

**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group
Wednesday, 18 May 2016 at 05:00 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.

Mp3: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-nextgen-rds-18may16-en.mp3>

The audio is available on page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Coordinator: The recordings have started. You may proceed.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Next Generation Registration Directory Services, RDS, Policy Development Process Working Group call on the 18th of May 2016.

In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room so if you are only on the audio bridge could you please let yourselves be known now? And, Daniel, I note that you're only on the audio at this time.

Daniel Nanghaka: Yes, I'm on the audio but I'll be connecting to the Adobe Connect room probably like in the next 10 minutes as I'm just now to the office.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Hearing no further names, I would like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll turn it back over to you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. This is Chuck Gomes. And welcome to each of you for this meeting today. We have some important things to cover. You can see the agenda in the top right there except maybe for Daniel but he'll be able to see that shortly.

The first thing I should do is ask if anyone has an update to their Statement of Interest, if so please raise your hand. Okay, then let's go to the very next agenda item which is the next steps for the working plan. And I'm going to turn it over to Marika to talk about those.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Chuck. Hi, everyone. So this is Marika. So on the work plan and I'll quickly pull up the latest version. As you all know, I think we spoke - we talked through a revised version that we shared with the working group during last week's call and then subsequently also shared that on the mailing list requesting further input and feedback.

You'll recall I don't think we received any that was followed up on or deemed necessary to make further changes. So as such, the work plan is now considered approved, but as we said, you know, this is considered to be a living document so we'll make updates and changes as required as the working group progresses and we suspect as well that it may be necessary on a regular basis to go back to it to make sure that we're on track or see whether there are further changes that need to be made.

As required per the charter, the leadership team will now go ahead as well and share this with the GNSO Council for their information. And we'll also - or we have already posted the work plan on the wiki. We anticipate that staff will be updating the work plan, at least from a timeline perspective, on a regular basis to make sure that we track the dates and mark items that have already been completed and of course post it on the wiki as such.

I think that's all I had to share at this stage. I know the document is still uploading but I think - there we go. We'll also put the link to the wiki in the notes so everyone will have it handy and is able to look there at any point in time if you have questions on where we're at or what the next steps are.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Marika. This is Chuck. And while we have the work plan up there, if you'd like, you might want to scroll down to Task 8 and you can see the task just before it - Task 7, the first outreach that we've done to the SOs and ACs and constituencies and stakeholder groups in the GNSO. So we're now on Step 8 and we're going to start Step - and Step 8a has been done by the leadership team.

And so we will be sending that out in Step 8b after this meeting. But we're going to introduce you to it on this agenda item in our meeting today. So just wanted you to take a look at that. We don't necessarily need to leave the work plan up there. But we - I just wanted everybody to see where we're at in our work plan and we'll be working on Step 8 this week and throughout the coming days. So please be aware of that.

Okay I think we can then, unless there are any questions, note that the link to the work plan is provided in the chat by Lisa. And so if you don't know what the link is you can certainly copy it there.

All right let's go then to the next agenda item, Agenda Item 3, which is an introduction to the draft possible requirements document and discussion of next steps from that. And just as a preparatory remark, before I start going over that, the - it's going to be very important that each of you when you receive this, after the meeting today, to start taking a look at it and thinking of other requirements, and we'll talk about that as we go.

But let's put the document on the screen. Again, you have not received this document yet. We thought it might be best to - because it's pretty big, there's a lot in it and we thought it might be helpful to give you an overview and allow

for initial questions and so forth to make sure you understand what's in front of you so that you'll be better able to complete the next tasks which are really going to be in the court of the full working group so with regard to Step 8 of the work plan.

So I'm going to go over - the first two pages are introductory in nature, for the most part. And so I want to go over a few things there. Just - and again just in the first paragraph I just want to emphasize like I already have, that this is Task 8 of the work plan.

And then the second paragraph, note that per the board's direction, we're starting off with possible requirements derived from the EWG final report. Now please understand that the board asked us to start there, but that doesn't give those possible requirements any special priority. Okay?

It'll kick things off and we're going to go through some of those today, and then all of you are going to be asked to add to that list using the sources that we gathered and the input gathering, the three subteams on data purpose and privacy, from the issues report, from - and eventually we're going to ask SGs, Cs, SOs and ACs to provide their inputs on that and possibly additional requirements. And of course all of you are going to be welcome to provide possible requirements that maybe didn't come from any of those sources.

