

**Policy & Implementation Working Group Meeting  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Wednesday 28 May at 1900 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Wednesday 28 May 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-20140528-en.mp3>  
On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#may>

Attendees:

Greg Shatan – IPC  
Chuck Gomes – RySG  
Alan Greenberg – ALAC  
Olevie Kouami – NPOC  
Nic Steinbach – RrSG  
Jonathan Frost -RySG  
Klaus Stoll – NPOC  
J Scott Evans – BC  
James Bladel – RrSG  
Wolf Knoblen – ISPCP  
Michael Graham - IPC

Apologies:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr – At-Large  
Kristina Rosette - IPC  
Olga Cavalli - GAC

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings  
Mary Wong  
Steve Chan  
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Terry Agnew: Thank you (Holly). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Policy and Implementation Working Group call on the 28th of May 2014. On the call today we have Jonathan Frost, Klaus Stoll, Alan Greenberg, J. Scott Evans, James Bladel and Olevie Kouami.

Joining shortly will be Michael Graham. We have apologies from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Kristina Rosette and Olga Cavalli. From staff we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Steve Chan and myself, Terry Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Hi everyone. For the record this is J. Scott Evans. We've had the roll call. I'm now going to ask if anybody has any changes to their statement of interest. Hearing none, we can move to the second item in our agenda, which is the review of Deliverable 1a. And we have a chart that's been placed on the screen here that you can see - I guess it's Marika's cursor we see here.

And it's my understanding that we went over some of this during our last call. Chuck, if you would just briefly talk about where we got in the last call and then we can go to what we're going to do today. He here? I guess - I don't see. So with that, what we're going to do today is we're going look down in each - these are the groups.

If you will see the top like Column 13 it says Implementation Recommendation Team, Special Trademark Issues Review Team. It's several different teams that have been created sort of outside the normal policy process over the last few years.

Somebody has us on the phone and has their speakers on. If they would mute one or the other, that'd be great because we're getting an echo. Okay.

So anyway, so you see here we've got what triggered the effort and it's different for each group that was done; some of them the same, some of them different; part of the issues frame.

But today we're going to focus - if whoever's controlling this would scan us down to the strong point - oops. Weak point. So that's what we'd like to discuss today with regards to the various groups.

Now we can see that some folks - I think Alan and Chuck Gomes both took serious the call for action during the two-week break. And they have filled in their thoughts with regards to certain of the efforts in this position.

But we see that we don't have anything with regards to strong points/weak points with regards to the Implementation Recommendation Team. So with that, I'm going to open it up to the floor to look - let's focus first just on strong points. If anyone would like to add some strong points to the chart they felt like this effort had.

I was a member of the Implementation Recommendation Team. And I think that one of the strong points is it sought input for solutions from the great - the biggest critics of the expansion or guess we should say possible solutions.

Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I think one of the strong - its strong point was it had people on the group that really knew what they were talking about. Conversely that's one of the weak points that it wasn't an inclusive group and therefore was subject to much criticism because of that.

Man: Okay. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That - Alan, you raise some interesting thoughts there because obviously inclusiveness is something within the ICANN world that's really important. At the same time there are situations where expertise is desperately needed.

So I think one of the questions we may want to grapple with in our working group is how do you balance the need for inclusiveness with the need for special expertise. And answering that question not necessarily on this call right now - if we can that's great but answering that question might go a long ways to helping us make some of the recommendations we're going to need to make going forward.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you Chuck. And I would agree with that because, you know, the whole point of having public comment period is to be inclusive. So I'm not so sure that I necessarily believe that every working group has to be, you know, demographically pure with regards to every stakeholder in ICANN.

That said, I do believe before anything is implemented it needs to be put out to everyone so that everyone has an equal voice in commenting on, refining or pointing out weaknesses or strengths of a particular proposed solution or policy. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Thank you. I don't think that's sufficient. And I understand completely the history and how this group was chartered and, you know, it was an unusual thing and probably something that we would not do again like that.

The issue is not so much is there an opportunity for comment but is there a perception that those comments are being factored in and the people who are doing the evaluation are doing it from a balanced point of view.

And like conflict of interest, perception is everything. And that group I think did not make the cut because of that. And therefore I don't think it's something we would replicate if we were to, you know, do life over again.

The result I think is pretty clear. And I may be the only one who believes this. But I strongly believe that the IRT came up with a lot of good ideas. But a few of the ideas were so bad tasting to much of the community that it caused the rest of the parts of the report to be basically ignored and tossed out.

You know, the baby with the bath water so to speak. And that kind of thing is what we would have to avoid in any future process. And, you know, so I think it's something to learn from.

It did come up with a bunch of good ideas. But some of them even though they were good were ignored because of other things that were along that - went along with it. So it's a, you know, it's a good thing to learn lessons from. I'm not sure we would want to replicate.

J. Scott Evans: James.

James Bladel: Thanks J. Scott. James speaking for the transcript. And I did want to agree with Alan when he made his initial comment that one of the - one of the real strengths of this group -- testing my memory here a little bit -- was the fact that the depth of expertise was such that, you know, we really - it really did not have to spend a lot of time...

Man: Right.

James Bladel: ...just to be. It was, you know, it was ready to work I think on day one. You know, I would like to put maybe something different in the hopper as far as a - I'm sorry. Am I still on the line or...

J. Scott Evans: You are.

James Bladel: You are. Your hold - okay. Great. I just heard some hold music there briefly.

You know, one potential weakness of this and other similarly past groups - I'm thinking now of a Whois Review Team that I participated on a number of PDP implementations is that there is this temptation to re-open some of the issues or some of the topics that were addressed or were unable to achieve consensus as part of a PDP.

And, you know, I feel like that any group that's convened that looks like an IRT in the future, whether that's this type of IRT or just a regular old PDP implementation group, really needs to have some very disciplined controls on re-opening the issue, the topics that were, you know, supposedly put to bed during the PDP itself.

