Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 27 May 2009 14:30 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Fast Flux PDP WG teleconference on Wednesday 27 May 2009, at 14:30 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ff-20090527.mp3

<u>Present for the teleconference:</u>
James Bladel - GodaddyRRc - Working Group chair
Greg Aaron - Afilias Ry c.
Paul Diaz - Registrar

<u>Observers </u>(no constituency affiliation)
Joe St Sauveur
Randall Vaughn
Rod Rasmussen (joined after roll call)

<u>Apologies:</u>
Dave Piscitello
Martin Hall
Kal Fehrer (for all Wednesday calls).

<u>Staff:</u>
Marika Koning
Glen de Saint Gery
Gisella Gruber-White

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, everyone.

                     This afternoon on the call we have James Bladel. We have (Joe Sims,

                     Civil), Paul Diaz, Randal Vaughn.

From staff we have Glen DeSaintgery, Marika Konings, Gisella Gruber-White. Apologies, Greg Aaron, Dave Piscitello, and Martin Hall, thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, everyone, and good morning or afternoon.

Well as we last left our heroes, we were discussing a way to expedite the review of Category 6 and Category 9, which was Marika posted to the list after our last call.

And it seems like there were - were there any comments at all Marika? I didn't - there was one.

Marika Konings: No, I don't see any. I have all - I only had one email saying someone, they could read it, but then I sent it out as a list as well as an attachment. But I didn't see any further comments or feedback.

James Bladel: Okay. Well, then I would propose for a working agenda today that we would spend a little bit of time on Category 6 and 9 - not too much, maybe 15 minutes total. And then the rest of the discussion being what we have - we only have, is it this call and two others prior to Sydney; is that correct?

Marika Konings: Correct.

James Bladel: And - okay, so and certainly we want to leave at least a week to review the report and give folks an opportunity to make suggested edits for the final report. But I think that the document itself is - in my opinion it's a little cumbersome to do a read-through on call.

It would take us probably four weeks of calls to go through the report line by line so I think that we should urge folks to try and tackle that on the list.

Does that sound reasonable or is there someone that would strongly prefer that we would go through the report?

Marika Konings: James, this is Marika. Maybe one suggestion is that we just focus on some of the most important changes.

I mean, like some of the changes will be editorial or as well like, you know, the executive summary will be updated accordingly. But maybe it will be helpful to focus some of the important parts like once we have an agreement on the, you know, still outstanding sections and the Recommendations chapters, to pick some parts out that we really want to make sure that everyone agrees and it's written as everyone wants it to be. That might be a suggestion.

And leave the text that, you know, was already agreed in the previous version, as is.

James Bladel: Okay. And we can discriminate between those two sections if we go back to the report that was posted for public comments before Mexico City.

Marika Konings: Yes, because in the version there is now, there is tracked changes. So I think it would be relatively easy to see which are substantial changes and which are just, you know, minor edits.

And some of them we have discussed I think, on the basis of the, you know, the public comments that we've been reviewing. So I still think the key sections are going to be the two that we basically left for now to provide an answer to and the recommendations I think.

Those are the two main parts that still need work and probably require the, you know, attention and maybe a read-through on the call.

I think the other parts, indeed as she said people need to take the time to go through it and then, you know, indicate that they've read it and agree or, you know, provide further edits or suggestions for changes that kind of need discussed on the list.

James Bladel: That sounds reasonable. (Joe), Paul, Randal; does that sound...

Man: (Totally) reasonable.

Man: Yeah.

James Bladel: Okay. All right, I certainly don't want to cut someone short if they - strongly about viewing the report in its entirety, but I think we all recognize that this is a very large document now and that that's probably not practical.

Marika Konings: And I'm happy as well before we have such a read-through then basically to go through it and provide you with, you know, the specific page numbers or line numbers what we, you know, should go through to make that process easier as well.

Or if you first have people review that, you know, and the week before the call to point out to people why we might focus a bit more time so that we, you know, save some time in looking for the relevant sections or things like that, that's helpful.

