

**Policy & Implementation Working Group Meeting  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Wednesday 20 August at 1900 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Wednesday 20 August 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-20140820-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr – At-Large  
Olevie Kouami – NPOC  
Chuck Gomes – RySG  
Greg Shatan-IPC  
Jonathan Frost-RySG  
J Scott Evans – BC  
Klaus Stoll-NPOC  
Amr Elsadr-NCUC  
Michael Graham – IPC  
Anne Aikman Scalese – IPC  
Stephanie Perrin – NCUC  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen – ISPCP  
Alan Greenberg-ALAC

Apologies:

Avri Doria-NCSCG  
Tom Barrett – RrSG

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings  
Mary Wong  
Amy Bivins  
Steve Chan  
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: The recordings have been started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Policy and Implementation Working Group Call on the 20th of August 2014.

On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olevie Kouami, will be joining us a little later in the call. We have Jonathan Frost, Amr Elsadr, J. Scott Evans, Michael Graham will be joining a little bit later today as well. Stephanie Perrin, Chuck Gomes, Klaus Stoll, Anne Aikman-Scalèse and Greg Shatan - we have apologies from Tom Barrett and Avri Doria. From staff we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Amy Bivins, Steve Chan and myself Terri Agnew.

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

J. Scott Evans: Thank you very much Terri, this is J. Scott Evans for the record. First I want to ask does anyone on the working group that is (permanent) have any updates to their Statement of Interest?

Hearing none we should move on. I'll reiterate that if you haven't looked at your Statement of Interest in some time I would suggest you do so just to make sure it's up-to-date. You may think it is and yet it's not. So our first item on the agenda is to look at the flowcharts that we have been discussing for the last couple of weeks. And to get sort of a consensus with regards to them so that we can then send them out hopefully to the various groups that are represented here to seek some high level input on whether we believe that our work is headed in the right direction.

It is our hope that parallel with the - in gathering this high level input from the various groups that we would also have staff putting together a more detailed process document that we would then edit and work from as we begin to hone in and refine this process down. And of course that's what eventually

will be going out for public comment, so that's our plan. I think you'll notice that in this chart it's been updated and it's been updated to add some coloring to it.

It's orange on my screen and several places on each of the charts you'll see that there is either a completely orange box or the box has some sort of orange indication or shading to it. And those are areas where we believe we need to be very cognizant of as we begin planning a more detailed process. And it also may be something that we want to get some input from the various groups - constituency advisory groups and things as we begin to do that to see if anybody has any particular opinion points or concerns or red flags that they want to raise with regards to those particular points.

So sort of setting out what I hope our goal will be when we finish up with this item which is number three - I'm sorry number two on our agenda today, I want to open it up to the floor to see if anyone, one, has any comments with regards to what I've just laid out as our sort of short-term plan with regards to gathering feedback. And two, if there are any particular comments with regards to the flowcharts themselves. Wow are we really going to get off that easily?

Super, I'm not hearing any comments or concerns so we'll assume that these flowcharts are at least in a good draft process that we can then elicit some input. Now in doing so we felt probably the most efficient and effective manner for seeking this input would be to have a template emailed that each of us, the working group would use as we solicited this input.

So we make sure that everyone is receiving the information in a standard format with a standard request for what we're seeking back in the hopes that it would cut down on the iterations calls due to maybe, you know, nuances and wording and/or meanings. And so if we just - everyone got the same thing, we hoped that it would sort of cut that down. And I think Mary had sent around about two weeks ago a draft email.

And then on our chair's call which occurred about 25 minutes ago - 15 or 25 minutes ago, Chuck raised a few issues and with just regards to some wording on what we were seeking to make sure that we were really clear. And he was going to during his enormous 15 minute break between the two calls look at it and suggest some additional words - some additional - some wording changes to this draft email. I think it's just come up in the Connect Room.

For those of you who are on Connect you can see that here is the draft email that we suggested. Chuck do you have - has this one been revised or do you (want to point out)...

Chuck Gomes: Let me look to see if this has my revision - I just sent out some redlines, it looks like Marika wants to say something, let her jump in.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika and just to facilitate review because I think the initial email actually went to the chairs as I've just accepted the redline and this is the version that Chuck sent including his edits, so just to clarify that.

