to make transparent changes to the proposed translation of the policy recommendation into the implementation plan, which I think basically conveys that, as in part of that translation when changes may be required. And I think that's what we are already talking about.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again. Let me just suggest that you go ahead and put that in there, we can still talk about it, and see how people put it -- it's really helpful if people see it; so if you can put that in there, and then we can tweak it further, or remove it if people want to do that. Any comments on that? I like it, but does anybody see any concerns -- have any concerns with regard to that change in the first sentence, say?

Chuck still speaking. I think that it deals with the problem that was identified by Marika first, I think, with regard to her comments on that sentence earlier. Anybody opposed to those changes in the first sentence?

Okay, so we've got that, and of course what we'll do is distribute -- thanks Cheryl -- for the agreement on that. And the -- and of course what we will do with all of the exchanges, as always, a red line will be distributed to the whole group, so that those not on the call get a chance to comment on these before we finalize the text and --

Go ahead. Somebody wants to say something -- oh, go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, in turn, it's just to know that I also -- this is Marika -- that I also made the suggestive changes, and then you worded in the last sentence by adding: in all cases, any such changes should be communicated to the GNSO Council, which maintains a right to challenge whether the change did affect the policy recommendation.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. And thanks for pulling that to everyone's attention. And that's a sentence that James is working on as well. In fact, if it looks like he finished typing in there, so let's take a look at that. James, why don't you go ahead and just read that out for the group and comment on it.

James Bladel: Thanks, Chuck. And, you know, this is shooting from the hip a little bit so I may have to clean up the words in this a little, but I think that there's a couple of items here that are different from the text that as it currently reads, that I wanted to highlight those. But in all cases all material changes, I think, as opposed to any, you know, administrative or basically ensuring that there are -- that all changes that are, you know, determined to be material, must be communicated to the GNSO Council, which maintains the right to review the changes, determine whether or not they are supported by the intent of policy recommendations and modified implementation accordingly.

Or, perhaps, recommend modifications to the implementation plan, would probably be a better closing phrase there. But I think that the key things here being that, you know, that the changes are required to be communicated to the GNSO rather than should, and that the GNSO has the exclusive purview to determine whether or not these are material changes, as opposed to administrative or error corrections, or non-material changes. So that --

Marika Konings: Thank you. Go ahead.

James Bladel: That's what I was driving at.

Chuck Gomes: Good. And now I -- I like it myself, but there's one change I would make and then I'll give it to Greg. I would remove the word "material" and the reason being, in this particular paragraph -- or actually talking about things that aren't material.

James Bladel: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Does that make sense?

James Bladel: And I can -- Yeah, it does. Mm-hmm.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Now, let me go to Greg.

Greg Shatan: Hi. It's Greg Shatan, for the record. I think James actually brings up a very interesting point in the removal of material, makes the point more interesting, which is that here in implementation in both B and C, we are talking about what process or -- you know, at a high-level what process should be followed if smaller changes are being made. I mean, maybe it's

all -- and there's really nothing in either B or C that addresses the -- you know, square on what would happen if there was a material change.

You know, the first sentence of each of B and C, you know, doesn't characterize what type of change is being made. I mean, C does, it says, it shouldn't affect the intent of the policy recommendation. I guess the question is; what if it does? There seems to be, kind of, like a missing man here, that I think James has picked up, which is that we've kind of bypassed the material changes to go talk about either -- you know, talking primarily about administrative updates, error corrections and clarifications.

And kind of don't seem to spend quite the amount of time. Maybe we need to -- changes that are, you know, definitely not merely administrative updates, error corrections and clarifications. And I haven't quite figured out how to deal with it in the context of these two paragraphs, but it seems like we've maybe gone down one branch of the path on the smaller changes, and not dealt head on with the issue of bigger changes. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. Now before I go to Marika, take a look at 2B and C below, and whether that covers it or not, but it seems to me that the more significant thing to maybe cover there, but let me jump ahead and I'll get you back in after you've looked at those; and James too, if you want to comment on that. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. I have a slight concern, by removing the material; because I think we may be creating, a system whereby any little change, the staff will need to go back to the Council. The Council need to review, need to spend time on it, where I think what we are really looking for, is in those changes that really affect the intent of the policy recommendation.

So I have a concern, by changing the material, because I think you don't really want Staff to go back for any administrative or error corrections, because again, I think where -- at least how I see things currently working that's where the Implementation Review Team comes in, and they also have the function, I think. In addition to Staff being able, or in a position to flag where they see there may be a need to change the policy recommendation, or there's -- you know, it's not implementable the way things are drafted.

