

**ICANN  
Transcription  
GNSO Next Generation Registration Directory Services (RDS) Policy Development  
Process Working Group Call  
Wednesday, 20 2016 at 05:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at <http://audio.icann.org/gnsso/gnsso-nextgen-rds-20apr16-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnsso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#apr>

Woman: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Next Generation Registration Directory Services RDS Policy Development Process Working Group Call taking place on the 20th of April 2016.

In the interest of time today, there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. So if you are only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now?

Hearing no names, I would like to remind all of you to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this, I'll hand it back over to Chuck Gomes. Please begin.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much and welcome to our RDS PDP Working Group call today. Special thanks to all of you for calling in at a odd hour of the night or morning, whichever it is for you. That's much appreciated as always.

And we have taken roll call. Does anyone have any statement of interest that needs to be mentioned? If so, if there are any updates to those, would you raise your hand now? I see (Susan)'s hand up. So let's start with (Susan).

(Susan): Hi. I actually made this announcement on the GNSO call last week but have not gotten to my statement of interest -- it's been a little busy -- to update it on the ICANN Web site. I'll do that today. But (Facebook) acquired a registrar, so. Yes. That's it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Susan). Appreciate that. And like she said, she'll update that on her online statement of interest so you can all see the update on there once she gets that done.

Not seeing any other hands, let's go ahead and jump right into the second agenda item, which is to report from the small team. And before I get that started, let me thank all of you who have contributed so much in this effort. It's been really impressive for me and I'm sure for all of you. So thank you very, very much.

We have - we're just about wrapped up in the summaries it looks like. And some of the (feeds) have started on discussing some of the questions. And we'll get an update on that now.

I think if it's okay we will start with the Purpose Team and let (Susan) take the lead and then allow any others on the call from the Purpose Team to jump in and add to the report from that team on their work. So (Susan), could I turn it over to you?

(Susan): Sure Chuck. And I want to thank my team. I have, you know, it was - I have not sent things out to request out in that timely of matter but they've been working hard. And we've gotten some responses, which I think will lead to a discussion today.

We are so close to being done. There's just two more - a couple more documents and we're pinging those people. They're committed to being reviewed and it's just, you know, the day job gets in the way.

So hopefully we'll have those done in the next 48 hours. So all of the documents would be reviewed. But I sent out a couple of emails over the weekend asking for input on, you know, to decide on what are the most important documents and, you know, and provide rationale on why team members think that.

I gave a few examples of what I personally felt were very important documents but just so that the team would understand what we were looking for. And we received Susan Prosser, (Maryann) and (Tajabi) all provided a response and documents that they've chosen.

And unfortunately I just sent out an email like 20 minutes ago or 15 minutes ago asking if they would be open to discussing those today and speaking about why they made those choices.

So any of the three of you willing to tell us what documents you've chosen and why? I know I'm sort of putting you on the spot. Susan Prosser.

Susan Prosser: Good evening. Good morning. This is Susan with DomainTools. And the three or four -- I didn't look at my email but I identified three of the most relevant to what I understand are tasks to be, which is to identify purposes and reasons for use and access to the data was primarily the EWG recommendations.

I think the work and effort that they went through identify really very clearly a lot of the purposes behind the daily use. The - specifically the Section 3, the Annex C and Annex A identify and define those specific tasks.

Follow that by - and this isn't necessarily in order but I thought, you know, primarily EWG. The 2012 Policy Review Team, which helps bring to light somewhat the CWG work was behind. The fact verifies the (size) (alignment); also identified clearly within their document reasons and purposes behind use of the data for security and for technical issues and things like that.

And then although somewhat older, the 2007 GAC communique; it does have documented in their communications identification of what they see for purposeful uses of the data as well. And so I thought that it's nearly ten years old but it's still is relevant and probably help support our uses.

And I know you had a - had suggested the RAA (Susan) and in hindsight I probably should have added that too was well because it clearly defines specific use by the registrars and things like that that they need for domain management and things like that. So those are what I would say help define our uses most for purposes behind the data.

(Susan): Yes. I mean you and I were sort of - had similar documents I think are...

Susan Prosser: Yes.

(Susan): ...dead on. And so obviously I would agree with you.

Susan Prosser: I think I - I brought in the GAC and I think I actually agreed with one of the other individuals who suggested that as well, so. But did you have any questions about what I suggested or...