James Bladel: Okay, fantastic. I think we probably would appreciate that to be highlighted.

Well let's jump into Category 6. There were the seven comments grouped in Category 6, all of them with an underlying theme of exploring the world of ICANN with respect to the fast book (unintelligible).

There's some pretty extensive views outlined by, I believe it was (Cal) who did this section. And there's some views here discussing where within the existing documents those items can be found.

Are there any of these comments that anyone has identified as being particularly new or introducing new information into the discussion or the report? Or are they going over ground that we've covered or looking at something perhaps in a new way. Is there any thoughts that's basically on these seven questions?

Okay, I'll take silence to mean that...

Man: James. (Cal) had noted - I mean it seems both 6, and I can even jump ahead now to 9 -- at least the ones I looked at -- these are - tend to be these questions, tend to be more supportive of things that we've already identified, perhaps underscoring, points that we've already made in our report. But it wasn't new information, it wasn't new points.

It was rather clarification or really underscoring conclusions, issues that we've already identified; things like that.

So I think we're covered with the treatment that we've already given the issues in our draft.

James Bladel: Okay, excellent. Others feel the same?

Man: Yeah, I do.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you. Well then the question becomes - because (Cal)'s responses are fairly lengthy and the question becomes how much or how little of that do we want to capture in the documents.

And I'm open to suggestions as from Marika, as far as how - you know, some of them I think, for example 6b, and others reference existing text within the document, so I think that there is no need to build on that

But if any of them - you know, as Paul said, most of these seem to support those points that are pre-existing in the document, so I don't think there is any need to refute or rebut any of those points made in the comments.

Marika Konings: James, as you pointed out, some of the answers are identical. So I'm happy to, you know - if you wanted to shorten the documents just to basically say well, see 6b or see answer to 6; whatever is irrelevant, where that answer has already been given to take out a bit of text here.

James Bladel: Okay. And I think that we can consolidate them into probably two or three responses for Category 6, and then maybe a few more for Category 9 just because it's so long.

Marika Konings: Yeah, I think they are the same. I think are some questions given the same answer applies. So, you know, either we can group the questions together or just refer - for the answer see the answer to question whatever.

James Bladel: Okay.

Marika Konings: So I can, you know, work that into a new version so people can (unintelligible) see if that - you know, if that makes sense or if they would like to see it differently.

James Bladel: That's a good approach. And, covering - wrapping up Section 9 because that one was so lengthy. It looks like there are just a few that are a few common responses that cover that category as well.

Marika Konings: Correct.

Paul Diaz: James.

James Bladel: Yes.

Paul Diaz: This is Paul. You know, for 9 in particular to like the IPC constituencies, for points where we identified G through J and, you know, as I said earlier they're basically concurring with the defining for the report, underscoring certain things that they feel, you know, are important and noteworthy.

They also talk about additional study and I think in our conclusion, while we don't have to necessarily reiterate the points that they're making because IPC is largely going along what was said in the report, the question about additional study is something we need to keep in mind as we work up the final touch for our conclusion section.

There may be a difference of opinion between members of the working group and how hard we push for additional study as opposed to what the IPC or even the Fellow and the other issues -- Mr. (Overton)...

James Bladel: Mm-hmm.

Paul Diaz: ...the same thing, you know, where there might be a difference in how we ultimately position our final report and the discussion of any additional work in this area versus some of these comments.

That is a distinction I just wanted to draw for the group. You know, whereas they are largely agreeing, it seems to be more interest on the part of these external responders pushing for further study, additional research, etcetera, perhaps more than we as a group feel is appropriate given the work that's been done and perhaps other areas, other policy work RAP, for example, for where it may be more appropriate to shift focus to those groups rather than continuing and fast flux specifically.

James Bladel: That's a great point, Paul. I'm thinking that - would you in favor of a perhaps a category within the recommendations and next step which just provides an over arching inventory of all the items that we're recommended for further study, and then perhaps on a final call we

could do an up or down vote on that vote, but just kind of see where there's - where the group's opinions are and whether those studies will be worthwhile in pursuing.

