

**ICANN Transcription
Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
Tuesday 28 July at 21:00 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 28 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/gns0/gns0-dmpm-28jul15-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gns0.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
Sara Bockey - RrSG
Benjamin Akinmoyeje- NCUC
Rising John Osazuwa - ALAC

Apologies:

Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Steve Chan - Staff

ICANN staff:

Berry Cobb
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, (Lance). Good morning, Good afternoon, Good evening, this is the Data and Metrics for Policy making Working Group call on the 28th of July, 2015. On the call today we have Benjamin Akinmoyeje, Sonigitu Ekpe, Jonathan Zuck, Sara Bockey, Tony Onorato and Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Joining

us a little later in the call will be Pam Little. We have apologies from Graeme Bunton.

From staff we have 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: Yes. This is Charlie Brown for the transcript. And we're here to talk about the data and metrics for policy development. And is there anybody that has any changes to their Statement of Interest who wants to speak up? All right. And I presumably everybody that is on the phone and not on Adobe Connect has already identified themselves.

So let's dive right into the Google comments. Berry, do you want to lead that discussion?

Berry Cobb: Sure, Jonathan. Thank you. Berry Cobb, or aka, Snoopy for the transcript. So I guess first and foremost - and Pam isn't on the call - but definitely thank you goes out to her for pointing the group out to the comments that were submitted by Google which are in reference to the GNSO review that is conducted by the Westlake Consulting Group.

You know, we don't need to read through these in detail on the call other than just to mention that I think much of what they've listed in their comments perfectly aligns to what we're - that we have documented in our initial report that we're about to put out for public comment so that's a positive reinforcement I believe.

And secondarily just for information of the group I did forward these comments or made mention of these comments to the staff that are assigned to assist with the GNSO review which I believe are under Theresa Swinehart's name. But anyway I forwarded them just a summary outline of

what our group is hoping to accomplish here and once we get the public comment posted online I'll forward them a link so that they can review and then pass along what this group is considering just in the - to keep the GNSO review team in line with what we're discussing here.

And there's Pam now. So other than that unless anybody has any other comments or anything in regards to the comments I'm not sure we really need to discuss it in detail. And now that Pam has joined, just again, thank you for showcasing or highlighting the Google comments for the GNSO review so that was very enlightening and definitely aligns with our work here.

Jonathan Zuck: Should we do anything to - this is Jonathan for the transcript. Should we do anything to showcase or highlight that (unintelligible) as we put our stuff out for public comment?

Berry Cobb: Jonathan...

Jonathan Zuck: I don't even know if there's a way to frame it in a...

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. We did footnote in one section of the report on one of the recommendations that discusses the alignment with I believe what is Recommendation 16 in the GNSO review. I think because it's still in a draft form and still going through their own public comment period I don't know that it would benefit much to really showcase or highlight a specific community member's comments within the report other than to just take note that it is a - one of the draft recommendations of that review which correspond to what we're doing.

And like I said, I believe others as well when we go out for public comment that Google will probably be informed one way or another or made aware of our draft report. And I suspect that they might even repurpose some of the comments that they've submitted for the review into our public comment period.

Jonathan Zuck: I mean, that makes sense. And maybe it's just a question of pointing to them to it and drawing their attention to it or something like that. I didn't think we should reference it in our recommendations but, yeah, so it probably is just a - one and one kind of bilateral communications. Okay so questions or comments about this - about these comments?

All right let's move on to the initial draft.

Berry Cobb: All right, this is Berry again. So I've posted the clean version of the draft initial report into the Adobe Connect room. You were all sent the actual attachments over the weekend. And I've given you scroll control should you want to follow along in Adobe Connect room.

I'm just going to highlight some of the major changes from the previous version to this one but I'll be referencing the redline just to help me identify what had changed and then you're welcome to follow along. And just please raise your hand if you have any points to make.

One thing to note from the suggestions that were sent in on the previous version, I believe they were all accepted outside of a couple of collisions on a couple of like the observations and one point of the report. Just tried to merge those into one cohesive statement by trying to maintain the overall continuity of what was mentioned in the particular bullet point. But outside of that everything else was accepted and definitely thank you for the input into that.