Chuck Gomes: Yes okay, thanks Marika, this is Chuck and I do see the changes. As you were talking previously though I realized there's probably a couple more edits but I'll talk about those when we - when it's appropriate.

J. Scott Evans: Anne?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes thanks J. Scott, it's Anne I'm reading what's on the screen and I notice that in the second paragraph we still have references to a proposed policy guidance process and a proposed policy input process. Are those - did we change those in the charts to GNSO guidance process and G- did we move to GGP in the new...

J. Scott Evans: I think we'll make sure that - I think you are correct Anne - this is J. Scott for the record, that on last week's call I believe there were some title changes with regards to what the process were called to make it clearer for what they could be used for. And I note that Marika has notated that as well as Cheryl and Mary.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: So we just need to go in and clean that up, but thank you for bringing that forward.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Are there any...

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again J. Scott...

J. Scott Evans: Yes?

Chuck Gomes: ...and one of the things you said in your introductory remark which I thought were correct is that we may want feedback on those - the orange boxes.

So I guess my question right now is do we want - the way it's worded right now we're just asking whether or not they think we're going in the right direction. If we also want to ask for any feedback they may have in terms of the thresholds and the orange boxes or anything else related to the orange boxes we would welcome that too. If so we need to add that to the email and I can do that after this call if that...

Man: I'm coming.

J. Scott Evans: Okay thanks Chuck, I see that Cheryl agrees to that and Anne has another questions - Anne?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes thank you J. Scott. Just two questions again regarding that middle paragraph. There's a reference to high level processes in addition to those that are currently available.

And I'm wondering if high level processes could trigger anything - any kind of negative reaction. And my second question which is similar in terms of language because at the end of that paragraph we say, where policies already adopted by the ICANN Board may need reexamination. I think that's probably realistic and that's what actually goes on, but again I'm wondering if there could be a negative trigger where somebody might be saying, hey why are we trying to imply here that policies that are already made, you know, have to be - are going to be reexamined all the time?

And so I almost would prefer that we say clarification or policies already adopted may need clarification. Do you see what I'm trying to avoid here in terms of an overreaction to, well hey that policy process we already went through that?

J. Scott Evans: Right - this is J. Scott - I guess having lived in this ecosystem far too long that it's amazing the words that can be incendiary.

So I do think we need to be careful about our terminology and phraseology to try to at least as best we can allow our experience to inform us and try to if possible clear - steer clear of certain pitfalls. So I appreciate the fact that you are raising a red flag there - Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks J. Scott and thanks Anne. So in that last sentence would it work to say, may need clarification or updating?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes that's - I mean that is exactly what I'm suggesting, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay after the call I'll get that because there's a couple of (unintelligible) done as well.

And also I need to - we need to add - I guess I need an answer to the question that I asked, do we also want feedback on the thresholds and any other input on the orange colored boxes at this time? If so I can add a sentence to that request - to that - that covers that in our request for feedback, but I need to know whether we want that at this time. Or do we just want to - this is Chuck again, do we just want to find out whether we're heading in a proper direction at this time?

J. Scott Evans: I see Marika's hand is up and then we will go to Anne - Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, one thing you may want to do is to point out in the latter noting that, you know, you'll see orange boxes and those are already areas that the working group has identified that will need, you know, further review at the moment that further details are available.

So that people are at least aware that those are some of the areas where, you know, further focus will take place. And then mention of course if any specific input on those areas and, you know, is also welcome. But indeed there will be another opportunity to look at that once a more detailed description is available.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, I agree with that too. I see (Omar) - this is J. Scott for the record, I see (Omar) and Anne agree with that. I don't see any objections.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes I agree too - I'm just away - I'm away from the screen for a moment.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, all right - Cheryl agrees as well. So I think that that - here's my suggestion, my suggestion is if everyone is comfortable with the concept of sending out a letter...

Man: I'm listening to a meeting - I can't...

J. Scott Evans: Okay, if everyone is comfortable with the concept of this I would suggest that we do editing and then we send it around to the group for a blessing. Chuck are you raising your hand again or is that an old hand?

Chuck Gomes: I am J. Scott, thanks. The - I realize there's one point that Anne made that I didn't respond to, the one about - in the middle of the second paragraph where it says high level processes.

