

TRANSCRIPT GNSO Review Working Party

Monday 21 September 2015 at 1600 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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.

Attendees:

Jennifer Wolfe
Klaus Stoll
Chuck Gomes
Bill Drake
Rafik Dammak
Jeff Neuman
Joan Kerr
Martin Silva
David Cake

Observer: Amr Elsadr

Apologies:

none

ICANN Staff:

Mary Wong
Marika Konings
Lars Hoffman
Larisa Gurnick
Charla Shambley
Terri Agnew
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much Aubrey. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening and welcome to the GNSO View Working Party Call on the 21st of September 2015.

On the call today we have Jennifer Wolfe, Chuck Gomes, Jeff Neuman, Amr Esaldr, Bill Drake, Rudi Vasnick and Karl Stoll.

We received no apologies for today's call. From staff we have Larisa Gurnick, Mary Wong, Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman, Charla Shambley, Terri Agnew and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you Jen.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you and thanks everybody for taking time for another call so close to our last call. Hopefully this is - this time works well for everybody.

And a special thanks to Chuck and Bill. I know you've been hard at work drafting a response.

For anybody who's not familiar with where we are if you missed the last call. As we reviewed the final reports presented by Westlake there were significant concerns about Recommendation 23 so much so that the working party felt that it was important to have a response to the Organizations Effectiveness Committee before they meet which I believe is next Monday.

Charla is that correct they're meeting next Monday?

Charla Shambley: Yes, this is Charla. That's correct Jen.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. So, they're meeting next Monday. So, the idea was to have some type of response to provide to them before they officially meet and before they receive the final report.

Just one thing as I was reading through the comments and looking at our past participation just one concern I want to raise before we jump into the substance is that we haven't had all of the groups represented. And I'm a little concerned about having an official working party response if we don't have significant contribution from all of the parties. So I just wanted to raise that point and see if there were comments or concerns before we jump into the details of the response.

Marika did you want to jump in on that? I see you commenting? Yes go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Sure, so this is Marika. Now I was just noting or actually a question that I had whether the working party's also planning to update the council on this letter and whether it will be looking for any kind of endorsement or signup or maybe formal transmittal even from the council on the letter.

I'm not really sure that as well working party has a bit of a different Spanish from the traditional working groups and drafting teams that the council usually operates or which usually communications to the board go via the council.

So in this case it may be different but, at a council meeting its schedule on Thursday and a note that an update on the GNSO Review Working Party is also on the agenda.

It may be worth at least informing the council of this letter and the plans to send that if not then possibly seeking endorsement or support from the council as well.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks Marika. And I'll just note in terms of our timeframe because I know this is a short turnaround time, you know, one possible way forward is to just notify the OEC that there are concerns without going into all of the detail so that we let them know that there are concerns about Recommendation 23

and that an official response would be coming and that could give us time to A, inform council and B also try to get more participation from all of the various constituencies and stakeholder groups.

Chuck, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jen. And I just want to respond to something you said in your previous comments. I definitely agree that any statement that comes from the working party should be supported by the working party by the members of the working party even if they're not on this call.

But we can give them that opportunity offline as well. And we need to do that.

And maybe it's just a matter of in some cases giving them opportunity to object or to make some edits.

I think it would be good if we can come up with elements of the statement that all of us can support if that's possible. If not, of course like Bill said we can all submit our separate comments.

But I'd like to think that there are certain ideas in a statement that all of us regardless of our perspective could support and hopefully we can head in that direction today. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks Chuck. Larisa I see your hand and Amr then you'll come next. Larisa did you have the clarification point there?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, thanks Jen. This is Larisa Gurnick for the record.

The organizational effect in this committee is getting a briefing and an update on Monday on the final report. But that's just one of the steps in the process.

They will then also consider the report and the recommendations based on feedback from the GNSO Review Working Party as well as staff. That's something that they had requested, some feasibility assessment on the recommendations and feedback on the recommendations.

