

**ICANN Transcription
Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
Tuesday 21 July 2015 at 2100 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group call on the Tuesday 21 July 2015 at 21:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-dmpm-21jul15-en.mp3> On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#jul>

Attendees:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr - At-Large
Jonathan Zuck - IPC
Pam Little - RySG
Tony Onorato - Individual
Sonigitu Ekpe – NCUC
Janvier Ngnoulaye – Afrinic

Apologies:

Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Sara Bockey - RrSG

ICANN staff:

Steve Chan
Berry Cobb
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Data and Metrics for Policymaking Working Group call on the 21st of July 2015.

On the call today we have Tony Onorato, Jonathan Zuck, Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Pam Little.

We have apologies from Sarah Bockeye and Graeme Bunton.

From staff we have Steve Chan, Berry Cobb and myself, Terri 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 you Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks a lot Terri, appreciate it. Welcome everyone. We're in the final stretch here and we've got some comments in the last couple of days on the document on the report draft.

So I think the best thing to do is - and Berry if I understand correct from the emails is integrate it both of the comments into one document.

So maybe the best thing to do is walk through this and see the change, recommended changes people made and discuss them. So Berry let me handed over to you.

Berry Cobb: All right, thank you Jonathan. Berry Cobb for the record.

Before we get started into reviewing through the document a couple of housekeeping items about our schedule.

So clear over in the right I pasted milestone dates to take us into delivery of this report which is going to be pretty tight.

We have one call scheduled next week on the 28th to hopefully wrap up the initial report and ready it for public comment submission which would be open on the 29th.

We'll do the normal 40 days which takes us to a close of the 7th of September. And of course that's - and then what I'm hoping to do is assuming that we do have the report or are able to submit the report to the GNSO Council by the 14th of September which is when motions and documents are due to - for them to be considered for the GNSO Council meeting on the 24th to mitigate any chance of the proposed recommendations not being approved by the council or put another way should it be deferred to a future council meeting I'm suggesting that we might try to review the preliminary recommendations in detail although the public comment period wouldn't have closed but to review those on the 3rd of September GNSO Council meeting.

I suspect that probably they won't change a whole lot. But what I'm hopeful that we can do is actually have this completed at the GNSO Council meeting on the 24th.

If we miss this then our next opportunity will be the GNSO Council meeting where we - in Dublin. And I suspect things will be very, very busy - very probably even busier than they were in Buenos Aires.

So in all hopes we can try to have this wrapped up before we travel in October.

The downside to this with the public comment period closing on the 8th of September, I'm sorry the 7th of September that really only gives us one meeting to review through comments and ready the final draft for submission which is about five or really four business days plus a weekend. So I do recognize that that's pretty tight.

I suspect that when we do open up a public comment period that we won't get a whole lot of comments but we'll just have to wait and see.

And if it turns out that we did get a fair amount and there's too much to complete prior to the 14th of September then, you know, we do have the fallback of moving this into October. But hopefully we can mitigate that. Pam please?

Pam you might be on mute.

((Crosstalk))

Pam Little: (Unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: Pam we can't hear. Pam we still can't hear you.

Pam Little: Okay can you hear me now?

Berry Cobb: Yes please. Go ahead.

Pam Little: Okay thanks Berry. I just have two questions based on what you just said.

When we - then the wording on the page we just - we are looking at shouldn't we say prepared for public comment rather than say prepared for submission to the GNSO Council? That's question.

The other question is timing. I'm just a bit concerned about rushing this out and the timing of it.

I'm mindful that the - I believe the accountability CCWG is going to are planning to post its final proposal I guess on the - at the end of this month. And then we have 40 days sort of overlapping with that work or the public comment period with that piece of work.

So I think people will be very distracted and focused on that one instead of this one. Maybe that's really not a concern.

And so I guess that sort of my two concerns or questions. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Great, thank you Pam. On your first question basically probably a week after we open up the public comment staff will start on the next version of this report that'll say final report.

We'll adjust all of the language that says that, you know, this is the final report to be prepared or to be submitted to the GNSO Council, et cetera, et cetera.

So a lot of the I guess cosmetics to this report will change significantly to prepare it for the council's submission versus the public comment submission.

To your second question yes you're very correct. You know, we're really competing for airtime here. And certainly the larger initiatives are consuming most of the availability.

I'm not sure what else we can do. Like I said it's I don't necessarily call it a chicken or the egg kind of thing.