So well go ahead and move right along. I think first and foremost, as you saw in reviewing the document we completed out the executive summary. Basically it's just a slimmed down version of the recommendations by charter question and we just imported the higher level recommendation within the executive summary and pointed the reader that they should review down into Section 5 for more details about those particular recommendations. But other than that I think the executive summary is pretty straightforward.

Section 2, the objectives didn't change at all. Section 3 and background, as I mentioned, there were just a couple of comments about reflecting the sections that were exported from the original final issue report so that it made a little bit more sense in the background area. But other than that nothing changed dramatically there.

Section 4 is members of the working group so I did get the spreadsheet tracker that the secretariat team uses to track attendance. I sorted it by the most meetings attended floating up the members that participated the most to the top and you'll see that that works its way down and of course it has its affiliation listed there as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yay, I'm in. Woo hoo.

Berry Cobb: You know, we'll discuss this a little bit later in the call about moving into public comment. But I think for the most part since this is hopefully our last meeting prior to public comment it's not really worth updating the numbers here to show that its 25th meeting. But of course when we do move into the final report we'll update that to make sure that it is fully reflective of the overall attendance.

Pam, I see you have your hand raised.

Pam Little: Hey, Berry. Thank you. I just want to bring to your attention we quoted some language from the issue report. But I - because this is clean version we cannot see, I believe there were some edits done by Tony. Given that we're quoting the original issue report I don't think we should edit it even though the added language might be better. You understand that I mean?

Berry Cobb: I guess I do. And, you're right, that is a very good point. And I will undo those minor edits.

Pam Little: Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Sorry, Tony, but yeah, I think that's probably the fairer thing to do.

Pam Little: Right, thanks.

Berry Cobb: Cheryl please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And despite my woo-hoo and I won business, I do have a point of actual seriousness about the attendance record and that goes to the note on Mikey O'Connor. As he resigned I think it would be reasonable for us to annotate that next to the two in brackets, there was resigned and a month added. Because otherwise it gives a wrong impression.

Now what is concerning out of that is that of course it meant that the ISPC probably wasn't as represented as it should have been and could have been. But at least people can take some heart from that when they look at the higher level of attendance by (unintelligible) but I just think, you know, when someone has resigned one really, yeah, well come on, Jonathan, resigned from the community. I think that implies along the lines of I'm not doing any more of this ICANN crap, includes the working group.

Jonathan Zuck: Oh I was actually being serious (unintelligible) which is that it wasn't so much that he decided he didn't want to be part of this group anymore but that it was...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh right.

Jonathan Zuck: ...that he resigned from the entire community and not...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: He resigned literally. He was out of here. I think we should do the courtesy to a very hard working person over the many years he has contributed to note that with courtesy rather than give a false impression. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Cheryl. I'll make that note as well. I think the reason why I overlooked it is you'll notice like with Andrew Merriam he had just recently announced to the list that he wanted to be removed which kind of reminded us that he had actually left, which is documented in the appendix sheet. And we'll make sure that that gets added for Mikey as well.

All right so moving along that's Section 4 and then the heart of the matter is Section 5. Again, accepted pretty much all of the suggested edits. Like I was noting just a little bit earlier, there were a couple of - oh I'm sorry, Tony, please go ahead.

Tony Onorato: Yeah, Tony. Sorry I just didn't understand Pam, I didn't understand the question raised before we got into the Mikey conversation about the edits you just explain what it is that you all agreed on that?

Berry Cobb: Yeah. So, Tony, you made a couple of suggested like I think verb changes or just to make sure that some of the text was written more eloquently. What that part of the report was actually an export from the original issue report and so we're essentially quoting that original issue report and it would make more sense...

Tony Onorato: Oh got it.

Berry Cobb: ...to make sure that we don't make any changes to that because we can't go back and change that original report that we were quoting from.

Tony Onorato: That's true. My eloquence can only go so far so that's fine.

Berry Cobb: Right, thank you Tony. So, yeah, so back into Section 5. Like I said on Page 15 clearly given the number of suggested changes it required a lot more eloquence and so in those updates there were a couple of collisions to some of the same bullet points. And I just tried to keep the same intent of the context of the statement and make sure that it read a little bit cleaner.

So when you look at the redline you'll see a lot of changes and hopefully when you're reviewing the clean one that the statements make much more sense that was - in the attempt there.