And they will be discussing that at their October meeting with the idea that then they would if they feel that they have enough information then they would make a recommendation to the full ICANN board to accept the report and consider action on the recommendations which depending on the full board schedule we anticipate might happen in February unless there is another meeting that ends up getting schedule in November/December timeframe.

So, I just wanted to review the timeline for you as you consider the best way to proceed.

Jen Wolfe: Thank you. That's very helpful. Amr thanks for your patience. Please go ahead. Amr are you there? I'm not hearing you.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, apologies this is Amr. I'd...

Jen Wolfe: There we go.

Amr Elsadr: ...forgotten to connect my mic and I adjusted that, yes.

Well, yes, thanks again for having me on this call because as I have said, as I have said I am no longer a member of the working party.

I think Chuck went over a lot of what I wanted to say. I think it is also very important that the working party members reach consensus on a short statement or a comment that the OEC can consider along with the final recommendations that Westlake has provided.

The - I think that is very desirable. I hope it could be done. And thanks Larisa for reminding us of the timeline. I - if I'm not mistaken next Monday is the 28th which is the deadlines that the working party also set to try to achieve consensus on a statement.

I think it would also be a good idea as Marika's pointed out to try to get GNSO Council endorsement of the statement. I hope we can do this in time as well. I think that may be a bit more challenging.

But what we could do I know as far as the NCSG is concerned we could probably bring this up. We have our monthly policy call tomorrow which we always have two days prior to the GNSO council meetings.

We could discuss this and brief our councilors so they could sort of have some sort of briefing and position on this prior to the GNSO council meeting.

If this working party manages to have something ready by Thursday that the GNSO Council can discuss I'm not exactly sure how we could sort of have the council approve this on such short notice especially considering the short timeline to next Monday's OEC meeting and when they're going to be considering their recommendations.

But I'm wondering if the working party does agree on a statement would it be helpful if the GNSO Council endorses it after the fact, I mean after it's been submitted or not? Some - I just figured it would be nice to hear thoughts from others here.

But yes, but I do think it is more vital that the working party members agree on a statement that may or may not be challenging. And I just don't - I don't only mean the timeline involved but also actually the substantive points especially the objections to Recommendation 23.

If we could get that done I would be - I would personally be grateful, thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks Amr. And Chuck I see your hand is up as well.

Just one quick note, I think if we are going to try to fast-track a statement and get it to council and hopefully get their endorsement by next Monday we probably need to really streamline this statement to just very concise points and then perhaps save some of the other additional information for a follow-up. But, Chuck please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Sure, well I'm all for getting the GNSO Council and obviously not just the council but their perspective groups involved.

But I think it's unfair to expect them to make a decision by Thursday and probably doesn't even follow procedures.

But it could be discussed, you know, surfaced on Thursday in the meeting maybe in any other business.

I think like Larisa pointed out this process is going to go on for a while. So there's plenty of time to have the council weigh in more formally as the process goes on.

Just like it will be for us if we come up with something that all of us can support this week and can get that out to the Organization Effectiveness Committee I think that's good. But that doesn't prevent us from, you know, saying that we're working on some other thoughts as well. And I think there's time for that as Larisa pointed out.

Now let me make - throw out a suggestion for the sake of this call. I wonder if it's possible in this call that for those of us on the call to identify what elements of the added address statement that they're at least on this call

there's no objection so we could get those elements of the statement out to the rest of the group and give them until end of the day Thursday or something or maybe even Friday to object or to suggest edits or something like that. And I'll stop there.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks Chuck and I agree. I think Larisa made an important point about the timeframe. It's not as though the OEC is deciding whether or not to accept this recommendation. There's still a lot of process and procedure and certainly time to, you know, weight in into much more depth.

So I agree if we can get to some sort of consensus, you know, I would want to make sure that, you know, I know we haven't had anybody from the BC or the IPC on for some time that we at least alert them to the importance of what's going on.

