

**GNSO – ICANN Sydney Meeting
GNSO Open Working session
Policy Process Steering Committee Discussion
21 June at 09:30 local time**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing at the PPSC Discussion Meeting held in Sydney on Sunday 21 June 2009 at 09:30 Local time. 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.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: All right. Good morning, everyone. I have 9:30 on my watch, and I don't know if it's a little fast or, so we'll try to get this meeting started sort of on time. We'll see if there's -- is anybody outside the room that we know of that should be in here? That wants to be in here?

I'm going to actually give two more minutes, I'm going to look out -- I'll go outside personally and see if there's anyone that's out there on these work teams, so two minutes. A.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay, everyone. Welcome. This is the combined meeting of the PPSC, which is the Policy Process Steering Committee, and I apologize, there's a lot of acronyms that we use in this group, and I think there is a glossary that's around that may describe these particular acronyms.

This is an open meeting, so anyone's welcome to attend, and if anyone else wants to join the tables, as opposed to sitting in the back, we welcome that as well.

What I think I'll do is I'll start out with a brief introduction.

The PPSC is -- for those of you that are not familiar with it, it's the steering committee that was -- that got together to discuss basically two main topics. That's the policy development process, which for those of you that were here at lunchtime yesterday, Margie went into a little bit of discussion of consensus policies and the policy process.

And also to talk about the use of working groups and essentially kind of the rules that should be in place for the new restructuring, the GNSO as it's restructured, and so what we're going to do during this first hour is really talk about the progress that each side has made, some of the difficulties or stumbling blocks that we've run into -- I guess we have the phone lines open, which is good.

And so we'll talk about some of the stumbling blocks, talking about

some milestones and how we could actually get to a point where, if -- if everything is as planned, the plan is to have the new council restructured by Seoul, which is only a few months from now. It sounds kind of far away, but, you know, there's a lot of work to be done between now and then.

So I think what I'll start is, I'll start with just an introduction of who everyone is. They can all introduce themselves around the table and around the back, and I'll apologize to the people that are in the back on the right side here, because I can't really see everybody, so if anyone raises their hand, I won't be able to necessarily to see you so it's probably best if you have anything to say, and I do encourage that, to come up to the mic and that way I can actually see you and we can call on you.

So I think I will start with for those of you that don't know me, my name is Jeff Neuman. I'm with NeuStar, one of the registries. We're the registry for dot biz, and I think what I'll do is I'm the chair of the PPSC, as well as chair of one of the work teams, the policy development process work team.

So I'm going to talk with Mike Palage over are there. If you could just introduce yourself, your affiliation and which of the work team -- if you're on one of the work teams, if you could just say that as well.

>>MICHAEL PALAGE: Mike Palage from the registry and business constituency and I'm on none of the work teams, to my knowledge.

>>MARILYN CADE: I'm Marilyn Cade. I'm a member of the business constituency.

>>JIM BASKIN: Jim Baskin from Verizon, business constituency, just not -- not a member of the any of the groups here.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Mike Rodenbaugh, GNSO Councillor, from the business constituency. I am on the PPSC and I'm on the PDP work team.

>>UTE DECKER: I'm Ute Decker. I'm a GNSO Council member from the intellectual property constituency and I'm listening in.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Olga Cavalli. I'm a GNSO Council member and a NomCom appointee.

>>GREG RUTH: Greg Ruth, ISPCP councillor, working group work team.

>>MARGIE MILAM: Margie Milam, ICANN staff.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Marika Konings, ICANN staff and supporting the PDP work team.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: I am J. Scott Evans from the IPC, and I am the

chair of the working team work group -- working group work team.

[Laughter]

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Ron?

>>RON ANDRUFF: Ron Andruff, business constituency member, alternate member of the operating steering committee and the -- a member of the -- a member of the working team for GNSO operations.

>>JAMES BLADEL: James Bladel, registrar constituency and member of the PDP working team.

>>TERRY DAVIS: Terry Davis, GNSO Councillor, NomCom appointee. Just listening in.

>>DAVID MAHER: David Maher, dot org, chair of the registries constituency and a member of the working team.

>>GRAY CHYNOWETH: Greg Chynoweth, Dynamic Network Services, a member of the registrar constituency and a member of one of the working teams. I can't remember the acronym.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: That's fine. There's a lot of them. If the people on the side want to come up and introduce themselves at the mic or if there's a -- there is a mic going around, too.

>>ALICE YU: Hello. This is Alice Yu from t.nic.

>>LLOYD THROWER: Lloyd Thrower, U.S. government.

>>KAHANKE LIYANAGE: I'm Kahanke Liyange, student from La Trobe University.

>>PAUL FOODY: Paul Foody, sitting in.

>>ILIYA BAZLYAHKOV: Iliya Bazlyankov, member of the working group.

>>ZUO RAN: Zuo Ran, from Conac, China.

>>RYOVICHI HOSOYA: Ryovichi Hosoya, from Japan NTT.

>>JOE CADY: Joe Cady, SG Intractive, France.

>>NACHO AMADOZ: Nacho Amadoz, dot cat, working group work team, or work team working group.

>>BYRON HENDERSON: Byron Henderson, dot travel registry.

>>CHRIS WRIGHT: Chris Wright, au registry.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Great. I think that's everyone. I don't think anyone walked in since then. Okay. So the way we'll start this is to just go and update on the PDP work team and I want to thank ICANN staff for helping to do these slides. We'll just give an update as to where the PDP work team is, and then we'll go turn it over to J. Scott to give an update on the working group work team.

So this is the objective. The PDP work team is responsible for developing a new policy development process that incorporates a working group approach and makes it more effective and responsive to ICANN's policy development needs, and then the primary tasks, as you see up there, are to appropriate operating principles, rules and procedures applicable to a new PDP, and implement -- sorry, and implementation and transition plan.

So essentially, you know, we're taking into account that a new PDP is -- going off the Board Governance Committee's recommendations, is to take into account that the new PDP is better aligned with contractual requirements of ICANN's consensus policies. We're putting emphasis on more work to be done at the prelaunch phase, to establish a PDP that's more flexible than the current one that we live on -- live under, including things like timing and dates, things like that, provide for a periodic assessment -- so how did we do? Does the policy actually achieve its goals? Is it working? Do we need to go back and revise any of our thinking?

Is it better aligned with ICANN's strategic plan and operations plan? And does it contain rules, processes, and procedures that are more effective and efficient from what we have today.

And so the way we've approached this is we started out in Mexico City and had a brainstorming session which really was just a session to just throw out ideas of things that people thought were working, people thought were not working, stuff we should keep, stuff we should just add to the process, and since Mexico City, we've scheduled biweekly conference calls and have had a number of them since that time in the last few months and I think we've made some pretty good progress which we'll talk about in a minute.

And we've also had input from external experts and we had -- one example is we had Thomas Narten from the IETF come in. He's obviously also a board member here. He came in to give a presentation on something that the IETF calls "birds of a feather" process, which is essentially a process by which the IETF introduces subjects basically that may result in a working group, may not, but it's to kind of just gather and see what the interest is in that particular subject, to see whether it merits further work. And there's -- although there's not necessarily mandated process is for a "birds of a feather," there are best practices or good recommendations that the IETF has put into place that I think are very instructive as to the way we could be doing things and we'll talk a little bit more about that in a few minutes.

So another thing that we had is staff had done an excellent background document on, you know, what is -- how do they view the PDP and the work that they've had to do, and staff has had a lot of work in these last few years on new PDPs, doing some background research, getting together all of the materials, and some of the issues that they've come across, things such as, you know, what happens when there's a topic that people want a PDP on, but the issue is so broad, what are ways that can help staff or help others to frame the issues more narrowly, so that, you know, when you do get a working group together, it actually can function more efficiently using some of the past examples that we've had over the last few years.

And what we've done in the PDP is we've broken down the work into five stages which are up here, and really we're -- we're -- the first stage, which is the planning and initiation phase is probably the one with the most meat and we've certainly spent most of the time on that and in fact, are still on that planning and initiation phase but I think we've gotten to a point now where we can actually move on to the next phase, which is to talk about proposal, review, and voting thresholds. Keeping in mind what that does not mean.

The voting thresholds were actually, on a number of areas, already set for us, coming out of the -- and I'm going to forget the acronym but basically coming out of last July where there was the compromise reached of certain voting thresholds that will be involved in some way in the PDP process, things of, you know, what does it take, what kind of vote does it take to initiate an issues report, what is it the vote that it takes if it's, quote, in scope versus out of scope.

But there's a lot of things around those voting thresholds that still need to be defined and those are the things that the work teams are -- need to work through.

So even though it says "voting thresholds," I don't want to make it sound that we have any input into changing those thresholds, but merely helping to define when they -- what they are and what they mean.

Then of course there's the work phase, which a lot of that is overlapped with the working group work team, so I -- I'm actually interested in hearing from some of the members of the working group work team as to where they are with working groups.

And of course then there's voting and implementation of the policy if -- if it -- if that's what it's intended for.

And then the assessment. So once there is a new policy in place, what do we do then? We got to assess its effectiveness and then some mechanism for compliance with that policy if it is something that requires compliance.

So Stage 1, planning and initiation, again, we're currently in -- under discussion, and for those of you that are around for the next session after this one, we'll go into much more details about this, as to where we are, but essentially we've broken that down into 11 phases, including who has the right to initiate a request for an issues report, what does an issues report mean, scoping out the issues, creating of that issues report once it's decided that that's something we should be doing, and then how to resource it and prioritize those issues to make sure that there's not too much work going on at once.

And we've been working through each of these phases by using concerns and questions. A lot of them were actually raised during the Mexico City brainstorming session, and a lot of them have been known or raised in previous -- for a number of years, with the objective of getting the work team consensus on a response which will help define what our proposed solution is.

And we expect to use a similar approach for the -- the other stages.

If you want further information on the PDP work team, there's a Wiki that we have that's available for anyone to view. There's a staff PDP background document. There's our planning and initiation working document. And a summary of the contributions by Thomas Narten.

I would also say that we're trying to arrange for a meeting with Thomas Roessler, who could speak to us about the W3C processes of especially how do they scope out an issue before the policy development-type phase.

So that's kind of an overall where we are with the PDP work team from a process standpoint. I'd be happy to take any questions. Recognizing that we're really going to dive in depth into this in the next session that starts at 11:00, is that right?

>>MARIKA KONINGS: 11:15.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: 11:15. So we've drive a lot more into the policy development process work team. We have actually a pretty sizeable document to go through. Some of the items that we've been discussing, plus we did a survey amongst the work team members on some of the issues that we've been talking about, and I'm happy to say that even though sometimes we have a tough time getting people to show up for calls, there was a -- a good amount of people that actually filled out the survey so I'm happy about that.

So before I go into more about the PDP, let me turn it over to J. Scott to just talk about some of the activities of the working group work team and the subgroups there.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: The working groups work team has divided into two subgroups, and one is trying to come up with the charter guidelines.

In other words, it's a document that's going to be used as a guideline for work teams to divine their charters and set up their charters for the work team. The other is the operating model sub-team and that is a sub-team that is going to look at exactly the processes that a work team working groups will use, when they are -- after they've been chartered.

We've finally come up with an outline for the charter guideline, a consensus. It has been posted on the Wiki. I think it was posted on July -- I mean, I'm sorry, June 9th, and we are now going to flesh out the text that will flow through that outline, working with our staff liaison and consultant, which is Ken Bour, who has worked very closely with us, to help us craft that so we can put it out for comment to our group and then to the larger group once there's consensus on the actual language of the text that fleshes out the outline.