That was actually my attempt to fix language that said clearly delineated processes because they're not clearly delineated yet. Anne do you have a suggestion as to how - what we're trying - what I was trying to do there - we haven't clearly delineated them yet, so we don't want to say that. They're still at a high level and that's why I said what I said. But if you have a suggestion for what might be better I would warmly welcome that.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Great, J. Scott may I have the floor?

J. Scott Evans: Yes ma'am.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay thank you, yes Chuck I think - I wonder if what we're trying to say here is more expedient processes or something like that.

I think probably what the trigger on the high level that I was worried about was are we trying to invoke processes that aren't going to include the entire GNSO community? Are we speaking of, you know, a high level process as something that we're saying well, you know, the Council gets to decide this or whatever and then that could trigger some reaction from certain, you know, constituencies. And in particular - so it kind of seems like what we're trying to do is get the organization to work more effectively and be able to respond to, you know, a need for guidance more quickly.



And I'm wondering if we should say outline more expedient or efficient or some - I don't have the exact words, I'm sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Well let - thanks, let me - I get your points and so let me take a crack at it and then we'll send it around to the whole list with the redline.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay thank you.

Chuck Gomes: And feel free to come up with other ideas - this is Chuck by the way.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Stephanie?

Stephanie Perrin: Hi Stephanie Perrin for the record. It just seemed to me - and I - there's nothing wrong with the word high level but somehow this paragraph - and I'm putting on my sensitivity feelers because as was pointed out earlier there's so many inflammatory things about revisiting decisions and the Board shortcutting, you know, etc., etc.

So are we not trying to institutionalize processes that would replace (ad hocary) - that's not a good word, but in which case you're trying to not just outline but set in place administrative procedures to replace ad hoc response? Or is that too firm?

J. Scott Evans: Well - okay thank you Stephanie, this is J. Scott again. Why don't we - let me get to the - why don't we just say that we're setting forth a flowchart outlining additional processes to those that are currently available.

And then maybe add an additional sentence that says, the flowcharts are intended to outline a -these processes at a high level? And it - and then

something like that. So we just tell them it's a flowchart - okay Chuck and then Anne.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks again J. Scott, Chuck speaking and I just wanted to comment. The use of the words outlining and high level and so forth weren't intended to imply how they would be used rather the working group hasn't provided enough detail yet and we know that.

They're still at a high - our outline of the process is still at a high level, that's what we were trying to communicate there. So because if the - if the people were asking feedback from look at them, they're going to be asking the same questions we have and it will be much more complicated. We do want - eventually want their input on that but it's still at a high level so we recognize that and we want to know if we're going in the right direction.

Now I like J. Scott what you suggested and I'll try and incorporate that. You know, we've created a flowchart outlining some possible additional processes and I'll try and bring all these thoughts together. I'm sure they will need for fixing but I welcome that from the rest of you.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes thank you J. Scott, I also liked your suggestion and I wanted to say that it might actually be helpful to us to refer to the charter where there's a question I think about developing a policy guidance process.

In other words if siting to that question in the context of the sentence might be, you know, hey we're just - we are doing what the charter asked, you know, request - we're looking at a question the charter asked us to address.

J. Scott Evans: Okay thanks Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: So the next question I have for the group is should this come from the chairs and vice chairs or should it come from the working group members to their designated organization? Does anyone have a point view?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck if I can jump in without putting my hand up. I like - I kind of like the idea of the representative do - sending it.

And then it provides a real easy line of communication with the group they represent, I think that's a positive. Now if we have a group that's not represented then it might be appropriate that - for it to come from the chair, so that's my personal opinion.

J. Scott Evans: Okay and Anne seems to agree with you on that. That sounds fine to me and I don't see anyone strongly disagreeing with that.

Cheryl Landon-Orr: Cheryl here J. Scott, I'm not disagreeing in any way, shape or form. I think internally and the main focus should be internally to the GNSO, that's an ideal way forward. But for external, you know, perhaps to the working - from the working group to chairs of the other ICs and FOs it should probably come from the chairs of the working group.

J. Scott Evans: Okay so we sort of have two that agree with that - Marika your hand is up.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, I think I'm kind of agreeing where Cheryl's coming from because I think also from a tracking perspective - because it would be good indeed at least if we could see where messages have gone out.