And I think that this group - I don't want to point, you know, besmirch the IRT here. I think that a lot of groups do that when they follow on to fill in the blanks or sand down the rough edges of some of the PDPs is that they don't always do a very good job of resisting, you know, re-opening those issues and re-fighting those battles. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Thank you. I'm not sure I agree. The IRT - the original IRT, not the Implementation Review Team version of the IRT, was created because there was a perception that the policy process had not yielded the needed results by at least that group. So they were re-opening things consciously.

The failure part of it I think, and indeed if you look at, you know, what we're now talking about in the future of how do we address a policy issue that shows up during implementation, you know, we too may be recommending that things be re-opened under controlled circumstances.

The failure of the IRT I think was because although the members of the IRT claimed, and I believe validly, that they made a lot of compromises and didn't simply give themselves everything they wanted. That was not the perception in much of the community.

And because the group wasn't balanced, there was no one on the group to essentially attest to that position. So, you know, it becomes an issue of if

you're perceived as being tainted, then you're not the one who can defend yourself. So and...

J. Scott Evans: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. I wonder if there's a fundamental question that comes up here because I think Alan's probably right that there were people that thought the policy development process missed some things. And maybe there needs to be a process to evaluate those kinds of decisions or questions.

In other words, you know, because before we get to the point whether we're in a situation where people are bringing up old issues and trying to get things they didn't get before, there's another question that has to be asked.

And that is okay, is there something that was possibly missed in the policy development process. And that question may need to be answered before we can truly evaluate whether people are just trying to get things they couldn't get before.

J. Scott Evans: Right. And this is J. Scott. One of the I think big disconnects is the fact that the policy development process was pretty clear with regards to new gTLDs. It said that there needed to be protection for the rights of third parties.

Where it got messed up was when the draft guidebook was put out there was no protection for the intellectual property of third parties. None. Wasn't even mentioned.

So it wasn't that there wasn't direction given during the policy development process. It's that when implemented it was not done. So that's my perspective.

Secondly with regards to weak points with regard to IRT, I think one of the problems - one of the weakest points was it was new territory. It was

uncharted territory. And so the Board knew what it wanted as far as an output. It wanted solutions. But then it didn't know what it was going to do with them.

And I think that that caused some confusion and frustration on everyone's part -the entire community's part, not just IP owners. I think that registries, registrars, I think IRT members who spent a lot of time. I think members who - of the community who felt that they had been left out of the process. And so I think that was a problem. Chuck is first.

Chuck Gomes: I'll be real brief on this one. Thanks J. Scott. You know, this particular example to me has a lot of information or it'll be very helpful for us in the work we have to do ahead.

As you can see by our discussion, we're discovering issues that I think we're going to need to grapple with. So I think we should flag this one as a great learning example for our overall efforts.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. J. Scott, I think both you and Chuck are right on in this one. You'll note in the name is the word implementation. Nowhere in the discussion and the vociferous discussions on the IRT proposals was there ever a statement being made saying you're re-opening policy.

You know, the policy was there should be protections and this was an attempt to build those protections, to architect those protections, which would at the time correct, rightly or wrongly, but at the time was viewed as implementation.

The catch was not everyone agreed that the proposed implementations were something that they wanted and something that were of the right form. So it wasn't a policy implementation issue at the time. It was implementation. And,

you know, the problem is that when the policy process leaves the implementation vague, it's a difficult problem.

And certainly in this one where the opinions were so divided. It demonstrates the problem. It doesn't suggest the answer. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks J. Scott. And Alan actually made my point that I was going to make. First I should say that I was hesitant to get into this discussion as a member of staff now. But since I was also a member of the IRT, which is the subject of discussion now, hopefully this intervention will be helpful.

But I said Alan did mention one of the points I mentioned - that I wanted to mention, which is that the mechanisms that were under discussion and that were ultimately recommended were viewed as mechanisms to implement an existing policy. This whole question of divide wasn't up for consideration then.

The other point that I wanted to make was that if you look at all the efforts that we're charting here, this particular one in terms of its creation, how it was created, for what reason, how it was constituted, is rather different from most if not all of the others.

And as a result, that probably led to some of the issues that we're discussing now. So it may well be a unique situation going back to the lessons learned that people were mentioning earlier that paying attention to how something is created, charted and constituted could avoid some of the issues.

And, you know, with respect to the perception of the community point that Alan made, in my personal view that was definitely the case. That because there was a very strong perception in the community about either a lack of balance or the interest represented, a lot of the subsequent discussion

hinged on that perception and so were not as helpful as they could have been. Thanks J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Great. Thank you. All right. Is there any other input or strong point or weak point with regards to the IRT? I didn't see that my comment made it into the weak points. This is J. Scott again for the record. And that was that there wasn't clear guidance on what the Board was going to do with these recommendations. Okay.

So then taking into account what Mary just said, why don't we go back - go over to the Special Trademark Issues Review Team and let's go up to the top to look at and remind ourselves how this was constituted.

So it says that, you know, in 2009 the ICANN Board sent a letter to the GNSO requesting its view to the policy, implementation of certain trademark protections mechanisms that were included in the draft applicant guidebook at the time in a company memorandum.

Specifically the Board letter requested the GNSO provide input on whether it approves the proposed staff model or in the alternate - propose an alternative that is equivalent or more effective and implementable.

So this is J. Scott. I would suggest here again one of the strengths is it is looking to the GNSO to recommend proposed solutions to identify problems. Does anyone else see some sort of strength here? Does no one feel like this was more - a more balanced group that had better representation? Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. The balance one can argue with, you know, given that the ALAC was originally given two people and then told you only had one at the last moment.

And other groups were to some extent excluded from participating. It was very much a GNSO effort. And perhaps the only effort I can recall in recent

history where there was not an openness to allowing other people into it. So that's on the negative side.

On the positive side there was perhaps because of the threats, you know, the threats of what the Board would do if we didn't come to closure. But there was a spirit of cooperation that I have very rarely seen in ICANN of people who disagreed with each other strongly going off into a corner and hammering out compromises.

As I said, some of them later disavowed but nevertheless, the people in that group operated in good faith and with a level of cooperation I have rarely seen. And I think it merits some discussion -- perhaps not now -- as to whether it was just the threats that did that and that's what it takes to make people work together. Or if there was some other aspect to it.

