GNSO
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference
19 August , 2008 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy A PDP Jun08 Working Group teleconference on 19 August 2008. 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-irtp-pdp-20080819.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#aug

Participants present:
Paul Diaz - Elected as Working Group Chair - Networksolutions Registrar c.
James M. Bladel - Godaddy Registrar c.
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC Council Liaison
Barbara Steele - Verisign Registry c.
Kevin R. Erdman - IPC
Sebastien Bachollet - ALAC representative Mike O'Connor - CBUC

Staff:
Olof Nordling - Manager, Policy Development Coordination
Marika Konings - Policy Director
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent - apologies:
Mark Trachtenberg - IPC

(Paul):   All right, hello again everybody. And welcome back. Appreciate the - you know, being here as well as the discussions and inputs that you provided on the list.

Let's see, for the sake of just administrative issue, I also want to thank everybody for getting the Statements of Interest in. Glen informed us that there's only one outstanding member who has not submitted a statement. We will work with her. And once they're all provided we will have a link put on the wiki that has everybody's statements. Just an

administrative thing we need to do as part of the PDP working group structure.

For today's call, if we can, I would like to initially focus on both the template for constituency statements as well as the timeline, the schedule that we've laid out. As always, these two are interlinked so if we can, you know, settle on these, kind of important.

The timeline that we have sketched initially, the draft, if tight. It could be achievable. I think very important, though, that we kind of handle our work through the template, get this process underway seeking our constituency feedback and sooner rather than later, you know, we want to have an accounting for where we stand with the feedback so that if it becomes clear to us that we will not be able to meet the deadline that we've set out in the draft, we can quickly communicate that to the council so that, you know, we have completely set expectations there in terms of when they can expect a report, whether it's a final report or just a status update.

The goal, of course, would be to have, if possible, the work completed in time for consideration at the (Cairo) meeting. If that - if we find that that is not achievable, we definitely - we want to have communication through Mike (rather than) to the council explaining, you know, where we stand, how much more time we need and then a more firm deadline with that new date.

So with that as background, I hope everybody has access to the wiki. It's a lot easier to see the documents, you know, altogether. And the whole purpose of putting it there so we can share edits. We're all

working off of one draft. And if you can go there now, please I would ask if we could perhaps start with these constituency templates.

As you can see, we have the draft posted up. There's a previous comment or two from me and then Mike Rodenbaugh has provided some more very thoughtful detailed comments. And we'd like to open up to the rest of the group to discuss those edits. Any other issues people would like to address, refining techs, et cetera, open it up to the group please. Anybody?

Michael O'Connor: (Paul), this is Mike O'Connor.

(Paul):   Yes Mike. How are you?

Michael O'Connor: Fine. Question for you - not so much about the draft per se, but the intent. Is the intent of this document to collect input that would then get folded into a broader statement, or is this intended to be a draft on which the constituencies are making policy comments? That make sense?

(Paul):   Yes it does Mike. In our call last week, we had kicked around the idea whether to approach this one as we have in the past (flex), where we would have two rounds of comments, initial comments, and then the more formal statements based on draft positions created by the working group.

At the ti- at last week's call, we thought that it would make no sense to push these out collecting inputs that will ultimately be folded into the draft report later on. In other words, these would probably be more of the initial state - stage - thinking along the fast flex lines.

Michael O'Connor: Okay.

(Paul):   And since it's kind of being set wide open - here are the questions that we, as a working group face, and we're putting the same questions to our constituency colleagues, the opportunity that is there for them to make very specific recommendations which could result in a new policy.

Michael O'Connor: But we will be working in parallel with them?

(Paul):   In parallel, yes.

Michael O'Connor: Okay. Well then, I think the one that at least seems to leap out is who is in scope or out of scope discussions.

(Paul):   Yes. Shall we kick that off now?

Michael Rodenbaugh: I don't think we should kick that off now in this group. I don't think that's an issue for this group.

(Paul):   Okay. Well, I guess Mike, I can push back a little bit on that but, you know, anything to do with scope of a working group I think is in - is fair game for a working group to discuss.

Michael Rodenbaugh: Actually I think that's what the council decides, which is a (charter).