If, you know, possible follow-up is needed as well, information may come back. And of course there's as well a situation that in many groups are represented by more than one member so that we would need to sort out, you know, who is the person that would send it to that group, or was it a joy

message. So I think from a logistical perspective it may be easier for the chairs to send it.

And so, you know, for those working group members that have been actively involved at least they may want to copy some of those and/or at least they would let them know the message has gone out so they can follow-up within their respective groups that this has been communicated.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, how about - this is J. Scott for the record, that I propose a compromise and that would be - come from the chairs and vice chairs with a copy to the designated person and we might suggest in the email that they reach out to the designated person who's copied above and submit their feedback.

Does that sound workable? Cheryl agrees and I'm seeing no disagrees so what I'd like to do then is circulate a redrafted version of this letter in the next day or so. And I'd like us to get it approved, you know, fairly quickly - probably by early next week and maybe we can put a deadline on that that if we don't hear back from anyone we'll assume it's approved and give them a deadline in which to comment. And then we will then begin getting it ready to go out - does that sound like a plan? Good - Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks J. Scott, I still don't have an answer to my question about whether we want to request feedback on the orange colored boxes.

J. Scott Evans: Oh I'm sorry I thought we did because there was a big discussion in the chat, I should have pointed that out.

It looks like everyone thinks there's no harm in doing that and it would not be - we could point out as Marika had stated that these are areas that we know that will need further consideration as we go through this process. Invite them if they have any concerns or thoughts with regards to those that they send it forward. I think that's where we ended up but I could be mistaken.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks J. Scott, it's Chuck and obviously I wasn't monitoring the chat closely enough.

J. Scott Evans: And it looks like (Omar) is saying he agrees with that. Okay, all right now as most of you know early on we sent some requests for thoughts to some of the stakeholder groups, constituencies and supporting organizations requesting that they come back to us with any information they may have with regards to enumerated questions that we put forth.

We asked for a lot of information, we gave them a lot of information. Three of those groups - the ISPCPs, the registries and the ALAC all responded in writing with their particular input. Several of the other groups said that they would get back to us in public comment when we did our final report. So in order to - for transparency purposes and just out of common courtesy Chuck came up with the idea and has drafted a set of letters, two of which everyone has seen because they were circulated with the agenda and with the chart that we just looked at earlier this week.

So and that was to the ALAC and to the ISPCP and so those have come out and been reviewed. And I didn't see anyone making any particular comment or statement that they shouldn't go out, so with regards to those two I just want to say thank you very much. I think that - I think this is the one with regards to ALAC that everyone has looked at and seen and we've all agreed is in order to be sent. I mean it basically - I'm going to let Chuck sort of let you know what he's done here so that everyone can see, you know, and hear from the author what his intention was and what we've done here - Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks J. Scott and I want to start off by thanking Michael and all of the - and Cheryl for the work they did in taking a look at those statements that we received and kind of summarizing the points that were made.

That made my job of drafting these letters much, much easier so I'm very appreciative of that. And basically what I tried to do in the letters besides just

thanking them is to highlight a few of their comments, not all of them because they would have been (unintelligible)...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: ...so and pointing out where we've already considered the input that they provided or whether it's going to be considered in the future. Whether we've already kind of agreed with them on something - things like that. And you can read it, I don't have to go - say anymore there.

And then encourage them to continue to provide us input through their representatives or through a future request for comments. So that's really what it is and I - if either Mary or Marika could send out the one to the Registry Stakeholder Group which was just done today that would be great. If anybody has any comments on those letters if you could respond this week so that we can meet J. Scott's timeline of getting this thing done by early next week that would be great.

J. Scott Evans: So I'm not sure this one has been circulated to the full groups so we will do that at the end of today's call to make sure that you all have time to review it. And hopefully let's say if you have any questions or concerns with regards to this if you can get back to us prior to close of business Pacific Daylight time in the United States on Friday. So that's 5:00 PM - Cheryl we're going by the normal person's workday not yours - 5:00 PM Pacific Daylight time on Friday August 22.

If you have any questions, concerns or comments regarding this or the other two letters to the constituencies and stakeholder groups, if you would let us know we will make sure that those are considered prior to putting these in final form. I'm sorry Anne I just noticed your hand is up.