Now it's really important that you look at the third paragraph there. Note that we're going to compile this list without any debate on the merits of each of the possible requirements. And then once we've got that done we're going to design a very systematic approach to deliberating on those requirements and attempting to reach consensus where we can. There will be some we'll have consensus that no, that should not be a requirement. There will be somewhere yes, we have consensus and there will be some we'll have to grapple with and maybe modify to reach some sort of a consensus. And that'll be a time consuming, but I hope very thorough process.

Now it's important that you understand the organization, and thanks a lot to Lisa for - and we tried to help but she really did most of it in terms of the way they're organized. So - and the first category, if I can use that word, of possible requirements are those that map to one of the 11 questions in our charter.

The second category would be those that may not map to one of those questions. And then the third category are foundational questions that are - have to be answered based on our deliberation on all of the possible requirements.

Now going down - let's see, looking at the screen right now, it would be on Page 1 there, the next to last paragraph where it says the grouping of the requirements. I want to call attention to that. They're not - the way they're grouped into the 11 charter questions should not be seen as fixed, okay? We may decide that a requirement may fit in more than one question or we may move requirements around.

We even - when the leadership team was working on this - we did that. We moved some already because we thought well maybe it's a better fit there. You may decide - you may suggest that, hey, I think it'd be better somewhere else. That's what we're going to do. And it's - and so don't look at that as a - the way they're grouped right now in this document as fixed. And even after we start getting your input we may move them around based on working group discussion.

And also, don't look at the order in which the questions are posted as - or the - excuse me, the possible requirements, as being fixed either. We will - like we've said over and over again the last few weeks, it will be an iterative process as we go through this.

And then now scrolling down to the second page we have a description of the notation. So each possible requirement is going to start with one of the two

character labels that you see at the top of the page right now. The first two, (SQ) and OQ are kind of general categories, foundational questions that we already talked about and then Category 2 that we talked about above, other questions that may not relate to one of the 11 questions in the charter.

Then the rest of the 11 are just abbreviations of the 11 questions so you've got users, purposes, gated access, data accuracy, etcetera, and I don't need to read through those for you. But just to show you. So that'll be the first label and you see the next little one liner there that says the QQ, that's the two-character label, will be followed by a D and a number - D meaning document, okay, one of the input documents - and we'll successively number those in Annex A.

If you were to skip ahead, and we don't need to do it right now, but if you were to skip ahead to look at Annex A, you'll see all it has in it right now is the EWG report as document Number 1. Okay? We're going to add to that significantly as we go through. But since the leadership team developed a list that's in the document right now from that that one is in there, that'll be Document 1.

And let me stop and ask Holly to ask her question or make a comment.

Holly Raiche: Yeah, I'm not sure what CX means. What do you mean by steps to be taken to enable coexistence?

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry, I didn't hear all that, Holly.

Holly Raiche: Sorry. Yeah, what for CX, what does it mean - what does the question mean, what steps...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Oh, the coexistence?

Holly Raiche: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so well for example - and this is all in the charter, okay, but coexistence, for example, if and when we develop some requirements and there's policy developed and implementation plan developed and so forth, how will a new system, if we - if it goes that way - coexist, for example, with the existing Whois system?

Holly Raiche: Okay thank you.

Chuck Gomes: And the transition. So it's - again, you can see more detail in the charter but that's what that one relates to.

Holly Raiche: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Does that help a little bit?

Holly Raiche: Yes, it does, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay. And we will have to - if we get that far, and I'm optimistic that we will, we will have to, you know, you know, figure out what steps need to be taken to enable the coexistence of the existing system with an incoming new system and overall transition. Good question, thank you.

And all of you, please feel free if there's something that's not clear even something I don't cover but you see on the screen, ask. And I'm - because I'm concentrating on the screen I'm not watching the chat real well so I'll ask the other leaders on the call and staff to call out if there's - if a hand or a comment that I do pick up on.

Okay, so the possible requirements then after the document - two-character document reference, and the document number, the D number, then there

will be a sequential numbering of the requirements so that would be - and that would be an R number, an R followed by a numerical number.