With regard to the operating model sub-team, we are still working on fleshing out that outline, and getting some clarifications for how the sections will be devolved, and what kind of guidance we want to offer through that, but we are hoping that in our session this afternoon, which I believe is from 1:00 to 3:00 this afternoon -- I think it's in the same room from 1:00 to 3:00, so if you want to be there, you're more than welcome to come -- we're going to flesh that out a little bit more.

So what we've got now is outlines. We're hoping to use the month -- the six weeks before the end of July to get a document out so that the groups have reached consensus that we can bring it to the PPSC, the larger group, then to consider and then we can move forward.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Are any of the -- so you've broken them down into two teams. Are the chairs here now or --

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: I don't believe so.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Is there anyone that's on those work -- those teams that wants to give an update as to where they are? I'm seeing silence.

Okay. Well, what -- have there been any issues as far as -- you know, I'll say with the PDP work team, as is I think kind of an issue with ICANN in general, there's a lot of topics going on at the same time, so I know with the PDP work team, we've had certainly good attendance at some meetings and at other meetings we've, you know, had to cancel calls because there -- you know, three or four people show up and, you know, two of those -- or two or three of those three or four people are ICANN staff, which we've gotten great support from, but, you know, we've had to cancel some meetings because of lack of attendance.

So have you guys been having some of those similar issues or --

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: I would say we've had exactly that issue. I have found as a chair, I got involved in the IRT process, and was sort of off the radar and I found that if I am not at the meetings circulating and cajoling everyone to show up, nobody shows up.

When I leave it to the subgroups to do things on their own without me coordinating everything, I don't get any -- you know, I get some attendance from stalwarts, but the problem we always have at ICANN is that everyone says, "Well, we weren't involved or we didn't have an opportunity to comment," but I just don't have people showing up.

I have, you know, a core of about three or four people that show up to the charter guideline group, and about one or two that show up to the operating model group.

So it's been difficult.

Now, when we've had the larger calls, where both groups were combined, I do get more folks to show up, but then it's really not any work getting done. It's more discussion about process than -- than actual work.

So I've talked to Avri and gotten some pointers on how to push things forward so that we can actually get things accomplished, and I think I've got some ideas for how we can get that done, and one of the ideas is to actually work with staff to just get us a rough draft to some of the documents out there, and then get people to comment on those documents, and we can -- you know, if we have something to work with, once the ball is rolling down the hill, I think it will gain momentum.

It's just getting it over the precipice so that it will go down the hill and so that's where we are now.

We've got an outline. The outline does have consensus, so I think fleshing out that outline with text, we just need to get a draft out there and rather than waiting on others to contribute, we're just going to put out a draft and then get everyone to make comment on the draft, just so, you know, we'll get something out there.

I think once we get a rough draft, it will get people's minds focused and ready to go and ready to start pulling it together.

I think it's the whole point of nobody really wanting to take ownership, and staff has really been very great about assisting and I'm going to work with them and we're going to get something out for -- just to get comment on. And I think once we do that's correct we'll have far more engagement.

Right now, it's a little confusion about what to say and how to say it, so we can use some of the brainpower that ICANN staff has, because they're very good at that, in being consultants, in getting us

something as a ground basis level to build from, and that's where we're going to -- that's where we're headed.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Marilyn?

>>MARILYN CADE: Jeff, can I make a statement that we could park and maybe come back to, but it's something that you and I just had a very brief conversation about.

I am on the PDP working -- the PDP group, and one of the experiences that I have, which I suspect is a virus that is -- has spread to many other people in the community, is this thing called work overload, and I'm wondering if we might -- before we leave -- look at our experience and think about how we might better structure -- or might give some advice about how work of this nature can best be done in the future.

So for example, at each meeting that we come to face to face, there is a Friday afternoon that is open, and maybe we should be thinking about trying to -- when we're doing something as important as this, thinking about how we put together a major period of time together to kick things off, and then go into the work -- the support of staff and the work with committees because I -- my experience, being on the council, when we took that approach in a couple of instances, came together face to face and we worked in a concerted, straight-through period of time to get an initial process launched, I found it easier to then manage the rest of the work.

And I -- you know, I think everybody's really committed to doing this. They understand how important it is. But I think what we're dealing with is, you know, just kind of workspace overload, and so while we might not be able to restructure what we're doing within this group, this might be a really good lessons learned in terms of our advice about the kinds of support and approach that could be used either to finish this work or in the future on work of this nature. Which does have a budget implication and I realize that, but, you know, if we'd started this out by saying to people who are on the group, okay, the Friday afternoon and Saturday after the next ICANN meeting, you're going to be locked in a basement room working on this, people would have planned accordingly. And so just to put that out, not to debate now but maybe to come back to.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Any other comments or questions? Gray?

>>GRAY CHYNOWETH: Yeah. I wanted to echo I thought that we -- the calls that I was on, we did have some limited attendance but I actually thought that we got some very good work done.

And I would echo the comment about staff. Ken was really crucial in kind of pushing the ball along, and I think part of the confusion, to my mind, or part of the lack of attendance was a lack of clear understanding of the roles that each of the sub-teams were focused on,

and, you know, so that you think that clarity of purpose kind of helps with feeling like you had some ownership and know when you get on a call exactly what you're going to do, and I think that the -- the end result of the work that we did will be that future working groups will have that clarity, which is, I think, a positive thing.

But I think that the -- in relationship to the two working groups that I was on, talking about the charter and the operating norms, I think that they -- you know, they will result in some very positive things. And with regard to a time to spend -- and I think that this is -- the afternoon session I think is intended as exactly what Marilyn was talking about, to spend some time together face to face in a way that really you're able to kind of move the ball forward, and I think that that was -- I think we were really floundering until Ken came in and we got those draft -- got that draft document done and then I think people have something to look at and chew on.

But it really takes someone who is willing to step up with a significant amount of time to build that document, and then people say, "Okay, well, I can take the half an hour or the 45 minutes to review that and give my comments" but to take the 4 hours or something like that that it would take to produce document I think is daunting and results in the kind of lack of participation that we saw.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Ron?

>>RON ANDRUFF: Thank you, Chairman. I'm not sure of where this fits into the dialogue of this morning, but I did want to put it on the table and perhaps we can answer it now or later.

As I mentioned, I'm working on the GNSO operations steering committee in the sub-working group which has to do with the GNSO operations work team.

Within that body, we are working on the -- on the rules of procedure for the new GNSO, and one of the issues, of course, will be quorum and voting. Voting. Can you just shed some light on how you might perceive voting will take place at the GNSO level and on which type of issues and so forth? Because right now, we're a little bit lost in that area. I don't expect this will be a final definitive answer. Just to give us some direction about what does voting look like vis-a-vis the PDP process? What will the GNSO Council, policy councillors, be voting on, as examples, perhaps?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Does anybody want to take a stab at that? I think Tim Ruiz.

>>TIM RUIZ: Well, if I understand correctly, the voting thresholds have all been defined, correct? So I think they're -- they're pretty much set and I don't believe they're actually -- you know, those can be redefined or expect to be redefined at all by the working group. So

are there other voting thresholds that are missing or that you're trying to define?

>>RON ANDRUFF: No, Tim. Excuse me. I wasn't clear. It was not about voting thresholds. Just trying to understand: On what issues or where does a vote happen by the GNSO policy councillors in relation to the work that PDP groups are doing, and so forth.

So just trying to understand, in the past whenever an issue came up, the councillors would vote and that would ultimately determine the direction of that policy. In this case now, a policy is not being determined by the council. The policy councillors anymore. It's being determined by groups, working groups. So the point here I'm trying to understand is: When will council vote? On what types of issues? Just so we have an understanding, when we're developing the rules of procedure or not -- I mean, there may be no changes but we're just trying to understand, where will voting actually come into play?

Agreed that the number of votes and how that's determined is clear, but we're just trying to understand: When will the council vote and on what types of issues? Is that more clear?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Well, so, one of the things that we were talking about in the PDP -- and I put this document up and I know it's real hard to read. I'm using Glen's computer so I'm not sure how to increase the size of some of these things.

We talked about one of the issues for our group is -- and why can't I get it to stay -- Number 5, which is what could be the end result of a PDP and I'm not sure why it's not staying on a topic, but...

And it's an interesting question that we've kind of -- we've talked about, because, you know, when a lot of people think of a policy development process most people associate that with a policy that comes out of it that is a consensus policy. That's something that's -- that puts an obligation on a contracted party or gives a contracted party rights or, you know, is something that affects their contract.

But in reality, the way a policy -- what we talked about is the way a policy process can be used is for other outcomes. There could be just - there could be no vote in the end, right? It could be just, "These are some recommended best practices that we think contracted parties or we think ICANN staff should be doing," right? It doesn't always have to be geared at ICANN -- at contracted parties.

So the question is not necessarily the GNSO Council will ever have to vote on anything other than maybe just accepting the report.

So -- but Kristina's got a comment.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: And I, too, have been in IRT land since Mexico

City, so I have a lot of list reading to catch up on, but it is my general understanding, Ron, that the council will continue to vote to initiate -- to request an issues report, to initiate the PDP process, but that as with regards to policy, it has been my understanding -- and if I'm wrong, I would very much like to be corrected -- that once the working group finishes its work and presents its report, that it's really the -- the council's role is going to be limited to saying, "Did they follow their charter? Did they follow the procedural guidelines?" And that if the answer to both of those questions is "yes," then depending upon what the output is, whether it's a recommendation for best practices or an actual consensus policy, that it is that thing that the council will be voting on. And as a practical matter, really won't -- again, as I understand it, if the first two -- if the answers to those questions are "yes" won't really have much discretion.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: So it looks like -- I see a couple people. I see Mike. I see Ron and Bertrand. I think Mike was responding.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: I'm just wondering, Kristina, where do you get that impression? Is that in the draft bylaws? I don't have that impression at all.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: From the conversations that started with the BGC report about the council needs to no longer be making policy but managing it.

>>RON ANDRUFF: Can you explain what you understand, Mike?

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Sure. Obviously the working groups are tasked with developing the policy, the recommendation for the council to consider. There is nothing hindering or preventing the council from changing that policy. We are the elected representatives. The working group is not. The working group is volunteers. It could be anybody on a working group. So, you know, there is no reason why the council should be limited from altering the policy, if that's what we decide to do.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Ron, did you have -- or did you just have a question?

>>RON ANDRUFF: I was just looking for some clarification on Kristina, but we got that now. Thank you.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I'm going to go to Bertrand. You didn't have a comment?

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: No, just all ears.

>>MARILYN CADE: Marilyn Cade, I'm speaking as an individual. I just want to make an observation about the GAC and offer clarity only from my own personal point of view and observation, right, which may mean it is not clarity.

I think there is strong validity in the point that Mike just made about the fact that the councillors are elected and they are, thus, empowered and entrusted by the constituencies who elect them or the Nominating Committee who appoints them to exercise certain kinds of responsibilities and judgments. And in the -- while we are, I think, moving the development, the research, analysis, development of the policy work into a working group, which should be multistakeholder, which should be also resourced and supported by ICANN, hopefully starting with a more well-founded analytical perspective going into the work -- in the working group. The working group will be putting forward a report. And here's the challenge we face. This is a bottom-up organization. If the policy council does not vote, then they are moving the voting to the board. So -- and I will say personally, I'm on the record as opposing that. And I have spoken at the microphone in the public forums before the board in opposition of that.

So I've actually thought that while you're moving much of the policy development work into the working group, it's clear to me that the policy council must retain its authority and responsibility and accountability.

Now, how you do that, I've basically assumed that you must vote even if your vote is to accept the work and support the work and endorse the work of the working group. Otherwise, what you're doing is to abdicate your role in a bottom-up organization and anoint the board, which is not something that I think any of the constituencies or the SOs or the advisory groups supported. And I'm not sure the board would have assumed that they would have been replacing you in that role.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: To be clear, what I meant is that what the council will vote on is going to be significantly more limited, at least that has been my general understanding.