Anne Aikman-Scalèse: Yes thank you J. Scott, it just went up. It seems to me that when we write back to those who provided input we should probably include

something about the process that went on when we met in London where I think, you know, you guys underlined and we all agreed that the work of this working group needed to be expedited.

And that there were, you know, pressures within the community to develop a more effective, you know, way of resolving, you know, disagreements and whatnot. And reflecting the fact that, you know, there's a reason we went directly to the development of the GGP process and that somehow that there should be a connection between these letters and what the groups will be asked to review immediately before a September 12 deadline.

J. Scott Evans: Okay so just got summarized, what I heard you say is you think that there should be some reference that ties into the email that will be coming around regarding the charts so that they'll be looking for it and lets them know that we're going to be - that this work has led to these charts and we want them to review those and get back with it, so that we just alert them to the connection between the two and that this is coming.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Right and maybe even to, you know, a recognized need on the part of the working group that these processes need to be - that the deliverables need to be expedited. And I don't know, you know, to my mind this is what happened in London in June, I don't know how you want to describe that or if you prefer not to.

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott, I - from my experience anytime you say stuff like that you're just setting yourself up for failure.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: I don't think we should put false time pressures on us, I think we're moving as fast as we can. Maria - Marika, I'm sorry.

Marika Konings: Yes thank you Scott, yes this is regard - I don't actually recall us talking about expedited.

I think the only thing we discussed in London is, you know, whether we should go back to weekly meetings to keep momentum going. Also keeping in mind the original work time that we had said that we're trying to deliver initial report by the LA meeting which I don't think we'll probably make unless we make part of them part of the other (unintelligible) questions. So I'm not sure I think that the term expedited is probably what we've been doing or trying to do at least from my perspective, but maybe I've missed something.

J. Scott Evans: Okay Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: That makes perfect sense to me in terms of what the group is trying to do.

I guess when I read these letters I - we talk in terms of how we are trying to take their feedback into account and there's a lot of discussion about here is how we'll take into account what you believe policymaking is and what you believe implementation is. And I think the working group has in a way moved beyond those questions and that's where I'm, you know, finding a bit of a disconnect I guess.

Because the input seems to be directed at distinguishing between policy and the implementation and yet it appears to me that our recommended solution to these issues says that's a false question. So that's all that I ask that we consider, I don't need to belabor it anymore. I mean I could, you know, provide some feedback offline.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, I'm going to go to Cheryl and then Marika, then Chuck.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks J. Scott, Cheryl for the record. I see what you're saying Anne but I guess I'm not particularly concerned along the same lines.



Because what I see this (lid) is doing in the other more chart or graphic space if it's some other work groups have done in the past where one goes through and specifically addresses and lists the response, the reaction and the outcome of everything everyone comments on by workgroup. I mean this is work that does get done in workgroups and needs to get done in workgroups, we should be doing.

And it fits with what the original - the first accountability and transparency review team had as part of its recommendations which meant that you had a closer and more open communication modality between people who are commenting in public comments and the work that they're commenting on. So it's I think a really useful thing, I guess I'm seeing the letters as even better meeting those needs and need more tabular mechanisms that have been included in reports in the past.

That's not to minimize that, I think they're still important though - those tabular responses. But I see this as a very good step forward, I'm going to stop before I choke to death, thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, all right I'm going to go to Marika.

Marika Konings: Hi yes thanks J. Scott, just maybe too to Anne's point by way of addressing your concern maybe in the letter we spoke about before has really made clear that that talks or those, you know, flowcharts are addressing one charter question.

It doesn't mean that the working group is done or is ignoring the other questions that have been asked. It's just that well they still need to get to those. But we already want to reshare what we've been doing so far so people don't, you know, are taken by surprise when we come up with more detailed recommendations. So maybe that's something. In the other letter we can make more clear that it's really specifically related to one specific charter

question and that the working group is still, you know, working and will be working on the other charter questions that will drive (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Right, thank you Marika - Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks J. Scott and everybody else's comment. I - first of all let me point out that there's a (mixer) in each of the letters, there's a mix of input that was so - that was talked a little bit about from the specific group. Some are things we covered, some are things we haven't covered yet.