(Susan): I don't.

Susan Prosser: ...(unintelligible) anybody else...

((Crosstalk))

Susan Prosser: The one thing I do want to know - sorry Susan. I keep on cutting you off. That the - quite a few of the other communications of the documents were very supportive in content about (meeting) purpose Susan and purpose details. But they didn't exactly define what the purposes were, which is why I only identified these that were specifically clearly identifying the purposes behind use of the data.

Other ones are very clear about we need protection and we need purpose driven information but not necessarily define what those purposes were. The Article 29 WP76 -- let me look at my email again; yes -- was pretty good about it.

I think (Fab) actually analyzed that paper. But it didn't specifically outline the purposes. I didn't identify that although I think it's a very supportive document on a tertiary basis, so.

(Susan): Good. So we have a list of documents that, you know, that you can start with at least. Well, we have all of the documents but. What was interesting in the three emails that we received there was - there's definitely overlap, which is good. Any other comments Susan?

Susan Prosser: No. And I actually did read - I don't know why I felt like I had a lot of extra time on my hands but for some reason over the weekend (and there) where I actually read most of the articles and a lot of the communique or a lot of the email responses back and forth.

And like I said, a lot of the interesting information around in support of purposeful data but not necessarily definitive about what the purpose and what the definitions of purposes were. Just good support around it.

(Susan): Okay. That's good to note too then. Okay. Then we're going to move onto (Tajabi). Did you - would you like to tell everybody the articles you picked?

Chuck Gomes: (Tajabi), if you're speaking we cannot hear you, so you may be on mute. Still not hearing anything. Okay. (Tajabi), if you can - okay, good. I see you're typing in the chat. So we've got an issue with the mic. While we're trying to get that resolved - this is Chuck speaking.

While we're trying to get that resolved, one of the things I'd like the Purpose Team to be thinking about, and I'll come back to all three of the teams later in the call when we get to next steps, is whether in the next week - okay. Well let me stop. It looks like (Tajabi) may be able to speak now. And I'd rather just go to him. (Tajabi), go ahead.

(Tajabi): Can you hear me now?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

(Tajabi): Okay. Excellent. Thank you very much. I just wanted to say that I definitely agree with all that's said about the work (we are purposing) now, the five articles. I just wanted to add that in my assessment I also included another article, which is the Article 29 Working Party Opinion from 2013, Number 3, which is about purpose limitation; perhaps a bit different from the other articles that were already mentioned.

This is not an article that really states different purposes that could be considered for our process but it mainly explains how you define a purpose of course in the context of personal data protection. But I think it will be very useful for us to also consider how the Article 29 Working Party defines what a purpose can be, how you should define it, how precise it should be.

I think that would be really useful, as it would also contribute to our work taking into the account the reason being compliant with European data protection law. Thank you.

(Susan): Thank you (Tajabi). And then is (Maryann) on the line? I don't see - so I'll just read from her email that she submitted to the subteam. She would - she said I would list the following inputs as most helpful.

Whois Policy Review Team final report 2012; SAC55, excuse me, Whois Blind Men and an Elephant, September 2012; EWG Recommendations for Next Generation RDS; GAC Communique regarding Whois 2007 through 2015; and Article 29 Working Party on ICANN Procedures for Handling Whois Conflicts With Privacy Law 2007.

And she says, as (Tajabi) mentioned, some of these documents are both useful and exhaustive and in my opinion represent a comprehensive basis for the upcoming decisions, discussions in our PDP.

So between those three individuals on the subteam, it looks like we definitely have some consensus growing on the documents that are most important. Of course that doesn't mean that we can't - we won't consider all documents. But it does give us sort of a point of view to the rest of the working group focus on those as the most important. So is there anything else Chuck you would like to hear from us?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Susan) and thanks team. The - I see that Stephanie has a hand up so let's let her jump in.

(Susan): Oh, sorry Stephanie. Yes, please.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. And apologies for getting the summary of that Article 29 opinion that (Tajabi) just mentioned in so late. It just arrived. And we discussed the issues of competition between the two lists, the purpose folks and the privacy folks.

There is another opinion of the Article 29 Working Party. It's a 2014 opinion that I am working on -- summary will arrive shortly -- that discusses the legitimate interest of the data controller.