J. Scott Evans: Alan, I have a question. If you wouldn't say it was more balanced, would you say a strong point was it was more inclusive than the IRT?

Alan Greenberg: Oh, it was certainly more inclusive than the IRT.

J. Scott Evans: So would you could that as a strong point? I mean when you look at your - you said the problem with the IRT - one of the weak points was it was not inclusive. So my question is when they did go to something that was at least arguably more inclusive, is that a positive - a strong point of it? That it had some...

Alan Greenberg: Yes and no. The haggling that went on in determining how many people each group had was to be honest as a not quite an outsider to the GNSO but, you know, as someone representing an outside group was embarrassing.

This was all held in private and determined before it went public. So from that perspective it was not - I do not think it was balanced from that perspective. It...

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I'm not...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...discussion as to how the - what the composition was. And it was an ugly political discussion.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: But the end result I think was reasonable given the subject.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I thought that I heard Alan give another strong point; the strong point being that there was excellent cross community cooperation or however we want to put that. I think that needs to be put in there. And then he's right. We probably have to figure out what motivated that. But that - what I heard was that was a strength.

Alan Greenberg: Oh it - the best I've ever seen if I may interject in ICANN.

J. Scott Evans: James.

James Bladel: Hi. James speaking. And just was going to add or to follow up on Alan's point. There's a presumption, and I don't know if this applies equally to all groups or future groups. But the cooperation that he described would necessarily I think require that the status quo was equally distasteful to all the factions that were participating in the group. Correct? That it wouldn't necessarily be a universal - something that could be applied universally.

J. Scott Evans: Well I'm not so sure that's true James because I would argue that the IBC folks were pretty satisfied with the IRT.

James Bladel: So why - okay. So maybe I'm misunderstanding Alan's point here about the group was cooperative because the external threat from the Board was that it would adopt what?

J. Scott Evans: I think they were going to adopt the proposal of the IRT input. The version of the IRT recommendations that staff had come up with were going to become the default. I think Alan's point was it drove those people who were the harshest critics into dealing with - and maybe it's true that I can't remember that the implementation that staff had finally put into the guidebook was in itself not satisfying to the intellectual property owners. I just can't remember. So you're (unintelligible).

James Bladel: I'm also struggling with the specifics of this particular group. But I think in general the cooperation through some sort of external pressure only works if that external pressure is not necessarily resonating with one of the (positions).

J. Scott Evans: Right. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. The position was - the staff's recommendation, which was sort of a watered down version of the IRT recommendations with some other changes, was distasteful to everyone.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Both the intellectual property people and the opposite side of the table.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Good.

Alan Greenberg: It was a good - it was a good Board threat.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right. So anybody else have another strength or weakness they'd like - Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I don't have a strength or weakness but I think we've just identified a technique. Encourage staff to come up with a mutually distasteful solution and it motivates people to cooperate.

J. Scott Evans: I'm not so sure that that's not true.

Chuck Gomes: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: All right. So now if anyone - if no one else has a comment here, is there anyone on the call that didn't participate because Alan and I did participate in both the IRT and the STI that from an observer's standpoint would want to give us a strength or weakness, a strong point or a weak point that they saw just as an observer from either of these two groups. James.

James Bladel: Yes. Thanks J. Scott. James here. And I was an observer both to these groups. And then there were - there was actually some follow on work as well in terms of for example the construction of the Trademark Clearinghouse and some of these other rights protection mechanisms that we're seeing in this vein.

And I think that one thing that was not clear to me as a follower of all this work was how they necessarily - how they were necessarily interdependent. You know, it seemed like there was a lot of disjointed and perhaps even slightly disconnected work going on in this area and it wasn't clear which effort at any given time was on the critical path.

And I think, you know, I - you know, I think that that - if that was frustrating for me whose, you know, been involved in these things for a number of years, I can imagine that someone just getting up to speed or a more casual observer would have been utterly mystified by that.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Thanks James. Before I forget and call the next person, I want to put into our - a note that - I wonder if we should sort of think about how at least with these two or maybe with all of them that are listed here - how a change in chairmanship and CEO may have come - affected how these things were chartered and how implementation was carried out because we had a pretty significant senior management change. Okay. With that, I'll go to Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: And just to - I don't have a new strength. But from an outsider I did see and was impressed with the collaboration that was going on across groups.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: So I'm just reinforcing that one strength. That was my perception. I was very impressed with that.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Hi. This is Greg Shatan for the record. You know, as an observer, not an official observer but observing from, you know, way outside, just an issue with where there's really only kind of one group. My perception is, you know, member of the IPC at the time was that, you know, it was relatively easy in the group for possibly kind of gang up on the employee for property interests.

And one of the specific, you know, issues if you look at the - I just took a quick glance in back of the report that came out at the time. And there was a rough consensus that trademarks that were - there was a whole issue of so called substantive review and whether trademark regimes that did not include substantive review were really, you know, worthy trademarks for protection.

I think that, you know, someone from outside the ICANN bubble would kind of look at that as being kind of an astonishing. Early from within the intellectual property community but outside ICANN would look at that was a rather kind

of astonishing set of arguments to make much less one that, you know, actually got rough consensus and a, you know, a minority view from the IT interest.

And I think there's a tendency and, you know, it works kind of in both ways to think an instance - and everything is up for kind of horse trading and negotiation. And sometimes, you know, you can get - end up getting too far down the road.

And I think that, you know, issues like that and a couple of other areas where the STI watered things down in a way that ultimately I think the IT community felt very uncomfortable with is what, you know, ended up resulting in the straw man solution.

So, you know, a weakness I think is where, you know, there are positions that the majority of the group or and just based on kind of sheer numbers you can end up with a situation, which, you know, significantly disadvantages, you know, one group and really doesn't reflect kind of in this case legal reality.

But because, you know, of the numbers, there was really no way for another result to come out. That may be, you know, again as an observer, I'm kind of, you know, watching through the slats and there may be huge things I'm mischaracterizing or missing. So those were kind of closer to the issue. You know, might want to comment. But I thought that that was a problem.