And then we can take essentially any next step or recommendation that references additional study and put it under that umbrella category.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, that might work well, James. And I share the - I think you caught yourself when you used the word vote. Ultimately additional study would not really be - we may recommend to GNSL Council, but it really would be the Council's decision.

James Bladel: Right.

Paul Diaz: And laying out as you just suggested might help them reach that decision, make it a lot easier for them, you know, get our expert opinion here's what we're laying out for them and suggesting certain course of action.

Of course, they can take it or leave it, but it probably would help them in deciding how to proceed and how to move forward.

James Bladel: Okay, and then to your point about referencing whether or not something should or shouldn't be included within the RAP, I think - and I know that this is not universally shared, but I view the RAP as somewhat of a narrower successor to some of the issues we've discussed within this working group. But I note that that group is already chartered and underway and so I wonder if there's a potential

problem in recommending that drawing a box around a particular study or issue and saying yes, this belongs in RAP.

What are your feelings on that Paul or anyone on the phone?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just maybe one comment about the RAP. I mean, that working group is not yet at PDP. I mean, their recommendations will probably be the basis possibly for PDP, you know, if they decide that there are policy issues that need to be discussed or were covered.

So if this group would feel that a recommendation would need to be taken into account for that next that, I guess there would still be room to the list of recommendations that might come out of the RAP combined with what this group would recommend in the same category or scope of issues for the GNSO to consider. I mean it's one option to take into account.

James Bladel: That's...

Greg Aaron: By the way, Greg (just entered).

James Bladel: Oh, hi, Greg.

Your ears must have been tingling? We were talking about your group just a moment ago.

Okay.

That's a good point, Marika. I had forgotten that was a preliminary PDP and that there may be some follow-up work there. So I think they're

going back to Paul's suggestion that we identify those areas that potentially could be (journing) to that group's work, and culture for their study or for the work, then I think that those recommendations that we should be sent to a Council.

Man: Just to clarify, James, I take the same (yield preps), even a stricter view in terms of the -- I prefer a very narrow scope for RAP. And I wasn't necessarily recommending that we provide, you know, develop a list and say, here, we think this should go to RAP or other.

Rather, I think just in trying to bullet form even, providing a list for Council members when they see the reports so they are aware of what's out there. I mean I know when the time comes to decide which ones we vote up or down I'm pretty sure I know how I'm going to vote.

I think we've done a lot of work in this group, but from day one I've always had very serious reservations about the mandate of this particular group and the focus on fast flux as an issue. And really don't want to, you know, lob this like a hand grenade into RAP but whatever the future PDP may look at. I think we've done a lot of work here and, you know, kind of need wind it down.

Just for the record, I want to make it clear, my recommendation was not to start picking and choosing items out of this report and passing the buck to RAP.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg. Actually I have a question since Sydney is coming up pretty soon. As I finish up our report here, what's the message that we want to get back to the Council? Are we saying that this group should continue or sugar wrap up? Should we say that we think fast flux is out

of scope or within scope? I guess if there is one thing we're going to tell them that they need to know, what is it?

James Bladel: The elevator speech, Greg?

Greg Aaron: Yes, what's the elevator pitch when this comes up in Sydney?

James Bladel: Well, my take so far, if I could take a swing at answering, would be that we are definitely advocating this group be brought to an orderly conclusion. That we created a body of work here that they serve to form, inform, or provide some research for other areas and other groups.

But we're not, I don't believe, formally calling for any particular actions in terms of additional policy work or -- and that's why I have worked somewhat careful around Category Nine, when there have been calls for further work or further study.

Because I think that there is a consensus that a narrower focus like that that we are working on with other groups like the RAP are probably the more appropriate way to define and develop policy or least discuss potential policy going forward. And that there is sort of a blighted issue is not really appropriate. And, you know, I don't know if that's universally shared by the group or if there some parts of that.