And this basically provides the balancing test that has been discussed both in the Article 29 group letters and indeed by the GAC in terms of how you balance the interest of ICANN as the data controller and the, you know, the individual registries. Sorry to be so slow. It's 1 o'clock and I'm not so good at 1:00.

But those two will be on my list when I send you my list. And I think we should think about cross-referencing back and forth between all three lists when we come up with the five because sometimes you need one to interpret the other. Thanks.

(Susan): Thanks Stephanie. Any other subteam members that would like to let us know what their top documents are or any comments from the whole working group?

Chuck Gomes: Okay. This is Chuck. Thanks to all of you for the contributions. A question I'm going to come back to you team as well as the other two teams when we get to Step 3 of the agenda would be is it possible in - before our next meeting depending on what we schedule for our next meeting - that may change too.

But anyway in the next week to kind of try and reach some sort of a consensus - rough - very rough consensus. Don't - I'm not suggesting to get real precise and formal but (consensus) that I'm talking about agreeing on a list of the most important documents. And it can be more than the four or five, that's okay. But really help the rest of the working group do that.

And then the second question I want you to think about - I don't know if this is real (uptake) or not that I don't want to be overly prescriptive but would it be possible because I note that some of the summaries are quite long even in



themselves and that's understandable considering how long some of these documents are. So I fully get that.

But would it be possible, and this is what I want you to be thinking about, to pull out some very short bullet points in terms of the main value and points made in these documents from the summaries probably starting with the person who did the summary because we don't want to - I don't want to suggest others doing that for them. But think about that. We'll come back and maybe talk about that briefly later in the agenda.

Let's go now to the Data Team and let me turn it over to Michele. And Michele and I'm going to give you the same freedom that I gave (Susan) in terms of I'll let you manage the queue on this. And you can take it away.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck. Michele for the record and everybody else. Good morning everybody. Sorry. Saturday mornings don't work very well for my voice or for much else about me.

Okay. So with respect to the data group, we - I also circulated the same kind of email and a couple of people came back suggesting some of the - some of the documents that they thought were the most - were the most pertinent.

And one of the things - well, two things that's within the data group that we've been discussing backwards and forwards quite a bit is that the lines between data and privacy and data and purpose aren't as clear as - aren't terribly clear at times.

So I mean while some documents might be more privacy related than anything else that they obviously have an impact on data. They same when we're talking about other documents being more about purpose. It also has an impact on data because data is always going to be there.

The - a couple of people of course have raised the issue around European data protection legislation, which is, as we all know, a moving target. It's all been a moving target but more particularly so in the last few weeks.

So just going back to emails and things like that, Holly is on the call, which is fantastic because I think it's her afternoon.

Holly Raiche: Yes.

Michele Neylon: So as she's more awake than I am, I'm going to call on you in a second Holly. Unfortunately a couple of the other people who might have been great candidates to talk about things this morning actually aren't on the call. But if anybody feels like they should pipe - want to pipe up, they can.

Sorry. So in terms of where we're at with summarizing the data, I think we're very close to done. I mean if there's anything pending at this stage, it's minimal. So I think I'll just - I'll hand over to Holly since she's more awake than I am. Holly, could you actually talk a little bit about what the documents that you thought were particularly pertinent?

Holly Raiche: Thank you Michele. Holly Raiche for the record. And yes it's 3 o'clock in the afternoon. Fabulous. The ones I think - and there is something to overlap here. The ones I thought were perhaps most useful that have been said before and I'll say them again.

The Whois Task Force, the 2007 report; the RAA Data Retention Specification document; the SAC54 and I note that (Jim) is on the call so he can - he can talk about that too and probably far better than I since that's his document; the - then the EWG Recommendations.

We had one of our (contributors) went through and very carefully summarized. A lot (assume) that report is really valuable and along with the materials, the EWG tutorials and the FAQ.

And the reason from my perspective as to why I found those most important - our group is supposed to be just identifying (unintelligible) of data that actually is being collected for whatever use.

And those documents together give a really thorough look at all of the information that is being collected, what it's being used for, which will lead to but is not necessarily the same thing as purpose. And I think that's where we have to start. So I guess that's my summary Michele. Thank you.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Holly. And I think it's wonderful we should get you to lead more of these conversations when we have calls this time of day. And the caffeine is slowly but surely kicking in for me over here.