I think it's really the Implementation Review Team that has that additional oversight and ability to flag to the Council if they believe that's anything is being done that goes against the intent of the policy recommendations. And we are here, if we insert everywhere the GNSO Council, it creates a kind of wide bureaucratic mechanism whereby everything has to go back to the GNSO Council, and I'm not really sure if that's what we are looking for.

And my suggestion would be to either keep in the material changes and either make a reference to, you know, the current Implementation Review Team to be the kind of filter to indicate to the GNSO Council if they believe there are material changes, or if it's all changes, they could clarify that, you know, we are not expected, if we changed, you know, the

spelling, you know, from American English to British English, that we need to go back to the Council to see if we get approval for that.

So that's why I'm only trying to find the balance here and that's my concern about removing the material from the way James has worded it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. Now, before I go back to Greg, and then James. I want to point out again, that there won't always be an Implementation Review Team, nor do I think it's even necessary to always have an Implementation Review Team. So if -- let's keep that in mind as we are expecting the Implementation Review Team to do something.

Secondly, I think if you remove -- if you don't remove the word "material" in that first sentence, in C, then you're going to have break that up into a couple things, because we are literally talking about changes in the rest of the paragraph that are not material. I'm not opposed to having a statement that covers material changes. In fact, that may very well be a good idea, if down under two; we don't think it's adequate there. But I throw that out, and then I'm going to turn it over to Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Chuck. A couple of different reactions. I think -- first to answer the question you asked, which was pull it down at 2 B and C, and reading below, this whole B is actually a mechanism to flag and address situations where there may be a deviation between the implementation of the policy had originally intended. And C is if substantive policy implications are identified during implementation the GNSO Council should be notified and the evolving process of resolving the issues, and should not be left to ICANN Staff, or to whomever ICANN has delegated this task, to resolve it by themselves.

I guess to a certain extent that captures the issue, but then, I'm not sure whether that means that we don't need to make a reference to it at all, in B and C, and I think that B, at the --

Chuck Gomes: You're talking 1-B and C?

Greg Shatan: 1-B and C, right.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Greg Shatan: That 1-B and C, you know, have -- deal with, first -- and B that -- let me go back to the one on the screen. The changes -- all changes need to be examined by the GNSO Council, it seems at least, and then -- but with C, I guess, they can make these changes, but should still be communicated to the Council. I guess in the material, and I'm not really going to try and bog down in whether this is principle or procedure to a certain extent, but it seems -- you know, and then, I guess that's where the issue of whether we take out "material" or not is --

You know, what is the -- you know, are we suggesting that the process is that everything goes -- which things should or shouldn't go to the GNSO Council or their delegates? And when, and you know, are we saying that there should be rights, you know, what are their -- in essence what is the

right of the GNSO Council, especially, you know, in light of the language that Marika pasted into the chat a little while ago.

You know, which talks about the -- informing the GNSO of its proposed implementation, and the GNSO Council may notify the Board, and request the Board to review it. That's kind of a different process entirely. So now the Board is involved. Maybe I'm kind of losing the thread of my comment here a little bit, but I'm not sure that it helps to distinguish between the -- if we are keeping in the second -- both of the -- the new sentence and the other sentence that begins, in all cases, prior to it, it seems like the prior sentence refers to the such changes, which are the immaterial changes, if you will.

So are we kind of creating --? And now maybe we are creating processes, one for material changes, and one for immaterial changes, or is it one for immaterial changes, and another one for all changes, in which case they kind of overlap so -- And then maybe we are getting bogged down here, and we have to think about kind of what we are trying rather than how we are saying it. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Hi, Chuck. I'd say I think I'm going to probably pick up the baton from Greg and even go a little further, and maybe even a little uncharacteristically blunt here. I think part of my confusion was that the sentence that I was trying to add and then modify, I felt maybe could apply somewhat to both B and C, and so perhaps it needs to be inserted as its own letter, either above or below those two, perhaps, you know, in light of the -- it would be the new D, and then everything would shoot down a letter.

But here's where I'm going with it, and you know, rather than focusing on process, I just want to back up and focus on principles, which is that -- and I'm going to personalize it a little bit, okay. It's that when we talk about policy, policy coming out of the PDP and the GNSO, we are talking about obligations, contractual obligations on contracts (INAUDIBLE) parties.