But if we aren't able to get consensus from everyone in the short time period, you know, perhaps there is just an alternative way of letting the OEC know that we're working on a response and that there's a concern about Recommendation 23.

But I'm all for digging in and seeing what we can get to in terms of consensus right now.

Bill, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Bill Drake: Well actually Jen you just said everything I was going to say?

Jen Wolfe: Okay, well great.

Bill Drake: Well, all right, well I - let me just add. I mean, I don't - I'm just curious as a person who's been driving this, have you been in much touch with the other groups that are supposed to be represented on this working party that to gauge their level of interest engagement and so on here?

Because I don't kind of know in a timeframe how - I mean yes, we - I agree with Chuck that we should go through the text and see what areas we - you know, we might all agree on.

But, I mean this is just working in such an oddly modular piece by piece kind of fashion when, you know, we're missing so many parties that for - it just seems to me the prospect for the group adopting a joint statement without the engagement of the others and you as you say for several weeks -- we haven't heard from some people for several meetings I -- it just seems hard.

And if that's the case then I think we would want to make that determination so that if people. Constituencies and stakeholder groups want to send their own messages prior to the Monday we can get that done because everybody's...

Jen Wolfe: Right.

Bill Drake: ...slammed with other work. And if we're going to wait until next weekend to say oh gee, we haven't heard from people from the IPC we can - you know, it's not going to work for us.

So I think we need to decide exactly - we'd have to have a timeline for deciding whether there's going to be a group effort. And if not then we need to move forward in our respective ways. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: No I understand completely. And Marika had made a comment in the chat reconfirming membership.

And I had actually just asked staff if they could give me some statistics on, you know, how our representation has been.

I think it probably is, people are busy, you know, this fell off the radar, it wasn't the priority or, you know, any number of reasons why people get busy and aren't able to be on the call.

But I think we do at least need to send out a note. And I'm happy to do it when we get off the call to just reinforce to everyone on the working party that, you know, participation is important, that we've got important issues. And if we don't hear from them, you know, we're missing that's really critical.

So I will certainly do that when we get off the call here today.

So it sounds like, you know, we can use our time here today to talk through the draft that's been circulated with some of the comments and see if we can agree on a few points.

But if we don't get feedback from all of the groups then, you know, I agree. I think you need to be preparing your own separate response before the Monday deadline.

So with that Bill did you have something else to say? Is your hand up again or is that just from before?

Bill Drake: No I'm a bad person and I...

Jen Wolfe: That's okay, just wanted to make sure. So with that unless there's objection why don't we go ahead and talk through the draft that's up on the screen right now. And I think it was circulated by email as well.

And Chuck you drafted it but I don't know if you want to provide any opening comments as to your approach and thought process. And then we can talk through...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jen. This is Chuck. I don't think there's a lot to say. I was just trying to get the ball rolling. And I wasn't - I tried to keep it fairly generic and not focused in any one particular area and pick points that I thought were applicable to the GNSO as a whole because that's really where I was bothered.

I thought that they made some - made a recommendation that seemed to be off base somewhat in terms of where the GNSO is at and where the GNSO is going.

But I - let's - my suggestion is let's just go through it piece by piece and see if there's any objections on this call.

And I think if there's one objection to me that's enough that we - we don't have the luxury of trying to debate consensus. I mean we can talk about it a little bit but I think if we don't have full consensus on this call then it's a clue that there probably won't be in the broader group and let's focus on the ones where we do. That's my suggestion, thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Great, thank you. And Amr I noticed your comment in the chat. I just forwarded you Bill's version that has the redline on it so you can open it up and see it maybe a little bit more clearly.

If anybody needs it and they don't have it let us know and we can forward that to you.

Okay so with that we'll go ahead and just start through the document.

So there's an opening section and then there are specific concerns about Recommendation 23.