Either we compete for airtime during public comment or we compete for airtime during the GNSO Council meeting. And it's really up to the group what - how they think the best approach should be.

So we can - we don't necessarily have to decide today. We do have one more meeting next week to try to wrap this up.

As another aspect we could extend the public comment period to 60 days for example to give the community more time to respond to this so that they can respond to the larger items first and then that would probably carry us into November to the November Council meeting to submit this to the GNSO Council.

So I guess maybe just think about it and we can make - try to make that final decision between now and next week's meeting although my preference would be to try to continue on the current guidelines.

Pam Little: Thanks Berry.

Berry Cobb: Okay. The second thing that I wanted to mention before we get into the report several of the - and well first off thank you for those that submitted comments back on the report -- very helpful.

I think a good majority of them were more content/language oriented and not so much on the recommendations. So that's a good sign.

But a few of the recommendations are requesting that the group or that staff will make edits to the working group guidelines as a annex to the GNSO operating procedures. And to update those they do require a public comment period.

So I was talking with Marika little bit yesterday and she suggested that we also include a red line edit of the most recent GNSO operating procedures.

So I will be taking the action after this call should we not have any more changes to the proposed text that we have that's listed as kind of the recommendation detailed update such and such section of the working group guidelines.

I'm going to include or redlined version for the group to review the working group guidelines themselves. And that will also be a part of the public comments.

And so, you know, it's the text that's included in the working group or in I'm sorry in our initial report here will be just basically cut and pasted into the appropriate section of the working group guidelines.

But that way that they occur together so that if and when the GNSO Council does approve these then the staff can - will have the green light to make those changes to the guidelines themselves.

Else if we didn't included it in this particular timeframe then we would have to wait for approval for the GNSO Council. And once they approved it then we would have to redline at that point and open up another public comment period.

So it's not so much about trying to expedite the time frame but to minimize unnecessary public comment periods when it can all be combined together in one and so that there's greater context as to what's being changed.

So to that point after our call today well make current revisions to produce Version 0.7 for the group to review and likely probably by Thursday morning then also include just a redline version edit of those working group guidelines for reference.

Okay with that in mind I think what we'll do is just briefly go through - will go through very quickly the minor changes. Like I said most of these are just a cleanup of the language that was listed here. None of the recommendations themselves seem to be amended too much.

And there's a few where there was some overlap between what Tony had submitted versus Pam submitted, going to be a little bit difficult to read on this screen.

But like I said when we produce the next version we'll make it more clear as to what the final statement will look like within in terms of readability and those kinds of aspects.

And so for the meantime I'm just going to maintain control in the Adobe Connect room as we move through this.

So starting on the cover page, nothing substantial here, a couple of suggested changes from Tony and Pam that we'll make. Moving through into the executive summary, this part of the document has been neglected up to this point.

The version, the next version that we send that will include some of the suggested edits here as well as we will import the proposed recommendations into the executive summary as well that we have listed throughout this part.

Objectives more or less the same, background there were a few minor suggestions here, nothing too substantial.

Pam had pulled a or made a call out comment to smooth out the language. I definitely agree success against a three-year plan wouldn't make much sense at all.

We will under Section 3.2 the final background issue we will add a section numbering to make that more intuitive.

And if anybody sees anything too glaring please don't - please raise your hand and let me know to intervene.

The same way as the language was listed here in this bullet item to just make it clear about the sectioning in the background part of this report.

We will update Section 4 which will include the name and affiliation of the working group members.

The meeting attendance numbering, there was some - there was a suggestion that this column be removed I believe by one of the other working group members.

This is kind of - this is a requirement of the typical reports. The problem is is actually getting to some of this data.

As you know we are using the (Cavi) attendance, I'm sorry the pilot program of the (Cavi) copy tool that we've been taking attendance as well as there's also the current method that's also being used.

So we'll have to do some reconciliation to make sure that those numbers are accurate. I'm going to have to work with the GNSO Secretariat team to make sure that that's listed appropriately.

And yes Cheryl definitely the column has to stay.

All right moving into Section 5 the heart of the matter again a few minor suggested edits in terms of the content.

Mostly just cleaning up working groups versus calling out the PMPMs specifically.

All right, this particular observation section I guess clearly in terms of the prior versions we should have done a better job of writing it because it definitely got a lot of edits, some of which collided between what (Sam) has submitted versus what Tony had submitted.

I don't think that it's - because these aren't necessarily the recommendations I don't know that it's necessary to go through these in detail. Again I believe it was mostly cleaning up the content itself and making it more clear.