Now I participated in, I don't remember how many PDPs, and the negotiations for the RAA, 2013 RAA for two years, and the work that was done on the Trademark Clearinghouse, and it was helping to stand up and design the concept of the Trademark Clearinghouse.

And so what I'm getting at is, if I could just work with Marika's team, and with, you know, some of the folks that were involved in those other projects, I would be glad to do that. Unfortunately, what happens with these policies, is that they are converted into language that becomes part of our contract, and then we have to deal with ICANN Compliance, who are great people, but they don't have a lot of flexibility.

And they will say, this is what we believe your requirements are in this area, and the implementation of this policy, period, full stop. And it's funny because they weren't there when I was working through the PDPs for

years. Or working on the contracts for years, and so I think this is what we are trying to say here. Is that if you're going to -- or you know, if the Trademark Clearinghouse is going to add new, you know, technical requirements, or change, or modify the way that the TMCH works.

You know, I just -- I feel like we need a mechanism to say, stop, time out. You know, you guys have strayed off course here. You're going to put, you know, the contracted parties in a position where they know what they negotiated. They know what they compromised on, and that's not what the -- what's now the preparing of the documents.

So, you know, that needs to be reflected I think in our principles, and I apologize to Staff, to Policy Staff especially who worked very hard to get to these -- to get to this language, that they now would feel that everything has to be run through this double check, triple check, quadruple check, but the answer is because it never seems to come out consistently on the other side, so we kind of feel like we need more -- we need more oversight into the implementation process.

So my thinking is, rather than trying to design separate layers for material, versus immaterial, or whatever, we just say essentially that changes need to be communicated. The GNSO, or whatever the chartering entity is, has the reason to determine whether or not those are in line or even keeping with the intent of the policy, and can make modifications to the implementation of the policy. And I think that's really, in three sentences, what we are trying to accomplish with these bullet points.

And I apologize that I take this way off the mark here, but I feel like, you know, we had this kind of -- I'm less concerned about the process, and building, you know, an airtight, step-by-step sequence here, and more concerned about making sure that, you know, that that enforcement of good policy is not the result of the work that we do here at ICANN. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes:

Thanks, James. And a couple more people in queue that I'm going to get to in a minute. First of all, I think we are all in agreement, that we don't want a laborious, bureaucratic process, but I think James is right that even little changes, little administrative, error corrections and stuff like that. At least need to be communicated. And maybe when we get into more specifics in our deliverables we lay that out in terms of some -- with some time limits and stuff like that.

And I also don't think it -- just because -- it's not as if every little change has to be communicated, and you wait for a response, the changes can be grouped together, and the administrative error corrections, simple changes can be communicated in a block. So I think that's all workable without having some slow, bureaucratic process.

One more comment, then I'm going to go to Marika. You know, the more I look at B and C, it's not really clear to me, and I as leading the group on principle, so I'm responsible there, but they kind of -- I'm not sure what the different principles are in the two. And they overlap because they both

deal with these minor changes. So I suspect we may need to work more on B and C, in that regard.

And then I'll stop there, and go to Marika, and then back to Greg.

Marika Konings:

Yeah. This is Marika. I think I actually like the suggestion that James made and I've already incorporated it as well, to actually make his language a new principle D, because I think there are differences indeed between the last sentence of C and the new D, where indeed the C talks about -- and you just spoke about as well, Chuck, about the need to communicate any of those, even small administrative details, and basically clarifying as well, that of course in any case the GNSO Council always has the right to challenge whether such changes did actually affect the intent of the policy recommendations.

And then the D point, I think, goes to those material changes, which indeed need to be proactively communicated and where, you know, the Council has the duty or responsibility to review those changes and then determine whether or not they are supported by the intent of the policy recommendations. So I think that goes more to Mikey's point where you have a more proactive kind of approval if there's any implication that those are material changes.

In regard to your comment on B and C, I think the difference is that B really talks about possible changes to the policy recommendation. Well, I think C is more what we spoke about, the translation of those. I said before, I think B may -- rarely happened, I mean, there may be certain cases where, you know, Staff basically says well, indeed if there is a very specific language in there, and that may need to be changed, that may qualify as a change to the policy recommendation, so it may also be good to have, you know, the B and C separately. But I guess, indeed, in most instances what we are talking about is really, principle C.

And one last point. You know, I completely understand James' frustration, but I'm really hopeful that when we actually start looking at implementation practices, that we can also look at some of the current models and -- you know, it came up on a call yesterday on the implementation of the UDRP last recommendations, where there is an Implementation Review Team, and actually very good, constructive discussion between the Group and Staff, trying to understand the intent.