In the opening section any comments or concerns?

My only comment is I think it is important that we recognize that there are many - there are 30, 35 other recommendations that are certainly less controversial and that I think there was widespread consensus for those.

So and I think Chuck has stated that here but I just think that's a really important point that we are making a notation that there are many other recommendations that we think should go forward and that we want to assist in the implementation process.

Any other comments in the opening section from anyone?

Okay seeing none why don't we go on and move into the specific concerns about Recommendation 23. Any comments here? Bill? Yes, please go ahead.

Bill Drake: One clarification Jen. Are we - when you are asking people for comments which version are you asking them for comments on?

Jen Wolfe: So we've got - that's - thank you for raising that point. So I've - I'm looking at the one that's up on screen which was the one you sent around Bill I think it was you sent around a PDF that had your comments.

So I'm assuming we're talking about this with your comments in tact where you've either deleted or added.

Bill Drake: (Unintelligible).

Jen Wolfe: Thank you for that clarification.

Okay so does anyone have comments on the section entitled specific concerns about Recommendation 23?

Chuck Gomes: We might want to...

Jen Wolfe: Bill?

Chuck Gomes: Jen this is Chuck.

Jen Wolfe: Oh.

Chuck Gomes: We might want to go through that - go through those one at a time.

Jen Wolfe: Line by line?

Chuck Gomes: (Unintelligible) yes.

Jen Wolfe: Okay perfect. Thank you. So Point Number 1? No comments? Point Number 2? And I don't know maybe I'll give you all a minute to read it in case you - okay seeing no comments how about Paragraph Number 3? Or Number 4? And I know this breaks into some sub parts so I'll start with 4A.

Okay. No comments. Okay so let's move down and look at 4A Sub I. So my only question is are we providing too much in here that is not going to get through the process that we're trying to get through in terms of getting feedback from all of the groups?

Chuck please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I think we need - a lot of this is needed for them otherwise they're going to not have any - enough context I think.

But they can also tell us if we're saying too much or if they'd rather, you know, not. But my inclination is I don't think there's an awful lot here. But I think what's there is probably needed for context.

If we try and make it too brief they're going to have a lot of questions and we don't really have a lot of time for turning around a whole bunch of questions.

That's my thinking. Though if others think there's too much let's trim it down.

Jen Wolfe: Okay, thanks Chuck. Bill please go ahead.

Bill Drake: I'm inclined to agree with Chuck. And it's not just the sort of academic inclination to more rather than less when it comes to words.

I actually think that, you know, context, ah, matters and that some of the points actually do need to be amplified.

And when we're dealing with folks or talking to folks who have not been inside the discussion each step along the way without a sufficient explanation some of what is being said or what some of the concerns that are in the community in various parts might be just won't be evident.

So if indeed people, you know, if we do get to the point where we're circulating this to other groups and then somebody wants to come back and say trim 14A a little bit in this way or get rid of that then we can deal with that.

But I think, you know, when go through an iterative process of drafting it's better to put the stuff on the table and take it off then there in the first place.

The only thing I'm wondering about is whether the structure is a little visually complicated 4A and then under that Roman I and then ABCDE under that then with regular under E 123 and then back to Roman 2 is - have we - is this - is the architecture of this will be - will this be completely transparent and so on to all is my wait list. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks Bill. And Chuck I see your hand is up if you want to address that question.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And Bill so it's a very good question. When I started writing this thing I was really starting out to just write an outline of ideas to throw out to the group and then it went a little bit further than that.

But I'm not wedded to structure at all. I think what's important is the ideas that are being communicated.

So I have no lock. I don't think that the structure needs to remain. So if there's a better structure or just use text I'm okay with that.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks Chuck. But that's certainly something we could correct. I think the only benefit of using some kind of numerical or letter combination is that if somebody wants to respond to a specific point it's very easy to have it labeled...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Keep in mind Jen, this is Chuck again. We could number paragraphs if we do so too.