But it doesn't seem like we are in a position to either call for a continuation or to say, you know, here's what we feel is direct action items that have come out of this group.

Marika Konings: James, this is Marika. I just have a question because there are a number of, you know, possible next steps that the group put forward to the community for feedback. And with what you're saying you imply as well that, you said that there is no consensus around any of these ideas that were launched in this particular chapter. Do I understand that correctly?

James Bladel: And I am doing this from memory, Marika, but if the ideas are calling for additional policy work or subsequent PDP then I think that, yes, that yes, they would be.

Marika Konings: I can quickly list them if that helps the group refresh their mind what at that point was discussed.

One was to redefine the issue and scope.

The second one was explore the possibility to involve other stakeholders in the fast flux policy development process.

The third one was explore other means to address the issue instead of a policy or development process.

The fourth one was highlight which solutions or recommendations could be addressed by policy development and best practices under industry solutions.

The fifth one was consider whether registration abuse policy provisions could address fast flux by empowering registrees and registrars to take down a domain name involved in fast flux.

And the last one was looking at a fast flux data reporting system.

James Bladel: Yes. I think, you know, not to get ahead of ourselves too much, but I think that some of those would be very narrowly supported.

Greg Aaron: This is Greg. I think whatever we do, whatever is decided, I think we do need to communicate and package those recommendations very clearly. At this point the document is very long of course and is fairly complex. But because Sydney is coming up, whatever we decide, we have to be really clear to the Council about what next steps we recommend if any. And maybe summarize those somehow.

Marika Konings: And Greg just to mention I don't think there will be, as it is unlikely we will be able to post the report in time for people to, you know, give it due consideration. I doubt it will be on the agenda of the Council. I mean it probably will be an update, you know - unless we have finished the report.

But I think still the Council probably will say, well we really haven't had time to review the report in depth yet. So I don't know if, you know, (we need to have a clear discussion and make recommendations to…

((Crosstalk))

Greg Aaron: Maybe Sydney is not the decision-making point.

Marika Konings: Yes, that's what I mean.

Greg Aaron: There must be a decision-making point at the Council.

Marika Konings: Correct.

Greg Aaron: And whenever that comes would have to be very clear about what we think they should do next, whatever it recommends. So that comes after Sydney, fine. But there will be a Council meeting where they have to figure out what's going to happen and we have to be really clear about it.

((Crosstalk))

(Dan): (Unintelligible)

Marika Konings: Yes, and you're actually correct (Dan), if it would be (point) as well for the group indeed to, you know, provide the arguments how it has come to that decision. And clear to demonstrate as well that, you know, that these were well thought through recommendations and supported by the groups. So I absolutely agree.

James Bladel: And Greg I agree. I just want to chime in with that while Sydney may not be the decision point it is still the target endpoint for the work of the group. And that while the Council may have further readings and it may take some additional time to analyze the report I don't really see us as a group continuing to meet and develop the report following that.

Man: Hello?

Man: Still here.

James Bladel: Just went real quiet there for awhile. But at least that was my take and definitely what we were signing on for here for this last group in the reboot of this group.

So for the remainder of this call, if there are no strong feelings on Category 6 or Category 9, then the next section, Marika as you suggested, perhaps we can consolidate those responses, pull off a common element and then create a couple of sentences that address these categories.

For the recommendations and next steps I think that we are and there appears to be support for creating a section for future study and future work and that we could consolidate those into a single section, perhaps bullet points even. Then address those our next call and see what sort of support we have. And actually we hopefully adjust those on the list as well.

Does that sound familiar? Is that acceptable to everyone?

Paul Diaz: It does James. Just a question.

Given the time that we have left to us before Sydney, I know it's a self-imposed deadline, but as Marika just described, you know, Council already has a full agenda and is probably just not going to go to Council in final form anyway. I guess I'm just wondering, you know, (tenants) on the call has been difficult and not a lot of traffic. The remaining sections that we have to do are going to require, you know, a lot of collaboration.