But we've - staff will clean this up and include a clean version so that it is readable or has better readability in terms of what is listed here.

There was a comment about from Pam to see the GNSO review recommendation Number 16 RE Policy Impact Assessment.

I believe you were making a point here Pam to include this perhaps as a footnote.

And then moving down this with the I think the third bullet from the bottom. This was original text that didn't seem to be cohesive. And there were a couple of suggestions to this as well to hopefully clean up that particular language.

All right, so moving through for this first section or for the first charter question there were no recommendations recommended by the working group.

So moving into charter question B Pam had a question about is the charter question meant to deal with ICANN's contractual compliance as the reservations below seem to assume?

And that is a yes to your question. When this was originally formulated back in early 2013 it was mostly about because at that time I don't believe that the current interface for submitting complaints was posted up onto icann.org. It still existed over on Internet which has been - since been migrated.

But at that time and prior to that it was much more difficult for Internet users to submit complaints to ICANN because they were not familiar with the Internet site at all.

And even if they were it was much - it wasn't very intuitive in terms of how to submit a complaint and what type of complaints to be submitted.

Since that time as everyone knows the contractual compliance interface has been migrated under the compliance section of icann.org.

And that there's much better division amongst the different complaint types as well as initial information to understand the type of issue that is being considered as well as an individual form specific to each complaint type when that is being filled out and then eventually submitted to ICANN.

So in short that is an answer to your question yes, that is an answer yes to your particular question that that was attached to the complaint intake system from compliance.

Okay moving on to the next charter question which I believe was a combination or no sorry a charter Question C, principles that enhance metrics and data available to better inform the GNSO policy development process.

There were a few suggested observations here. Tony did make a comment so for the last bullet.

Since we referenced the use of principles don't we need to or want to say here including XY and Z even if it doesn't really have a home here by referencing the fact that principles were used and considered were inviting the question of what principles?

The principles that the working group used earlier in our process are listed further down. I think instead of repeating them what we'll do is put a pointer to those that they're at least listed at the appropriate section if that's all right. And well - I'll highlight that particular change in the next version and see if that still makes sense. If it doesn't then maybe we can look at repeating them.

Tony please?

Tony Onorato: Thanks Berry It's Tony for the record.

Just to be clear I apologize. I wasn't suggesting that we duplicate the citation to the principles.

I guess when I went through the document it wasn't clear to me at that point that we had put them in later.

But I - I'll take a look at the next version. But just to be clear I'm not suggesting that we put them in twice. But I think your idea's a good one of putting a point through it because it does leave us dangling otherwise.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Tony. And yes, but your comment is appropriate that it's kind of left dangling there without making mention of what those principles might be. So some solution needs to be worked out here so definitely agree.

All right and as we discussed in our last call the prior version to this I believe Version 5 did have some preliminary recommendations but they had been accommodated for either in other recommendations or the other outliers were actually the principles that kind of guided our work within our own working group.

And perhaps maybe that some of those should be listed as sub bullets here. That's per Tony's comments.

Okay, moving forward into the next section which is just Charter Questions B, E and F we're pretty familiar with these.

Fortunately there weren't very many comments submitted here which is a positive sign.

Most of the observations seemed intact. And also as well there were a few that were added.

And Tony had a comment here with respect to disclosure. At least some of the data will be incorporated into the resulting reports and thus be disclosed. Therefore shouldn't we say here for disclosure consistent with ICANN's public policymaking process?

I believe that would be an appropriate correction. I think there's - it probably does need to be expanded upon.

Where this line of thought is going because these were some of the principles that we had used as part of our building out our decision tree to cover those cases where certain data obtained from contracted parties may have a certain degree of sensitivity to them and how we would address that.

So I think in terms of kind of a use case for our discussion that should that request be submitted to contracted parties and it would require a third-party aggregator to synthesize that data and remove any direct connection with any one particular company or contracted party that dated itself would never be disclosed per ICANN's public policymaking process.

However the resulting report as a result of that aggregated data would of course find its way back through the GNSO Council or into the appropriate working group's report.

And so I think that's probably does make sense to make that a little bit more clear with this particular bullet. Any questions or comments regarding that part?

Okay. And then secondarily I believe these two particular observations were added by Pam and which is in regard into retail and wholesale pricing for use

in consensus policy which I believe is an actual provision in the registry and registry or agreements which I believe is considered outside outside of the picket fence in addition to that.