Jen Wolfe: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: Because the fact is I think you make a really good point there. When people are commenting even internally within a working group if there's a real easy way to reference what you're referring to that is very helpful.

Jen Wolfe: Okay, so we could try to clean it up and maybe just create some numbers, maybe just number everything so that's very clear with some sub points.

Okay well continuing on then and we're in 4A Sub I. And then we have an ABCDE. So I'll just go through and call for comments on Paragraph A. Say what about Paragraph B. Not seeing any comments. C?

Bill please go ahead.

Bill Drake: I'm going to comment on my own text which sounds - I just want to add - I just want to underscore something.

Roman IB. What - I just want to be clear. What they are suggesting basically would mean that for example in the case of NCSG that we move to the CSG model of operation.

And that - I think that merits consideration. You know, it - we're talking about creating a situation where a lot more people are going to have to do a lot more work in a duplicates of parallel manner on issues where in many cases non-commercial acts for example might well agree.

And I'm a bit puzzled sometimes when CSG colleagues tell me about how much they can't possibly be part of a singular CSG position because their views are so different because in many cases I find a lot of commonality among their views. Those are just being expressed by different people.

So I just think it's just worth contemplating. I mean the same thing, you know, if registries were to develop constituencies how operationally this would play out for everybody I think is something really needs to be considered beyond the simple issue of, you know, whether people have council chairs wired to constituencies and so on. So I just wanted to underscore that point. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks. Chuck please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And Bill in response to the points you raised there we kind of do that within the registry stakeholder group already in a sense of interest groups.

Now we haven't had but one major interest group. There's been another one but it's been fairly inactive.

And so within our processes we kind of do that already. It's just not called constituencies. It's called interest groups. And it looks like based on some new charter revisions that seem to have support in the Registry Stakeholder Group that we will probably have more interest groups in the future.

So I think whether it happens at the Stakeholder Group level and then behind the scenes in those groups

I don't think in our case - and I'm just speaking from my perspective of the registry case that it matters too much -- but your points are well taken.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks Chuck. Any other comments on Sub Paragraph C we're talking about right now?

Okay, well moving on any comments on Sub Paragraph D? Yes, Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Jen. This is Amr. I have a suggestion on Paragraph D. I don't think it's terribly important but I'm going to make it anyway.

I was wondering if here sort of just to further it the role of the bottom up multi stake holder model in policy developments in the GNSO I was wondering if you - if it would also be worthwhile to mention here that not all PDP working group members are actually members of GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies that GNSO working groups are the primary source of policy development and they also include - they are open to membership to anyone at all.

And so just sort of as another point to elaborate on why this - the linkage between representation on council and sort of weight and policy development is just really not an accurate observation. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Okay thanks Amr. So maybe adding to that regardless of seats on council or participation in any constituencies or stakeholder groups is that what you mean?

Amr Elsadr: Yes pretty much.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Any objections to that suggestion?

Okay. So then moving on to Sub Paragraph E any questions or concerns on that section?

Okay seeing none we'll move on to 4A sub ii. Any comments on Sub Paragraph A of that section?

Okay not seeing any, Sub Paragraph B of that section?

Okay, so, moving on then now we're at 4B which is on Page 3 if anybody's following along. Any comments on Section B? Okay I'm not seeing any comments. Then how about Sub Paragraph C under Section 4?

All right, so then moving on to the final section it's entitled Working Party Conclusion and Recommendation.

The only thing that I might suggest that we add here is just a reinforcement that the other 35 recommendations, you know, need to be further considered but any other comments?

Seeing no comments, any other - oh Amr, please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Hi. This is Amr again and I apologize for coming in late but I'm - I just have a slight concern on Section D maybe a combination between Points 1 and Sub Sections 1 and 2 or i and then ii.