And if felt similar things when I was working on, you know, even on some, you know, regular working groups that in order to get somewhere, you know, on consensus on certain things, you know, ended up agreeing with things that were just, you know, very un-palatable because there's just not enough support for intellectual property interest versus everything else. You know, that's just again my viewpoint. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Thanks. I asked for it, so. Next is James.

James Bladel: Hi J. Scott. James speaking. And to your point about the staff changes particularly execs to staff changes that occurred, you know, while some of these groups were going on or in between or in the interim between them, I think that's a good point that we should capture and certainly examine.

I would submit that that is - that, you know, I think we all felt a sort of a fee change on some of these topics. But I think that that is a concern and perhaps a weakness. In my opinion I think that policy development should be to some extent or just a reasonable expectation of staff agnostic.

And so, you know, the fact that we can point to, you know, something working effectively or more effectively under one regime that didn't work previously or vice versa, I think that is possibly a concern that it should be captured as perhaps a weakness.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Two things. On the original question it's worth pointing out for those who don't have the history that there have been two executive management changes since these things happened.

You know, these weren't on the previous regime. These were two regimes ago. And a lot has changed in many ways. Some changed and was then reversed. So we're really talking about a very different world that we're in today.

And, you know, almost surely it would not happen in either of the two previous, either the current or the previous regime would - things would not have unfolded the same.

With regard to Greg's comment, I think there were a couple of things that are worth noting. In terms of the regimes of different trademark regimes, Greg is

right. There were - there was a lot of discussion about whether we should allow unverified trademarks in.

But if I remember correctly, that was one that although it was in the report, staff categorically ignored and changed because they believed that that was now something they could legally defend. And therefore that was a substantive change that was made from what the STI recommended to what was ended up being implemented in staff. And some people didn't like that but so be it. The die was cast.

In terms of the overall compromises, that's an issue I think we're going to have to deal with because yes, partly due to time pressure but partly due to the fact that they were people with very different beliefs in that group. There were compromises made in the interest of coming up with a recommendation.

And, you know, people don't like making compromises. And if they have options and the intellectual property folks did have some options, then they tried to change things after the fact because the compromises were no longer palatable or viewed as acceptable. And I don't know how we fix that. But it's something we have to acknowledge. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right. James, is that an old hand or a new hand?

James Bladel: That is old. I thought I lowered it but there it goes.

J. Scott Evans: All right. All right. So that's a good point. So let's now move on to formation and work of the Red Cross IOC Drafting Team. And let's look at how this was constituted. It was constituted for policy advice was asked of the GNSO Council and of the GAC of whether there should be special protection for the RCRC ICO and IGOs.

The Board authorized the (presidency) of implement the new (unintelligible), which includes follow element. The 30 May 2011 version of the applicant guidebook subject to revisions agreed.

Two, with the GAC on June 19, 2011 including incorporation of text concerning protection for specific requested Red Cross and ICO names for the top level only during the initial application round until the GNSO and GAC develop policy advice on the -- I can't read that word -- based on global public interest.

And then in September 2011 the GAC sent a proposal to the GNSO for granting the second level protections based upon the protection afforded the IOC RC as (being) top level. In the same month Section 2.2.1.2.3 was added to the latest version of the new GTL guidebook dated 19 September 2011.

In October 2011 the GNSO Council decided to create a small group that would constitute a drafting team to develop a response to the GAC. The result being IOC RCRC Drafting Team create a set of recommendations protecting the IOC RCRC names at the top level that were adopted by the GNSO Council though ultimately not by the Board. Okay. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. The question - that description at the top says the Board request included IGOs. I didn't - certainly IGOs were not - I don't think were discussed by the drafting team.

Chuck Gomes: That is correct Alan.

Alan Greenberg: And I don't think they were in the Board request but maybe we just ignored them. I can't remember that part.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. IGOs were added later. Say it was not - it was just RCRC and the IOC names that were involved in the drafting team work.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. That's what - I know that's what we talked about. I didn't think we ignored part of it. But I wasn't - that I didn't remember. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. What's a strong point?

Alan Greenberg: If I may keep talking for a moment, the group was formed the say way as any other GNSO XX working group drafting team these days. That is was open to anyone who wanted to participate. So from that perspective, that meets the multi stakeholder model that we're using now.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. This is J. Scott. I would (offer) another strength is they went to the GNSO Council and requested that they provide the response. I think that's a strong point.

I think here again one of the weaknesses from my point -- this is J. Scott for the record -- is there's no clear indication of what they're going to do with this output. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure that's actually correct. I mean the Board was asking for input so they could consider it as input from the GNSO, the policy body of ICANN in considering the requests that were being made by the GAC.

So I'm not sure one needs to be any more definitive than saying that needs, you know, they were looking for input from the GNSO, which had been, you know, which had not addressed those particular issues. They just weren't on the table at the time the original policy was discussed.

And although it wasn't 100% clear whether this was policy or implementation and we hadn't gotten to the point of quite identifying that question yet, they were looking for input from the GNSO. I'm not sure we needed any more clarity than that.

J. Scott Evans: Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks J. Scott. And I think Alan alluded to this that in this particular instance the one thing that may not be clear to maybe folks new to this process is that in all of this priming for this particular instance there was GAC advice and I - and GAC correspondence directly to the GNSO Council as well.

So from where I sit at the time as a former member of the committee, it seemed that some of the impetus came from a sense of the GNSO wanting to respond to the GAC's request and the GAC's points on this particular issue.

And I probably need to go back and double-check these records. But I just wanted to say that and Alan or someone else might remember because I think at the time there was a sense that the GAC and the GNSO might be able to work together or collaborate in some respect and that just didn't happen presumably because the GAC had quite a lot on its plate.

And my sense is that that at least in part contributed to the formation and the urgency of this work.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Thank you. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Okay. Some historical background on this. First of all, in the policy development process there was a Reserved Names Working Group that I happened to chair. And it's not fair to say that this issue was not dealt with. It was. But the decision - the consensus of the group was that not to give special protections to these organizations or others for that matter.

Now in the process from the time the first request on the Red Cross IOC names came up, the Registry Stakeholder Group - the biggest concern was that it just seemed to open up the door for any organization that wanted it to get reserved names. It was overly broad.