So for Charter Question A, again, the group didn't make any proposed recommendations. Moving down onto Charter Question B which is about the compliance component, again, the group didn't make recommendations.

On Charter Question C, which was about the guiding principles, I think the big change noted there, which Tony had mentioned, was the re-import of some of the key principles that pretty much drove our working group here. And so on Page 18 at the bottom of that is a listing of those principles that we had used in the past and hopefully that improves the continuity about discussing that the working group was using these guiding principles and then to complete that message here are those guiding principles.

Okay so and then I believe there were no recommendations for Charter Question C, again just noting that more of the actual group's recommendations are placed down in the further charter questions.

Moving along onto Page what I believe is 20 which is Charter Questions D, E and F, there were just a couple of small typo suggested changes in the observations. And then I think that there were a few changes with the first recommendation.

And the first, which is really listed on Page 21 under the preliminary recommendations, Recommendation 1, I did add an additional statement in there just to make it a little bit more clear that, you know, we're looking to not only provide the opportunity to acquire data or enter metrics in the early forming stages of the policy process but I also added the inclusion of working groups as to not limit them should there already be a working group inactivity or somehow they determine that they need additional data and that they can use this pilot program as well.

And then moving on to Page 22, I did make one note to this as well because in looking at the policy process the first stage being issue identification, which again is where stakeholder groups and constituencies can make a request to help validate some of the issues that they're seeing before requesting an issue report.

I did make the - I did include the sentence on the first paragraph at the last onto Page 22 which is in the issue scoping phase meaning that the Council has instructed staff to create an issue report. I didn't want to limit the possibility that staff could also try to acquire data and metrics should that be necessary. Again, as I've mentioned before I doubt that much of that will change as it won't necessarily be a part of the pilot program but more to draw out that, you know, that's something that staff could try to attempt to do at that stage of the process should there be time.

I think one of the bigger restrictions is that typically staff only has a 45 day window to deliver an issue report back to the Council. Of course sometimes depending on the complexity of the issue being reviewed sometimes those - that 45 day period is extended for additional time.

And then I believe the rest of the edits were just a little bit smaller as we also discussed on the - I think the fourth or fifth paragraph the inclusion of fiscal year '17 or fiscal year '18 to just kind of leave that more open ended depending on when the pilot would conclude.

And then lastly I did import the possible success criteria conditions which members should probably take a pretty close look at. There were a few submissions back on the list and I basically just cut and pasted those and formulated them into a bulleted list for us to consider. And certainly I suspect or hopefully will get some decent feedback from the community about how to enhance that success criteria through the public comments.

Okay. And again if you do have any questions, concerns or comments please let me know. The other change to this section I did also update the expected impact and could use any feedback if you think that this was out of line. But in short that basically just trying to highlight that, you know, the desire of the pilot is that - is going to enhance the ability to acquire data to enable a more fact-based decision making aspect to the policy process.

And then just made a little notion that, you know, the implementation or the execution of this pilot would have an impact on the GNSO policy budget within ICANN but didn't label any like specific amount because we aren't trying to restrict ourselves to an overall amount as each request will be considered as it gets submitted to the GNSO Council.

And then of course the secondary paragraph to the expected impact is, you know, asking the community if they have any additional input to that impact.

Okay don't see any hands or comments. Moving on to Section 5.3.5 which is Charter Questions G and H. Like the other sections just a couple of typos or verb changes within the Observations section. And then we move on to the following page about the preliminary recommendations.

So Recommendation 2, again, is denoting the early working group outreach with the recommendation details. And we'll get into the quick review of this but the other step that I took when making this next version is the export of the suggested edits to the Working Group Guidelines which was also

attached in the email that was sent out in redline form. And we'll just quickly highlight those after we conclude with this section.

But in essence there weren't any big changes for this particular recommendation. And then we move on to Recommendation 3 which is on Page 26. A couple of minor details there, I did add one little bit of note because under the suggested text that would be added to the Working Group Guidelines on Page 50 there is kind of bracketed notes there that are just kind of meant to instruct staff as to what changes will be made.