Jen Wolfe: So just to confirm, you're on 4B? Is that you're talking about 4B? I just want to confirm we're all looking at the same thing.

Amr Elsadr: Yes.

Jen Wolfe: Is that correct?

Amr Elsadr: I'm at 4B.

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, that's correct. I'm just I'm a bit curious about - I mean having read this quickly on the combination of what is being said here under Section 4B and as well as a recommendation in one of the earlier points on adjusting stakeholder group procedures to represent all constituencies when councils vote. I believe this was in 3B if I'm not mistaken.

I'm just wondering is the working party actually here kind of endorsing the notion that stakeholder groups should direct their GNSO councilors to vote on issues because that's not the way it works in the NCSG.

Elected councilors are free to vote whichever way they believe is best - is the best way to represent non-commercial registrants.

So I was just - I would just like hear from maybe from others on their thoughts on these two sections. And I - I was a bit confused. Really I'm not sure if it is adjusting this or not. And I was wondering if that was the intent? And if not maybe we could sort of clarify what the actual intent is. Thank you.

Jen Wolfe: Chuck did you want to respond to that?

Chuck Gomes: Yes I would especially since I wrote it. So Amr there was definitely no intent to suggest that. So if it comes across that way we probably need to tweak it some way. So think about ways that that could be made clearer.

But in my opinion Westlake's conclusion seemed to assume that that all councilors have that freedom to use their best judgment after listening to their stakeholder groups comments and so forth without any specific direction.

And if you take that assumption away I don't think their conclusions follow very well.

So again there was no intent to suggestion that for in other words some of us to say we all should be like the registries or something like that, not at all.

But I think their conclusions follow from that assumption and it's a wrong assumption is all I was trying to say.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks Chuck. Amr do you have a follow-up back to Chuck on that point?

Oh I see you just...

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Amr again. Yes I put my - so I want to make - respond...

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Amr Elsadr: ...to Chuck in the chat. And thanks Chuck. I completely agree with your conclusions here. And maybe I just kind of do need to read this over a couple of times. It's just it confused me a little bit.

But I will try to suggest some changes on the comments I made regarding GNSO Working Group participation. Maybe I'll try to take a go at this as well and see what the rest of you folks have to say about it. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks Amr. And I just following along in the chat I know there was a request if we could get the Word document. Bill I think you had the latest version and it as circulated in a PDF.

Is it possible for you to circulate that in a Word document that could be edited? Sure, okay great. So Bill will - I think that was the latest version. Correct me if I'm wrong. I haven't seen another version come through so I think that was the most recent version was the one Bill had circulated.

And I know I saw Rudi. I know your comments in the chat as well that you're still working through the deliberations on this.

I - I'm assuming that's going to be the case with everyone. And we don't have anybody from, you know, the business constituency or the IPC on the call at all. So I'm sure they're going to have to weigh in on this as well.

So I know it's hard to do but at least while we're all here we can complete talking through the document and get those comments capture.

So any other comments on the closing paragraph Chuck?

Chuck I can't hear you. Did you start - did you go in?

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry, I had put myself on mute temporarily. This is not on - well it is a little bit on the closing paragraph. I do support your suggestion Jen to add something there about the work needed to be done on the other recommendations. I think that is good to put in there as well.

But I wanted to go beyond the document itself and ask a question. Is it fair to understand at least at this point in time and with the exception of places where we already know some edits are going to be suggested like Amr just said, is it fair to say that nobody on the call at this point has any big objections with what we just went over?

And as - and then let me put another qualifier on that. And that is understanding that anybody on the call that is going to come back can come back with some objections when they talk with their group so we're not eliminating that possibility.

But I get the idea from either the silence or whatever on this call that we have a statement like that now that once we remove the redlines and the comments and stuff so that they don't influence people that are on the call unduly that we have a good starting point to put out to the group as soon as we have the final edits that Amr and maybe Jen are going to suggest.

Is that correct? If not, it'd be good to know now.