So look at the example there in the paragraph just a little below middle where it says, finally. So you can see the example, UP-D1-R3 so that means it's a user's purpose - it's related to the user's purposes question, the source of the question is D1, which if you look in Appendix A is the EWG report, and then the R3 means that it's the third possible question. Now keep in mind the order of them doesn't matter so - but so that's what that would mean.

And then the - if you look at the other example in that paragraph, DE-D1-R4 so DE, if you look up above that's data elements question related, the document, again, is the EWG report because that's all we have in here right now, and then R4 is the fourth question in that question category.

Let me pause there. And this'll - you'll see it further I think Lisa did a pretty good job of explaining that in the text here. But if anybody has a question please speak up or raise your hand. Okay.

Okay, then the next paragraph just indicates you're going to find throughout, at least the way we did it, and some of you may do it differently and that's perfectly good, some of the possible requirements can be quoted verbatim. And others it doesn't make so much sense to do that because they weren't worded as requirements but requirement is implied. So we're going to be flexible about that.

Ultimately we want to end up with good wording on the requirements in cases where a possible requirement includes a quotation from the reference document, we put it in quotes. So but it doesn't mean that all of them have to be quoted from the document; many of them will not be.

And that covers the introduction. So I'll pause again and take a look at the chat. I see Alex - let me look at yours there. A pretty good suggestion there by Alex so that makes sense. Now I don't think we'll get into triple digits on...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...requirements. I'm kind of hoping not. But I think the two digits would cover us so thanks, Alex, for that.

Alex Deacon: Thanks. This is Alex. I think so too but thanks for that.

Chuck Gomes: Oh no problem. I appreciate the suggestion. So notice also the last sentence in that paragraph starting with possible there. The possible requirements don't have to be specific to today's Whois system, in fact they - most of them probably won't be because today's Whois system is so limited. So keep in mind we're starting from a clean slate on that and not that we can't use elements or come up with questions that we've discovered from the existing Whois system but we're not restricted that way.

Any other comments or questions? Now I'm not going to go through all the questions. We've got 20 pages in this document right now as our first cut. But I do want to start off with the user's purposes category. And the only reason that's first is because it was first in the charter. Doesn't mean we'll deliberate on that first, we'll decide that later and we may go back and forth like I've said.

So the basic question here is who should have access for the gTLD registration data and why? And possible requirements then are started here. And you'll see that as we go through it right now there are going to be about, for users and purposes, there are going to be 43 possible requirements listed. So we stayed well within the two-digit realm, okay.

Now those are all just taken from the EWG report document Number 1, okay? Now some of them, let's just go through the first couple and then I'll point out another structural thing. But you'll see then that - and this is a quotation from the EWG report - requirement Number 1 in this category is in support to ICANN's mission to coordinate the global Internet system of unique identifiers and to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier system, information about gTLD domain names is necessary to promote trust and confidence in the Internet for all stakeholders.

Now some of you may not like that one or you may want to change it, that's okay. We're not going to do that now though. Okay? When we deliberate on that one we'll decide whether we want to keep it, whether we want to change it, whether we want to combine it with something else but it's input that we will deliberate on.

You can see the second question then is another quote from that report, gTLD registration data must be collected, validated and disclosed for permissible purposes only. Okay. We'll debate that one when we get to deliberation.

Now I want - and I'm not going to go through and read all of these so don't worry about that. But I do want to call your attention to possible requirement 3, okay? gTLD registration directory services must accommodate in some manner all identified permissible purposes including the following users and permissible purposes.

So we've got kind of introductory possible requirement there with a bunch of sub-possible requirements that flow from that. And notice that those are indented to show the relationship there. So if whoever is controlling the screen can scroll down. And by the way I think it would be okay at this point to give everyone the ability to scroll around. Now you may want to stay with where I'm at, you may not, and I think that's okay now that we've covered the introduction and so forth. So all of you now have scrolling capability. "

But if you scroll down then you will see that the requirements 4-14 are all under - are sub-requirements under Requirement 3. And I'm just pointing that out just so that the structure makes sense.

Stephanie, you're up, go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks, Chuck. Stephanie Perrin for the record. So I'm just momentarily confused here. This coding - in this coding a reference is required, you have to have a reference document. So if we are coming up with requirements that cannot be found in any of the documents that we have gone through does that mean it is off the table or...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Absolutely not.