(Paul):   Yes. Both Mike's - I - as I'm looking at the wiki and if everybody else is confused, please bear with me. I'm realizing, Mike, the edits that you

suggest - Mike Rodenbaugh - the edits you had suggested are, I guess, were only in the email attachment that you sent.

You didn't make those to the wiki draft so your - the way you've positioned, the text you've offered and whatnot, unfortunately folks, rather than see it on the wiki, I need you to go to Mike's email - Mike Rodenbaugh's email of a couple of days ago and open it up there.

Michael Rodenbaugh: (Unintelligible) yesterday.

(Paul): Yesterday's, okay. And in particular, the way Mike Rodenbaugh has offered, or tried to handle the issue of who is and whatnot.

Michael Rodenbaugh: I'll just briefly explain it. I can read it if that helps. The question specifically mentions who is policy, so to then say that it's outside of scope is crazy. And I've had back and forth with the (Paula Smith) party to, with (R.A.) and (Chuck) and the council and I don't - there's certainly no agreement on council even, whether this is (in) or out of scope. It hasn't been discussed by council.

(Paul): I know.

Michael Rodenbaugh: It's not really for the working group or a potential option (unintelligible).

Woman: I'm not hearing Mike very well. I don't know if it's the same for the rest of the group, but he's dropping in and out.

Man: Yes, I agree.

(Paul): Yes, Mike, if you're on a speaker phone, perhaps pick up the headset. It's just - it's very faint and it does seem to be dropping out a bit.

Michael Rodenbaugh: Okay. Is this better?

(Paul): Yes, okay. That's coming through clearer. I was going to say something as well Mike, but give everybody an opportunity. Would you please just repeat the, you know, the last thing you said, in particular, your communications with council?

Michael Rodenbaugh: So our - yes, I mean, I talked with the chair and the vice chair of the council about this and (Paul), you were on that email thread. You know, I mean, clearly we don't necessarily agree, but to - I don't think there's ever been a decision that this potential option is outside of the scope of the working group.

It's something we certainly can take opinion on and then decide what to do. It would be, in my opinion, ridiculous to just ignore it when it's specifically mentioned in the question, first of all, and has been considered all along as a potential option.

(Paul): Okay. For everybody else on the working group, just want to add my interpretation, the guidance that I've received from (Gena Socouncil). I respect what you're saying, Mike, but I came away with a different view, both (Ivory) and (Chuck) have made it pretty clear to me that that thought recommending who is changes is beyond the scope of this working group.

With that said, they do hold open the idea that we could make suggestions that would be addressed elsewhere by the who is working

group or some other group that deals with it. But my strong sense from both of them was said if this group were to come back with recommendations, policy - recommended policy changes that would impact who is - that that was beyond the scope of our charter.

Michael O'Connor: I think that given that the scope of this -- this is Mike O'Connor, sorry -- given that the scope of this is already pretty broad, I would tend to try and keep the scope as narrow as we can and adding who is on seems like - like let me (ask) you if you're getting a similar sense from the chair and vice chair and maybe we ought to let that one go.

Michael Rodenbaugh: Okay, we're not talking about debating the broader who is issues of availability and accuracy, right? We're talking about simply making a piece of information that's already collected available within the who is database. So I - you know, I think that we could frame the question to just to ask specifically what we want, and I tried to do that.

But alternatively, let's talk about this for a second. What other options? We've talked about talked about this in our group and there've been none that have come back as potential other options. So it seems to me we're pretty ridiculous again to go out with a survey asking for constituency statements and ignoring, you know, basically the only conceivable option that's been put on the table at this point.

Michael O'Connor: This is Mike O'Connor again.

(Paul):   Okay Mike.

Michael O'Connor: I apologize for sort of joining late and missing a couple of those
                    calls but are we at a stage in the process where we've even begun to
                    propose options?

Michael Rodenbaugh: We went around and had a discussion amongst the
                    members of the group on the first couple of calls as to all these
                    questions and I know there's been email traffic on them as well.

Michael O'Connor: Well, it's - you know, sitting on some of the prior groups, it seems to
                    me there are several other options that we could throw out. I'm not
                    sure that this is the right time to have them and I think the thing to do is
                    put the who is scope question to bed and then get on to other kinds of
                    option choices, but it does seem to me that there're other ways to trade
                    emails beside through who is.