And then there was an additional bullet here about the care in regards to personal identification information.

I think we can leave this in here but perhaps it might be prudent to put a footnote that I don't believe it's in ICANN's remit to obtain any of that information let alone about any care to it.

I'm not sure A, that there's any relevance to the policymaking arena B, but I would suspect that I'm not clear on this. I may be need to do some homework. But I don't believe that we wouldn't even be allowed to get any of that information. Pam please?

Pam Little: Thank you Barry. I would differ this to the group. But this were input from the Registry Stakeholder Group members when we were developing this framework or principle.

So I'm just trying to respect their wishes to have this here. And if folks in this group feel it's inappropriate or do I recover elsewhere or whatever then I'm happy to take them out.

I just want to make sure that our working members proposed principles are reflected here. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Pam. Perhaps may be what we should do maybe we should preface the principal in stating that it's not - again I need to do some homework here but I just don't see how we would ever use PII in any of our policymaking and that should probably be stated upfront. And then in the unlikely event that it is used that may even be too granular there.

But I mean, I agree that if it does if it were to ever be used certainly that care should be used in handling it.

I'm just - I'm hopeful that the policy arena would never need it Pam.

Pam Little: Thanks Berry. I'm not sure, it's just the (unintelligible). We're not talking about, you know, the aggregated data. We're talking about if registries or registrar provides data and that data contains personal information or personally identifiable identification information then that should be protected, should more careful in telling such data.

And I have seen data that contains such information. Even within ICANN compliance you would have reported personal email address or personal information. And compliance would just forward that complaint to registry or registrar. Then it becomes a kind of email that has personal information.

So I just want to make sure we don't have that kind of raw data that contains personal information that as a result of this data requests on the contract party gets disposed somehow.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Pam. Yes, and, you know, that does make sense.

I guess if there was some sort of request from the community where that third-party aggregator could be used perhaps there could be a possibility that some of that information might be transferred there then the care should be taken. So you - I think you're right. Thank you for that.

Pam Little: No problem.

Berry Cobb: All right moving right along into the preliminary recommendations so this first one is in regards to the pilot effort. And Pam had a comment here. Are we envisioning a working group or stakeholder group or constituencies? See recommendation details that follow.

I think what was meant here is the, you know, I think first and foremost of the scope of the pilot program is only the GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies. Certainly we wouldn't want this to be expanded so that other SOs and ACs would particularly request one of these types of reports at least for the pilot effort.

And I'm not trying to exclude ALAC Cheryl but I think we need to maintain some control here. And then of course then breaking out that it's either at the stakeholder group and/or constituency level.

Pam?

Pam Little: Okay Berry I think my question here is are we inviting say a working group or drafting team to submit proposal or are we inviting say Registry Stakeholder Group or Intellectual Property Constituency? It's just not very clear to me because they are obviously different bodies. So that was my question.

Berry Cobb: Right. Yes thank you Pam. That makes more sense. It's both.

So the idea of the pilot is to attack the two earlier phases of the policy process. The first is at the issue identification stage before issue is passed on to staff to write an issue report.

So the - a very loose use case could be that the IPC is - has come across a particular issue they could submit a formal request obtaining funds to acquire data to further define that issue before taking it to the GNSO Council of producing and having staff producing an issue report on the road to the working group so that's kind of one area away in the early aspect of it. So any stakeholder group or constituency could do that.

The secondary use case is that a - an established working group is - has come across in some of their deliberations where they need additional data.

And then that working group would also make a submission request to the GNSO Council.

And so you're right, I think we probably need to amend this language in here to make that a little bit more clear.

Pam Little: Right, thanks Berry.

Berry Cobb: Okay moving on this is the implementation or I'm sorry the recommendation details. And Tony had submitted - pardon me. Tony had submitted a comment here.

Shouldn't this be how assessing whether data and metrics collection can assist? Seems to be the job we are undertaking. Shouldn't this be asking how the data and metrics can assist in a particular situation?

And Tony I believe here all you're really suggesting is just the changing of that particular word if I'm understanding that correctly from whether to how.

Tony Onorato: Yes, that's all Berry.

Berry Cobb: All right, great.

All right thank you. Moving along so also part of staff promised on the next section I'll remove - no, I'm sorry, (Tonga Petu), please go ahead.

You might be on mute.

Okay folks being asked in the chat to provide a little bit of clarity on the pilot.