Jen Wolfe: Yes I agree. And I know there's a lot of silence on the call. And I can certainly anticipate that that's either you're all just reviewing this for the first time or you just don't have the information from your respective groups in order to comment.

But certainly if to the extent that you can comment it would be helpful to know if there's general agreement or disagreement with this approach.

And I guess on that note I - while we're all on the call just as a backup position for us if we cannot get agreement from everyone basically within the next week do you want to provide some sort of statement to the OEC that states we're in the process of providing a more formal response? What's the thought process there so that we are prepared to respond accordingly?

Amr has a checkmark. Bill you have your hand up. Bill please go ahead.

Bill Drake: You know, I just want to underscore and I - sorry to be consistently grumpy about this whole thing. But the fact that this was something that had not been vetted with us and just appeared in text and we are now on such a short timeline to respond to it is really tremendously aggravating.

And so it's - to expect that everybody else is going to respond on the timeline that would make it really practical for the entire - for the full group much less the GNSO Council to agree in text is probably not going to be realist is my guess.

So in that case then either we send a note to the - I have - I just I can't stop calling it the sick whatever it's call now, the OEC.

Jen Wolfe: Organization Effectiveness...

((Crosstalk))

Jen Wolfe: ...Committee.

Bill Drake: Yes, yes, okay fine. Organizational Effectiveness. I like (SIC) much better. It was much more illustrious.

I - you know, I think it's probably going to be at the end of the day more realistic to send them a note and say hey you all, a statement may be forthcoming than it is to expect that we're going to get everybody to buy in on this - by the time it has to be - it would have to go out.

So either we do that or we say okay, we're not going to do it jointly.

But insofar as it seems like at least among some of us there's broad consensus on the direction I would (unintelligible) set aside the possibility of a joint statement prematurely.

So I guess what I'm saying...

((Crosstalk))

Jen Wolfe: Well I understand. I'm just trying to prepared to know, you know, if - if we don't get - if we only have a one week turnaround time I just want to make sure we're - we've talked about what do we do if we don't have that.

Bill Drake: I totally agree Jen. And I guess what I'm trying to say in my long-winded end of the day way here is that probably what would make sense would be to send a not to them saying we're working on a possible joint statement expressing concerns about Req 23 and buy our self a little bit more time to do this to see whether evolving consensus is really possible here.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks. And Chuck I see your hand's up. Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes I want to agree also. I definitely think we ought to at least send a statement that some concerns have been expressed and we're working on those if that's all we can send.

At the same time I'd like to see us really try to say more than that if we can get at least non-objection from the rest of the members of our group on some of the items.

Because I think it's more helpful sooner if we can do that. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Thanks Chuck. And absolutely. I mean I think we're going to give it our best efforts to get this circulated.

On that note my question and I know Amr you wanted to make some changes, you know, so that we don't have a lot of people making changes to the same documents are you hoping to take the next pass at this Amr or was - does anybody else want to volunteer?

Amr Elsadr: Hi. This is Amr if I can respond Jen.

Jen Wolfe: Sure.

Amr Elsadr: Yes, thanks. Yes I don't mind taking a pass at this. I can try to work on it tonight and have a draft circulated within a few hours maybe hoping that will be enough time to kind of have everyone sort of take a look at this and maybe take a stab at making edits - more edits if they want to.

Jen Wolfe: I could either do this in a word document, circulate it or I could maybe just sort of cut and paste the text to a Google Doc where others can work on it collaboratively whatever the groups decides is the best approach. Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: So I think either approach. Google Docs certainly works and it's easy for others to make changes or circulating a Word document with changes being tracked.

Is there any other opinions? Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Not an opinion so much as let's start with a clean version of Bill's last edited document so that the real changes are real obvious. That's just a suggestion.

And then let's go - that'll make it easier. And I think Amr if you can put them right into that clean document it's the clearest and simplest.