Also (unintelligible) a couple of the other members of the group are on the call now. I'm just looking at who just logged in. (Sarah), do you have any thoughts or (Richard)? No. Maybe. Well I'm calling on people randomly but earlier in the morning or late at night depending which way you all look at it. Okay. (Sarah) isn't ready at the moment and (Richard) probably in a similar situation to me.

Okay then. The other question of course I think a lot of people have had is, you know, what are the next steps, where are we going to go with things. And just to, you know, as (Lisa) pointed out on our list, the fact that some of these things are still evolving or still moving, it's something we need to be conscious of but shouldn't be something that we need to worry too much about at this juncture.

I mean if we're - if you go back to the overall work plan for the PDP, there are different phases. And, you know, when we get to - get further down along into like Phase 2, that's when we can go back and read this - some of these points to see where they've moved to.

I'm talking about things. I'm talking about, you know, the registration, the regulations around data privacy and things like that. I think that's pretty much where we're at Chuck. So I'll hand it back to you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Michele and again to the whole team for the great work. And I want you to be for a little bit later in the call be thinking about - you and your team thinking about the two questions I asked after the Purpose Team; i.e., can you, you know, might it be possible on - especially on some of the documents that you deem to be more - particularly important whether or not it might be able to have the author of the summary list some key points in a brief bullet form. It would make it really accessible.

Now when I'm suggesting that, I'm not suggesting that we restrict ourselves to the bullet points when we get into our deliberation; not at all. But we will be relying on especially those on the teams and in particular those who did do the summaries to help bring things to our attention from those documents as we're doing our deliberation even in more detail. But the bullet points would help - possibly if it's doable help us highlight some really key things as a group.

Also I want to emphasize that we're - we've asked each team to list the documents they think are most important and I think that will help us zero in early on on the most important documents.

But please understand that that doesn't - we're not going to restrict ourselves just to those that are most important. To the extent that there's relevant information from any of the documents that have been summarized, we will be able to use that information.

And again, it'll be really helpful if those who did the summaries will be able to point those kind of things out as they see things are relevant. So thanks again for that team. Let's go now to the Data Protection Privacy Team. (David), I'll

turn it over to you. Looks like you're on mute (David) at least from my perspective here, so.

Woman: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: There we go. Looks like you came off mute. Not hearing anything (David). So let's see what - this is Chuck again. (David), if you need a dial out, they can - the staff will do that. In the meantime, is there anyone in the data group that might like to jump in and share your thoughts in terms of what documents you seem to be particularly important?

Okay.

Just asked – this is Chuck again. I'll just ask everybody to be patient with us while we try to solve the technical problem. (Holly) your hand's up. Go ahead.

(Holly): Yes I just noticed that (Blad) is typing and he also did a couple of really good invaluable summaries. One of the documents that I think is really important was the FOC 54. Now I noticed that Jim Galvin will be (unintelligible) this call which will be really important. I don't know if it's better that I symbolize it Jim. I think the other slide did a really good job on a couple of them. So I think between FOC 54 and what was identified in the EWG are probably the two most important. And I imagine it won't be that difficult for either of us.

But I would say since our job is to actually list all of the data that we're talking about I don't how you want that summarized unless maybe categorized or something like that. But it's – if you really want a data set I don't know that you want to summarize because then maybe you can explain what you want by summary by way of summary, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Holly). This is Chuck. And by the way I think I said (Jada) when I should have said privacy, data protection.

(Holly): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry about that. But you're absolutely right (Holly). That's a very good point. That doesn't lend itself so much to bullet points like maybe the - some of the others might. But I would just ask the team to think about how you could and may be in the case of like data elements for example just listing all possible data elements but some way to concisely present to the full working group the main things that came out of the documents that would be fine.

So I don't know if (Blad) or Jim let's see I have to – bear with me well I catch up on the chat here. So Jim or (Blad) did you want to speak up and talk to this at all? Certainly (David) if you have a mic speak right out and we'll let you take over. In the meantime Jim go ahead.