I would be delighted if the reality was closer to what Mike and Marilyn are talking about because otherwise I don't see the point of being a councillor. But that's a discussion for another time.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I'm developing a queue. I have Tim, Bertrand, Philip Sheppard and Ron.

>>RON ANDRUFF: Just a question on that point, Chair, seeing as I brought it up. I'm asking just for some clarification for our working group.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay.

>>RON ANDRUFF: Thank you, sir. So following what Marilyn just said, then the vote could take place saying, We agree with the working group but it could also say, We disagree and kick it back to the working group, correct? Is that how everyone is understanding?

>>MARILYN CADE: I would say --

>>RON ANDRUFF: But it is still a vote to kick it back?

>>MARILYN CADE: Remember, this is my personal point of view. I would say if you think of this as almost like a management structure, right, you have a business unit that has done work and they send it up the line and the management team goes "not done yet, do more, circumstances have changed, you need more resources, I'm firing all of you and starting over."

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Let me try to go back to the queue. Thank you, Ron and Marilyn.

Let me go to Tim.

>>TIM RUIZ: Yeah, that was the point I wanted to make. It wasn't just the matter of the working group will do their work, it will get sent to the council and then the council is just going to do what it wants with it and change it and modify it or whatever. I think the process would more often be that if we weren't satisfied or we had concerns or questions, that we would kick it back to the working group to work further on it. But I do agree. I think that ultimately the responsibility has to rest with the council. We don't want to kick it up to the board. But I think most of that responsibility needs to be exercised by continuing to use the working groups or other working groups, whatever, whatever is needed to get the work done.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. I have Bertrand next.

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Actually, I wanted to say that the two points that Marilyn and Mike were alluding to are two different points. One point is whether the council actually does vote to validate the process of the working group before sending it to the board so that the council does have the actual say which means that the board in the end will probably have a competence that is to accept what the council has done unless there are very specific circumstances.

But fundamentally, what Marilyn is saying is that it's the council that makes the decision to endorse the working group results and not the board. The other point that Mike was making is a very different issue. Because if the council is limiting its role to either endorsing or sending it back with additional recommendation, that's one thing. The second thing is very different, is whether the council receiving a consensus report from the working groups has the capacity to twitch it, to, basically, say, well, Resolution 1 is okay, 32 is not and 35 is.

In that case, it sometimes deconstructs the consensus at the lower level. And it is the same distinction as the distinction you have in a jurisdictional order between the appeals court and the last resort

dealing with procedure. In the appeals court, the appeal court can reform the decision and say basically you judged wrongly, I judge differently. If you go to the Supreme Court in the American system, the Supreme Court doesn't necessarily rejudge it or at least -- maybe I'm wrongly assuming how it works in the U.S. system, that I don't know enough. The way it works, for instance, in the court system in France is that the equivalent of the Supreme Court is just allowed to send it back to another court to be rejudged but not make a decision on the substance. And I think here it is a very important distinction you have to make, whether the council has the capacity to influence the substance or just to work in the process to send it back and be reconsidered.

And what I'm surprised at that stage is that it is a question. It is absolutely amazing that at that stage of the process and of the discussion within ICANN, as it's always the case in all issues, when we address issues within ICANN, very deep policy questions emerge very late. I'm sorry, just a personal contribution. But it is an amazing experience.

This is "the" fundamental question related to the Board Governance Committee recommendation that the council is less legislative. This is "the" question number one, the fact that you don't know exactly yet is amazing but great because this is a very good question.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I still think it is a debated item and I don't think there is a common consensus viewpoint at this point. That is one of the issues that is later on for the PDP work team to discuss. I'm trying to get back to the PowerPoint. I think it was on this slide up here, stage 4, voting and implementation. I think that's an issue that we haven't gotten to yet as a work team, but certainly you hear from the brainstorming session that we had that there's a debate going on.

Let me go to, first, Philip Sheppard and then to Tim.

>>PHILIP SHEPPARD: Thank you very much, chairman. It is, of course, a Sunday and Sunday is a day typically suited to philosophical discussion.

[Laughter]

And that's, of course, what we're having. And the reason we're having one is because none of us know how effective the outcome of a working group is going to be. Some of us have experience of certain work groups in the past, and we have our own opinion about the effectiveness of a working group and consensus building. That's irrelevant to the future. It may give us a few about the future, but we'll see what the future holds for us.

So we don't know how effective a work group consensus is going to be. It may be that it is great and it is clear and indeed the role of

councillor actually becomes one of voting and endorsing from the work group and it moves forward beautifully. But it may be messy. It may emerge that the work group is split useless and making nothing clear in terms of opinion. So it comes back to council to make a decision in terms of what we do next, how do we progress it. And all options must be open in terms of what council then wants to do. Is it sufficiently urgent that the council itself has to make a decision? It may be, depends what the issue is. Do we have the luxury of time to send it back to the same group? Do we form another one in the naive hope that the outcome will be different? All these things are plausible, but all of those things must be within the remit of council and those elected to do so. So ultimately the power must rest with council. And if it doesn't, then the whole concept of electing council, et cetera, just flying out the window. We might as well scrap that and start again on this whole process of reform. Thank you very much.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Thank you, Philip. Tim, you had a comment as well?

>>TIM RUIZ: Yeah, just a similar thought, that there is no, you know, single concept or definition of how recommendation -- what they're going to look like. It's not -- they don't fit into some formula or some template. They are going to vary all over the map. They are going to be quite different depending on what the issue is. And so as Philip said, we need to have that leeway in order to be able to act appropriately depending on the type of recommendations or work that we get back from the working group. It is impossible to predict it's going to be exactly this way in every case. So there is no way to say, this is precisely how the council should react in every case. We have to have those -- that leeway in order to act appropriately depending on what the situation is or the issue is.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Mike?

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Yeah. Just continuing on the theme, one big issue that I think certainly the council has to be the ultimate arbiter of is whether a working group recommendation is in scope of ICANN policy making for consensus policy, for example, you know, because the council are the one that is are looking at multiple policies and presumably understand the bylaw provisions that Margie has now made very clear to us and can make that call. Whereas, a working group which is composed of volunteers, many of whom may never have interacted with ICANN before ideally, frankly, just would not have the tools or really should not be their place to be making that call because it is the council's place in the first place to task them with a charter and then, of course, to review the recommendations and make sure that they are what the council wants and are implementable.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Any other comments on that?

I actually want to turn back because this discussion is interesting as far as some of the things that we've talked about in the work team.

And I think one of the issue questions going back was, what are the potential outcomes of a policy development process? And I meant to throw this out because we have so many people here from differing backgrounds and different opinions, is to throw it out to everyone and say, okay, these are the few things that we came up with as possible policy outcomes that would go to the council, putting aside the voting and what they decide to do with it.

But the different outcomes we thought of and brain stormed were -- this is in a weird place in this document because it is at the bottom of the page and next page, so I'll read it. We thought obviously one of the outcomes could be a best practices or guidelines which would be non-binding recommendations. And that's, again, could be non-binding on a contracted party but it could also be something we talked about as ICANN, ICANN staff. It should be ICANN staff should be doing X, Y and Z. It doesn't have to be a registry or a registrar has to do X, Y and Z.

The outcome could be the one that we're mostly familiar with is the consensus policies which would be binding on the registries or the contracted parties, registries, or registrars or possibly both.

They could be policy frameworks such as charting a course for a broad range of activities. That's the parallel there for new TLDs. That was a working group that was -- the outcome was not going to be something that was going to be binding on registries, registrars or frankly that was going to be a best practices but was a general question from the board to set parameters on the introduction of -- or policy issues involved in the introduction of new TLDs.

Again, I think you're right as far as either there is going to be no - - since there are going to be different outcomes, it is hard to generalize in advance what the council can or should do. But that said, I think there are a number of people in the room that may still feel that there should be some guidance we should be able to give or parameters in which the council should act in to kind of avoid the top-down decision-making as opposed to the bottom-up. It may be avoiding the substitution of a councillor's policy position. You don't want to substitute necessarily a councillor's policy position for the work that's been done for a working group, unless there is some cause to do so. So there is competing concerns there.

Is there anyone in this room -- is there any possible outcomes of a policy process that are not up here or that would require different rules? Again the three ones are the guidelines or best practices, consensus policies or the policy frameworks such as a new TLD. Any other outcomes, Bertrand?

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: There was a possible category of a decision that is outside of the scope of the consensus policies that is, for instance, not to the scope of a general policy like launching

the gTLDs but that can be something that is, I suppose, not exclusively regarding registry, registrar agreements or within the picket fence framework. I suppose there are decisions by the council that can be binding and that are not specifically in the framework of the existing arrangement. Am I mistaken?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: You triggered something in my mind about things that are going on now. If there's a -- there could be -- although I'm not this has been done. There could be a working group established to respond to another Supporting Organization. So for what's going on now, let's say the GAC comes up with a position on the geographic names. Well, in this case there was a council response, a letter -- we could debate that whether that was appropriate or not. But in theory, there could be something that's less time sensitive, a subject that comes from the GAC or where they're asking for thoughts from the GNSO, and there could be a working group set up to respond to that. So I don't think that's kind of covered in one of our three areas, is basically providing advice to other Supporting Organizations or other groups which wouldn't result in a framework. It wouldn't result in a guideline or a consensus policy. That's different than what you were saying.

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: For instance, if you look at the question at the fast flux or problems related to spam or security issues, is, for instance, the answers or the decisions that will be taken ultimately on the fast-flux hosting going to be consensus policies within the framework or are they going to be decisions by ultimately the board that will be enforceable? It is a question -- it is an open question. I don't know. If they are not -- what I mean is the consensus policy is something that is directly linked to the agreements existing that plan the existence of this framework. There might be other decisions and maybe I don't have the example.

>>MARGIE MILAM: Yesterday I covered a little bit about that. There's other ways of having enforceable policies against contracted parties but you have to look at the contract for the specifics. So they don't necessarily fall within consensus policies. But there are other placeholders in the contract. So it is limited to a certain extent because of the contracts. But it is a little broader than just consensus policies.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Marika?

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Just to add specifically on the fast flux PDP, what is currently in discussion as well are recommendations for additional work maybe with other groups or looking at best practices. So I think we are already currently and the PDP is ongoing, we are not only looking at consensus policies or changes to existing policies but trying to see if there are other means to address the issues that are being dealt with.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: And also -- and then I'll take a queue. When we talk about "in scope," there are actually two different things as far as in my mind as far as "in scope." There is "in scope" within the contracts but there is "in scope" within the GNSO. There could easily be a working group that's established that doesn't come out with a recommendation or policy that's within scope of the contracts but it could still be within scope of the GNSO as a whole. So I think that term is often used interchangeably, and it has been debated as to what in the current bylaws -- the current bylaws now call for a -- at the time an issues report is created, it calls for the general council to issue a decision on whether something is in scope but it doesn't differentiate between the two. Now, in my mind initially, going back years when I was looking at that provision, I had always thought it was "in scope" within the contracts. I had never thought of it as "in scope" within the GNSO.

Others did think of it that way. So when we came together, we didn't know that there was a difference in viewpoints, but we all agreed that "in scope" was something at that time that the general scope should put a view on. It is funny because the first time it happened for me when I realized it was in the Feb '06 PDP when we talked about contractual conditions as far as existing contracts and whether there should be recommendations or changes within existing contracts. I always took the approach of, well, this is beyond the scope of the contracts -- the existing contracts to actually talk about this, where others said, no, it may be beyond the scope of the existing contracts but it is not beyond the scope of the GNSO. And there is never really a bright line test to see that. But I think it is important for us to recognize that that's crucial. And it is something that I think we need to provide clarity on if we still keep this "in scope" distinction.