Stephanie Perrin: ...are we going to have a code...

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: No.

Stephanie Perrin: So we have a code for brilliant new idea.

Chuck Gomes: In fact, we may call it...

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...for that reason, okay? But, yeah, very - a good point, Stephanie. And you heard me say earlier I think that we would open it up for working group members or members of the community to suggest a requirement that can't be tied to a document and we're going to do that. Let me let Lisa respond as well. Go ahead, Lisa.

Lisa Phifer: Thanks, Chuck. Just to amplify that point, if there are suggestions that are made on the email list with new possible requirements that actually will be a link and we'll be able to include that link in the annex and number that as well. The idea being we can always get back to the source of the suggested possible requirement whether it comes from a formal document like those already identified by the subteams or just an email message to the list.

Chuck Gomes: So, Lisa, this is Chuck again. So in other words if it was an email suggestion from Stephanie that would be on the list in Annex A so that we would have that. Now what - what - I guess you don't - so the source - what would the source letter be?

Lisa Phifer: Yeah, well we'll just number sequentially as different inputs documents are used.

Chuck Gomes: Oh that's right, it would just be D - it would be D whatever - D56...

Lisa Phifer: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I should have known that. It was a dumb question on my part so okay thanks. Does that help, Stephanie? Hopefully that answers that question.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes, it does help although, I mean, if I suggest something I think I'd rather cite some kind of scholarly reference to back myself up rather than have my suggestions deleted later because they didn't have a reference document behind them. I mean, I sense - I'm a little uneasy about this because there's a...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah...

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Perrin: ...there's a vast plethora of documents looking for more data and not so many saying why there can't be more data. But I'll just put that on the record there.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay, let me suggest something. This is Chuck. Okay? The fact that something isn't linked to some specific source document should not be limiting us in including it. Now we're going to deliberate on it but I mean, it's nice if you can relate it to a source document but if you can't I don't think we should give it any less attention. We need to deliberate on it. Now we, you know, on its merits, not on whether it came from a good source.

Now the fact that it comes from a reliable source, that's a plus, but we may reject some of those so I hope I'm assuring you that we will be open to any possible requirements that are proposed and we will debate those and decide what to do with it. And if it comes from an individual in the working group we're going to debate those just like we will one from the EWG report or one from a data protection authority and so forth. Okay?

And I'm sure you're still going to be a little leery on that but I'll keep trying to emphasize that. Hopefully the chat is helping some people. If not please raise your hand if you want to - a further explanation.

Okay, I'm going to scroll down myself here. And you'll see they keep going. And as we're doing this we may, sometimes find one that duplicates another or overlaps another and we may combine them eventually, that'll all happen in deliberation. Don't worry too much about that right now if we - if you try to go through the list of however many requirements are in this document right now everybody - oh was that somewhere else and everything, you're going to spend a lot of time on that. That should fall out when we do our deliberation.

Okay let's go down then to the next category so we'll go past the users and purposes and takes us I think to gated access, which is on Page 5 towards the bottom of the page is where gated access starts. And you'll notice the introductory paragraph is just like the one up above, the basic question is what steps should be taken to control data access for each user purpose.

And then the possible requirements start. And so you can see again, if you scroll down to GA-01-R1, okay the first question from the EWG report under gated access you can see it's a quotation there. I won't read it. You can read it yourself. And I'm not going to give you time to read all of these. You're going to get a chance to do that after this meeting when we talk about the - when we send out the document or you can look at it on the wiki.

So you can see again possible Question Number 5 has some sub - I mean, possible requirements, sorry about that - as for sub-requirements under it that fit together. And again not reading those you can see as you go through the gated access one that there are, again, quite a few requirements, in fact there are about 55 to go down to Page 10, you'll see that there are 55 possible requirements there. And once everyone in the working group starts contributing we'll add to that list, 56, it'll just have a different document

number. And we'll add the documents to Annex A as we get new requirements.

Any questions so far? Okay, then again I don't probably need to go through this. I'll let you scroll down on your own. But the - once you get past gated access you then get to data accuracy on Page 10, same pattern, and I'll let you scroll at your will. If you see something that you have a question about. I probably should call attention on Page 10 to the yellow highlighted area there. And I'd like to ask Lisa to explain what that's all about. So just before you get - just before you get to data accuracy there's a yellow highlighted section there on Page 10. Lisa, would you talk about that a little bit please?