Jim Galvin: So thank you Chuck. This is Jim Galvin for the transcript. I just wanted to acknowledge that, you know, I'm happy to write a summary that's useful, you know, for the fact that people where I said in the chat that I'm not part of the data or privacy team but I don't imagine that. And I see (Lisa) indicating here that she had a summary for 54 in the data team. So that's fine. But if it would be helpful to Privacy Team I'm happy to do that. And (Holly) indicated that she wanted to talk to us about that. That's all thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jim, Chuck again so appreciate that. (David) any chance you have audio now or ability to speak I guess? If so please speak up. Not hearing anything I'm assuming not. So again I'll throw it open to anybody on the Privacy Team that would like to share their thoughts. Otherwise we'll move on on the agenda.

Okay well thanks. I know I've been watching the emails on all three of the teams. And I know that the Privacy Data Protection Team also had a lot of emails and there's a lot of work going on there. But I glanced at the status sheet and it looks like good progress is being made there.

So let me – let's go on then to the next part of the agenda which is to confirm the next step and target date to complete the small team outputs.

Now I haven't talked about it yet today but the small team outputs are more than just what we've been talking about so far in this meeting. That is the, you know, which documents do you think are most important. And there was a list of questions that we ask each team to start discussing. So I want to keep those targets in mind as well.

So notice in the chat the last message from (Lisa) which is a really important one, it'll be really helpful for the teams to review the summaries and make sure that the most relevant bits are reflected. So that's a task it would be very good in the coming week for each team to do. And I'll ask the leaders in the teams to decide how best to do that. But that would be very helpful and zero in on the questions that we've asked in addition to the one we focused on today, what are the most important documents.

And the sub questions that I kind of add to that if it's possible to provide a quite concise listing of the most important things from the document that you've learned. So let me see, is that a realistic thing to do realizing that it may look a little different for each team as (Holly) pointed out? And then we'll talk about the actual questions that need to be – that have been posed for each team as well. Stephanie go ahead.

Stephanie Perrin: Thanks Chuck, Stephanie Perrin for the record. I think we have the try to come up with bullets. We also have to verify because sometimes folks who were analyzing a document did it maybe without the background and context and might not see what somebody else saw. So those are good tasks to do.

But I would just say that it's while you might be able to boil one of those letters from the Article 29 group down to one paragraph I defy anybody to boil the DWG report down to one paragraph. And I think, you know, whoever's looking at it is very kaleidoscopic in that respect. You'll see different things

and it and you'll see different things in each chunk and you may still be answering the right questions.

So I think we should maybe try to sort some of the documents out is very heavy lifting. I mean even the Whois Review Team is going to be easier than the EWC report for instance because you've got your ten recommendations there, you know? You see what I'm getting at?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Stephanie. This is Chuck. I absolutely do. But I also note that even with the EWG report each team's going to be looking at a particular subset of that or subset not, necessarily just in one place for example purpose sort data or privacy. So it's not the whole report but your point's well taken.

And again I'm not trying to be over prescriptive. The team has the freedom to do it anyway. The goal is to make it as easy as possible for the full working group to zero on on elements of it. We can go back and look at the detail in each report as applicable. And we will. But something to help guide the full working group in a fairly concise way realizing that we will have to dig down into the detail in a lot of cases. (Lisa) your hand's up. Go ahead please.

(Lisa Pfeiffer): Thanks Chuck, (Lisa Pfeiffer) for the record, two points. One is I've been actually going through and consolidating the summaries into a single PDF as we discussed last week I guess now that we have the summaries in. One of the things that I'm noticing is that the summaries are somewhat uneven depending on the level of expertise of the person that reviewed the documents.

We have a lot of people in these working groups that are very well-versed in a couple of the documents because they were either part of developing them or part of a team that developed them. And as Stephanie mentioned in the chat that it's kind of boiling the ocean to try to review everything.



But for those people on the Working Group that do have really focused expertise like Jim mentioned (Holly) asked Jim Galvin to take a look at the summary of (Cycle) 54 if you know you're really familiar with the document that's on the list even if you didn't summarize it if you could focus on reviewing that summary and just making sure that the really important aspects got covered somehow in the summary I think that's one way to kind of make the task a little bit easier. You don't have to look at absolutely everything but documents that are really in your ballpark if you will.

The other thing is that just thinking about when we're trying to pull out bullets points from the logger summaries of the relevance of the documents it's not really trying to boil the summary down to an even shorter summary in my mind. It's more trying to identify what's the relevance of the document to our work.