Let me take a queue. I know I saw Mike. I saw Tim, Alan. Okay, so start with Mike.

>>MICHAEL PALAGE: Thanks, Jeff. I've not been very engaged in this group, and I'm just trying to get up to speed. So my apologies if this issue has been addressed previously. One of the things I'm looking at with this PDP is how it's going to scale going forward with new entrants into the name space and particularly when those entrants are not sort of, if you will, private entities but perhaps governments or IGOs that may be coming forward because right now the only process for one to get into the zone is through this gTLD process.

And if you look back at the 2000 round, there were two IGOs that applied the WHO -- the UPU and the World Health Organization. And in the 2004, it again was the UPU.

So looking forward, does this group view a carve-out for governmental or intergovernmental agencies in the current process? Or is the current thinking right now if you're a gTLD, this is it, tough? Or are they going to sort of recognize some carve-out? Again, I'm just trying

to reconcile that because when you look at the name space historically, there are some things -- there are some gTLDs, dot mil, dot gov, dot edu that, if you will, have fallen outside the traditional ICANN gTLD policy development process. And, again, I'm just trying to reconcile these two issues going forward. And it would help from those members of the group to see whether they view a potential carve-out.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Before I go to Tim, does anyone want to respond to that question? I see Alan.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: We certainly haven't discussed that, but my gut feeling is if it's applied for under the new gTLD process, it falls within the scope of the GNSO. Now, that doesn't mean for any given issue it's applicable. So the policy that we came up with on domain tasting on the add-grace period didn't apply to some domains because they didn't have one at all. So they were excluded from that consensus policy applying to them. But if they had, it would have applied. So I don't think I've heard any discussion within ICANN of the new domains not falling under the GNSO other than the ccNSO.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Anybody else with a thought on that question? Okay. Let me go to Tim.

>>TIM RUIZ: You know, we've -- we talk a lot about -- and it's pretty much the work that we're doing within the PPSC, is all focused on the whole policy development process and the working group up to where the GNSO, you know, finally accepts, or however we want to frame that, the recommendations from the working group.

What I think is somewhat missing, that I have concerns about and not sure how we would address it but something I think that needs to be considered, is what happens to that recommendation after that? Because, you know, looking at the new gTLD process, for example, there is a lot of policy development process going on in regard to new gTLDs as this thing is implemented. So just how far can that go or how far should it go? And what's the process through which that should go in order for that policy to continue to evolve as it's being implemented? And then I think -- this occurred in other cases in the past, and I realize when you are in the implementation phase, you run into things, some things might have to be adjusted or massaged, but I think particularly with the new gTLD process, it really points out how dangerous it could potentially be by allowing this continued evolution of a policy for who knows how long or what period of time. But there is nothing here in this whole new restructuring that really addresses that issue. It is kind of looked at as something outside of the restructuring but I don't think necessarily it is because it affects the work that this new structure produces. So I think it is something that deserves some attention.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: So I think -- and maybe I'm wrong and others can jump in. I believe we haven't gotten there as the PDP work team yet,

although soon will, is the fourth item there which is the voting and implementation. I think that doesn't -- and maybe it's more in the assessment of policy effectiveness as well. Those two are general categories. We had discussed this within the PDP work team as to the role in -- to date, what it's been is there would be a policy that comes out and then they throw it over to staff and then they go, okay, implement it and then the staff comes out with an implementation paper which I agree in a lot of cases there could be elements that people view in that implementation plan as "wait a minute, this is setting policy." Is that something that should be in the implementation plan and what is the role of that working group? Should it necessarily be dissolved once something goes up to the council and then goes to the staff to implement -- or the board to order staff to implement? Maybe the working group shouldn't be dissolved at that point? Maybe it should be continually involved in that implementation maybe, maybe not. These are subjects that we're kind of -- between Number 4 and 5 of those on there. But I do -- that's an issue that was discussed and needs further discussion. Bertrand?

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Yeah. To chime in on this very point, it is a very, very important point and the new gTLD process is an absolute topical example of this. The moment you decide that something is moving into implementation is a critical moment in the current process in ICANN, because it's the moment where basically the ball passes from one side to the other one. Namely, from the community and the whole development process to the staff.

And the ambiguity of this threshold at this moment is putting everybody in a weird situation, because as you said, there are many cases where the implementation document itself is bringing new policy questions, like there is a real choice. In particular, I give a very concrete example.

When I was looking at the -- at the implementation guidebook, I mean, the draft applicant guidebook for the new gTLDs, the very fact that there is a single sheet structure for all types of application is not necessarily mandated by the PDP before, but it is a major policy option, and in a certain way it is an ambiguous situation where you cannot blame the staff for addressing the issue, but at the same time you put them in the position of having to make a policy decision and we don't have the mechanism to review the policy dimensions of the implementation.

So I think this notion that there is an implementation policy component is very important, and maybe the transition between drafting of the policy and implementation is more progressive. It should be in stages, like there is the general framework, then identification of three or four items for implementation, then the policy guidance for each of those items and then you can move progressively into the actual plan, the -- the distinction between the two phases was probably too sharp here, I suppose, seen from the outside.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Anybody else with comments on that? Tim?

>>TIM RUIZ: You know, just real quick, I appreciate Bertrand's comments. I agree there. And, you know, I think the key is that maintaining that bottom-up consensus-based concept and idea when policy issues are addressed during implementation -- and I'm not sure we're there yet. You know, comment periods and things are very much appreciated but I'm not sure that's the best way to gauge, you know, that there's consensus on a particular issue when it's actually a policy that's being set.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. What we're going to do now is we're going to take a little break because we're going to deep dive -- sorry. Oh, I missed Alan. I'm sorry. I apologize. Alan?

>>ALAN GREENBERG: I actually had comments on that one also, but I was being patient in waiting.

With regard to the discussion that's been going on right now, I think it's very important that the council not take a position that "We discussed this three years ago, we asked everyone for opinions and, therefore, it can't be changed, it's cast in concrete."

The real world does change around us, and there are times when some of the other people in ICANN are not as engaged in our introspective policy development process as perhaps they should be, and so I -- so I think we need to make -- put into it a process by which we can modify these policies after they're passed.

And the same, of course, goes for the -- what we're now including in most policies. That is, a review period, to see if it's really working.

On the other hand, we can't afford to start a year process every time a little part of the policy needs to be tweaked, but somehow there should be something in writing to say how we are doing this and not just have it be completely ad hoc as it has been in the gTLD process.

The other thing, going back to the previous discussion on outcomes of PDPs, I think we want to be careful that for issues which are within scope of the GNSO, we don't proscribe or forbid types of outputs because we didn't think of them this week when we're writing up the policy. We want the GNSO to be able to fix problems and change policy, as necessary. It doesn't have the right to legislate it, but we don't want to make -- stop the GNSO from making recommendations, regardless of the exact details of how it's going to be implemented.

So I think we need to be careful to leave things open-ended.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. All right. We're going to take a short break. Actually, it's a longer break, to 11:15, and then we're going to do a

deep dive into the PDP initiation and planning document that we have up here. We've talked a little bit about it. Talk a little bit about the results, the survey results we did, and then get into the next phase, the "B," which is the -- oops, I went to the wrong one, didn't I. It will be these slides. There we go.

Which is the proposal review and voting thresholds question. So we'll take a break and see everyone back here at 11:15. Thanks.

[Break]

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Everyone, welcome back. This is the policy development work team meeting of the PPSC, the Policy Process Steering Committee, and so we're going to do a deep dive into some of the issues that we talked about at the full meeting of the PPSC.

Is there any way we can shut the door? Sorry.

>>GLEN de SAINT GERY: Yeah.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. First thing that I want to do is that we did a survey -- I guess we're pulling up the Adobe connect as well, if there's anyone that wants to join that room.

We did a survey of the -- we're on the planning and initiation phase, which is Phase A, talking about those subjects, and we did a survey on the different outcomes and the things that we've been talking about.

And so we're going to display the results of the survey.

There were -- correct me if I'm wrong, guys. There were 12 people that responded?

>>MARIKA KONINGS: I think 11, because one didn't fill in --

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. So there was 11, which is pretty good, because the work team is only 12 or 13. 14 people maybe. So --

>>MARIKA KONINGS: I think there are more, but active participants --

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. So pretty good participation on that survey. I did not fill one out as the chair, just to try to keep a more neutral view on things.

So I just want to go over the results first, and I think the results are pretty indicative of helping us to move forward. And maybe -- Marika's got the hard copy of the results, so we can actually go over the numbers because right here, they're kind of pie charts.

So the first question we asked everyone, of the outcome that we came up with, is: "The current status in which an issues report can be

requested by the ICANN board, GNSO Council or an ICANN advisory committee, should that be maintained?"

In other words, should there be other parties that will be able to introduce, or should we change it any way, and I think you'll see that the vast majority had said that they view that those are the appropriate three parties to make a request for an issues report.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: If I just may, because, I mean, on several of these questions, comments were added. I mean, after this meeting, we'll -- I need to put all the data together and then publish a more comprehensive report, but this is just to get an idea of, you know, where the group feels along similar lines and where there is disagreement.

And also maybe just to preface, the reason for the survey, you know, this is not a vote or, you know, a final decision on what the final outcome on these issues is going to be, but this was really a way of trying to, you know, get a -- feel the temperature of the group, especially since we had, you know, difficulties in getting participation from time to time, and as well, give people an opportunity to, you know, fill in some ideas or suggestions that they have on these different issues.

And just to add on this point, I think there was, you know, 8 people said yes, 2 said no, 1 expressed no opinion.

I think one person that responded with a "no" basically indicated that of course in the new GNSO you won't have the GNSO Council making the request, but it's under the two houses, or there's now voting thresholds, so that's something that might need changing.

So that was one of the comments made.

So another comment was received saying that there could be an increased threshold of support. They said, "This will help reduce the preponderance of narrow issues. One thought would be to consider that the council or board can initiate a report alone, but other SOACs must have the support of other SOACs or work in conjunction with the council or board."

And someone else suggested that there should be some possibility for groups of actors -- to be determined who those should be -- to submit rather than request an issues report in a predetermined format that should be explored in order to make this initial exploratory step more bottom-up.

So those are some of the other comments received in relation to this question.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. So let's actually -- I want to take the first

comment that you had raised -- or that was raised, which is on the bicameral -- the fact that there will be two houses. And I think the assumption was that there's still a council and the council would still vote on things. The council still would initiate an issues report. Maybe there's different thresholds with it, but the council would still come to a vote and initiate the process, even though there's two houses. And Alan's shaking his head, so do you want to add?

>>ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. It's still the council making decisions. The thresholds require a specific threshold on each side of the house, on each side of the council, to have the council make the decision but it's still the council deciding. It's just the detailed rules of the voting have changed.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. I don't know if that person maybe meant -- because I think it can be -- I don't know the exact numbers, but isn't it one house or two houses, a certain percentage, or one house basically indicating that if one house would request an issues report and vote in favor of it, even if -- I mean, technically, of course, it's still the council, but maybe that was what that person had in mind, but -- not trying to put words in the --

>>ALAN GREENBERG: But that was in support of the previous one, which said you only need 33% of the entire council, or something, so it always could have been done by a small -- by a minority of the council with full objections on the other side -- on the contracted parties or the non-contracted parties, and could still be initiated, and this just maintains the relatively low threshold for initiating a PDP, which I think was there -- it happened before my time, but I think was there to allow a PDP to go forward even though one of the parties disagreed and didn't want to see it done.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Right. So the point is, the council is still acting, and so I think the wording is still correct. It's still the council initiating it, and the voting thresholds are what they are.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Uh-huh.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: So if we want to move -- and the one that was no opinion, did they just not to respond to anything or --

>>MARIKA KONINGS: No. I mean, I think "no opinion" should be interpreted as no -- I mean, that's how we phrased it, I think, in the other questions in here. I think it was just no opinion, but it's no strong view either way.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Okay. And by the way, this survey is still open for anyone that has a -- hasn't done it yet and so I encourage -- Marika can resend out the link again.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. It was a sent a number of times last week.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: But she could send it again.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: Last week was a bad week.