Lisa Phifer:

Sure, Chuck. This is Lisa Phifer for the record. So, Chuck, you were talking about the notation that says, "Check for alignment with the process framework Phase 1 for this question." And then there's a small image there that actually comes from the process framework - the row in the process framework that elaborates on in that particular case the question of gated access.

And it subdivides the question of gated access into the three phases, the requirements definition phase, then the policy design phase and then implementation guidance.

The point of including this here in the list was really to help us think about these questions and what we should be focusing on when gathering potential requirements or possible requirements.

That we needn't at this stage of the game drill into the level of detail that we will during policy design in Phase 2 or implementation guidance in Phase 3. We can really focus on what appears in that left hand column there under requirements and use that as a guide to figure out how in depth the possible requirements might need to go at this stage.

That doesn't mean that if you're uncertain about whether it falls over from possible requirements of the policy you shouldn't go ahead and suggested it. It's just to help us think about how to scope those possible requirements.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Lisa. This is Chuck again. And again, when we as a Leadership Team went through the development of this list that's in front of you, we decided well that's probably an implementation issue, should be moved up. So we moved it.

And so we'll all be doing that. And so I like Lisa's suggestion that, you know, if you're not sure, put it in. We can move it around later. It's better not to be thorough and not miss requirements rather than being worried about whether it's right at the first time.

Welcome to Adobe (Daniel). So I'm just reading a comment in the chat. Bear with me a second here, so. So and at this stage we're not going to debate which documents are the most authoritative. We probably have differing opinions on that. But we will give them all their just due as we do our deliberation.

Okay. As you scroll down, you'll go from the data accuracy and there's another how many - let's see - data accuracy - another 32 possible requirements.

And you'll see on Page - at the bottom of Page 12 then - at the end of data accuracy, you'll see another yellow section. We won't explain that again. But now you know what those are relating to the three phases.

And we're not going to get into policy development in Phase 1. That's the middle column or implementation guidance in Phase 3, the third column. But it's not a bad idea to keep in mind that the principles we're going to come up with and deliberate on will then be what policy needs to be developed for and policy needs to be implemented then.

So that's where the working group is headed depending on what critical decisions are made in Phase 1 and at the end of Phase 1. So you can see data elements next. And that goes on. There's again quite a few. There are about 40 there.

On Page 17 then it gets into privacy. And after privacy we get to - there are 45 there for privacy. And then we get to the next section at the top of Page 22. And you may want to scroll there because I want to talk a little bit about that there. And I need to scroll down on screen to Page 22 myself.

So top of Page 22 then is an important comment. And this is something that the leaders grappled with a little bit here. So up to now then the possible requirements cover the first five questions in the charter, the five that this workgroup has looked at most so far because after the first five questions, we have a decision point to make.

And so what we decided, and you can tell us we're - you don't like this idea and we can handle it differently. But what we decided is that rather than being - now you'll see that there are possible requirements listed for the remaining six questions from the charter from this page on.

But we didn't do as thorough a treatment of those in review. FY, you'll see lots of to dos in there, okay, if you scroll forward. Because we thought that the document's long enough as it is and we will get to those other questions - other six questions.

But for right now if there - unless somebody - unless a lot of people object extensively on this, we'll add more detail to these later rather than making the document longer right now, again, realizing that after the first five questions once we finish deliberating those, we have some fundamental questions to answer, so.

So that's what the statement at the beginning - notice it says the following sections have not yet been completed. And we will do that when we get there. So you're welcome to - there's - you're welcome to look at what's there. But we will spend more time on that when we get to that point for this document.

And so then if you scroll to the end, and again, there's six different categories of possible requirements in this section that's not completed. But you get down to after the other questions category - so there - I said six. There's actually seven I think including other questions.

And then we get to foundational questions. And you can see the foundational questions there. Is a new policy framework and next generation RDS needed to address these requirements? If no, does the current Whois policy framework sufficiently address these requirements? If not, what revisions are recommended to the current Whois policy framework to do so? Okay.

Now like I said, I think in the last meeting -- it may have been another meeting -- some of you already have answers for those questions. I understand that. I probably do too. Okay. I won't reveal that - what my answers are because what my answers are don't - doesn't matter.