But I also think we should have a timeline. You know, we really should be first of the day tomorrow get this out to the full working team.

And let's not forget Marika's suggestion that I think's a good one.

In addition to asking them to look at this document and see if they object to -- and I think it should be worded that way -- if there are any objections of suggested edits to any of the statement to provide it not later than, I don't know, end of the day Thursday, something like that's probably reasonable considering our short turnaround. But also...

Jen Wolfe: There's a council meeting on Thursday afternoon I think too Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jen Wolfe: Council meeting Thursday. So we might want to get it - I mean if we can deal with that quickly so that we could at least send it to council.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine. You know, again we're asking a lot because people are involved in lots of other things.

I'm not opposed to that. I was just trying to stretch it out a little bit further for people. But that's okay Jen. I respect your call on that if you want to try and shoot for that. I don't know how early in the day the council meeting is. I haven't looked at that. Amr can probably tell us.

Jen Wolfe: I think it's late.

Chuck Gomes: But last of all let's end it with giving them the opportunity to tell us if they're no longer participating in the group so we don't have to factor those people who have just dropped out and don't intend to participate. We don't have to factor their involvement in.

Jen Wolfe: So fair enough. And I will take it on my initiative following this call to send out a note to the working party distribution list letting them know that this document is going to be coming and that we need their participation to object

to it if they so desire to and also just reinforce as you've said that they intend to continue to participate.

I think it would be wise if we can at least get a draft of what's being worked on to council, you know, by Thursday morning. I think their meeting is in the afternoon Eastern Time. Sorry. I think that would be ideal if we can. I understand that we're working on a very tight turnaround time.

So Chuck is that a new hand?

Chuck Gomes: It is. Just one more thing Jen. I think it'd be helpful if we ask them to object by item number. Obviously...

Jen Wolfe: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...if they want to object to the whole thing they can. But otherwise it's too easy to say there's one thing they don't like and they dump the whole thing so...

Jen Wolfe: Understood. Right, of course. Of course.

Okay. So I think we have our plan of action. Amr thank you for volunteering to take the next pass at it.

As that comes back around obviously we can comment on the emails read and make any remaining changes.

I will send a note to everyone as we just discussed. And we will target getting a copy of this to council prior to their council meeting so that it can be discussed.

I know we are slated during council meeting to have an opportunity to report in on this. So obviously I can provide more detail as to the nature of our discussion and where we are.

And if there is some objection by council or if there is objection from any of the groups by email thread I will just reconfirm that we'll provide a notification to their OEC before their meeting on Monday that there is concern about Recommendation 23 and a more detailed response will be coming.

If any of your groups want to have your own separate response, you know, certainly understand if you need to be working on that. And we'll do everything we can to get a formal response from the working party.

Just one other note on our next steps, we are working on getting another call set for next week to discuss the other 35 recommendations which we haven't touched on with the goal being there that we would look at the ones in particular where there was widespread consensus in the public comments.

Those types of recommendations that we might be able to prioritize to get moving into an implementation and then looking at any others where there might be disagreement or controversy over those so that we can separate those out and start to make recommendations on implementation for the OEC.

Because I know they are looking for us to make those types of recommendations. So if you have not responded to the Doodle poll that was sent out by Charlotte please do so that we can get that next meeting set.

Are there any other comments or we've got about ten minutes left on our scheduled time. Any other comments from anyone?

I see a few people typing in the chat, want to give everybody the opportunity to speak. Anything from staff?

Nathalie Peregrine: No.

Jen Wolfe: Okay. Okay great. Well if there's no other comments or business for this call we'll go ahead and conclude this call and pick it up on the email thread and look towards our call next week to discuss the other recommendations. So thanks everybody.

Man: Thanks.

Jen Wolfe: Appreciative your time, appreciate you making this work...

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jen.

Jen Wolfe: ...on a short timeframe, turnaround time. Okay thanks. That concludes the call.

END