They'll be more apparent when you see the redline version of the Working Group Guidelines. So for example like the first one for an issue report that wasn't listed in that original list so that was to be added same with the charter and then of course we updated that all of the work products are going to basically refer to IRTP Part D which is one of the most recently completed PDPs. And I think that that will help improve the consistency or really more the continuity of the different types of work products that a major PDP would produce.

One thing to note here with, you know, assuming that these - our recommendations are approved by the GNSO Council and staff goes to implement for this particular section of the Working Group Guidelines the work products of the IRTP-D of course won't have the new templates that our group is also suggesting.

However, hopefully, you know, by sometime next year after we have the new work product templates and we have completed another actual PDP, for the sake of fun, let's call it IRTP Part Z, and let's assume that they use all of the updated templates, of course then I'm going to make a note with staff that we update this particular section so that there is continuity between the section about highlighting what the work product template are as well as then referring to the actual examples so that they show what the updated actual documents are.

Okay moving right along, Recommendation 4 is the charter template. So this is on Page 27. Now there are a few substantial changes to the text here. And the reasoning for that was pretty much my own mistake. When I first reviewed through the Working Group Guidelines the particular Section 6.2 of Annex 1 on Page 53 does have - I wouldn't necessarily call it a template of the charter but what I've - when looking at it closer what it does have it highlights the key - or the critical requirements of the charter itself but it's not in of itself an actual template.

So when I was - and it's done at a very high level. And when you compare that to an actual charter there are several places that drill down at a lower level than what is just described, for example, in like Section 2 of the objectives of the charter. And it's really more general statements as to what's to be accomplished in filling out the charter versus what is actually - would go into the charter.

So the original recommendation was for Number 4, was really going to be 2 was to first update the Working Group Guidelines and then, second, update the actual charter template. So it made more sense to just update the charter template since that's part of what the previous Recommendation 3 was in terms of creating those actual templates. And I removed the updates to the Working Group Guidelines for that section.

Okay, again, no crickets as Jonathan points out. Pretty much the same thing for Recommendation 5. And based on the template recommendation that was added to the charter that is also going to be imported into the future final report template. The use of the word "template" is almost too much here. But we want to make sure that that pseudo continuous improvement recommendation is permanently listed in that charter so that it's always embedded there and will force future working groups to consider it when they're formulating their final consensus recommendations should they have any.

So that takes us into Recommendation 6 which is also at the bottom of Page 27. I did add a short brief paragraph here to separate what was occurring with Recommendation 6 between what was trying to be accomplished in Recommendation 4 and 5 which really just updates to those particular templates.

Recommendations 6 and 7 go back to the work products that this group created which is the decision tree as well as the metrics request form. And so it just needed to kind of keep the continuity in terms of how the report is structured. I just added a quick paragraph to introduce the following two recommendations which is Recommendation 6 and that was to basically create some introductory language on what the decision tree is about as well as the metrics request form which essentially was creating a new Section 4.5 into Annex 1 of the Working Group Guidelines.

And then of course Recommendation 7 which is the import of the metrics request form and a decision tree. So the one thing that I'd like to point out on Recommendation 7 which is at the bottom of Page 28 and also on the top of Page 29, I think the original kind of idea was that our decision tree, the flow charts, would be embedded somewhere in those Working Group Guidelines.

And for those that may not be aware, previous working group the Policy Implementation Group, their recommendations, which won't go into details, but essentially they provided a bunch of - a few various other forms of tools that the GNSO Council can use when terms of responding to different types of questions or policy type questions either from the board or from other SOs or ACs. And some of which also involved implementation with what the GDD team does within ICANN.

At any rate, long of the short, they came up with a series of processes in how these new tools will be used by the GNSO Council. If you haven't read it it's actually a pretty good report and it'll help you understand what those tools

are. But there are a series of process diagrams that are a part of those actual tools.

And I think just literally two weeks ago staff updated the completion of those new processes and created an Annex 3 and updated other parts of the Working Group Guidelines. So this version that we're about to review is a very fresh version.

But what I noted there is that the tools that the Policy and Implementation Working Group created are described there and there's only reference to the process documentation. There is no flow charts or anything in the Working Group Guidelines and I believe staff made a decision to keep those out but have them accessible in a different location of the GNSO Website.

And so what I'm - with your approval I think we want to try to replicate the same thing. So what initially happened is that the new Section 4.5 was created in the redline version of the Working Group Guidelines and then below that as the metrics request form. And in there is a link to the decision tree that can be used which once approved and implemented will reside somewhere on the GNSO Website.