And I'm just concerned that what we said earlier, for example, you know, that we make it very clear for Council. In doing that is going to take a bit of effort. You know, we had people step up before going through the different things on a checklist here, but, you know -- I'm not being very articulate, sorry. I'm just very concerned that, you know, we reach a point where I think we're all burned out by this process.

And even though we are close to the end, you know, our conclusions and recommendations our next up sections, so very important. And, you know, maybe we divide it up as we did previously, post something to the list. It might be easier for people to edit rather than create. That's all well and good.

But I'm just really kind of concerned that if we don't have some draft done by Sydney, and now into the summer months where scheduling is even more difficult and whatnot, when does this particular process end? And, you know, if it's ending with a whimper because there's not as much involvement and whatnot. This whole process has been different than the typical PDP effort. And, you know, I can't say clearly enough just because I'm so confused and frustrated by the process, that lets put it this way, as we look at these sections I am volunteering to help.

But I think it probably works best if at least two people who I think start putting some text, putting it on the list and telling people, getting a definite deadline, you have got to vote up or down. You know, say your piece about whatever were doing and give ourselves a very short deadlines. Because honestly, you know, as we get close to Sydney and certainly beyond, I mean I just don't see how this group remains in

any way functional, given the level of participation interest that we have seen over the past weeks going into months now.

So, again I'm sorry that is not very (articulately) stated. It's just a reflection of my frustration with the overall process. But I am volunteering to help. Let's craft some language, but give everybody a very, very short deadline that hopefully we can have, you know, some pretty decent preliminary text before Sydney.

And, you know, I think we kind of need to within the group decide, all right, when do we tie it off? I mean sort of enough already. And, you know, present it and move on to new issues.

James Bladel: And Paul, I agree. And I think I and a lot of other folks share your feelings on this.

A couple of thoughts and possible suggestions on how we could go from here; Marika I think has printed or posted to the list the last two sections that are required which is Section 8 and 9. Is that - 5.8, 5.9 and then 8 and 9. Is that correct Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes. I think - I'm trying to recall if I posted them separate to the list, but I think I did some time ago. But I'm happy to repost those.

James Bladel: Yeah, maybe that would be a good starting point. And then Paul, it seems like, you know, I agree with you completely that I think we have an obligation to provide opportunities for input and participation. But, you know, in the absence of that, we kind of have to go forward with the core group of folks that are making the time on the calls and on the list.

And I think that, you know, if that's the group that wants to, you know, carry this thing over the finish line and then be done with it, I think that that's fair. You know, I mean it certainly wasn't for lack of opportunity for others to chime in.

So what I would recommend is that - because I would volunteer, as well and I hear a volunteer from you and perhaps if we can get the other folks on, I know that Greg and (Joe) and Randal and (Rod) and some other folks have been very active in the calls lately and I think that we all share the idea that we want to get this wrapped up.

So perhaps if we can get some volunteers and address these last four sections on the list, and, you know, if there are no other objections raised, either on the list or on future calls, then we can - you know, we can report that and move on, but I don't think that it's - I don't think we should hold up our momentum, what little we have, you know, waiting for those other - or leaving the door open for others to jump on board.

Marika Konings: Jim, can I suggest something?

Maybe if indeed we divide up those sections and indicate who are the volunteers, I could post up to the list with the call to others on the list to sign up for any of these groups or get in touch with the people that have volunteered to write something on a section so everyone has an equal opportunity to participate in the writing on these issues or in the end chime in when a draft is being circulated.

Would that be a way to sort of maintain the dynamics and the momentum, but at the same time still allow others that are not on the

call or, you know, are not able to participate in the calls but would like to be able to participate in an email exchange or on that to participate?

James Bladel: I think that's a good idea.

And what I was proposing is something along the lines of what Paul is suggesting which is we identify some folks to take the lead on each of the outstanding sections and start to put some draft text together, even if it's just an outline at this point, you know, (words) missing is not critical at this point. And that we finish that activity on the list with the goal of having something to review during our next call.