One of the positive things that happened from our perspective speaking from the registries' perspective is that over time then the GAC zeroed in and became much more specific and clear and removed a lot of the concern that we had that it was overly broad. That anybody could come up and ask. They tie it to some international laws and so forth.

And to that extent then our concerns and the registries were largely alleviated because that overall extension of applying this to other organizations seemed to be mitigated somewhat. So that's just background information. I'm not sure that that helps us in particular but I think it's important for information on the back run of this particular process.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Marika. Marika, if you're speaking, you're on mute.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I was just trying to get off mute. And taking time - it's taking some time. And no just Chuck to know that I tried to capture your comments, which I think both was a positive and a negative where I think the negative was that, you know, it was an issue that was already considered as part of the PDP and basically discarded.

But the positive side of it that it was, you know, instead of making an overly broad request, it was tightly scoped, which facilitated the discussion and also changed the position some groups had taken as part of the PDP. That's what I captured in the document. And I also put it in the chat.

I just want to make sure if people feel that I'm capturing some of your comments incorrectly or go in a different direction as what you wanted to share, please feel free to either speak up or just put in the chat what you would like to see changed or after I send this out to the mailing list, you know, send me any corrections you may have because I'm trying to capture as we go along and may miss something as a result.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Thank you Marika. Does anyone else have a strength - a strong point or a weak point they'd like to add to the discussion with regards to the RC IOC Drafting Team? Greg.

Greg Shatan: Hi. It's Greg Shatan. I'm trying to remember back to that since I was on it. And I think, you know, one of the weak points I think was that there was kind of a, you know, a number of people involved who were kind of there, you know, kind of in a very single issue kind of participants who are, you know, really not there to kind of represent stakeholders per se but to represent a particular stakeholder's interest.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right. That might be a criticism for everyone. Every one of these. Okay. It's Chuck, is your hand up again?

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Yes. There you go.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. The - I don't think I totally agree with you Greg on one of the points you just made. I don't think it's bad to have people there representing their own interests as long as it's clear that they're doing that and we're aware of their particular interest.

In fact I think the only way you're going to get people in most cases to even get involved is if they have a particular interest even if it's for their own organization.

In the end we need to try to work together to (rid) solutions that most people can support. But I think it's good that we have people like that in the group.

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Greg Shatan: And, you know, maybe there's a - I'm actually kind of going at a different point because I do agree with you. We can't, you know, we can't all - if we only had committees of disinterested people, we'd probably have committees of zero in some cases because everyone has, you know, a viewpoint or an interest of some sort.

I think maybe what I felt was that there was kind of an information gap or that the - that those were there to accomplish specific things for specific interests are often better prepared and don't necessarily get the thorough vetting of what they are putting in front of the group from the rest of the group.

And I'm not saying that necessarily having been unhappy with the outcome from that group but just trying to look at it as a - in a sense as a disinterested observer.

But that I think that there were times when I'd just feel that, you know, somebody who has put together a brief, if you will, to support a viewpoint comes up against a working group, which is not, you know, prepared - are still prepared to counter it that there sometimes can be kind of an imbalance that's caused by the higher levels of preparation of those with, you know, particular interests versus the rest.

And I think that sometimes that the opposite sometimes is that you have people who are knowledgeable and expert and the - everyone else who is - doesn't, you know, know too much but is fully free to form an opinion kind of can end up, you know, holding the rest of the group, you know, bringing the rest of the group into some peculiar places though.

I don't know that I'm kind of satisfying my own standards of intelligibility in what I've just said. But these were kind of some of the - the dynamics can get skewed by having different levels of kind of preparation or investment. Maybe that's the way to put it.

You know, where there are group - where there are individuals in the group with wildly different levels of kind of preparation and investment and knowledge in the group, you can end up with - it can be difficult sometimes to get to a reasonable result.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I'm going to go to Alan and then I'm going to go to Chuck and then I'm going to cut this off so that we can move on through the agenda. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Thank you. I think what Greg is describing and what I'll try to describe I think is more relevant on the next group. That is the generalized or the PDP Working Group instead of the Drafting Team.

But there is very much a perception that the IOC and Red Cross went into this process saying - and I'll - it's not fair for me to characterize what they said but I'll try anyway. Essentially we have already presented our case to the GAC and the Board. We won. So stop trying to change it.

And it's that position, not so much that they're better prepared, but they went in with a sense of prior assurance that they would get what they asked for, not quite realizing that it's being referred to the GNSO for essentially a fresh look at it, not just to rubber stamp what the GAC already said. That made the discussions exceedingly difficult. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. That was pretty well said Alan. I think - and by the way, in compliments to both those groups, maybe one a little bit more so than the other. I think they gained some respect for the GNSO processes as time went on.

And I think you're right. These two groups kind of flow together even though they weren't the same necessarily. The - they did think that they should get it

regardless of GNSO processes and I think they moderated their view on that as time went on.

Also, I think there were - in some cases it wasn't just because it was level of preparation or expertise that kind of overwhelmed some cases. There were honestly some real disagreements.

Now some people never admitted to those disagreements. Some people continued - one group in particular continued to take the position that international law was just as clear as a bell.

When in fact what happened was, and I think this was a good thing that the - and this really does got into the next one is that we - because of this difference of opinion in terms of what the international law covered, we actually went out to and asked the General Counsel's office to do the - some research and study and let us - give us some advice with regard to is international law clear on this or not.

So I think part of Greg, of what you may be getting at was one group in particular just thought they had all the knowledge on the law that was necessary and that we were ignoring it. And that was hard - that was hard to deal with. And in fact the General Counsel's work then I think helped the group in that regard.

So I'm not sure it was so much preparation and expertise. In some cases it was actually just definitely disagreement in terms of what international law actually did protect and didn't protect more so than it was just preparation.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Great. Okay. With that, we will close the discussion on this point of the agenda. And we will move on and I'll quickly ask Greg if he and Avri have had any chance to look at this Lightweight Response Mechanism Working Group that you and Avri had said you would look at.

Greg Shatan: I have to admit that we - I haven't heard anything from Avri. I guess she's not on the call. I did not have a chance...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Greg Shatan: ...to really deal with her.