[Laughter]

>> (Speaker is off microphone).

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. So it went out --

>>MARIKA KONINGS: 11 responses. And just for the record, staff filled in -- Margie, Liz, and myself completed one response as well on behalf of staff.

>>TIM RUIZ: (Speaker is off microphone).

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah, I have the --

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I'm sorry. Can everyone use a microphone when they're speaking because it's being transcribed. I apologize.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: I mean --

>>TIM RUIZ: Yeah. This is Tim. I was just asking if -- you know, how many responded and if there were any demographics on that. And I'm sorry, I came in a little bit late, if I missed that, but --

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. I'm happy to go through the list, if no one objects, but, I mean, I presume everyone that stated an opinion here is happy to --

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, I think you can go through the list of people that responded.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Sure.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: So responses were received from Wolf Ulrich Knoblen from the ISPCP constituency; James Bladel, GoDaddy, registrar constituency; Liz Williams, BC; Zbynek Loebel, from the IPC; Greg Ruth from the ISPCP constituency; Avri Doria, NCA, chair of the GNSO council; Bertrand de la Chapelle from the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the GAC; J. Scott Evans, IPC; Paul Diaz, Network Solutions and registrar strategies; Mike Rodenbaugh, business constituency; and then Margie, Liz, and myself on behalf of ICANN staff.

So those were the responses received to date.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: (Speaker is off microphone).

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Can you just use the mic?

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: I'm sorry. So the question was, did -- Marika and Margie, you did the surveys that are in these results?

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yes. But we just did one for staff. So we didn't fill in three. We just one. We shared the same opinions --

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: You didn't stuff the ballot box?

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yes. Didn't want to tip the balance.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: So, I mean, compared to the membership of the PDP team, I think that was a pretty good turnout, so it was good. There's still a couple more people that need to do it and we look forward to their opinion, so this is just a -- again, it's just to test the waters to see where we're at on the issues that we've been discussing. So on Number 2, which is -- I think you might have jumped.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Oh, sorry.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: So Number 2, which related to the procedures for requesting an issues report, we had a question on there: The reference to the initiation of a PDP for the request of an issues report should be removed from the bylaws, as the initiation of a PDP does not start with the request of an issues report.

And the answer that we got back, the numbers were...

>>MARIKA KONINGS: I just gave the page away, but I think it's the --

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Same thing?

>>MARIKA KONINGS: The same -- let me just. Sorry. So it was 8 in favor, 1 no, and 2 no strong view either way.

Some of the comments received were the first one, "Well, why not reword it to initiation of a PDP process. This process can be cut short with a no vote on Step 2, but the issues report is an integral part of the PDP process.

I presume this is from the person who said "no."

Second comment received was saying actually, it should be -- it could be possible to make only a mechanics of the existence of a policy development process in the bylaws and describe it in more detail in a separate document. In addition, suggestion was made to have two documents in initial stage, an issues paper and a staff recommendation

regarding the actual launch of a PDP.

And a third comment was made saying if the reference was removed from the bylaws, I assume this working group will recommend replacement text that more accurately describes the process to launch some desired policy work.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Does anyone have any questions or comments on that? Alan?

>>ALAN GREENBERG: Just a quick one. I think the real issue is not to use the same identical phrase to be -- to refer to several different stages in the process, so whatever we come up with should be clear and not confusing.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Correct. I think for --

>>ALAN GREENBERG: But whether one -- the first stage or the second stage is the one that initiates is rather moot, as long as we don't use the same term twice.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Yep. Okay. The third question is: Are the procedures outlined in the bylaws still relevant and efficient?

And I think, you know, it's the exact -- I mean, looking at the pie chart --

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. Strongly divided crowd. 3 yes, 4 no, and 4 no strong opinion.

There were six comments received because as well the question was asked and if you answered no, how you should the procedures be -- be updated.

So first comment was the procedures are still relevant. Their efficiency is strongly correlated with the management capabilities of the relevant working teams.

The second comment stated that a request for an issues report should be accompanied by some explanation of the need for same.

And the timings need to be changed. The voting of creating a task force should be changed to a vote on creating a charter. For the most part, yes, but not as written and then they listed the issues that are currently in there.

The third comment states that the many evolution is the move towards a working group model and a better communitywide interaction during the early phases of the issue scoping and goal setting that must happen before the actual PDP is launched.

The fifth comment says that at a minimum, the time lines need to be updated. What's the point of deadlines if they are never met? "Never" in capitals.

More information needs to be provided at the time of the request. And the last comment says that clarification might be needed on how to whom requests needs to be submitted.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: So I think in this one, the actual comments are much more helpful than the question, the yes or no, which is good, which is fine too.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Going on to the next one, this was -- there were no requirements as to what information a request should contain. Would a template be helpful, including items such as definition of issue, identification of problems, supporting evidence, why should the issue be considered for policy development, and I think there, the results were pretty strong in favor of some sort of template, and can you just go over the comments and --

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. So 10 stated yes, 1 person stated no. Comments were received it could help as a guideline for creating a request, but I have some doubts whether all kinds of requests could be pressed in a formal template.

A template can include recommended data sources or subject matter experts and could help define rather than restrict the issues under study.

Template can also reference any existing policies that are relevant.

Another comment stated, "Yes, but a template information required should be flexible. One size does not fit all.

Generally templates mean one size fits in and you better fill in every blank even if it's irrelevant.

I tend to think that a set of guidelines of things to be considered might be useful but would avoid anything as bureaucratic as a template."

And the last comment received stated, "Definitely a major improvement."

>>JEFF NEUMAN: So I think one of the things that we meant by template in our discussions was not necessarily that every field needed to be filled out, but it was a template that contained the fields that others would consider helpful to know that information if you had that, at the time the request was made. I think that's kind of the tones of the discussion, and so even the person, I guess, who sounded like voted

no might be okay with that, but if anyone's got any comments in this room --

>>MARIKA KONINGS: The next question actually goes into the mandatory nature or -- of such a template, so --

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Right. So --

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Maybe we should take that one together.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. So if you answered yes to the previous question about templates, are you of the opinion that the completion of the template should be mandatory step in requesting an issues report. And this one was a little bit more divided as between the yeses and nos.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: So actually 7 said yes, 4 said no, but additional comments were submitted here as well, saying it shouldn't be a precondition for accepting the request. Mostly yes, but this should not be a barrier to good faith efforts to initiate a report. So subjects -- so a subsection of mandatory information must be stated with other more detailed information considered optional.

Second person said but this should not become an excessive preliminary exercise where requesting an issues report. I would prefer requesting a preliminary inquiry becomes a process in itself, adding to the vast amount of paperwork.

Third person said the template should be very concise. And the person refers to a previous comment that they made.

Must retain flexibility and not impose rigid requirements as to format or content.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Anyone with questions on that? Okay. Jumping right along to the next one. This is a pretty strong one here.

Is requesting an issues report the same as initiating the PDP?

And I think this is -- the answer is pretty obvious. We had a number of these discussions and so the answer "no" here reflects really what we thought it would reflect, which is, no, that there is a distinction between requesting the initiation report -- I'm sorry, requesting the issues report, initiating a -- and initiating a PDP and so obviously what -- when we rewrite this, there needs to be a clear distinction of what it means in both cases. And so we've had a lot of discussions on this issue in the -- in the calls. I don't know if this is worth talking about now, if anyone's got any questions, but I think at least to the members that have been participating, it's pretty -- pretty clear. Okay?

>>MARIKA KONINGS: So I mean, the comments -- yeah. There were 10

no, one -- one stated no opinion, some stated that to my understanding the issues report is the basis for initiating a PDP. Please advise if I'm wrong.

Someone named it a tricky word game. It is the same as initiating the PDP process and should be part of the defined process. How else do ACs have the ability to force consideration of an issue if the issues report is not a bylaws mandated part of the PDP process? Whether it is part of the PDP per se seems to be an academic semantic differentiation.

Someone said, "No, but it amounts to requesting a preliminary inquiry. The whole process should lower the barriers to entry and the agenda setting. To let issues emerge early with the possibility of easily dismissing abusive requests. And another person stated if the requester cannot fully define the issue and provide credible supporting evidence, further policy work may be needed before a full-blown PDP can be initiated.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. If you answered no -- which is interesting, because I don't think -- oh, I'm sorry. Yes. If you answered no to the previous question -- which is everybody -- should advisory committees be allowed to initiate a PDP.

Now, this discussion comes in light of our calls in which the current bylaws state that an advisory committee could initiate the PDP, whether or not -- well, actually, no, wait. Hold on.

It doesn't. I'm confusing this.

The current bylaws say that the advisory committees can request an issues report, and that it -- but it would still go to the councils after -- for a decision as to whether a PDP would be launched. Am I getting that right? Alan's looking at me here.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: The current bylaws, if I remember correctly, use the term "initiate a PDP" at at least two and possibly three different points in time.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Right.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: We need to be clear whether -- whether starting the -- whether requesting the issues report is initiating the PDP or initiating the process associated with ICANN policy development in the gTLD environment, which it used a different set of words -- I mean, right now, I think that answer -- the large answer "no" is the advisory committee should not be allowed to initiate the creation of a working group to discuss consensus policy. I think is what that answer "no" is to, and not reversing the very first question of should advisory committees be allowed to initiate -- request an issues report.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I think that's right.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: I think we have a nomenclature problem here and until we fix it, we're going to continue to get -- being confused.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Well, in a couple of the calls that we had talked about -- and you're right, we do need to fix the nomenclature but we had talked about initiating the PDP was synonymous with the working group. The creation of a working group.

As opposed to initiating the policy process, which is the issues report and everything prior to that. So this question was meant to get at: Should advisory committees be allowed to initiate the process of getting a working group together, you know, secure passing the council - the council vote on that. And I think -- so what were the comments that were received? And the comments may be indicative of the language.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah, I think the comments were along the lines that we've discussed now, basically saying the ACs can trigger initiation of a PDP by requesting and cooperating on an issues report.

Another said, not alone. They should work with the GNSO Council and our board.

Again, word games, they should be able to initiate a PDP process, if this is the PDP or -- pre-PDP or just a fair step in the provisional PDP that can be determined -- sorry -- after this first step, I believe, is a semantic detail.

And the last person said this question is ambiguous. If it means that ACs have the right to submit a request for the preliminary stage, the answer is, of course, yes. If it means an AC should have the right to order the launch of a formal PDP like the board currently does, this is an issue to be discussed. There are pros and cons, but it is certainly worth considering.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I think the last comment sums up pretty well. Bertrand?

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: To that one, which was actually my comment -- (laughter). Oops.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: So much for anonymous.

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: No. Anyway, the point -- I fully support what you and Alan were saying. The ambiguity in particular here is "initiate." It is very interesting because "initiate" both means starting the initial phase but also "initiate" is like ignite somehow.

If this question means, Does an AC have the right to say, I asked for it so you go, whatever the council says, I think obviously the answer

should be no. But if it is, as Alan said, the right to request that it is initiated, the initial phase is launched, the answer is probably yes.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Moving on, should more details be provided on how an advisory committee can request an issues report? Currently, the bylaws don't have any details as to how this request should be made. All it says is that an advisory committee can request an issues report. So here it looks like we probably had, let me guess, like, 8, 3 and 1?