Trying to understand how it can be implemented, how it can be enforced. I think that -- you know, hopefully that can be a model that we are going to base ourselves on looking forward on how we can do this in a better way, instead of going back to where it didn't work. We didn't have Implementation Review Teams, or we didn't have the new PDP Manual that foresees some of those mechanisms.

And hopefully we'll have our review in the future instead of, you know, going back to where we know it didn't work as well, or it maybe could have, or should have.

Chuck Gomes:

Thank you, Marika. Greg?

Greg Shatan:

Thanks, Chuck. A couple of things. I think, and I hate to say this, to a certain extent B and C are kind of weighing us down in terms of dealing with the language. And I think we are losing, to some extent the principles involved, and also kind of the workflow that might be involved. You know, some of the kind of overlap between B and C probably should be worked out, or maybe even, B and C should be kind of rewritten entirely.

But I think the point seems to me, and I think James is -- which is that when implementation occurs without oversight by the policy development body, and involvement, there's a higher degree of risk that the implementation interpretations won't match the policy intention. And the Implementation Review Teams are one potential solution of that.

It seems to me that a principle that should be that the GNSO Council, or the GNSO should, itself, as a body, should have some -- either implementation review team or some other group, past with being able to review and respond, or at least review and monitor and respond if necessary to all the works that's being done by the Implementation Team, essentially in -- with a -- essentially in real time, or is close to real time as possible.

You know, what the right of the GNSO Council, and whether it's the community or the Council, or an appropriate entity of maybe would turn us in the EWG deliberations, all of which seem to be in play here in different ways. That it's, you know -- in each case it should be essentially the same thing.

It should be the GNSO Council or its delegates including without limitation or, you know, IE and IRT, or some group tasked with being the point person, should receive this stuff, whether it's material or immaterial, and that they should -- they should have the right to communicate directly back to the Implementation Review Team in this, and move things forward.

You know, have the dialogue that you referred to, Marika, in order to kind of un-kink things and avoid unintended policy changes from language that might not have been have been appreciated, you know, during the handoff from the Policy Development Team to the Implementation Team. And getting -- and then maybe the issue is kind of first to talk about the workflow, and then what the reaction -- and then who it goes to, and lastly, what the potential range of issues and reactions are that can be, you know, identified and acted on by the GNSO body that is doing that.

You know, which may include dialogue or it may include referring it up to the Council for discussion. Last I would note, and I kind of go back to a point I made earlier about Marika's -- the language that pointed at in the currently PDP which is that basically the GNSO -- as this is proposed, the GNSO Council is supposed to talk to the Board if it has concerns. I guess it's the idea that once the policy is developed and the Board approves it, it's not essentially a Board policy, or consensus policy, and that the changes to that policy maybe can't be made without Board approval, as well as, you know, perhaps GNSO approval.

So whatever we are proposing here might be significantly different, and that may even raise some kind of governance concerns, if the Board is left out, but clearly the idea that the policy development body, that understands it, and thought they were projecting out, particular implementation, and they see it and say, that's not what we meant, you know, isn't involved. That's a bad idea, and one I think we need to make explicit that, you know, on the one hand the GNSO needs to commit to having something -- a real time response type of team, or at least a decent response type of team.

Understanding that, you know, many of us are volunteers, and even those who are kind of getting paid to do this, are still getting paid to do a lot of other things too. And that as -- you know, with that kind of obligation also comes kind of a -- maybe not a privilege -- but a right to kind of comment. So, that's kind of my thoughts. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. Now in my opinion, and I'm asking you to challenge me if you think my assessment is wrong. I don't -- I'm not hearing any significant disagreement on the points that are being made among us. Okay. Our challenge is to word B, C and the new D in a way that puts it all together in a clear and helpful way. So what I'm -- first of all I want to know -- please speak up if you think I have that wrong.

Secondly, if my assessment is correct there, then I'd like to ask for two or three volunteers that will would work together between now and our meeting next week to try and redraft, and you can start from scratch if you want, and whatever is easiest. B, C and D and you could add a new one if you want, but help us with -- I think it's tough to fix all this wording in a call with the full Working Group.

Then we spend -- if this sounds like a workable approach, that we spend a little bit of time on next week's Working Group call to finalize the language, any final tweaks, but I don't want to spend a lot -- I don't want to keep spending time every week on principles.

So if we could get two or three people to volunteer, to work on those and propose it on the list before the meeting, as soon before the meeting as possible. And then we'll spend a little bit of time next week on just agreeing on that final language, and then we move right on to the main topic next week, which I'd like to think will be the start of deliverable one.