So it's not as if we're covering issues that we're just talking about issues that we've already decided. In those cases that's stated. In other cases it's something we're coming up to, in one case I remember I think in the one I wrote today it's something we're just about to get into. And so I don't - it's not just issues that we've already made decisions on. So I just wanted to point that out in the letters. And I think it's important that we think of these letters from the point of view of the three organizations that are involved.

They submitted the comments, this is feedback to them specifically and not look at it so much from the point of view of the working group as it is too. We're trying to thank them, give them an idea that we're considering their input and will consider their input further as we're moving further and so forth. I think it's helpful to look at the letters from their perspective, less from ours.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you so much Chuck. Okay so again our hope is that you all will look at these letters - there are three of them, two went out in the email on Tuesday I believe it was that had the information with regards to this meeting today.

The third will go out after this meeting, that's the letter that's before you that's going to the registry stakeholder group. And if you have any comments, concerns or anything else, if you would make those to the list prior to close of business Pacific Daylight time, 5:00 PM on Friday August 22 that would be greatly appreciated so that we can hopefully get these letters out early next

week to the various groups that were kind enough to participate in our information gathering early on in the process.

That's great - in that regard I'm also hopeful that sometime in the next 24 hours we will also have the draft email that we looked at earlier. And if you would do, you know, look at it and get comments to us let's say it goes out the next 24 hours, get comments to us by close of business on Monday which is the 25th I believe of August, by close of business Pacific Daylight time than we could get that out as well. We'd want to space these somewhat but not a huge amount of time has to occur between the two.

And then we'll get - we'll have - we can mark those two things off our list as completed action items and move this thing forward. So that's sort of our takeaway from today with regards to these items. Does anyone have any additional questions, concerns or comments regarding any of the communications and/or the chart that we were reviewing earlier - the version of the chart?

All right, I'll now ask if Mary or Marika, I'm not sure who's controlling our room today could put up our deliverable one matrix because there are some questions you will see in the parenthetical in our agenda that we need to sort of consider. Because we had slightly put those to the back of the list saying that we would consider these after we look at the other issues, A through D. So if you'll scroll down because you all have the power to scroll, the scroll bar is between the agenda tab on the right and the main screen.

And if you will scroll down you'll get to Section E, the question is I think we started talking about one of these because I sort of had in the back of my memory the fact that we heard from Alan on one of the questions. But question - I'll read them - the first one for the group, what options are available for policy ("consensus policy" or other) and implementation efforts and what are the criteria for determining which is used?

Then there's sub-questions under each of these, the first being for policy and implementation of the spectrum rather than binary, the second sub-question is what are the flavors of "policy" and what consequences should attach to each flavor? And C, what happens if you change those consequences? So I will open it up to the group to say, you know, what are the options for the policy and implementation efforts and what are the criteria for (determining) which of these? Does anyone have any thoughts?

If you look at the discussion we've had to refresh your memory, if you look at the far right-hand column of this chart that's in the center of the page you'll see some of the points that have been made with regard to Question A. Those people felt like they were on a spectrum, so with regards to B - oh Alan has joined us and has raised his hand - Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I - I guess I'm feeling - I'm having a little bit of a feeling of déjà vu because we've been discussing this, you know, sort of all of the work we've done to date really is focusing on this kind of question.

And so to some extent the answer is on the formal books right now all we have is the formal PDP and ad hoc processes that have been acceptable to the community. And each time we've done one it's been different. And, you know, we rarely use the same process again. And, you know, in general we have picked them based on whatever felt right at the moment.

I don't think there's anything more definitive. Hopefully coming out of this process we're going to have something more concrete but at this point it's been the PDP or ad hoc.

J. Scott Evans: Yes I think you may be right. So - this is J. Scott for the record; that was Alan Greenberg for the record that just spoke.

I think you may be right and I think as I sort of look at our discussions our thought was that we wanted to take the whole point of doing the process is

right, the different processes was to take the emphasis off of trying to define it as policy implementation - policy and/or implementation and look at more of what the ultimate outcome was. And that would put it through a certain decision tree which translates into one of these additional processes, right - either the PDP, either the like or fast track PDP or either, you know.