So we did discuss this in the last call but the coming out of Buenos Aires during our face to face there was discussion about at the particular time that

a - first and foremost I think the group had determined that we need some sort of pilot program to see whether this is really going to work or not.

And a big part of that is securing funds because there's a decent probability that much of the data that needs to be collected is external to ICANN and has some sort of financial resource requirements behind it whether it be some third-party type data that is not affiliated with ICANN or contracted party or the opposite side as if a particular request was submitted to contracted parties that likely there would be - it would potentially be somewhat sensitive data and that a third-party aggregator would be needed to synthesize that data in a way that it's not affiliated with any one particular contracted party in and of itself.

So an example would be we were obtaining data on transfers and on successful transfers versus failed transfers.

And as a very loose example GoDaddy submitted their data. And given their large amount of registrations it could pretty easily construed that the size of the number would be GoDaddy.

So instead that particular number would be aggregated in a way amongst all of the several registrars so that it was maybe a more summarized level of success versus failed transfers so that in the use of that data we couldn't pick out that this proportion was as a result of GoDaddy versus this portion was a part of name.com.

The point is is that there would be financial sources, resources required for that third-party to aggregate that data.

So in that context there was - there is the recognition that there's a bucket of funds that could be required.

And given the - given that this is an initial recommendation that really hasn't been accomplished I think prior to this other than very large requests such as like the WHOIS studies that was greater than \$250,000 the suggestion here is to create a pilot program that has a limited scope around it that does have access to financial resources to complete these particular requests.

The - this particular pilot would then be evaluated from a perspective to understand how it worked, what worked, what the demand was, what the cost aspects were and should it be shown that the particular pilot did prove successful then if you read through the details then we'll look at the communities actually submitting a formal budget requests through the community budget cycle in either fiscal year '17 or '18 upon the evaluation of that pilot program.

So that's kind of the distinction of it would probably be more difficult had we not suggested a pilot and just requested X dollars of some bucket of money without some kind of context or experience and how this was done. It likely would probably not be approved.

So the idea of the pilot program is to help try to provide some scope and context about what these requests may look like, what the demand might be look like. And then that will better shape a more formal request through the GNSO down the road.

Does that help?

All right, great. Yes and Jonathan makes a very good point as well. We just have entered into fiscal year '16 from a budgeting perspective.

So to just make a flat out recommendation that we submit a - we submit a recommendation going straight through the community budget process wouldn't occur until way later this year early next year when that whole process kicks off.

But those funds wouldn't even be available until the start of fiscal year '17.

So as Jonathan points out this is a bridge that particular gap until then that once the council really approves this and staff implements it that we can hit the road running if should these requests are to appear.

Okay so as I had mentioned these preliminary level of consensus for this recommendation for the time being each one will have - will list consensus, not full consensus but there - knowing that there hasn't been a formal consensus call. So we'll make sure that each one of these is updated for the suggested recommendations.

And then secondarily we'll update the expected impact of the proposed recommendation now that it seems likely have these particular recommendations nailed down.

I think probably this particular recommendation in regards to the pilot program will probably have the most extensive impact statement while the other ones are pretty cut and dry because they're really mostly either creations of templates or updates to the working group guidelines. So the stack, the impact there would be pretty minimal.

Okay moving right along to charter question G and H and this was about the framework for distributing information and how do we incorporate the process described into the policy development process?

A couple of minor edits to the observations, nothing substantial here. And moving along into the preliminary recommendations which is also pretty much untouched.

And just to reinforce the recommendation details this will be again imported into the actual working group guidelines as a red line so that they can be

shared in context will still maintain the recommendation details within the working group's reports.

I will add footnotes to these to also draw the reader's attention to actually refer to the actual redlined document so that there's continuity there.

Okay moving right along recommendation three is the work product templates. There were no changes here. Again issue report charter and final report just to give you kind of a heads up this is something that's kind of already being work on or at least initiated by staff to update work product templates and certainly update the suggested part of the working group guidelines here.

But again this recommendation is really more to keep staff honest than anything else.

But predominately was also to tee up the one recommendation about kind of the continuous improvement that we've talked about after consensus policies had been approved and later recommended to see that they made the intent, the policy intent.

Great, right next page this was the charter template update which is in Annex A down in the documents, the final report template. Again that will be the same extraction from the chart template that will show up in the final report template.

And then Recommendation 6 is also an update to the working group guidelines to introduce the metrics request decision tree and the metrics request form that are also found in the subsequent annexes of the report which is also Recommendation 7.