But the charter does ask us to fully deliberate and develop requirements so that if the answer then that a new policy framework is needed, then the requirements will need to be used to develop policy in Phase 2.

And notice - well let's take a look at foundation question from Document 1, which is EWG report. Abandon today's Whois model. The EWG unanimously recommends abandoning today's Whois model of giving every user the same entirely anonymous public access to, in parens, often inaccurate gTLD registration data.

That's a quote right out of the EWG report. Okay. We will deliberate on that very fundamental question there. And then you can see Annex A. It's only got one document in there right now. It won't just be documents. Like Lisa said, it could be an email from one of you or something we conclude from one of our meetings; could be a variety of things but we'll document the source so that we can track - trace that back.

So that's the document. There's a lot there. We have a lot of work in front of us. But let's let me first of all ask if there's any questions about the organization and then we'll talk about next steps. Okay. Okay.

So then - and I'm going to go back now. We can just leave the requirements up there for right now. Stephanie, let me turn it to you and then I'll continue.

Stephanie Perrin: Okay. So Stephanie Perrin for the record. So basically if I go through this 26 page document and I provide annotation and reasons as to why this one here ought to be thrown out and that one there ought to be thrown out, is the input that we are gathering at this stage, every one of the 120 people goes through it and provides feedback on which ones they like and which ones they don't? I'm a little confused about what happens next.

Chuck Gomes: Good question. And the answer's no. We're not there yet. We will do that together as a working group once we develop a systematic approach to deliberating on these possible requirements. That's when we will do that.

And we don't - you don't have to do them all at once. So if we decide for example to do the privacy questions first or some of them first, we'll take them one by one and I know that sounds like it's going to take forever and it will take quite a bit of time.

But we will, you know, hopefully be able to go through some of them fairly quickly where there's easy agreement or for or against and so forth. Okay.

But people, everybody in the working group will get a chance to give the pros and cons for specific ones. But you don't need to do that now.

Here is what you're going to do now in the next - let's see. I'm looking at the work plan. So Step 8c in the work plan and, you know, we don't necessarily have to have it in front of us. But it says - and this is a full working group task.

It's to review and comment on Draft 1 of the possible requirements -- you're looking at Draft 1 right now -- and ask the working group to supplement the list drawing from other identified input documents. And we should have put there or individual contribution.

But so the next step, Step 8c is for the full working group to add to this list, not evaluate it; add to it. Okay. And hopefully - and it's okay to add one that may duplicate it from a different source. We'll have to correlate those later but that's okay.

But all you're asked to do right now is help us come up with as complete a list of possible requirements for the first five questions only. Okay. Assuming everybody supports the fact that we didn't complete past the fifth questions the possible requirements. We'll get to that later.

Just - now how are we going to do that? How do - how should you do that? And I'm not trying to be dictatorial in terms of to say how you should do it. But this is a point where those of you that summarize particular documents - reviewed them and summarized them from the three small teams we created.

I'd like to think that you're some of the best to add requirements for those documents. It takes me a lot longer to go through it than you because you reviewed it and summarized it and so forth.

So I fully hope that those of you that participated so impressively in terms of reviewing and summarizing those other sources will contribute to adding to

the list. And again, you only need to focus on the first five questions.
Stephanie, did that answer your question? You have - you want to say more?
Okay.

That's a great question. I'm glad you asked it because all we're asking and this is Step 8c in the work plan. And notice that we're suggesting that from the 18th to the 31st of this month - in other words, through the end of this month start - we put starting tomorrow. You can start today if you have time left today. Of course for some of us it's still the 17th, so.

Woman: (Yes).

Chuck Gomes: So and you can start on the 17th for those that want to work till midnight tonight. So that's okay. All right. So the - that's the next step. Now what the goal will be then by the 2nd of June -- this is in the work plan -- would be to create a second draft of the possible requirements that sufficiently complete - this is Step 8e now. That it'll serve as a foundation for our working group deliberation, which is in Step 12.

And we'll also be able to then do a second outreach to allow community members to add requirements that they think we missed. So that's where we're headed right now with Step 9 being that second outreach in mid-June but before the meeting in Helsinki.

And then of course we're going to have to - before we actually start our deliberation, there's some things from the charter we need to firm up. How are we going to use the - how are we going to reach consensus?