(Paul):   Yes, and for your benefit, Mike O'Connor, and the others on the call,
                    please correct me if my recollection is wrong, but on a previous
                    discussion on this first question, it is true that the group in discussing it
                    to date has not come up with other mechanisms by which we might -
                    wait a minute, I am getting ahead of myself.

                    There was a suggestion for it - for some -another way to potentially
                    share this particular data point, the registrant email address would note
                    that the question as it's currently drafted in the charter based on the
                    last email I saw -- I think (Barbara) had sent -- making note that this is
                    an accurate statement but only for the thin registries not the thick
                    registries.

                    So we might need to change the language just to clarify that. But
                    ultimately, if we're, you know, to look at or to even request, in the

constituency statements that folks think about making this particular data field a requirement, and the registrar who is, again, Mike Rodenbaugh, I respectfully have to disagree. I think that is - absolutely becomes a who is access issue and again, based on the feedback that I've received from council, it's beyond the scope of this working group to make that sort of recommendation, so...

Michael Rodenbaugh: Number one, you don't have any feedback from council. You have one email from (Ivory) and one from (Chuck) and one from me.

(Paul): Yes, specifically one this issue.

Michael Rodenbaugh: So this hasn't been addressed by council. The only time council addressed it, who is was actually specifically mentioned in the question, so I just - we do disagree. I think I just don't really understand why we wouldn't try to ask the constituencies what the downside would be assuming that who is stays as it is today, that one other piece of information would be published.

So I just don't really understand what the downside is about asking for that. I don't understand what other options you'd be asking for given our prior discussions, so it just seems like it's a waste of time and a wasted opportunity in my opinion.

Man: (For all those) on the call - thoughts, suggestions?

Kevin Erdman: This is Kevin Erdman speaking. And I just wanted to suggest that it doesn't seem inconsistent to allow comments on the who is aspect as well as exploring other avenues of mechanisms that would address the

problems or the, you know, issues that have been identified to this working group. So to me, they're not mutually inconsistent.

I think it's just a matter of, you know, prioritization and making sure that we have adequate discussions. And also the final product, we - I think we do need to clarify if the who is aspect is going to be part of a core recommendation or merely a comment on an issue that effects the issues that we're supposed to address.

Olof: This is Olof here, if I may just comment briefly. Although - well who is - and who is recommendations would probably outside the scope of an IRTP (CBP), there's nothing prohibiting us from mentioning who is, and perhaps make it clear that although it's not the purpose of this PDP to make recommendations on who is, well - and then use some of Mike's language.

The working group is interested in your views on these opinions, on that potential (law firm) but pre - but particularly in your views about any other options not involving who is. If we make it clear, I mean then of course the constituencies are free to comment with whatever suggestions they may have. Perhaps that's a way forward. I'm not sure.

(Paul): Okay. What do others on the call think? Using Olof's suggestion as guidance - I mean, certainly he's been involved in so many of these. What do others think?

(James): (Paul), this is (James).

(Paul): (James), please.

(James): I agree with Olof's approach that we can mention it, we can identify it as something that we're not necessarily willing to tread into but establish a demarcation on the subject and then go forward on the other areas.

(Paul): There seems to be consensus for at least collecting comments. Is there anybody dead set opposed to do that?

Okay, hearing no strong opposition, then let's focus on how we will ask the question. I think the language we use will really determine what sort of feedback we might get. To that end, again, what we have on the wiki - and I would ask, please everybody in the future, posted suggestions are always so appreciated, but please post them to the wiki so we will be working off of one draft.

If you're doing this now, Olof and (Marika), is it possible for you to take Mike Rodenbaugh's Word document and get this up onto the wiki? I'm just wondering is it a simple cut and paste or, the functionality to upload and attach a file?

Olof: Rather copious, otherwise we end up with a file attached to something but it's very easily - so the question is more you copy, paste that and replace what you have right now because we I think I can do that almost right away.

(Paul): And okay. And just that section for now.

Olof: Should we proceed with the discussions and then try to make some kind of (state) on it - of the weekly - on - of the outcome? I could, for

example, have a go at trying to rephrase what we now I think have agreed upon concerning the very first question on the (issue one).