So does the document say something that will help us determine the order that we have to tackle questions as part of phase one? Does the document say something that we'll have to just drill into and great detail in phase two, you know, sort of trying to look at where in our big chunk of work that document will be most relevant. I think that kind of feedback would be really helpful to get from the team. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Lisa) this is Chuck. And you said that much better than I did. And I think that narrows the focus a lot so I appreciate that. Greg your turn.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Greg Shatan for the record. And I'm listening to in particular the data team and the purpose team and choosing let's say, you know, certain members thought were the key documents. And it seems to me and this is kind of I'm offering - this as observation there are, you know, at least on the part of some people have an enthusiasm to jump from the question of purpose or data to the question of applying privacy laws, in particular European privacy laws to the question of data and purpose. And I think that's what we really had the third piece, the privacy theme or data and privacy

protection, privacy and data protection team for. And I think that you made some sense that that kind of desire or unintentional as desire to kind of let the concept of the three teams bleed into each other may reach kind of the idea that this is a bigger project in the sense than it is.

I think an interesting exercise might be to, you know, for the first two teams to look at as a question of data and the purpose without considering the issue of privacy law, just getting to the issue of what data is being – could be collected, what purposes could be – could it be put to and then let the privacy data - the Data Protection and Privacy Team deal with the privacy aspects of the documents we're looking at.

It seemed that a number of the documents that were picked for the first few teams actually were privacy documents. And, you know, without obviously could be that they're just looking at the purpose and data parts of those which are already in one case I think (Chabi) was talking about, you know, limitations. And if we're already talking about limitations we're talking about, you know, applying this aspect of privacy law that might limit those things and not as a question of purpose itself. So if I think if there is kind of more attention to the walls between the three concepts of those groups we might get kind of better discrete information than not have kind of so much of a pile to deal with. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Yes thank you Greg. This is Chuck again. And I think that's helpful advice. There's someone dreaming in the chat on that. And we're going to get to the point where they bleed together trust me. But we're not there yet I think is what Greg's saying. And we need to that point but let's just hold off a little bit till we get into our deliberations after we develop a work, a more specific work plan. So thank you very much for that.

And let's just spend a few minutes then talking about next steps. I'm going to kind of trying to blend together items three and four on the agenda. Because the leadership team talked about the idea for – an idea for next week's

meeting that might be helpful. And we need those of you on the teams to help us understand whether it would be helpful.

If we made a change to next week's meeting scheduling it at the time it's scheduled but adding a little bit of time before and after so that it becomes 135 minutes total instead of 90 minutes total and allowing each of the three teams to have 45 minutes that they could use on a call assuming they've done some work during the week because if you don't do any work on your team was between now and then 45 minutes won't be near enough.

But that idea was tossed around in the Leadership Team. And just curious whether some of you think that would be useful if we made that change to the meeting that's scheduled for next Tuesday. Thoughts on that. Michele? Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Thanks Chuck. Just bearing in mind just one thing to note I think we need also to rather than making a definitive decision right now we might need to put that to the main list as well as I'm conscious that there's quite a few people who weren't on the call this morning. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Michele, good suggestion. So let's make that an action item. But we need to probably set a time limit on that. So if we could put that to the main list with maybe 48 hours to make a decision so that we can give people somewhat reasonable notice in terms of any change to the meeting time and which block of time will be used for each of the teams. So good suggestion. Let's do that and but let's make a decision in 48 hours whether we want to make that change.

And then if the teams can provide any important terms of if a particular block of time is particularly useful for your team I don't know that it will matter a lot. But certainly any input in that regard if we decide to go that route would be helpful because will want to get out a notice of any changes soon after the 48 hour target. And (Lisa) your point's well taken. We're always going to have

conflict but and especially with a group that – of the size that we have so that points (taken).

So we will do that. Certainly if anybody has any comments pro or con on that idea please put them in the chat or raise your hand and share them with team right now. And I'll just pause for a few second at least to see if anybody wants to jump in on that. And I see several people possibly typing in the chat there so we'll watch for that as well.

Now if we decide not to do that change in the meeting structure for next we still have the time to get up to speed and see how the – each of the teams are doing in answering the questions. I'm going to assume within a couple days we'll have all the summaries done. And then we need the teams to start reviewing the summaries and especially those with expertise in particular areas to make sure we've got the best possible information for the full working group. So just looking, I'm not seeing anything new in the chat yet.