And the charter gives some guidelines there but we need to beef that up a little bit and so that when we're deliberating we know in advance how we're going to try to agree on consensus or not on certain items.

Okay. I apologize again for all the talking I'm doing. But hopefully everybody - at least those on the call will have a good foundation for what's next.

Now one of the action items from this meeting of course is to go out to the full list for the many who aren't on the call with regard to the assignment and - of starting to add requirements and send those to the list. Make sure you identify where you think they go. Don't get too hung up on that. In some cases it'll be obvious, some cases it may not.

You can put them in more than one category if you want. But that's - does anybody on this call not understand what the task of the full working group is between now and the end of the month?

And we'll have a chance in our meetings - our meeting on the 24th to talk about this again and answer people's questions and view progress and so forth. Please don't wait till the 31st.

But - and again, let me emphasize that the second draft that we do isn't expected to be perfect or totally final. We'll probably think of some more requirements after that and that's okay. But let's make it as complete as possible.

We'll - and Stephanie, I agree end of the month might not be long enough. No time will probably be long enough with the issue that we're dealing with. But we're trying to balance keeping progress going sufficiently well without overly rushing.

If we find we need a little more time, we can adjust. You've heard us say that the work plan is not in concrete and the target dates aren't in concrete. So we will react as we need to.

But don't think that we have to have all of them by the 31st. We will discover more after that. For those that have already reviewed some of the

documents, if we - taking advantage of your expertise and experience with the documents to date, that should help us do it a little bit faster.

One thing - at least this is a personal goal of mine is as Chair, it'd be really nice if we're at a point when we get into Helsinki where - ideally it'd be nice if we were into the deliberation so we could actually do some in person deliberation.

Whether we get there or not we will see. But that would be really nice. But the more progress we can make before the Helsinki meeting, the more effective our in person meeting will be. And we don't have very many of those. Okay. Only three times a year do we get to have those on a regular basis. So that would be really nice.

Any other questions or comments? I see that Lisa reiterated what I emphasized earlier. We really need to - we really need to - and I'll ask the Vice Chairs to do everything they can to encourage those who contributed to your sub-team work to help us a lot because they can probably do it a lot faster than the rest of us in terms of finding requirements.

So (Susan) and (Michele) and (David), if you'll help us on that in encouraging the people that were on your teams, that would be great. Okay. So I think - and I better scroll back up so I can see people's hands. Thanks (David) for the checkmark. I appreciate that.

So let's go ahead then. I think we can go then to Step 4, which is planning for the Helsinki meeting. And I think it'll turn it back to Marika again if you would please. Marika, are you...

Marika Konings: Yes. I'm here. This is Marika. Just took me a little while to actually get off mute. My phone doesn't always cooperate. So in relation to the Helsinki meeting, I think as we already discussed during the last meeting, there have been some changes to the schedule but I think we're currently at a stage

where it's probably relatively sure that the sessions that have been scheduled for this particular working group will take place at the times and dates that were included are good here in the draft agenda.

Again, I do have to point out it's still not final. So changes may occur but we're hoping that we're at least getting to a stage where things will stay relatively fixed.

And so there's currently a cross community session scheduled on Monday from 5:00 to 6:30 local time. And a face-to-face meeting for the working group on the Tuesday morning from 8:00 to 12:00.

And what the working group will need to do is consider or think about how to use that time in a most efficient and effective manner. It's probably worth pointing out that the objective or at least the - as (unintelligible) in a new meeting format, which is in a way experimental. We haven't tried it before.

But the real idea is to allow for sufficient time for cross community deliberations on topic that are of broad interest. And this is one of the topics that has been identified as being of broad interest.

So it will be for the working group to think about and how to organize that session and to structure it in such a way that it's both, you know, allow for engagement, discussion, conversations with all those in attendance. But at the same time of course also ensure that the output of that session is rather than - and able to feed into the working group deliberations.

Something that we already started discussing a bit with the Leadership Team is that it will be right before and as well as ahead of that meeting we're able to inform people interested in this session of, you know, the background, which materials they should review.

And maybe even consider having a kind of Webinar open working group session to allow for people to ask questions or do a more one way kind of briefing because at least as we've understood the ideas that as little as possible one way updates are to be provided as part of those cross community sessions.