(Paul): For everyone else on the call, do you have access to the attachment that Mike had sent out yesterday? Can you see his recommended changes? Importantly, is there anybody who cannot? All right, then Olof, why don't we work off of that and, as you've offered, we can take a crack at revising the template after the call?

Again, I would introduce both the template and the timeline together because according to the timeline, we're supposed to have these templates ready today so that we can begin the process of soliciting the input. Again, given the very, very tight schedule that we have, we'll need to get this approved by the working group I would think within the next 24 hours just so those things can get pushed to statements, forms can get pushed out and begin collecting.

(Marika): This is (Marika). In addition to that, we'll need as well a text for the launch of the public commentary on the initiation of the PDP for which we'll use the template probably as a basis, like a shortened version of that. So that's something that will need to be approved as well by the group.

Following this call, Olof and I can work with that, once we have an agreed upon text for the template. It shouldn't be too difficult to derive, to a text for the public commentary on that.

(Paul): All right.

Olof: If I may suggest a comment - looking at Mike's comments and Mike's version of the document, it includes - I mean, there are changes that are also comments. So do you wish me to list that up to the weekly right now which I think I can do in five minutes or so, including the comments, or should we proceed in any other way?

Michael Rodenbaugh: Do we have editing crews as we go? Do I have editing crews, because I can just cut and paste as we're talking.

Olof: I think you have. You should have.

(Paul):   I believe if you...

Man: I apologize. I'm not really good with wiki yet. I'm working on it.

Olof: Okay. Otherwise I can copy, paste.

Michael O'Connor: Olof, I think that the idea that Mike suggested a minute ago where you just copy past that section rather than the whole Word document would be a good idea. This is Mike O'Connor.

(Paul):   Agreed, because I don't want to get far ahead of ourselves and wondering what was originally there and what has been deleted. So let's go section by section.

Michael O'Connor: Edit. And the editing that's going on - a suggestion. What if we took the part of Mike's draft that starts, "Note" - the parenthetical part - and made that the fourth bullet rather than as part of the lead off bullet, so that it would read, first bullet, "What options could be explored," second bullet, "For each option, please identify," third bullet, "Please identify

examples," fourth bullet, "Note - conceivably could be an option to require," so that it splits those apart and makes it a - you know, diminishes the impact of it just a little bit when the readers go in. Just a thought.

(Paul):   Thank you Mike.

Olof: Okay, I'll have a go at that and try to pre-paste it with - although it - what you said earlier, although it is not the purpose of this PDP to answer on.

(Paul):   I'm sorry Olof, you were - I missed that because I'm taking notes as well. Could you please just repeat?

Olof: Yes. I just mentioned that, okay, I'll put that as a second bullet and I'll preface it with, "Although it is not the purpose of the PDP to propose modifications of the who is," and so on.

(Paul):   Mike Rodenbaugh, how are you with that?

Michael Rodenbaugh: I'm trying to upload my edited version at the moment so I'm not there. Hold on.

(Paul):   Okay.

Michael Rodenbaugh: Have you changed the text on the page, Olof?

Olof: I'm - if you're editing, okay, I won't touch it right now then.

Michael Rodenbaugh: Yes, I was going to say one of you take editing control otherwise you're going to wipe each other's stuff out. Okay, so hold on. I'm just about to be able to post it here. I think I've got it. You want a second bullet. How would you start the second bullet, Olof?

Olof: Just preface it with, "Although it is not the purpose of this PDP to propose modification of who is,"

(Marika):   It would be the fourth bullet, not the second.

(Paul):   And move it down. Thank you.

Olof: Oh yes.

(Paul):   Okay. So let's see if this...

Michael Rodenbaugh: All right. There probably needs to be a little bit of (printing) now, but - all right, so if I save this - what happens? Saving - all right. So, all right. It's there now.

Olof: So we refresh, all of us.

(Paul):   Yes. Can everybody see that now?

Man: Yes.

Man: Looks good.

Woman: Yes.

(Paul):   It's got an extra bullet but we can fix that.

Michael Rodenbaugh: Yes that's...

Man: That work?

Man: Yes, you've just graduated to wiki king, Michael.

Michael Rodenbaugh: I apologize. I will try to get with the program.

(Paul):   Okay, so everybody - you can see it. Please digest it a little and...