So (Lisa) let me put you on the spot in terms of maybe a quick summary since you're working so close to this. And thanks again. We're going to probably be doing this every week (Lisa), for all the work you do for us. But thanks for the incredible job you've done in supporting the three teams. And could you share some just kind of a quick recap on what needs to happen in the next week before our next meeting?

(Lisa Pfeiffer): Sure Chuck. So this is (Lisa Pfeiffer) for the record. I think where we stand now we have just a few summaries missing from each of the teams. So for those summaries that are missing we'll send out some reminders so that everyone is aware that they're on the hook for the missing summaries. But we should be trying to get the rest of the summaries in and into the consolidated document within the next I would say day or two at most so that each of the teams can review all of the summaries that have been submitted to their team thinking about the question that was posed to all the teams by

the team leaders about which of these documents will be the most relevant to this PDP and why.

In addition to that then each of the teams I think needs to step back and take a look at the longer list of questions that we had in our work plan from a week ago trying to think about which inputs additionally generated the most discussion within your team. which inputs might be obsolete or just superseded by some of the other thoughts that you found and other key takeaways that you take out of this exercise.

I think the other thing that we talked about today was looking at some of the summaries and pulling out key bullet points for those most important for - I don't really want to say important but most relevant documents for each team, pulling out some bullet points that really concisely captures why those documents are really important to this PDP and when they will come into play during the PDP. I think that's it.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Lisa, Chuck again. And I'm noting the discussion going on it looks primarily between Greg and Jim in the chat. And we're going to get to those points guys. We will. But that will be a big part of our deliberation. So hang in there.

And I want to wait make a general comment. You know, we don't want – we could stress this exercise that we're involved in right now on for months if we allowed it. And I don't think that's a good idea. We need to allow sufficient time but not too much time so that we can get our work plan finalized and actually get into the deliberation as all of us desperately want to do as – and we need to do that.

So it'd be really good if by the time we get to the Finland meeting we're just going to be focused on policy. And I think there are reasonable chances that we'll be able to have a significant meeting maybe three or four hours. I can't speak for the team that's assigning the schedule. But in Finland that wouldn't

be an opportunity for us to involve lots of members in the community that's not – are not part of our working. And we want to be able to take advantage of that.

And I think it would be great if we're well into our deliberations then and we can design a session for Helsinki that will really take advantage of being able to have people from all SOs and ACs and people that aren't even associated with SOs and ACs participate in our work in Helsinki. So we – I'm really cautiously optimistic that we'll be well into our deliberation by the time we get to June. And I think that's realistic. So any questions or comments about next steps, what the tasks are in the coming week? And let me pause and just see if anybody wants to add anything.

And Stephanie will probably talk past one other quite a bit. And we're going to have to challenge each other in that regard so and that's okay. But, you know, I think what I'm seeing in all the effort that's going on right now I hope all of us are gaining a great respect for one another and our differing points of view. Because that's going to help us as we okay we have our differences. We're going to articulate those. We're going to go back to source documents that will help backup the cases we're making. But ultimately then we're going to have to get creative and cooperative and come up with answers to the questions in terms of what the requirements are.

And I think this exercise that we're going through right now will help facilitate that not only in terms of the information from the sources but maybe even more importantly the respect for one another in terms of what we're doing so it'll help us really collaborate in an effective way.

- So are there– is there anything else that we need to cover? We will confirm the date and the meeting time because it will change a little bit. In order to allow each team 45 minutes we need to probably start a little bit earlier little bit later but still staying close to the same block of time that is regularly scheduled for next week's meeting. And that information will be forthcoming.

Not seeing any questions or action items let me turn to the Leadership Team both staff and the three vice chairs and see if you have anything you want to add before I adjourn the meeting. Okay so I think we're done for the day. Thanks again for everyone joining. And again special thanks for those that joined at particularly odd hours of our 24 hour day. That's much appreciated. And I think it's good that we can even though it's a smaller number of people that are in parts world where they, you know, three or four times out of the month have to have a bad time it's good that we give them the chance to work in our meetings in a very in a more realistic time for them. Thank you very much to everyone and I think we can adjourn this call and stop the recording. Have a good rest of the day whatever time it is for you.

Woman: Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you. Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END