From the staff side, we've already started brainstorming a little bit about how such a session could look or what kind of approaches we could take. And I think the idea is that we may put some of those ideas on paper and work with the Leadership Team and then we'll turn those around to the working group to get your feedback as well. But of course if you have any ideas or suggestions, I think those would be very welcome as we move towards the Helsinki meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Marika. This is Chuck again. And I think it's fair to say that the Leadership Team really things that we need to take full advantage of the ability to involve others that aren't a part of the working group, not even as observers, in the sessions we have in Helsinki.

So hopefully before our meeting next week we will send something out to the full group to discuss in that meeting in terms of a proposal for structuring those meetings in Helsinki. And it'd be really good if we can come up with a pretty good picture of that at the end of our meeting next week so that we - that can be posted.

I'm being pressured by people on the Meetings Committee to get something more specific in terms of what the - what our meetings will consist of both for the cross community one and the actual working group session.

Now just to let you know the working group session is going to be a four-hour meeting and there is a break in there. In fact there may be two breaks in there the way that's structured. No, I think it's just one. But anyway, there is a break.

But one thing that'll be different about the in person meeting and remember there will be remote participation for those of you who will not be there. But the one thing that'll be different we will allow guests to participate in the meeting whereas in working group - regular working group meetings on these teleconference calls, members are the only ones that can participate.

Others can listen to the transcript or see the chat and so forth. But in the in person meeting we will allow participation from guests who are there. So that'll be a feature that doesn't happen in these teleconference calls, so.

Any questions or comments on the sessions in Helsinki? Okay. And by the way, because by then hopefully our second communication outreach message will have gone out; we can also use those sessions if we decide to get input on requirements that may be missing, so.

All right. I think then if there are no questions on that, that we're down to our last agenda item that is - and basically we have a meeting next Tuesday, the 24th, at our regular time. And so, and really we - it's really important -- I can't emphasize this enough -- that working group members spend some time adding requirements and send those to the list so we can start building that.

Lisa, do you have any guidelines you want to give working group members with regard to sending additional possible requirements to the list?

Lisa Phifer:

I think that we'll be learning a little bit as we go along. But to the extent that the possible requirements come from one of the key inputs that are - that's already been identified, it would be useful if you identify the key input in the same way that it appears in the Wiki or in the case of documents that it came from the three sub-teams.

You can just cross reference the document as it appears in the list. You don't have to provide the full title and the link again. Just make sure that we get that same document.

I think that we will as part of consolidating all the possible requirements be the ones to actually add the numbering to probably - as people pull together possible requirements maybe not worry too much about assigning the sequential numbering - numbers or figuring out which document number you're pulling from.

But just focus on getting the content, getting the list of possible requirements and providing - where it makes sense providing maybe page numbers or section numbers to that source if it comes from a document so that'll be easy for everyone to get back to that source later on.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Lisa. Chuck again. So make sure that you identify the question of the first five questions and if it doesn't relate to one of those, should they use the OQ or category Lisa?

Lisa Phifer: Yes. If you're fairly certain that the possible requirement falls into one or more of the 11 questions, by all means identify which question you think it fits under.

If you're really uncertain whether it fits into any question at all, that's when the OQ category is sort of a parking spot for this is a possible requirement but I'm just not really sure where it fits.

Chuck Gomes: And let me - I said we're going to focus on the first five questions. But Lisa pointed out something that's really important I think. If you're going through a document and you see something that's in the last six questions, go ahead and identify it. We'll put it in there now so that we don't have to redo it later.

So don't restrict yourself to those five. We certainly would like you to focus on those five to find requirements but as you run across something for example that's a cost issue or a risk issue or any of the other of the six last questions, identify it. It'll save us time later and it'll save you time having to go back and find that again. So that would be fine.

Okay. Well I think that we have wrapped up this session. Is there anything I've missed? Anybody have a question or a comment? We all have work to do. So really hope that everyone will contribute so that the load doesn't fall on just a few individuals.

All right. Well thank you very much everyone. And look forward to the input the rest of this week on possible requirements from other sources besides the EWG report. And if anybody thinks we missed one from the EWG report, you can submit that in too. So remember, we're not evaluating them right now. We're just listing them.

Have a good rest of the week. And we'll be talking to each other on the list. Meeting adjourned and the recording can stop.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day. Operator (Jovelle), if you could please stop all recordings.

END