Because I think that the next - you know, as we mentioned, we have two other calls after this one, so the next call would have to be focused on finalizing those sections with the final call, you know, mentioned, Marika, being a read-through of all the changes of the delta text from the previous interim report.

And then we can go to Sydney and say, look, this is what we have, you know. We've got the participation as best we could. As Paul mentioned, it was a challenge sometimes getting everyone's schedules to line up and we go from there.

And I think that also addresses somewhat of Greg's desire to put some packaging around this so that now the hundred plus page report can be presented and something that's digestible by the Council.

Randal Vaughn: I think part of it might be just that it kind of seems like a long time to spend on the comments, at least that was my hit. And I know folks are very diligent about reviewing them, but it just seems like, you know, if

we had a lot more comments would we have spent ten times as long or...

I think we've done a fine job of looking at them. I just want to make sure we kind of wrap it up.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, I totally agree with Randy.

And for the record, I want to make it clear, preaching to choir with the core group that's on the call today, you know, absolutely don't want to ignore anybody's inputs. And certainly I think Marika has got a great idea how to lay it out so that others who couldn't be on the call today whether they're the active members who just truly were busy or people that have sort of drifted away are given the opportunity.

But, you know, it's been suggested by multiple people now, let's just kind set a definite short-term deadline. You know, we'll commit to putting some text together, get it to the list and say, hey, speak up by such and such a time or that's it.

A concern I have honestly is that this goes to Council -- pardon -- just as in an update, I mean, and Sydney and that there are certain Council members who may not be fully aware or perhaps are aware of the history of the group and want to take a more (extended) - well, you know, let's give them more time and whatnot. No. I don't think more time is necessarily is going to make a difference on this particular issue.

It should be wrapped up and brought to a close. So the more we can do to frontload it and say, here we are, and basically we're done guys, here it is, I think that's better.

If we don't meet our own deadline by Sydney, I have a feeling, you know, it's just left open-ended and, you know, then we're kind of struggling with this thing through the summer, and that's just not in anybody's best interest.

James Bladel: Yeah, and I don't think anybody wants or is going to allow that to continue, Paul, at least within this core group. I think that you're right. There's a danger that folks in Council may feel that way, but I think that we need to present it to them as a hard stop.

Paul Diaz: Great.

James Bladel: With our recommendations and say, you know, if we want to continue work in this area, you know, certainly it's Council's prerogative to call for that but we recommend a narrower charter and a reconstituting group because that is I think - if they think attendance - you know, if we think attendance has been shaky the last couple of weeks, I can only imagine if this thing were to pick up the Wednesday after Sydney.

It would be myself and Marika and that's probably about it.

Randal Vaughn: I was going to say, I think a lower attendance right now is just because it's sort of working through the comments which, like I say, I think it's being done at a very diligent way, but I just think that that's something that a lot of folks are kind of willing to let folks handle, if you get my drift.

Paul Diaz: Yeah.

James Bladel: I hope that's the case. I do. I know that we have a lot of folks that, you know, want to contribute the - or contribute in different areas of expertise and some of it may be technical or security related or sharing some differences experiences there.

But the comments - and some of them are - especially the comments tend to rehash issues that have been put to bed long ago. And so, you know, it can be kind of a drawn out part of the process but I think it's important to give them equal hearings.

So Paul - I have one volunteer in Paul and then myself. Any other - and Paul do you have a particular section that you would like to take a swing at? It looks like we have a few.

Paul Diaz: Well, I mean, I'll start at the top, 5.8, 5.9, so I'll start putting together language for those two.

James Bladel: Okay. And what do you think is a reasonable timeframe to have something to the list? Do you think by the end of this week, perhaps or Monday?

Paul Diaz: End of this week would be the goal.

James Bladel: Okay.

Paul Diaz: I have a busy day tomorrow, but I think I can get to that.