>>MARIKA KONINGS: 8-2-1. You are getting the hang of it. Some of the comments received were the bylaws or rules of procedure should clearly outline how the requests should be processed. A flowchart would be very helpful. Another person said that an explanation, a flexible template should be required but not in the bylaws.

And a guideline to considerations might be useful. The objective is to have very concise formulations in the bylaws and possibly annexed working methods.

Excessive precisions creates documents that are hard to understand. It probably wouldn't hurt to have a staff advisory that explains the process ACs have used in the past to request an issues report, example, with the support of GNSO Councillors. I'm not convinced this needs to be enshrined in the bylaws though.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. The last comment is interesting because I don't think we said "in the bylaws," but I guess people read that into the question.

Okay. In theory -- I think this is missing a couple of words here.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: In theory, there is currently no limit on the issues that can be raised as there is no requirement for the issue to be within scope, i.e., within ICANN's mission and linked to gTLDs.

This assessment is carried out as part of the issues report. Should an initial assessment take place when an issue is raised?

So six said yes. Three said no. Two said no strong view either way.

Some of the comments received stated that assuming you mean doing this in the issues report in line with the above comments, the objective is to lower the bar for raising an issue, i.e., a very bottom-up agenda setting, but have simple modalities to dismiss abusive requests should a topic be out of scope. Some independent process, not only ICANN stakeholder council, should provide an appeal mechanism in case of dispute regarding the scope.

And the second comment reads, requesters need to be encouraged to submit issues that are narrow and defined so the scope determination can be made.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Any questions on this one? I see Marilyn and then Philip.

>>MARILYN CADE: Jeff, I apologize for being out of the room earlier. I had an unfortunate conflict. But I just want to catch up on this point.

The topic that I want to ask is, you know, let's say that an item comes up that actually will involve not a single SO but multiple SOs. If there's no way to raise it within the Supporting Organization -- and I could think of it as a security and stability issue and will affect both CC's and gTLDs. So if there is no way to raise it in the policy council, there would be, I think, no way to even initiate the cross-SO conversation.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry. You're talking about raising --

>>MARILYN CADE: So if we don't allow an issue to come forward for at least discussion.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I think this question is should there be an assessment as to whether it's in scope or not.

>>MARILYN CADE: I know, I know.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: But it is not necessarily saying that the issue shouldn't be brought forward.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: I think where the issue came from -- because currently that assessment is only carried out as part of the issues report, so whether it's within ICANN's mission. And the question was related -- I think Marilyn is basically asking another question, how do you -- well may be related. But if the GNSO Council can only look at or address issues that are within ICANN's mission and just only link to gTLDs, how can you then get issues on the agenda that are not only linked to gTLDs?

>>MARILYN CADE: Yes, that's exactly it.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah, Margie.

>>MARGIE MILAM: I don't think that the scope issue is that narrow. If -- in your example, if it had no applicability to gTLDs, then you're right. But if it has applicability to ccTLDs and gTLDs, then I think it is still within GNSO scope. That's how I look at that.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Philip was next.

>>PHILIP SHEPPARD: Thanks. It is interesting you have done this survey, I think, because it exposes misunderstanding of the original

intent of our current policy development process, and I think at least understanding where there is misconception is very useful.

But if we look at certainly what the intent was in the policy development process, which is pretty well captured by its current writing, it's fairly clear. The idea was that there were three groups within it makes sense: the board, council and advisory committees, who might have some sort of idea, however wacky it may be. Here is something that council should address. And the idea was that should be able to be raised with a fairly low bar.

And then you had this process called the issues report whereby it is duly assessed as to whether or not it goes any further. That's exactly where the scope issue hits.

The point of that process was that it may not be clear to the people first thinking it is a possible issue as to precisely whether or not it is scope, et cetera. And expertise about that must rest with staff to do the evaluation. That was the nature of the issues report.

Now, I think what has happened over time is that the nature and complexity of the issues report as interpreted by staff has perhaps been wider than the thinking of those who originally constructed the PDP. And if that's the case, I think it's a question of how we look at the implementation of the issues report. Maybe staging it in terms of the scope issues can be up front as sort of a first pass and go no further, if that's -- if it is out of scope.

But, I mean, the main construct behind it, which is, is it something we might need to talk about and now we do a good check, I think, is a very strong part of the existing PDP and a very useful part of it that we don't want to lose.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I don't know if we read the comments on this question. Did you want to read some of them? I can't remember if we did.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: I think we already did.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: We did on this one?

>>MARIKA KONINGS: I think so.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Sorry, forgetting.

So then the next question is should the requester identify the desired goal or outcome of a PDP? Again, this was the relation of whether it should be something that's a consensus policy or best practices or policy framework or any of those items. And do you want to go over that?

>>MARIKA KONINGS: It is a 7-2-2. And there were quite some comments in relation to this one.

First person saying possibly if this can be done without biasing the participants of the working group and it could identify desired outcomes that are beyond ICANN's remit and are impractical to implement.

Second one says, and define what problem a PDP is designed to resolve.

Third one says, yes, to the extent that it can be determined. Sometime it might just be there is an issue here that needs to be looked at.

Fourth person says, yes but this should not be binding. The purpose is to help actors evaluate what is the expected amplitude of the issue. In that respect, a clear typology of outcomes, guidelines, consensus policy, decision and general policy are four possible categories, would be helpful.

And the last comment stated requesters should be encouraged to identify their desired goal outcome. Otherwise, the community could be overburdened with multiple policy initiatives that barely meet the threshold requirements to get started but don't have widespread support and will be seen as a waste of time.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Any questions or comments on that? Alan?

>>ALAN GREENBERG: I find that one quite interesting actually because on the last issues report I did, we included hoped-for outcomes and were severely criticized by a whole bunch of people to say that's not an inner request for an issues report. You are not supposed to be predicting the results.

And, yet, I found in the discussions, it focused a lot of the discussions on what the issues were and to understand what the problem was. So I like that outcome.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: I'm sorry. Mike?

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: For me, you are really prejudging what the outcome should be if you are doing that. Bottom line is we always have a range of potential outcomes that there can be from consensus policy to best practices to whatever. We've outlined them before, and we have a beautiful slide, I think, with them. That answer should always be the same to that question, and you shouldn't prejudge which one until the working group has done its job.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. I see Marilyn makes a face as she wants to say something.

>>MARILYN CADE: I want to see if I understand this. If you're requesting an issues report, that is probably because you've done a lot of research on an issue, you're affected by an issue. So, you know, I'm not sure that I understand why you would not have the option of identifying the desired goal.

I would also, however, assume this is the requester. This is not the person that drafts the issues report. So I think there is a difference here between "I request an issues report" -- and I'll go back to an issues report that I've requested many, many years ago on transfers. Clearly there had been -- there was a cross-discussion between competitive registrars and the business community and ISPs and the desired goal was an established transfers policy that was clear and articulated and had recourse.

Now, that's not to say that the issues report identified that, but the request and the justification for moving ahead with an issues report, I would think, does have to identify what the desired goal is. The issues report is supposed to be neutral, but I think that's different than request.

So I'm kind of feeling like I don't -- I don't understand why the request would not identify a desired goal, not to say that the council approves that as a goal.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. I know I saw -- Okay. Alan and then Mike.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: I will let Mike.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Just continuing on, I should have been more clear. I'm not saying they should be discouraged from doing it. I'm saying it should not be required because, for example, with the fast flux working group, when I got that issues report going -- request going, I really had no idea how it ought to come out. I just knew it was a big problem that probably was within the scope of ICANN's mission to address and was able at least to convince enough councillors of that, that we got it going. But, honestly, had no idea how it should have come out at that time.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Let me go to Tim and then Alan. Sorry about that.

>>TIM RUIZ: I think, too, it depends how you define "goal." I mean, if you're going to say, "Well, we want an issues report on transfers," that's pretty difficult to deal with. I mean, what's the problem statement? What is it that you're trying to solve?

I think just in the request for the report, defining what you see as a problem or what the issue is in itself implies that there is some goal. The goal is to fix the issue. And so I think that in a broader sense, you know, a goal should always be a part of it.

Whether or not there should be detailed response about how that issue or how that problem should be solved is a different question, and I could see where there might be cases where that might be included but it doesn't necessarily have to be.

But I think just a properly framed statement or a properly framed request for an issues report would in itself imply some goal. If it doesn't, then it is very difficult to act on.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Alan?

>>ALAN GREENBERG: I support what the last two statements were. I don't think this should be required. There is certainly going to be issues where you know there is a problem and you know we need a lot of discussion and investigation but you can't predict what the outcome is.

There are others where the requester can predict an acceptable outcome that would satisfy them. That may not be what comes out of the PDP. If we look at the domain tasting one, what came out was not what we envisioned when we went into it. But I think most parties were happy with it, and that's fine. That's what the process is about.

But if you do have some projected outcomes, then that helps to focus on what the problem is. And I think we certainly shouldn't forbid it.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Bertrand?

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: I would like to determine a term that had been used previously and in one of the questions, which is "flexibility" because the key -- the key question is how aware are people of the actual issue, the dimensions of the issue, the proper solution or so before launching this whole process? The initial part is actually a cleaning of the issue.

If -- in general terms, the community is very aware that there is a problem. If the basic assumptions are relatively well-known, then the initial part will focus on what is the expected time frame? Is there an urgency of sorts? How are we going to compose the working group and, basically, do we agree on the goal? Like, what is the policy that should come out of it?

If, on the other hand, it is a very tricky issue, people are not very aware that it's important, it's obvious that the initial phase will focus much more on additional information, issue scoping. And so in one case, it's possible to go very far in the request saying basically based on what we know, it's likely that the solution might be this but it is not binding and it is certainly not a necessary part of the request.

In other cases, people will say, we sense there is a problem here and

the initial phase should highlight the problem and what should be done about it and whether it should be addressed at all or not.

So flexibility in here is the main criteria, whether at the same time the desire is to go as fast as possible when a certain number of previous elements had been clear before.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Any comments? James back there has got a comment.

>>JAMES BLADEL: Is that on?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: It is.

>>JAMES BLADEL: Forgive me. I don't know if I fell into the purple or not. But it may have been a question of me not reading the language of this particular survey item correctly. But just to kind of build on what Mike was saying, I also had the fast flux working group experience in mind when this came up.

And I was thinking if a requester identifies a goal early on, a lot of folks can join a working group and that is kind of a first to occupy that particular issue in sort of a stated goal. And it can have a lot of staying power even if during the course of the working group's deliberations other legitimate uses come out or other types -- we find out the issue is much more complex. We keep circling back to this stated goal that was laid out initially which may or may not have any relevance anymore to the outcome of the PDP.

It just seemed to be this kind of ball and chain around the work of the working group that maybe should have been separated earlier and moved on and could have sped up the entire process. I think -- I just wanted to get that in for the purple.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Any comments on that? All right. Jumping on to the next one.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: The next one was actually an open question so I didn't put up here but I can quickly go through it.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Not too quick because they have to transcribe.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: I will try to be slow. Next question is what actions are needed in order to ensure precise and narrow definition of an issue? And nine people provided some input on that one.

First one stated providing issue-related information as comprehensive as possible. Squeeze the initiator for providing information. Set criteria against which you can question.

Understand appropriate role of ICANN and organizations within the

ICANN community in effecting an issue.

Early and frequent consultation between affected parties.

I don't think we can prescribe this. It will vary from case to case.