And I see Jonathan, you have a comment in the chat, is someone on staff particularly good at just proofreading as opposed to content? Is this in reference to what I was just discussing with the decision tree?

Jonathan Zuck: It was. I mean, it just occurred to me that, you know, as I've read through this I've been reading past anything - I know some people have been doing some cosmetic stuff and maybe there isn't - that's been enough. But I didn't know if that was part of the process to have somebody that was just a wizard at the English language read this as well. Because if not I can give it to our person here (unintelligible) that does that for us just to do that one last pass, it's just on grammar and not anything substantive.

Berry Cobb: All right, thank you. I guess a couple of things. The first part of your question is I'm not entirely sure, however Julie Hedlund that's on David Olive's team more or less owns the Working Group Guidelines and so, you know, as part of the public comment period when staff reviews through - I should say other staff outside of us that are just working on this working group have any other inputs we'll make sure that that gets imported through the public comment process.

But the other part of it we'd welcome your input from your content editor which could also be submitted as part of the public comments that have suggestions. As I've warned you before, I'm not the world's best writer so I'm sure there's probably a couple of enhancements that can be...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: ...should we do a grammar pass on the document before we put it out for public comment, non-content, that's my point, non-substantive.

Berry Cobb: Right. Well I guess we'll talk about the public comment...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: ...typos and stuff. Yeah, no I just mean this document before we put it out there should we just have a hardcore proofreader go through it?

Berry Cobb: If we can - I mean, since we're at the end of the recommendations in terms of reviewing that there's not a whole lot more has changed. And I'll circle back to answer your question, Jonathan, in just a second because that touches upon the public comment itself.

But I'll just note for the working group the rest of the annexes which contain the draft charter that included a couple of adjustments that Tony had made, then Annex B which is the decision tree and Annex C which is the form, all of

those suggestions were incorporated into this clean version. So that's pretty much a review of this version of the document.

So really the next question I guess for the group is do you feel that we're ready for public comment? And if so can we do it as early as tomorrow? And I'll re-point out to you again on the right hand side of the chat room, you know, this is a pretty aggressive schedule. Should we start it by the 29th? That means that it would close on the 7th with a 40-day period. And that really gives us a little bit less than 7 calendar days to prepare the final - review the comments submitted and prepare the final report to try to submit to the GNSO Council by the 14th.

So to circle back to your question, Jonathan, if you would like your copy editor or content editor to take a look at this for grammar we need it - I need it by tomorrow by 10:00 am our time so that I can submit it to IT to get it open and have the public comment period start by tomorrow. So that's a pretty quick turnaround time.

Then secondarily as I mentioned, you know, based on past experience in terms of the public comments I could surmise that we might get four or five comments from our stakeholder groups and constituencies and perhaps the ALAC as well. But I don't - I can't imagine that we'll probably get more than five to seven comments at most.

So I'm hopeful that there won't be a whole lot of substantial or suggested changes based on the comments. You know, certainly it's typical that the last two or three days of a public comment period is when we start to see what some of those comments are going to be or put another way, often it waits until the 11th hour for comments to be submitted.

So should there not be anything too substantial or - of a great departure from what we have in the initial report, I think it would be fairly easy for us to turn it around. That said, on the worst case scenario is that we do get substantial

feedback from the community and there are lots of questions raised about either the pilot program or some of the other recommendations that could cause us, you know, to go beyond that seven calendar days.

And like I mentioned, so if we miss the 14th then that will push us into October. So before we move into just a quick review of the Working Group Guideline changes is everybody on the phone here comfortable with us moving into public comment tomorrow? Green check marks or heck yes on the phone would be helpful. Or I should say if anyone objects speak your mind, otherwise silent is - silence is assent.

Getting a fire when ready. Jonathan says yes. And hearing none...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can you imagine a green tick?

Berry Cobb: Okay yes. Green tick from Cheryl. So tonight I'll be preparing the public comment form. Jonathan, yes, if you do want to pass it to your staff and you can I guess really get it to me by noon or so tomorrow fortunately we're three hours ahead of the West Coast so we should still be able to get it in time with the IT group or the Web group to publish the report. FYI, I'll be near your office tomorrow, by the way.