J. Scott Evans: Do you think that's something that you could have for the next call?

Greg Shatan: Absolutely. And I'll try to plug in with Avri as well and try to...

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Okay.

Greg Shatan: ...see if we can work that.

J. Scott Evans: So now we'll move to discussions of Deliverable 1c question. And Marika, if you would just bring the group up to speed of what went on in the last call with regards to this that we can then pick up and spend a few minutes doing this looking at the rest of 1c.

Marika Konings: Sure. So this is Marika. So basically the document on the screen, you know, has captured some of the notes and discussion that we had during the last meeting specifically on Section C. And I think we basically got to Question C in that regard.

We covered Item A and B and with those we also noted that, you know, those might be more relevant in relation to some of the other charter questions and deliverables.

I basically dove into Question C, the notes in which you'll see incorporated in the document. And I think that's also what triggered the suggestion by Greg and Avri to maybe think about, you know, sort of details on how possible lightweight mechanism may look and what kind of charter such initiative

would need, which, you know, may form a basis for further discussion or looking at and whether that will be a kind of one size fits all or whether that will be certain elements that would - that, you know, could be added on or taken off depending on the issue at stake and whether indeed there are any kind of minimum requirements that would be needed at this part of such a charter.

And so basically I think where we left off at C - I don't know if there's anything further that needs to be added there. You may note as well that in this document I made a couple of small updates and looking back as well, you know, having now received input from the (ITPC) and constituencies.

But we also already had previously input from the Registry Stakeholder Group as well as the ALAC. So what I did try to do is capture there where I believe relevant, you know, some of the comments from their documents from the Registry Stakeholder Group. They responded to some of the questions that we have on here. So you'll see that inserted here.

I did add as well an additional column at the end, which captured this page and some comments from ALAC that seemed relevant to this specific question. And the idea would be as well as we move forward that we of course do the same for the other deliverables and charter questions trying to capture the input received from other parties on these topics.

And of course you're all encouraged to, you know, indicate if there's anything missing or any further information that should be added to these templates, which we hope to use eventually of course to build the initial report and as well, you know, kind of serve as a repository of the conversation and discussions that we're - we've had.

So I think we basically left up at that on Question C. And I think we did discuss that quite extensively. So I'm not really sure if there's anything more to be said. I noted - I did add the input from the Registry Stakeholder Group

on this item. But I think as I noted as well in a note their comment was actually I think taken from the input that they provided to the discussion paper so it actually preceded the formation of this working group.

And as you'll know, they - in their comment they specifically encouraged the GNSO to initiated a working group to actually develop such a mechanism, which I think is, you know, what we're actually trying to do at this moment.

So J. Scott so maybe as part of the input on C. Otherwise it may make sense to move on to D. And as I've tried to indicate there as well, I think the first part of the question may more specifically relate to Deliverable 2 and 3, which is Charter Question 3. But the second part I think may be relevant to the deliverable that we're looking at here.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Thank you Marika. Does anyone have any comments about 1c? Okay. Let's move to 1d. Does everyone see on the screen the questions? Okay. So the questions - this is J. Scott for the record. But I see our - are what lessons can be learned from past experience?

What are the consequences of action being considered policy versus implementation? Why does it matter if something policy or implementation? Under what circumstances if any may the GNSO Council make recommendations or state positions to the Board on matters of policy and implementation as a representative of the GNSO as a whole? How do we avoid the current morass of outcome derived labeling?

For example, I will call this policy because I want the consequences - I want certain consequences handling instructions to be attached to it. Can we answer these questions so the definitions of policy and implementation matter less if at all? Does anybody - oh, I'm sorry. Yes. Because the next one's me. Does anybody have any additions I think we need to consider especially having any deletions, any thoughts whatsoever?

Alan Greenberg: J. Scott, it's Alan. I had to step away for a moment. Can you tell me where we are?

J. Scott Evans: Yes. We are considering the questions on 1d - Deliverable 1d. The questions to be considered and trying to determine if those are adequate, if they are apropos.

Marika Konings: And J. Scott, I think you're actually further ahead than we are because I think we're still in Section C, Question D. Sorry. Like the column is indeed labeled questions. I think...

J. Scott Evans: Oh I see. All right. I moved ahead. I'm sorry. My mouse is not being very nice. I have the ability to manipulate it technically.

Marika Konings: Yes. And I think maybe (unintelligible)...

J. Scott Evans: So what you're talking about...

Marika Konings: ...number...

J. Scott Evans: ...(inter) column further information?

Marika Konings: Yes. And then it's basically it's - on the question side it's the C, review questions for discussion. And then in that you have questions for discussion where we're basically I think at Item D, which starts with one of the advisories (unintelligible) recently.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Sorry. So do you see that Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I now see where we are.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Yes. I think that's - I think these are very important and I think we learned that -- this is J. Scott for the record -- in going through the first chart. Does anybody agree or disagree? Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Not agreeing or disagreeing but more going to the second part of this question. You know, how can the work of these consultation mechanisms be updated to take into account input from all the SOs, ACs and the public?

And I think that probably goes as well to one of the fundamental questions we probably need to look at as well as a working group is that, you know, recommendations are - and this is specifically looking at, you know, those instances where the Board may come back and ask for input on implementation or, you know, having identified specific policy questions.

So the question is basically once recommendations are adopted by the GNSO Council and then to the Board and then move into implementation indeed, what, you know, what (rule) or what need is there indeed to have broader participations in questions that come back to the GNSO specifically for input and feedback on the recommendations that were adopted by the GNSO Council?

So I think we, you know, as said, go through the mechanisms. You know, somebody already commented on that certain mechanisms were too limited, that they should be more open.

And at the same time I think we've been seeing as well currently in some of that implementation work and does that need to go back to the group that actually developed policy recommendations and they were the ones that, you know, originally came up with the policy recommendations and maybe best positioned to provide input.

I think this questions goes a little bit to, you know, how can we make sure indeed to I think as we also said in the principles that, you know, any implementation related discussions or any alternative process would also need to recognize multi stakeholder model. At the same time make sure that it doesn't turn into, you know, a new policy effort where I think we're looking most of the time here.