Michael Rodenbaugh: I'll work on the next one.

(Paul):   Sure, if you want to jump ahead Mike.

Michael Rodenbaugh: I'll do that.

(Paul):   Do the same thing - what you had proposed. Then did you have the citation, the link, that you needed for the hijacking report?

Michael Rodenbaugh: I do not have that.

(Paul):   Okay.

Michael Rodenbaugh: I'll get that later.

(Paul):   This is the 2005 report, right? A couple of years ago?

Michael Rodenbaugh: (I think so), yes. I think there's only been one.

(Paul): Yes, I found it so if you put yours in I can put and paste the link for you as well.

Michael Rodenbaugh: All right. So that'll be far less contentious. All right, it is posted now, so.

Michael O'Connor: A comment on the fourth bullet.

(Paul): Sure, go ahead Mike.

Michael O'Connor: To strengthen it a little, you might change it to, "Although it is not the purpose," other than, "Necessarily the purpose." That seems a little expansive there Michael.

Michael Rodenbaugh: You're not going to let me have my lawyerly wiggle room, Michael?

Michael O'Connor: No, sorry.

(Paul): Fair enough. Are you okay with that, Mike Rodenbaugh?

Michael Rodenbaugh: Yes.

(Paul): "It's not the purpose" - we'll cut out, "Necessarily?"

Michael Rodenbaugh: It's gone and I'll repost that right now. This editing thing is actually not too difficult. All right. So then I think this should be there now with the - about the (S-sack) issue.

(Paul):   Okay.

Michael Rodenbaugh: All right.

(Paul):   Just to - as we move through this so that we don't...

Michael Rodenbaugh: Actually hold on. It's not quite ready. I forgot to delete one clause. Okay. That last sentence is deleted.

(Paul):   Just for everyone on the call, so we don't lose one another, please just read everything that's there, you know, make sure you're comfortable with it. We'll circle back and kind of go through one - issues one, two and three, give everybody opportunity to have comments, et cetera, as we deal with these editing efforts right now.

Michael Rodenbaugh: Okay. So that's done now. Issue two, first bullet.

(Paul):   You have yours. Okay.

Michael Rodenbaugh: You want to refresh.

(Paul):   And Olof or (Marika) - and I have the citation Mike's created, room for the link. How to paste in the actual, the URL for the (S-sack) report.

Olof: Yes, we...

(Paul):   How do I - I've got it. I can do it right now. I'm just wondering is it a right click to open, create the link. How does it work in this software?

Olof: I think you - how was that now?

Man: I think if you just double click on the page, it will go into edit. Mike, that means that you should stop editing now.

(Paul):   Just for the moment. Okay, it says, "Replace with your own text." See if this works. And always rollback, right? Did that work?

Man: It's close. It's close enough. We can fix it later.

(Paul):   Okay. What is not working Mike?

Michael O'Connor: It's just added a second step so that...

(Paul):   It doesn't open straight up? It goes to something in between?

Michael O'Connor: Yes. But that's now.

Olof: That's another...

(Paul):   Okay, we'll figure that out.

Michael O'Connor: Yes, that's a cosmetic thing we can process.

(Marika):   We can work on that.

(Paul):   Simple enough. All right. Okay. And while everybody's kind of digesting this one, Mike Rodenbaugh, do we want to jump into your third?

Michael Rodenbaugh: I'm not yet - I'm about to finish editing and putting in all my edits and uploading that.

(Paul): All right.

Michael O'Connor: So Mike, if you started editing while (Paul) was updating the page with his link...

(Paul): Yes, it might've...

Michael O'Connor: You will overwrite what he did so be careful when you start. You have to sort of - it's - the only drawback to this...

(Paul): Only one at a time.

Michael O'Connor: ...is that it's very take turn. Olof and I had a great time on an earlier PDP where I think we stepped on each other, like, three or four times in a row before we figured out what was going on.

Olof: We're good at that.

Michael O'Connor: Yes. It got pretty hysterical on that call if I recall.

Man: Is there an undo button?

Michael O'Connor: No.

(Marika): No.

Man: Well, control Z works.

Michael Rodenbaugh: Control Z? Oh, it did work. Cool.