Now does anybody want to comment --? Anybody, disagree with my assessment, first of all, that we are really, I think we all want basically the same things, we've just got to put it into words. Anybody disagree with that?

Is your still up Greg, or did you want to respond?

Greg Shatan: No. That's an old hand.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Nobody -- oh, let me go down, so I saw -- I think I saw an "agree" there's another "agree". Okay. All right, nobody is disagreeing so now, the

big thing is to get two or three volunteers to work on B, C and the new D, or whatever else that fits this altogether. Any hands left up now, I'll assume it's to volunteer.

So Greg, you're volunteering? I'm still seeing your hand.

Greg Shatan: Old hand.

Chuck Gomes: Old hand, okay. All right. Is there -- now let me look in the -- okay. It's may be a tough week for people. Actually if this is a tough week and we can't get volunteers, and we need some volunteers that need a little more time, I don't think that's a problem, we can finish the principles in two weeks, if that works better for everyone.

So, if you want to volunteer but you need more than a week, just speak up. I notice that Marika is able to assist. James is checking his calendar. Some of you have made some really good points, and if those -- I mean -- and it would be great to have you help with this language, because you obviously have identified some things that would help.

Okay. That's, Greg will help. So we've got Greg, Marika will provide Staff support, and she of course -- she and Mary both provide more than just Staff support, they are helpful in a lot of ways, including on the content and so forth, which is fine. So we probably should have -- it might be helpful to have one more person that would work with -- and I don't -- we don't know yet whether James can do it.

It would be great if you can, James, because you've made some excellent contributions to this discussion today, so you'll probably -- your thoughts would probably be a real asset.

J. Scott -- J. Scott says he'll help. I think I saw that.

J. Scott-Evans: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, J. Scott. I think we've got a group going forward. Now, if that group needs an extra week like J. Scott said in the chat, that's fine. I mean, it's not going to hold us up, getting started on deliverable one, if we finalize these principles in two weeks. And Nick is there so -- okay, so let's make sure we are clear.

So, we've got James and Nick, and Greg, and J. Scott with Marika's help. So will somebody kind of volunteer to take the lead? Don't think that's a huge responsibility just somebody to keep it moving.

J. Scott-Evans: I think Marika is taking -- she said she'll start the thread tomorrow.

Chuck Gomes: Excellent. Thank you, J. Scott, I appreciate that. And I just saw that, now that you've said it so.

J. Scott-Evan: Yeah, my only problem is I teach, and I have to write a final exam so -- but I will do my best do as much as I can.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And again, for the four -- five of you, including Marika there, if you need a little more time just say it. We'll finish this off when you're ready, when you're able to put something to the list. So we don't want to drag it out too long, because the principles are supposed to be the foundation upon which we do everything else. But just let us know and get something to the list as soon as you can.

J. Scott-Evan: Well, I think the thing is, we conceptually, the reason we can move forward is -- this is J. Scott for the record -- conceptually we understand what we are trying to do is just wordsmithing it into text. But conceptually I think we can move forward, because that general principle is there. It's that if there are any changes that are significant, they have to be put through some sort of process, or reviewed by someone, and there has to be some ability for people to bring their concerns forward. That's sort of the overall concept as I understand it.

Chuck Gomes: That's very well said, J Scott This is Chuck again. And I think we are just about out of time. Is there anything else we need to cover? We are going to start meeting weekly. Next week we will certainly start deliverable one by going over the Mind Map, and the information that's in the second tab in the work plan, under deliverable one, and move on from there. And we will deal with the rest of the principles as soon as the group provides us some suggested language.

One last thing on the principles is that, and I was assuming this was covered in the Avri changes, but it was marked kind of differently, but in D1, E, Avri suggested changing "need" to "should" -- unless anybody objects -- I think we can go ahead and make that change to "should" -- so just to be clear on that -- some say it was marked a little bit differently, and the rest of the change wasn't made in the text.

Did you get that Marika, down there in --? I guess it's off now, sorry. I was look at my printed sheet, so it's under item one, S, current S, that meets too at the top of the -- right there, right there, yes. Just change that to, should, anybody object to that?

All right. Any other business; anything else anybody needs to bring up before we adjourn the call for today? Thank you, everybody.

Speaker: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: We are getting closer, each meeting. So I appreciate it.

Speaker: Thanks, everybody.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, everybody.

Marika Konings: Bye.

Speaker: Bye.

END