James Bladel: Okay. And then remaining is - and I have two action items remaining,
                   so if you'll forgive me, I'm just going to volunteer what I'm already
                   volunteered for which is that need to get some information on the
                   (Ryan Hade Act), Safe Harbor Provisions and then also go through
                   each of the individual comments and find the point of reference for
                   them in the existing document and then note that on the comments
                   analysis form.

                   So I'll take that and I will have that done, as well by the end of the day
                   on Friday, both those items.

                   And that leaves two open slots for, is it Section 8 and Section 9,
                   Marika, that are the remainders? I think that is the case.

Paul Diaz: Marika has actually posted a couple of things on the list quite some
                   time ago; 10 or 12 days ago.

James Bladel: Yeah and...

Paul Diaz: Yeah, 8 and 9 and then the only comments we had were from (Joe).
                   And I was wondering if we - you know, if we have agreement by default
                   in here because it's been quite some time if we can just kind of
                   address (Joe)'s issues and then see, you know, if that's possible to
                   integrate those with the Marika's comments and see what happens
                   with the group on that.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm sorry, I was just realizing I was just on mute when I
                   telling which chapters were still open.

So the chapters that are open is 8, which is interim conclusions and 9 which is recommendations and next step or next step.

James Bladel: Okay. And we do have - we have some text there, as well, or is it...

Marika Konings: There is some text from the initial reports, so basically they are listed as interim conclusions. I mean, the group might decide that the interim conclusions, the only thing that needs to changed is take out the interim.

I guess Chapter 9 will take a bit more work. If that's the possible next steps I guess that might turn into recommendations or some kind of conclusion linked to Chapter 8.

So maybe it might be a good suggestion to look in those two chapters together because they're closely linked or it might be a combination into one chapter that is conclusions and recommendations or something like that. So...

James Bladel: Well I think that's agreeable, as well, combining them into a single section. And I think that we have a lot of fodder for potential next steps, both within the report as it stands and then in Category 9 as a comment, so...

Marika, why don't I volunteer to help you on that. Maybe we can put together some text. That one may not be done by Friday. However, it may be done over the weekend or next Monday, but I'll go ahead and put my name on that, as well.

So just to recap, Paul is going to take a swing at Section 5.8 and 5.9. I'm going to take my existing task items, as well as consolidating 8 and 9. And then we can review those texts hopefully on the list prior to our next call next Wednesday and then that call will just be a minimal discussion with just kind of an up or down acceptance of the text or possibly to some minor edits.

And then, you know, the final call before Sydney would be reading through the delta document, wrapping up the work and then as Greg suggested, perhaps making sure that it has a concise narrative that we can put together what we're asking Council to do with this document and this PDP.

Does that sound like a reasonable course of action?

Paul Diaz: Yeah, sounds good.

James Bladel: Okay. Was there any other items that we wanted to cover on today's call, otherwise we can adjourn a little bit early and just start watching the list for protect updates.

                Okay. It sounds like we're wrapped up then. I certainly appreciate the diehards that have seen us this far. If you could see us a little bit further, I think it will be - you know, we'll come up a tunnel on the other side.

Randal Vaughn: Sounds like a plan.

Paul Diaz: Yeah, sounds good.

James Bladel: Okay, thanks. And then Marika, perhaps you and I can have another conference call just another chat some time tomorrow when it's convenient for you where we can just kind of put together the action list and make sure everything - all the materials that we need on the list - I don't want to overburden staff with this, so...

Marika Konings: I'm happy to put together an action list and send it you by email so you review it. Tomorrow will be tough because there's a Council call, as well, in the afternoon which, I guess would not be a natural time for us to talk seeing the time difference.

So I'm happy to put the action items together and send it back to you and we can get it out to the list tomorrow, if that works.

James Bladel: That would be fine.

Okay, well thank you everyone for your time and have a great morning and let's put some additional actions on the list here and let's keep it moving.

Paul Diaz: Okay, guys, bye now.

James Bladel: Thank you bye.

Marika Konings: Bye.

END