(Paul): All right, while we're working on this, just for everybody else on the call, looking at the clock, we have about 20 minutes left on this call. Ideally, we'd be great - we really should try to get through this - reach agreement on the template today and then would like to look at the calendar again and get everybody's buy in with it or at least to have a sanity check, make sure that we all feel that it's still achievable.

So I would again just ask as we're refreshing these, look at issues one, two and I assume three, and then in a moment, once we're ready we'll go over them, make sure that the text is acceptable all around.

Michael Rodenbaugh: Okay it's done.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Paul), excuse me. This is Glen. Today there is no back to back call with the who is so you would normally have - be able to go over. Next week there's a back to back call with the who is, and then after that you can have more time for these calls.

(Paul): That's how I - thank you Glen. That's how I remembered. I'm not sure if everybody else is ready and prepared to spend more than an hour a week on this but, you know, let's at least get through today's call. We'll do next week's call in that same one hour slot and then we can poll the group next week to decide if we feel we need more time or if the one hour is still adequate for the level - the amount of work that we need, that we have in front of us. Okay.

Michael Rodenbaugh: It's uploaded. It's done now. All the changes that I suggested in the Word document.

(Paul):   Thank you Mike.

Michael Rodenbaugh: That's (unintelligible) to this point.

(Paul):   All right. Well, hopefully everybody's had time to review and think about issue one. So why don't we do back to it and throw it open for comments? Are there people that are happy it, with the (checks) as it's now presented or are there any additional changes you'd like to see made? Please, the floor is open.

Michael O'Connor: This is Mike O'Connor. I'm fine with it.

(Paul):   Mike. Anybody else, in particular if there are changes that you would like to see made?

Olof: Olof here. I think in the very first bullet point, I mean, there was a change which Mike has suggested in the first bullet point, and that's to delete, "Other." Just to say - because that relates to a previous version of this. What options can be explored for (unintelligible) email address to (unintelligible) debatable?

Michael Rodenbaugh: Yes, okay. Sorry, I missed that one. I'll change that too right now. Okay.

(Paul):   Okay.

(James):   (Paul), this is (James).

(Paul):   Yes (James).

(James):   Very minor, but it seems that there is a dependency between bullet point one and bullet point two. I'm wondering if we should combine them or possibly make bullet point two a follow up to bullet point one? If conceivably a respondent has no other options to suggest, then bullet point two becomes irrelevant - if I'm reading that correctly.

Michael Rodenbaugh: You're saying put the fourth bullet first and mix the first two bullets?

(James):   Just the latter part - mixing the first two bullets.

Michael Rodenbaugh: Okay sorry. Okay, so I think that was two. Okay. And I'll figure out how to delete that full extra bullet in there. I (can do) wiki (part) two.

Man: I can help with that later. That's easy.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Rodenbaugh: Yes, I made the change (James) suggested.

(Paul):   Okay. Very good. So how is everybody now with issue one?

Man: Good here.

Man: Good.

Man: Thank you.

(Paul):   All right. Then moving ahead to issue two.

(James):   (Paul), this is (James). I'm sorry.

(Paul):   Yes (James).

(James):   I'm thinking about this here. Is it possible that someone would be happy with the status quo? Have we left a - have we left open that door with these three bullet points that someone could say I'm happy with the current methods of exchange of data? I imagine that everyone has issues with it, but I'm considering that might be a potential response.

(Paul):   Understood (James). I mean, I read it when it says, "What options?" And options certainly is always the status quo.

(James):   Okay.

(Paul):   How do others feel? Should we make that more explicit or are people free to define status quo as an option?

Michael O'Connor: This is Mike O'Connor. I agree with (James). You might want to amplify that option just a little bit. You might say parenthetically - you could say what options, parentheses, including the status quo, closed parenthesis. Or something like that, some way to amplify the notion that the status quo is fine I think is a good enhancement to the...

(Paul):   I don't personally agree with that but I think we need to leave that to...

Man: Me either.

(Paul):   ...that door open.

Michael Rodenbaugh: I think what we ought to do, maybe just - maybe it would help to provide the whole question from the charter rather than break it up. We've just taken the first part of the question. It was three sentences because I think they're useful. And then maybe say - I mean, I agree with you - and then say, "If change," - "If you think change is necessary, what options are there?" - something like that. It appears we've lost the context of the question on the survey.