Very specifically choose our questions. I think some noted and I think it was James who basically pointed it out as well how to make sure that it's still, you know, narrow enough and doesn't go back into issues that were already addressed or discarded and, you know, people using that, you know, second bite of the apple approach and, you know, other questions that may come up.

And I think that's where this question basically goes to. How can you find that right balance between openness and representativeness and at the same time, you know, focus and being able to really address the issue that's being asked.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Anyone have a comment, concern? Okay. Do we move to E? There should be recognition of the potential overlap and responsibilities between an SO/AC and ICANN such as when an issue can be the subject of a PDP, which now it still may be appropriate for staff or the Board to act in ICANN's multi stakeholder bottom up policy development structures.

The inability to reach consensus on key issues could produce stalemate that by default preserve the status quo instead of enabling badly needed changes. Example of this might be the (verbal) integration issue or the changes to the RAA.

In addition, there may be instances where competing policy advice is given by different SO/ACs. How is the Board expected to handle such situations? And there is a question from staff here whether this is in scope. Comments?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I think I maybe add to that or just explain why they're not in scope. And I think I mentioned that already earlier in, you know, introducing the document is that in looking at this question as I said, you know, the discussion paper initially was, you know, more focused on the broader conversation looking at, you know, all SOs, ACs and, you know, policy implementation from a broader level than just the GNSO where we're currently focusing.

So this is really asking the question of, you know, what should happen in case, you know, the Board gets advised or recommendations from Organization A? They say A and Organization B says, you know, the complete opposite. What should happen in that case? And currently there's no mechanism for that. And, you know, should there be a mechanism?

You know, personally I do believe I think that is an issue that needs to get addressed and there should probably be a kind of mechanism that, you know, would - instead of having the Board, you know, pick one child over the other, have a kind of, you know, conciliation mechanism where both parties are, you know, put in the room and, you know, asked to work it out between themselves with mediation or, you know, Board encouragement as such.

But I'm not really sure if it's within what we're currently looking at. And maybe not in scope is, you know, too firm on this because, you know, potentially this could also be one of the elements that the working group wants to address as part of the framework deliverable, which I think we're looking at.

You know, what should be the framework for policy and implementation related conversations? Maybe one aspect there could be as well that indeed if the Boards asks a question on implementation to different SOs and ACs then, you know, the GNSO for example says it should be done in this way and the GAC says, you know, the opposite, how should that be dealt with?

So it may be relevant in that conversation but I'm not really sure in this specific deliverable if it belongs here. So maybe not in scope is too firm at this stage and I think it may fit in certain places but again, we put it there as a question mark and I think we'd be interested to hear what others believe is relevant in relation to this specific question.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I see we've got a couple of hands. Chuck. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry. I was on mute. I think Marika hit it right on the head that this really most of the time comes into play with the GAC versus the GNSO. And I'm not sure it's an issue that we should get into in this group in terms of how the Board should deal with those.

But one part of the issue that does seem in scope; if the GNSO was the policy making body for generic names and the GAC is an advisory body, if we're not careful we turn the GAC into a policymaking body and we have competing policymaking bodies. And that's problematic. So that part of it may be in scope but I'm not sure.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I guess I view most of this as not so much questions we have to answer but refer to it periodically as we're answering the other questions to make sure we're factoring in the issues that it's considering.

And, you know, I don't think in the general case it's just a matter of GNSO and GAC. Thankfully we haven't had the problem. But what would happen if the GNSO and the ccNSO recommended completely divergent rules on handling IDNs? You know, that's not an advisory committee anymore. That's an SO.

And we both in theory have complete control over our own domains but they better, you know, it's like the U.S. Congress and the U.S. Congress and the

House of Representatives and the Senate have to end up with a bill that matches each other. They can't do different things. And how do we - how does the Board or how do we resolve those kind of issues?

So I think this is one of those background things that we have to keep on looking at as we're going forward to make sure that we're not getting ourselves into a paradox situation or a situation with recommending something that ultimately may cause more problems than it fixes.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Thank you. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Just a follow up on Alan's - one of Alan's comments there. I don't know that it's so much out of scope as it is it's being handled by another working group and that is the cross community working group effort but involving both ccNSO and GNSO and so forth.

And I think it's probably best for us to let that group handle the particular issues that Alan brought up about the ccNSO and GNSO coming up with different conclusions. And so I would suggest that we defer that particular issue to that particular group.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right. Michael Graham.

Michael Graham: Yes. I don't know that I would agree Chuck totally with that in terms of deferral. I thought that Alan sort of hit it on the head that it is certainly something that we need to keep in mind in considering these other areas as we go along rather than putting together a specific process that would be followed or rule of priority or anything else.

And at the same time I think keeping in mind the potential conflicts between this SO and other SOs and other ACs in terms of whether it's a policy in which case it is GNSO or it is - if it is something else when that needs to be involving other SOs and ACs as part of the GNSO process. So I don't know

that I would defer it. But I would keep it in mind and perhaps watch what the cross team is coming up with as they do.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right. Alan, is that a new hand?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. That is a new hand. I guess I don't agree with Chuck that this is something that the cross community working group rules group should be looking at. That only kicks in if the GNSO and the (ccNO) so as an example, have the wisdom to say let's work together.

We're trying to make sure that there are - that we don't end up in situations where there are different policies, which could conceivably happen. You know, if each of them doesn't realize that there is an overlap or that the rules they're coming up with are in direct conflict to what other people.

And we've had some situations in the past where it came dangerously close to that. So I think it's a background thing that we have to consider. And I don't think we can ignore it and say it's someone else's business. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: All right. To that I'm going to bring this discussion to a close. And we pick up on F when we meet again. But now we need to go to the discussion of next steps and our next meeting. Currently our next meeting is scheduled for the 11th I believe - June 11, which means that will be the last meeting we would have before London.

And so the first question is is there - and I'll show by a show of hands and you can vote in the Adobe Connect whether you all feel we should have an additional call next week so that we can have two calls for London. So I ask that question now and put it to the group so we can see where people come out. Okay. I've got one yes and bunch of abstains perhaps. Or I...

Chuck Gomes: Hang on a second J. Scott.

Alan Greenberg: Tell us what the answer's for.