At the issues report level, policy staff should be able to ask clarifying questions. The question may not be narrow -- may not be a narrow definition but rather an agreed concise formulation that encompasses the different dimensions of the issue.

If the purpose -- if it is the purpose of the very initial stage is to help participants to define issues of common concern or interest and agreed goals, i.e., the purpose of the PDP, in many cases the problem is not the absence of a narrow definition of the issue but the lack of clarity requiring the different dimensions and the actual objective pursuit.

And one person said "to be decided." There is no one-size-fits-all answer to this question, but it seems likely that a more robust definition will be developed if more than one vocal persuasive council is driving the issue.

There need not be a precise or narrow definition of an issue. And a last comment refers to workshops, templates, birds of a feather and community discussion as examples.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Obviously an open-ended question got a lot of different types of answers. I think it's helpful, though, and glad people responded with good substance.

The next question we asked was should an initial assessment be foreseen whether GNSO policy development is the appropriate response to an issue raised or whether other alternatives are deemed more efficient to achieve the desired outcome? This was pretty split between those that say yes or no opinion or no strong view either way or -- or no by itself.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: It was five yes, two no's and four no strong view either way. And some of the comments stated: Are there examples for alternatives? The assessment is just a recommendation. It might be useful as long as it's not binding on the council. The policy development process can actually cover a broad range of issues and outcomes. It is part of the issue assessment, i.e., preliminary phase to verify collectively that the issue is indeed important, that there is an agreed goal and the nature of the desired outcome.

This should be reported in the staff-produced recommendation at the end of the preliminary phase.

We should avoid multiplying ex ante checks and base the process on

the assumption that people will use it fairly.

This may not need to be a requirement, but it seems folly to forge ahead with PDPs that are deemed largely out of scope by staff and don't have widespread support at the council level, i.e, fast flux. Better to develop more knowledge first and make a better informed decision whether the issue really lends itself to policy work.

Policy development can have multiple outcomes so it does not need to be restricted.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: One of the first comments to that I thought was interesting. It was just a question. It says, Are there other alternatives? So maybe we could talk about that for a second. Are there any other alternatives? There is an issue brought up and the assessment is whether GNSO policy development is the appropriate response to the issue raised or whether all alternatives are deemed more efficient. The question was, what are other alternatives? And do people have a thought on that? What were they thinking when they were responding to this? So, Alan.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: I haven't responded yes. Those aren't mine. I think the answer to that depends on who it is doing the requesting. I mean, an advisory council has the ability to advise the board to do something. The board may, I guess, initiate a GNSO PDP at that point.

But the GNSO itself has other mechanisms that it has used on occasion, writing letters to various bodies, the board or other groups are included. So I would have thought that's almost a given, that whoever is initiating it is looking at what tools are at their disposal and deciding whether this was the right tool to use in this particular case or not. I sort of take it as a given.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Does anyone that responded to this want to have a comment for that? I mean, are there people that bring up an issue -- I guess Mike, you brought up the Fast Flux one.

When you were initially assessing that problem and bringing it up, did you think that there were other vehicles within ICANN that you could have used, as opposed to bringing it up through the GNSO or...

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Well, SSAC had already issued an advisory at that point, so no.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Trying to draw out some conversation. So if it wasn't through GN -- so it was your view that if it wasn't through GNSO, it wouldn't be handled at all or that it was --

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Well, it wouldn't be handled by ICANN at all. I mean SSAC had done their job. They came out and they said, "This is a problem" and they actually suggested that we do something about that,

and so I acted on that.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. And Tim?

>>TIM RUIZ: It -- the question was is there -- should an initial assessment be foreseen. I guess I'm just trying to understand what was meant there. You know, who would do the assessment. Is that the requester? Foreseeing an assessment? Or is that the GNSO or the staff or...

>>MARIKA KONINGS: I guess that will be the next question.

>>TIM RUIZ: I mean, did -- sorry, Mike. Just quickly, I think, you know, it's an interesting question. I think in my mind, it kind of relates back to the question about, you know, the -- you know, should there be an initial assessment of scope, you know, or those kinds of things that I think help to inform the council as they're looking at these different issues from a -- from a -- just an ability -- the ability to properly prioritize their work or to be able to, you know, focus, look at the resources available, whatever it might be.

So I think, you know, all that's valuable, but of course, you know, who -- who's going to do that assessment I guess would be the question.

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Well, I mean, I would say just inherently, every councillor has to make that assessment when they decide how to vote. Every constituency has to make that assessment when they instruct their councillors how to vote. Just it's inherent in the process.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Philip?

>>PHILIP SHEPPARD: I think actually this was a very interesting question to have asked. And in many other processes, I mean, when you're looking at doing work, you -- you ask the same thing: Are there different alternative ways of achieving the same outcome.

It strikes me that, I mean, if we look at the existing content of an issues report, there are five things which the staff managers are required at the moment to include within that. I think it strikes me that maybe adding this -- the idea of a sixth, which would simply be "Are there alternative means to achieving this," as a natural part of this process, which could simply be a, you know, "no" followed by two lines, "this seems to be the only way," or "yes," and a paragraph to follow, would be a useful part of the issues report.

Now, sometimes it's going to be easier to do than others, and if there's complexity, fine, that can just simply be indicated. We don't need to, in my mind, imply a lot of extra work to do that, but I think simply addressing the question is part of what you get back in the issues report would be quite useful. So again, it's asking the staff manager, to my mind, would be part of the way you would -- you would

implement that, if it's felt desirable. Personally, I do.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thank you, Philip. Anybody else with comments on that? Bertrand?

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Yeah. Just a quick comment.

Actually, I think there was a remark by somebody regarding not multiplying the prerequisites or the preliminary evaluation before the preliminary evaluation and so on.

I think what we're listing, all the discussions we have here and all the questions that we ask, are basically the equivalent of a checklist for the preliminary phase, and so it should be the things that should normally come into the discussion during the preliminary phase, like if there is anybody who thinks that there is another way to do this than a PDP, this should be part of the discussion, like, "Hello! Why don't we use another process." And so it should be recorded, taken into account in the issues paper, or whatever.

So I think what this question means is that it is part of the range of issues that have to be taken into account, rather than a separate process that is a sub, sub, sub, subpart of a preliminary process to judge whether we should launch a PDP or not.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Thank you. I think you're right. I think a lot of these are -- these topics have all come up in one way or another during our calls, and, you know, we're trying to assess, you know, what the group's view is on these things. And you're right, it -- what we're getting out of it is a checklist or at least people's thoughts on the checklist. Again, not necessarily a required element to be filled in in the checklist but certainly helpful elements or that some feel would be helpful to have, and so you're kind of following the questions right, I think.

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: If I may make an additional comment. We might have here an illustration of the distinction between the categories that I was -- that we were discussing before, because the whole process is a framework. What we have here is the equivalent maybe of guidelines. This whole checklist is very close to the birds of a feather document that was presented. Like it could be a document that is for the benefit of working group -- sorry, of the initiators and managers of the initial process saying basically when you discuss this issue, keep in mind the following list of questions to guide your discussion, period. Which is very different from having it as a formal framework that says, "You need to have first a discussion and a decision and a vote within your group on Question B slash 73C or whatever."

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Right. And once we come out with the checklist, then we'll ask the question, again, as to whether the group feels any of

these elements should be mandatory or not. You know, that's a time that you could reask the same question. And the answer may be: No, none of them should be.

But we'll reask the question at that point.

Anybody else with a comment on this one? Alan?

>>ALAN GREENBERG: Just a very quick one. I think the wording "a checklist" I think is very helpful to give people who are new in this process -- there's a lot of turnover in ICANN, and to give them an idea of what is expected and the questions they should be asking I think is very useful.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. All right. The current requirements for the content of an issues report are predefined by the bylaws. Are they -- are the current elements still relevant?

And this one -- I saw Alan just shrug his shoulders. Maybe that's the general view of -- there was no strong view either way. It seemed to take the -- take the cake on this one.

Do you -- so the comments here would be helpful.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. So someone suggested that another template is necessary for this, so it can be populated with relevant information and a checklist for completion should also be included along with a proposed time line.

As indicated previously, there should be a distinction between initial issue papers -- two to three pages -- and staff-produced recommendations in a Secretariat function regarding the launch of an actual PDP.

The content of these documents is too precise a level of detail to be in the bylaws.

And the last comment stated, "It will depend on the outcome of the discussions regarding the pre-request phase."

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Any questions on this one? Nope?

Okay. Is an issues report still the desired outcome of the planning/initiation phase?

And the answer here was pretty strong --

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. 8 yes, 1 no, and 2 no strong view either way. So some of the comments going with that...

As mentioned above, the outcome of the initial preliminary phase

should be a recommendation drafted by participants in the initial phase with the support of staff as Secretariat that describes the next steps proposed and the rationale for it.

Concision is key here and the format should be somehow a draft resolution for the council to adopt as-is unless it objects according to an agreed procedure.

Council should be a validator, not the decision shaper.

A report is likely the outcome of the planning and initiation phase, but whether this is called an issues report and whether this is a staff-only report should be further discussed.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Any comments? Is the person who made the -- the last comment -- what was the -- can you say that again? I'm just trying to digest that one.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: I think that was staff. Basically, we feel that probably a report will still be the outcome of this phase. That, you know, outlines different views, information found, findings of a workshop. You know, if there's a decision to have a public comment period or request the opinion of constituencies, we think that a report will still be the product that will be sent to the council for consideration, but whether we call that an issues report or whether it's only compiled by staff or by others, that seems to be still open for -- for discussion.

But, you know, I don't want to speak for the rest, but I do think that indeed some of the detail that is currently in the bylaws shouldn't be there, and probably should be in a separate document, and again maybe have some kind of, you know, template for what kind of categories you might want to include. I mean, maybe the issue is the recommendation of staff might be a requirement that you leave in the bylaws, but some guidance might be helpful of what other kinds of information are deemed useful for the council to take an informed decision.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Any questions or comments on that one? I see Alan's got a puzzled look.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think it's a comment on this one, but it strikes me as we've been talking about it that the -- what we're calling the issues report is always we toss something over the wall at staff and 15 days later or 30 days later or the agreed-upon time they toss it back.

[Laughter]

>>ALAN GREENBERG: And I've gotten the impression, as we look at this more and more, that there should be a little bit -- we should (a) allow

enough time and there should be perhaps a little bit of iteration in the process, because there are cases where things just get missed, and it's locked in the issues report forever, and there's no opportunity to refine it.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: And I think we need, somewhere along the process, some iteration to see a draft, at least to pass it back to the people who made the original request, "Are we answering your question?"

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. And one thing that I would strongly advocate is indeed that there's an opportunity for the community not to maybe comment on the recommendations or, you know, challenge certain findings, but be able to make factual corrections. Because indeed as you said, you know, in 15 days, it's a deadline, it gets published, and that's it. I mean, yes, we can put out, you know, an updated version, but it would be really helpful if we can, you know, put it out saying, "This is the preliminary report. Can you just check to make sure that we've covered all the information? Is there any key, you know, information or data that we've missed that we didn't see that you think needs to be included"; that indeed there is this possibility to say, "Okay, and here's the final one. We've made the correction. You know, it's not intended to be already a discussion on whether to initiate or, you know, how to address the issues, but just any of the factual -- is the information correct."

>>ALAN GREENBERG: I think bottom line, between staff and volunteers, an immense amount of effort goes into the PDP process from its very early pre-initiation stages through whatever ends up coming out, and it would be nice to -- if we had some level of comfort that's really addressing the issue that was raised, and I -- I think -- believe there are cases where there has not been the case because of things along the way.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Bertrand, did you --

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Yeah. I think there are two -- the discussions on the -- on that issue were very interesting in the group, and indeed the question of the responsibility -- the respective responsibilities of staff and whatever group can help draft the outcome is important.