(Paul):   Okay. So with that in mind - so we'd like to cut and paste the question.

Michael Rodenbaugh: I got it.

(Paul):   Still in there Mike? Okay.

Michael Rodenbaugh: Yes.

(Paul):   Ultimately all of these changes make a lot of sense because this template is also going to form the basis for the public consultation. We don't want to open up or raise any unnecessary questions.

Michael Rodenbaugh: Anybody else trying to edit because it - be hung up.

Man: No, you the man.

(Paul):   Yes, I think.

Olof: I'm out of it.

Michael Rodenbaugh: Okay, refresh. There we go. So then if we believe change is needed, what options should be explored. Okay.

(Paul):   Yes.

Michael Rodenbaugh: See if that works better.

(Paul):   Should we refresh Mike? Are you ready?

Michael Rodenbaugh: It is saving, saving, saving.

Man: It's in now.

(Paul):   Okay.

Man: It's a little - you know, again aesthetically it can use some tweaking but, you know, we'll deal with that later.

Man: It looks really. I hate to say it. All right.

Man: Well editor is just a tiny bit weird. It definitely surprises you. It's no problem.

Man: All right.

Man: The words are right. It's just...

(Marika):   We can fix the look later.

(Paul):   The format. Yes, the formatting is straight forward enough. All right everybody. So we've moved the charter question all down and put it in, made the tweak at the beginning of the first bullet. Is everybody comfortable with this?

Michael O'Connor: Yes, it's a good one (James). Thanks for bringing that up.

(Paul):   Mike, if you're still in editing mode, do you mind doing the same then for issues two and three, if we're going to pull the charter questions and lead off with them?

Michael Rodenbaugh: Yes, got it.

(Paul):   If you could please.

Michael O'Connor: Why don't we leave Mike to that task which will probably take a few minutes and take a moment, then, and look at the schedule while he's doing that?

(Paul):   Okay, fair enough. All right, so going back, looking at the schedule, we, as you can see, by today we're supposed to be finalizing statement template as well as launching the public comment period. Olof and (Marika), please, in terms of the public comment period, there is a specific number of days the comment period has to be open for. Could you just remind us, what is that again?

Olof: Twenty days.

(Marika):   Twenty days.

(Paul):   Two-zero, 20?

Olof: Twenty days, yes,.

(Paul):   Okay and that is calendar days or working days?

Olof: Calendar days.

(Paul):   All right. Oh, I'm sorry, as in bylaws. Read the full header (Paul). Okay, so if we were to launch it today then it would be until the 8th of September.

Olof: Yes, but...

(Paul):   The 8th is a Monday so if we miss a day or two, I mean, we're still looking at week of September 8th.

Olof: That's how...

(Paul):   If we need an extra day or two to get all this formalized and set up, correct?

Olof: Correct.

(Paul):   Okay. Now, we will have approximately two weeks between the close of the public comment period and the deadline for constituency statements, correct?

(Marika):   Yes.

(Paul):   Okay. So I mean, that gives constituencies some time to also monitor any public inputs and however that may or may not impact their views on these questions. So the 23rd of September is the deadline for constituency statements.

Now this brings me back to the question posed to the group last time. Constituency statements will come in, a report will be created. As the timeline is currently set up, there is not time - I'm not sure that - let me rephrase that. I'm not sure there is enough time to go back to the constituencies for formal statements on whatever our draft report might propose.

I know, for instance, within the registrar constituency, we need like a minimum, I think it's 34 days according to our bylaws for formal statements. Again, this would be for formal comment period on whatever draft report we propose.

Any other constituency reps on the call, please, do you feel that you might have a conflict within your constituency if we do not go back seeking sort of formal comments on another draft report?

(Barbara):   This is (Barbara). I'll need to check on that and let you know.

(Paul):   Okay.

Michael O'Connor: This is Mike O'Connor. I think one of the differences between an initial report and a final report is the final report has had formal comments from constituencies. And so, one way out of this would be to not issue a final report but present an initial report to council.

(Paul):   Yes.

Olof: Actually I have to correct you there because the only difference according to the normal PDP, sort of how it was conceived, is between the initial report and a final report. There is a public comment period only.