And that pretty much takes us through all of the recommendations.

There was a conclusion in next steps section and Tony had, a couple of suggestions here which I believe do warrant the change here.

This was - this text that was originally placed here I think was prior to us finalizing some of the recommendations. So I don't think that there's any issue with removing and/or editing what is listed here.

Again the little particular graphic here just highlighting the areas that are recommendations or the areas of the policy process that the group's recommendations are affecting. And then we just move through into the annexes themselves which I don't think requires us to go through.

They were really just small little typo type changes that were suggested by those that submitted changes. And especially I do think - Tony please go ahead.

Hi Berry. So I did add a couple of substance things here. That's point 2 under key metric considerations was an addition. I don't know if you hadn't gotten to it yet but your preface suggests that it was mainly non-substitute language issues. And I did add that in. And then on the next page I saw there's another addition.

Berry Cobb: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Onorato: (Unintelligible) because it was also in red marks.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Onorato: (Unintelligible) itself.

Berry Cobb: Yes, thank you. So the completed version will have the text highlighted in red so that the community can distinguish that from the black text. But your suggestions I think were helpful here.

I suspect if anything that if when the community reads through this this will probably be one of the areas that we might get either confusion or hopefully some more substantial comments about how this should look.

Certainly those that have had quite a bit of experience in producing charters for working groups at the drafting team stage will hopefully provide some better input to how this little framework can be improved here. So thank you for the suggestion. And I think what you suggested here made sense.

Okay so that takes us through the charter. Then of course the next section is the decision tree. Again hopefully this isn't too confusing for the community to review through. But there were no suggested edits there. And then lastly is the Metrics Request Form which were just a couple of minor changes.

And Pam also highlighted on a Metrics Request Form perfectly correct comment here to not limit it to just the intake system but the ICANN Contractual Compliance Team as they might have other systems of data.

All right so that takes us through this version of the report. Like I said in the next day I will have the next version out for the group to review. Probably a day after that I'll have a redline version of the actual GNSO operating procedures which shouldn't be a shocker. But want to make sure it's in front of the poor working group before we submit it along with a public comment forum.

And then by the end of the week I will have a draft of the public comment request that staff submits to the Web Admin Team to post up on to icann.org the public announcement.

So we'll review through these one last time on the 28th. Hopefully everybody will agree with what we have here so that we can launch this on the 29th.

And Jonathan in the meantime or in the near term especially after we launch the public comment we should probably start thinking about how we want to position this for an interim update to the GNSO Council as I described earlier so that we can try to preempt any kind of notion to defer this as just to get it off the council's table.

All right, any other closing comments or suggestions by the group before we terminate the call?

Pam please?

You know, you might be on mute again.

Still silent Pam.

Pam Little: Sorry Berry. My phone is cutting out. I think there's something wrong. Can you hear me?

Berry Cobb: Yes now we can.

Pam Little: Okay so my question was in my email when I attached the suggested edit which is we have a couple or quite a few recommendations which reads like the working group directs staff dah, dah, dah, to do certain things.

So my question was can a working groups such as this one actually direct staff to do certain things or can the - or should the direction actually have to come from the GNSO or the ICANN board? It's not just not very clear there.

But I think at the beginning you said Marika said we can do this. Is it subject to public comment? Is that the answer?

Berry Cobb: Thank you Pam. I had that on the top of my head to mention it and then thank you for reminding me.

For the initial report it's going to be the working group. But when we prepare the final report we'll change that section to the GSNO counsel direct staff. So that's the interim change.

Pam Little: Thanks. Okay.

Berry Cobb: Or as Jonathan has listed in the chat that works as well. And so as a matter of fact I'll go ahead and make that particular change for this next version.

Pam Little: All right, thanks.

Berry Cobb: Thank you for bringing it up.

Pam Little: No problem.

Berry Cobb: Okay anything else? Jonathan any closing comments?

Jonathan Zuck: No. I think this is looking good. I'm excited about it and I think it's really relevant to the accountability discussion because it's - makes us a little more accountable for the facts.

So I'm pretty excited about the work we're doing so thanks for all the excellent work you guys on staff. You guys have been really carrying the lines here this and we really appreciate it.

Berry Cobb: All right excellent. Well thank you everybody. We'll see each other through emails and on the phone one hour earlier next week. All right, take care and I'll talk to you then.

Pam Little: Bye. Bye everyone.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks Berry. Bye all.

Terri Agnew: (Leann) if you can please stop the recording.

END