Chuck Gomes: I'm looking at my calendar.

Alan Greenberg: J. Scott, it's Alan. You gave us two options. Which are we talking...

J. Scott Evans: I'm sorry. The two options are whether we want - yes or no on whether we want to have an additional meeting next week. So that would be June 4. So rather than meeting again in two weeks, we would meet once on the 4th and once on June 11.

Alan Greenberg: May I ask a question? Is there anything pressing that we've committed to presenting or doing in London that we are not in a position to do yet and we need the other meeting for?

J. Scott Evans: Not that I'm aware of other than a status. I'm sorry Olevie. I don't know when you asked the question. That was me speaking. And okay. I've got Alan no, Chuck yes, Michael yes.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Just for clarity, my note says if there's nothing we desperately need to do to meet...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: ...to meet the London schedule, then let's stick to the schedule we decided on.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I've got nothing from Greg. All right. Based on - Jonathan Frost is abstaining. So at this point I think - (unintelligible) just voted yes.

Alan Greenberg: I should point out that I believe another group is scheduled next week because we're not supposed to be meeting.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I don't remember what it was but I remember seeing something on the agenda. Maybe Mary or Marika know. I thought I saw something being scheduled for next week.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm looking at the policy calendar and the only thing I see there is an (unintelligible) call.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Then maybe...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Maybe it wasn't scheduled. Maybe it was just one of the options. It was the option for something and I can't remember what it was anymore.

Marika Konings: Yes. And this is Marika. It may be something indeed that's in the process of being scheduled. I don't know if Mary or Terry have any idea what it may be but, you know, to be fair I think we did agree on the last meeting to meet, you know, in two weeks.

So I don't know indeed how that may have affected people that are not on the call today. So I did know that even though we confirmed this meeting quite some time out, our attendance has slightly dropped some. I'm hoping that by the scheduling of a meeting already next week, it won't drop any further. And that what we have now will, you know, maybe it will resolve...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Looking at the votes we've got I just - not having a majority of the group here and only have three people say have a meeting next week, I'm inclined to say that we not have a meeting next week. But I'll listen to anyone that has a different opinion.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. The meeting - it was a doodle for the meeting on the CWG framework principles. And Mary sent out a message yesterday or I think it was yesterday saying it's not settled yet but the likely time is next Wednesday at 1600.

J. Scott Evans: Mary's raised her hand.

Alan Greenberg: Oh sorry, 1600 is early in the morning so that's in my time. So it's no conflict. Sorry. I was...

J. Scott Evans: Mary.

Alan Greenberg: ...I was ignoring the UTC part of it and it would have been a conflict then. So it (unintelligible).

Mary Wong: Alan, I believe we're actually going to have the meeting on the Thursday now.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Mary Wong: But in any case it would not be a conflict.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Mary Wong: So I'll double check and send you an email if I haven't.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. I remembered seeing the 1600 with ignoring the fact that it said UTC. So it was a red herring. Sorry to have bothered you.

J. Scott Evans: Michael Graham.

Michael Graham: Yes. I was just wondering - sorry for the bad connection. I was just wondering if we're not to have a meeting if perhaps we could work on something -- I know Chuck was going to be working on something -- that we might actually

have some people begin working on some drafting headed towards that next meeting in two weeks if that's when our next meeting is.

Otherwise we're sort of in this dead zone over the next two weeks and heading to London with the status being we start getting close to something ever two weeks and then we stop.

J. Scott Evans: Well that was - Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I will point out that last week when we discussed the timing, the issue was raised of should we have weekly meetings until London. And the decision was made no.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: And that I think...

J. Scott Evans: So that's...

Alan Greenberg: ...and the fact that we have pretty low attendance today I really don't think we should change the schedule.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. That's fine. But I will say that where we are losing momentum is that nobody is taking the two weeks before to do things to get us in a good position to pull through these calls fairly quickly. So myself included.

I note that only Chuck and Alan had gone through this chart and supplied - the first chart we did and supplied the comments. And I don't know if anybody has done that with regards to the Deliverable 1 questions that we're looking at. But we need to do that in order to keep this going forward.

But there needs to be work done on the list so that we don't lose our momentum. And so we - I would, you know, we're going to have to do

something. So, you know, we need to commit to doing that so that we're in a good place that we can move forward.

I mean at the very least I can see that people would have time to go through the Excel sheet and put the strong point, weak point. That's not, you know, terribly exhaustive.

Now maybe it - these long questions require some thinking and having a discussion but we can - if people will put things down in the Excel chart, we can pull through that fairly quickly and then spend the majority of the time working on the template here. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I just want to suggest that in our next meeting two weeks from now that we try and wrap up the strong points and weak points in that one section.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Because I think that's doable.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Even if we have to spend most of the meeting...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...it'd be nice to get that part done. I thought that the discussion that we had today on the three items was - is going to be really helpful for us going forward in what we're doing.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: So I'd like to at least set a tentative target for that two weeks from now.

J. Scott Evans: Great. I think that's a great idea. And I think we can do that. With that, we've got four minutes left. I'm going to ask if anyone has any other business. Any other comments? Okay.

So for our next meeting why don't we have an agenda that includes the roll call, completion of the Deliverable 1a review chart; strong point, weak point and confirm next steps next meeting.

And if Greg and them can get something to us, we can add the look at the draft standard template for the lightweight response mechanism. But we won't put that formally on the agenda until we hear back.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: All right. Thank you all very much for your time. I would encourage everyone to go through that Excel spreadsheet and put your weak point, strong point down. And if you were not involved with some and don't have a perception but someone in your constituency was, you might want to reach out to them and get their thought and speak, you know, with the voice of your constituency. I see - Marika, is your hand back up?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Just to note for the next meeting we may also want to set some time aside to think about what we want to do in London as that is the last meeting I believe that we actually...

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Well that's what I meant by confirm next steps next meeting, which would be on the agenda. We'll just give it a little bit broader - more time. Okay? Anything else? Thank you all very much for your time. We appreciate your participation today. And we look forward to speaking with everyone again on the 11th.

Coordinator: This conference is now concluded. You may disconnect your lines at this time.

END