(Paul):   Ah, okay.

Olof: So - but while we have (mucked) it out in different ways over the years and depending on the circumstances and the - also the coverage of the PDP, for example, we worked frequently with evolving drafts of initial and final reports when the situations called for it. For example, in the new (DTLB), that was quite a succession of initial and final draft versions.

Michael O'Connor: I guess - this is Mike O'Connor - one of the difficulties in not having time for formal PDP responses from constituencies is that it will make the first round responses less free flowing, less brainstorming, and you know it will - they will - if there the only time that a constituency can comment, they'll probably treat them as sort of less wide open. We'll probably get a lot more cautious comments from constituencies if this is really the only time that they get to speak.

Olof: Well, to comment on that, of course what happens next is of course when the initial report has been produced and public comments have been received - and of course, the constituents can make public comments as well. That's possible - when the (girls get) the final report section, that is when the council can start and continue deliberations for quite some time.

So, of course, the constituents have the opportunity to use their council representatives and that's what frequently happens in the final phase of PDP.

(Paul):   Yes. This is (Paul) and I'm going to wear just my network solutions hat for this comment. My concern with that, Olof, is that I would think that the council, when they receive it, you know, will sort of - a natural question will be, well what were the constituency views on this report?

They have to only go to the list of public comments on the second period because there's not enough time built in there for all the constituencies to work through their formal comment process. That might be problematic. Ultimately - again wearing my network solutions hat - I'm concerned that I think we're really trying to squeeze this in and we're probably unnecessarily constraining ourselves to hit a deadline.

And again, it - we noted from our first call, no deadline was even suggested when this working group was first created. I, like (Barbara), want to go back and check with the executive committee, the registrar constituency and get their input on the lack of a formal comment period, again for - with enough time for a constituency wide formal comment period.

But I would, you know, again wearing that network solutions hat and also the chair's hat, just suggest that I think this timeline is probably too tight and that, you know, we might want to consider delaying the date that we tell the council we will submit the final report.

We, I believe, can probably give them a very good update on the status of our work going into the (Cairo) meeting, but again, I feel that the - trying to get this all completed by the beginning of November for that meeting is an unnecessary arbitrary deadline.

Olof: Olof here. Could I just make a quick comment? I think it's not secret that we would set a new Olympic record at PDP with some margin if we actually managed that deadline.

Man: Yes, I think it's really now problem to push it past (Cairo). We've got plenty to talk about at council at (Cairo).

Michael O'Connor: Yes, and this is Mike O'Connor. As the chair of a couple of PDPs that have been under a lot of time pressure, I agree wholeheartedly, and I think that what would be good is to add the step to the list, you know, so that it's clear to the constituencies that they've really got two chances to comment, the first one being fairly open-ended and more like brainstorming, and the second one being an actual formal response to a report.

(Paul):   Okay. Is anybody against that? Does anybody feel that the schedule as it's currently been suggested, is workable and we should really endeavor to try and get it done in that time?

          Okay. Then, you know, unfortunately we've basically run out of time here. What I would ask the group is in our next call if we can complete our review of the template. In the interim, we'll work with staff and we will revise this timeline to include an additional section as we just discussed, some additional time for the formal constituency statements.

We'll move the dates around as is appropriate, pushing back the template and the initiation of the public comment period, ideally just a week, and then all the dates that follow thereafter. And those will be our first orders of business on next week's call. Does that sound acceptable to everyone?

Woman: Yes.

(Paul):   Excellent. And, you know, (Barbara), myself, both Mikes, going back to your constituency, (Kevin), to your constituency colleagues as well, if there's, you know, a strong feeling about, you know, the amount of time necessary to get those group statements, please be prepared to update us next week so that we can put the dates in and then everybody will be comfortable with them.

                With that then, I think everybody for their time. I encourage you all to look please at the wiki, you know, consider the suggested changes that have been made. Again, we will make this our first order of business next week. And again in the interim, we'll work with staff to update this timeline as well so that, please, between now and next Tuesday, go to the wiki, check these things out and we'll dive into it as soon as we start up next week. Again, thank you for your time and see you soon.

Man: Thanks, (Paul).

(Paul):   Okay (unintelligible).

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye.

END