The second thing is, during the discussion, we raised the fact that there was probably a beginning and an end that could be formalized by different types of documents, and that the initial phase can be either very short, if it is a simple, very well-known issue that people really want to address quickly, or can be more lengthy if it is an issue that really has to be dealt with in detail.

I think the main outcome of the discussion on the PDP was to

highlight the incredible importance of the preliminary stages, and my experience in the little time that I've spent in ICANN in the last three years is that there is a big danger in the rush into the process.

Like the preliminary stage is done very quickly, and say, "Yeah, we need a PDP," and then -- Bing -- the whole shebang comes in and it lasts for ages because in many cases, as mentioned before, the scoping of the issue or the understanding of what is at stake and sometimes just the formulation of the problem, like working tirelessly at the beginning to formulate the problem in a way that encompasses all the interests of the different actors, is sometimes more important than six months of work later down the road.

So I would highlight in this respect that the preliminary phase has two critical elements slash dangers. The first one is the entry bar, which is the agenda-setting, whether you can easily bring an issue in. The more preliminary checks, the harder it is for an emerging issue to be coming up early enough.

The second danger is closing it too quickly and rushing into the PDP.

So flexibility in having additional discussion, maybe create an informal group to discuss the issue and have pre-fined the report is sometimes a good way to launch the PDP only when people are really ready to do it.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: So let me ask a question of, I guess, Alan and Mike as being two of the people in this room that have requested the issues report, and without putting you on the spot too much, have there been instances where either of you have wanted more involvement in the issues report or have not necessarily been happy with the way the issues report came out --

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Can I, after that, comment as well?

>>JEFF NEUMAN: And then I'll turn to staff to also comment to say whether they wish the two were involved.

So is there any comments or thoughts you guys have on that, or are you okay with the way the issues report turned out?

So Mike?

>>MIKE RODENBAUGH: Well, I wasn't asked for help during the process. Had I been asked, I certainly would have -- would have given some, I'm sure. But then again, you know, if I get to help, then why shouldn't eight other people get to help in the process, so that becomes really unwieldy. Then you've got a drafting team, you don't have staff working on a report.

So -- but clearly I was not happy with the way that issues report

came out, but for another reason. It was because staff, you know, made a firm recommendation that they didn't think a PDP should go forward at that time, that other work should go forward, and that created tension between staff and a subset of the council. A majority of the council members, actually, as I recall.

And, you know, that -- that's another issue which we can talk about, which we'll talk about later, so I don't need to belabor that point, but --

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Let me go to Alan, and then I see Kristina, and then I want to hear Marika as well. So Alan?

>>ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I've only been involved in two, and one of them, I think, worked out just the way I was hoping, and the other one, there were some problems, and if we were to do it over again, I would do my best to try to make sure the outcome was a little bit different. So...

>>JEFF NEUMAN: So what were the good things? We'll start with that. So when you say --

>>ALAN GREENBERG: Well, the good things are the issues report, I think, addressed the question, confirmed that there was a problem, confirmed that there were a number of possible solutions. And, you know, that was the one on domain tasting.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Right.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: The one on post-expiry -- expiration domain recovery, there was one major problem with it, and I think if there had been some iteration, it would have been addressed properly, and because it wasn't, it remains to be seen just how successful the process is going to be.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: Hopefully we'll cover from that, with you there are -- you know, there are issues which should have been different.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Let me go to Kristina, and then to Marika.

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: I just had a suggestion slash request that I think would be helpful on several levels with regards to issues reports, and that would be for staff to prepare and include, at the end, just a list of, you know, references consulted or factual information relied upon. And I think that would accomplish several goals.

First, it would help those reading the issues report understand -- just to know what factual information staff had access to and what they

relied upon. And to the extent that there may have been inverted omission simply because staff didn't have access to particular information, that would be a way to highlight that.

Second, I think it would allow people to understand, in many cases, how staff got to where they got to in terms of their recommendation.

And finally, I think it would serve as a really useful starting point for if the issue then goes forward, whether it's to a working group or a drafting team or whatever, and there may be people who are interested in the issue but don't have the same factual background in it, this would be a really good kind of source list for them to go to, so that they can become -- get as up to speed as everybody else, so that when you start the work, everybody has the same basic factual underpinning, so you're not having to play catch-up all the time, which I have found can really slow the process down.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Let me go to Marika and then I'll go back to Alan.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. No, just a comment on Kristina's point. I think it's a really good idea. I mean, the only issue is that sometimes it's really difficult to actually find sources and it often comes back to talking internally or getting experiences and coming back as well to a point that Mike made, it's for us sometimes really a challenge indeed when we research or write the issues report that we cannot go back to one person and ask questions, because we should do -- do it then to everyone.

So often indeed we operate in a -- in a silo, and say, "Okay, well, those questions will come at a later stage," because we don't want to see either as talking to one person for information and then not the other. So that's -- you know, that's one of the challenges and I think why we really see a need for more discussion and information at those beginning stages.

And just a comment on, you know, the experiences with how the requests for issues reports have been received.

I mean, you know, with the ALAC, that experience was really good because they actually came to us before with they submitted the request, so we actually had some time to try to understand what the issue actually was and really try to get as much information as possible out of them before, you know, the request was actually submitted and, you know, the clock started ticking. And that has been lacking on some of the other issues where they were, you know, without us knowing, put into the council, voted upon, and "Here are your 15 days," and that has proven to be really difficult. So even though you're not completely happy with what was in the issues report, from a staff perspective that was really helpful to try to understand what do you see as the issue and, you know, trying to focus as well so -- in

the issues report on digging into those specific questions. So...

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Alan and then Bertrand.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: One of the things that bothers me is that we're having these discussions and we use expressions like "if the problem is well understood," and we're assuming ICANN is a monolithic organization where everyone has the same knowledge, and that's far from the truth.

We can have issues that have been talked about at workshops and ad infinitum for the last two years, and there are other -- there are people in the community, often very knowledgeable senior people in the community, who are oblivious to the issues because it hasn't been something they've focused on.

So ICANN is not monolithic. Issues can be very well understood, but still a complete new game for half the people on council.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Let me go to Bertrand, and then see if we can go through a couple other questions.

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: One precision on the comment that you just made.

Did I understand correctly that in the face -- in the current mechanism, when a request for an issues report is being made, the staff is not supposed to have interactions with people? I mean --

>>MARIKA KONINGS: I don't think -- I mean, it's not an official rule but we -- you know, personally I would view that as a way that some might say you're being influenced. If I would only talk to Jeff on a certain issue but not to Alan and the community would find out, it's very easy then to say, oh, yeah, but then Jeff guided -- I can see that here.

There's no -- there's any official rule but -- and anyway, the 15 days don't allow for much --

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: This is exactly the point I want to make. The mechanism, I understand, and once again I'm discovering things as I go along, so apologies for the naive questions sometimes.

It really looks like what Alan was describing, like tossing an issue, then oops, nobody talks to anybody. Make sure that nobody talks to anybody! And then wait until the staff, in its wisdom, brings the answer that, yes, of course it's a very important issue or, no, it's not.

I mean, this cannot work.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Well --

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: I mean, excuse me, now I get the understanding why I see PDPs lasting for ages, because there is no interaction before the thing is launched.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: So what I'm hearing is to just to kind of summarize, what I'm hearing is that perhaps there is -- should be some sort of -- before the issues report is formally submitted to the council for a vote --

>>MARIKA KONINGS: The request even.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: -- that there -- well, at least at this stage --

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Uh-huh.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: -- that there should be some or -- there should be -- there maybe should be some mechanism that -- where there should be a review by those that brought up the issue to make sure the issues report captures exactly what was intended to be captured before the council actually votes as to go, "Okay, a working group should be launched" and develop your charter based on this issues report.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. Because one of the suggestions that we've made as well in our paper is, for example, for staff to be able to, you know, put out specific questions as part of -- a bit of a short public comment period, so we can actually get the information we need, you know, to really do a comprehensive issues report. And have more work done in workshops and discuss issues with the community to get as much information as possible to really indeed allow the council to make an informed decision and not on, you know, a sometimes limited 15-day phase in which you're trying to pull an issues report together.

Often on issues where there's very little public information available, so we're relying on, you know, experience from other staff members on these issues, you know, complaints that are being dealt with in compliance or services, just to, you know, try to build the issues report.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Let me go -- I'll go to Philip and then Kristina and then we have to actually end it, so let me go to Philip and then Kristina.

>>PHILIP SHEPPARD: Thanks, Jeff. I presume that the mentioned 15-day deadline is just historical interest because one of the things we'll be looking at is whether or not we want to amend that.

I think it's a very interesting discussion and I think it does underline some of the problems that's been here. Particularly hearing from staff the problems they're having in doing a staff task I think is very useful.

I mean, for me, one thing I think can be achieved by combining what we heard earlier in terms of Kristina's recommendation in terms of relevant sources, which to my mind would include "why not" you know, and "we had dialogue with, you know, this individual who is part of the group who made that request in the first place." That would be, to my mind, legitimate transparency in terms of explaining that. So that would help in terms of that interaction and the report naturally has that transparency, so we know that -- that that discussion took place.

And for me, it's an open question -- which is the other suggestion I think we heard -- about whether or not there should be this sort of, you know, preliminary issues report and then a short comment period just to make sure it captured things, and I'm not sure if that's necessary, if you have the other part of it, but I'm open to it. But I think that's -- I think we're getting close, I think, to quite a good process and I think as part of those suggestions we've heard so far.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks, Philip. Kristina?

>>KRISTINA ROSETTE: Philip just asked my question.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: There you go. And one last comment from Marika.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Yeah. One idea could be as well, when a request for an issues report is received, it could be an option as well that staff actually comes back yes, we can do this in 15 days, 30 days, no, we would strongly recommend that a workshop is held first because we feel there is not enough information available in the public domain or we would like to run a public comment period to solicit contributions. So that might be a way, as well, to facilitate this need in certain cases for more information. I mean, in some, we've been able to do it in 15 days where there's clear information available and it's, you know, very narrowly defined issues. Then, you know, it's sometimes possible.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. Well, I want to thank everyone. We're going to release the survey results to the entire --

>>MARIKA KONINGS: World.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: To the entire world. Well, at least to the PPSC, the whole PPSC, including the two work teams, just so everyone can see the results. Everything is public anyway. I mean, people can see it on the Wiki.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Just one question.

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Yes.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Do we allow for -- because I heard some, "I

actually didn't have a chance to fill it in." Do we --

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. That was to be my next -- I think we should keep it open.

>>MARIKA KONINGS: But then I cannot do the results yet, so --

>>JEFF NEUMAN: That's a good point.

Let's give a few more days to allow people -- like let's give another week. Or how long is it going to take you to compile the results?

>>MARIKA KONINGS: Well, give them at least another week. It probably wouldn't happen before I get back from Sydney, so --

>>JEFF NEUMAN: Right. So what I'm thinking is, we have our regular biweekly call, so which would probably be two Thursdays from the end of this meeting. So hopefully by then, we could have sent all the results to everyone out?

Okay. So we'll do that. There are a couple questions we didn't discuss, and maybe we'll finish them up on the next call that we have as a team, but I think this has been very helpful to kind of create the checklist, and then we will get into topic "B," which is the next phase, but I really want to thank everyone for filling out these forms and discussing it. I think these -- the discussions we've had here have been really helpful, and it's good to have so many people, so I really encourage those that are on my work team to maybe now that things will get a little bit less hectic, hopefully, to join in a couple weeks on our next call. Anybody have any closing remarks? Questions?

Well, I want to thank everyone, and I will see everyone around. Thank you.