So I think that was our whole point is to - you would sort of look at where you planned to end up and that helps you identify which of these processes are the most suitable to giving you the outcome that you are attempting to achieve. So I think that's how we answer this question is we try to take the emphasis off that so that these questions no longer are the center of the debate. So does anyone have any comments or concerns or agree/disagree. I see we had two hands go up almost simultaneously and being a Southern gentleman I'm going to go with Anne.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank J. Scott I'll try to be brief. I agree with you as far as those remarks and as I look at these questions I think we probably need to be mostly concerned about what are the consequences if established processes are not followed?

So it's - when we say what happens if you change those consequences and you take - B, when we say what are the flavors of policy and what consequences should attach to each flavor. When we did our study of items that, you know, historically have been taken care of on an ad hoc basis those could almost be correlated with, you know, the use of the word flavors here. And what one can see from our study is that there are adverse consequences when, you know, there are not established policy or guidance processes that can be followed to resolve those kinds of issues.

So again these questions may need to be rephrased or answered in the manner you suggested or in that manner, citing the fact that we studied those flavors and they weren't, you know, that attractive.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks J. Scot and Anne and also Alan for the question or issue you raised. First of all I think that Anne may have given us a nice response for one of them at least so hopefully we can get that out of the transcript or whatever.

But I think Alan's right that we have covered a lot of these things, it is déjà vu for sure; we have hit on some of these things. Well then all we need to do is to capture the conclusions that we've come to based on the work we've already done. We don't need to spend a lot of time on it. But secondly I wanted to point out - and this is fresh in my mind and not because I'm from the registry because - but because of the work Cheryl did in drafting that letter today to the registries, they provided responses to each one of these.

So would you like me to read those responses to each of these questions just for input, not because the registries are right or anything but because we want to consider their input?

J. Scott Evans: I don't have a problem with you refreshing our memories to what they had to say.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, this is Chuck again. First of all our policy and implementation on a spectrum rather than binary, they had a very short answer, yes. Which I think is a conclusion that we've kind of come to ourselves..

J. Scott Evans: I agree.

Chuck Gomes: B, what are the flavors of policy and what consequences should each - should attach to each flavor?

The registry is responsible longer on this one. It's not clear that policies come in flavors. If flavors mean categories here are some possibilities. Simple versus complex, explicit versus general, policies with well-defined implementation, details versus those with few implementation details. They go on - implementation of policies that are simpler, more explicit and that can contain considerable implementation guidance will be much easier to implement.

But depending on the issues involved it will not always be possible to develop simple and explicit policies with very clear implementation guidelines. And that's the end of their response to Question B. Then Question C, what happens if you change those consequences? The registry response was as follows, it seems more realistic to be able to change the flavors than to change the consequences.

Efforts can be made to develop policies that are as simple and explicit as possible and to include as much implementation guidance as possible. These are worthy goals and there will likely be limitations on achieving them for some policy issues. So ultimately there will be cases where the negative consequences are unavoidable and that's the end of their responses.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, all right any comments? Okay well then I - if we don't have any comments, you know, I - my suggestion is that we simply close out here knowing that there, you know, yes it's on the spectrum.

That there are different types of policy and in the past that they have been - this is J. Scott for the record, they have been dealt with in a somewhat ad hoc fashion and that's caused a lot of frustration both in the process and in the outcome. And - frustration and uncertainty, and what happens if we change those consequences? You know, it's hopeful that we'll provide us more stability and certainty of outcome. And then that's our answer and we move on now to next week doing deliverable two and three.

Does that sound workable for everybody? I'm seeing some green checks, lots of green checks - good. So that's what we'll do, we'll capture that and get those in our charts so we have them for our record. With that I'm going to thank everybody for their time, remind you all to please look at the three letters and get your comments in. Also to look for and expect to receive soon this template email that will be going out to the various constituencies working as those supporting organizations and stakeholder groups.

Make sure that you're comfortable with that and get any comments with regard to that back to us. And we will meet again on the 27th at the same time. We appreciate it very much and we look forward to talking with you next week. Thanks everyone.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Thanks J. Scott.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Thank you J. Scott, Chuck, everybody, bye.

Woman: Bye.

Coordinator: Once again the meeting has adjourned. Please disconnect all remaining lines, so thank you very much for joining, enjoy the rest of your day.

END