All right so with that said any other questions or comments before we move on to the Working Group Guidelines? Hearing and seeing none this should go pretty quickly in terms of the redlined review which is nothing that has changed from the initial report, just other than importing this into the Working Group Guidelines.

So as mentioned, I believe under Recommendation 6 and 7 was the creation of a new section of Section 4.5, which is on Page 53. Again there is a

introductory statement trying to describe what the decision tree is as well as the metrics request form.

And I've put footnotes over to the right because, you know, the - because the DMPM recommendations haven't been approved and staff hasn't implemented there is no formal home to create links for yet. So I've created comments here that will - when community members are reviewing through the particular recommendations that pending the formal upload of the particular document to the GNSO Website then we'll attach the appropriate link to the document.

So, again, nothing substantial changed here other than just import of the section and inclusion of the form within the Guidelines. In terms of our recommendations about creating the templates, as I mentioned, you know, not to - as I mentioned before, staff is actually already working on the creation of these templates.

Again, this recommendation was mostly to keep us honest but it also made sense that since we're making changes to the import of a particular recommendation into a future template it also made sense to go ahead and update this Section 5.0 of the products and output, again, which will be two subsections, the actual templates themselves. And then as you see on the following page, which will be an update to all of the IRTP Part D work products that were produced from that working group.

And then I believe the third part of the change was in Annex 2 which relates to the Recommendation 2 which is again the early working group outreach which was the inclusion of these two sentences that talk about expanding beyond the SOs and ACs where possible in that early outreach especially where additional expertise that may not necessarily exist within the community.

And then secondarily the inclusion of a quantitative component to that outreach as well as - in conjunction with the qualitative input. So those are really the three major changes to the Working Group Guidelines. Other than that I believe everything else was left intact. Any questions or comments about the redline version?

As I mentioned, we will be attaching this redline PDF as a part of the public comments so that community members in reviewing this they can make the connection between the actual recommendation and what the changes to the Working Group Guidelines will be.

And the primary rationale for that is should the GNSO Council approve the working group's final recommendations we've gone through a public comment for these particular changes so as soon as that happens staff can immediately go to implementation to get these updated and posted on the GNSO site as soon as possible.

All right, so that's all I have in terms of the review of the documents. Lastly is Step 4 of the agenda, the actions are on my part basically to get this ready to launch for public comment. Our next meeting we'll probably try to shoot for, let's see, so September 7 is the public comment close. We may try to schedule a meeting September 1.

And what the - there would be two parts to that meeting. A is begin to review any public comments should any be submitted. Secondarily I'd like to, as I've highlighted in the right part of the Adobe Connect room, the GNSO Council will have a meeting on the 3rd. It's our intent to get this - the DMPM work as a agenda item so that Jonathan can attend and just do a 15 or no more than 15-minute update on the group's recommendations to the GNSO Council.

The intent there, again, is to prep the Council, inform them of what's going on as well as they would still have a few days in terms of reminding them that the public comment period is still open. But to answer any possible questions

that the Council may have in preparation so that if we do meet the September - I'm sorry, the September 14 deadline to submit documents and motions that when they review that at their 24 September GNSO Council meeting that it'll more or less be a quick approval and they can move on to other agenda items.

But the idea is that hopefully this isn't too confusing or controversial to the Council and that it wouldn't be delayed or postponed to a following Council meeting.

All right so that's all that I have for today. As soon as we get the public comment posted I'll send out links to everybody and send around to all of your colleagues. And we'll communicate over the list in the meantime. As we get closer to the beginning of September we'll definitely send out a calendar invite for that particular day and get that going forward.

So I'll turn it back over to you, Jonathan, for any departing comments and then I think we can close the call.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks, Berry. And thanks to you and Steve and Terri for all your great work on this document. I'm really proud of what we're doing here and I know we're doing it under adverse circumstances with the accountability stuff going on at the same time. So I appreciate everybody getting onto the calls and being a part of the discussion. So thank you much and let's get this out for public comment and see if we can get this in front of the GNSO in September.

Anybody else have any questions or comments before we close the meeting? All right great. Thanks, everyone. We'll see you soon.

Berry Cobb: Thank you.

END