

**ICANN San Francisco Meeting
PDP WG TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 16 March 2011 at 12:00 local**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Jeff Neuman: Okay we're going to get this session started. It's on the Policy Development Process. It's actually on the new Policy Development Process that's been worked on for the last couple years. And my name is Jeff Neuman, I'm the Chair of the Policy Development Process Work Team.

And I have some members of the work team up here. So when there's, if there's any questions that anyone wants to ask they will certainly be able to jump in. As I'm just the chair I'm representing neutrally what, some of the thoughts and discussions that we've had but these guys can all tell you about their thoughts on the particular issues.

So the whole objective of our work team is that we're responsible for developing a new Policy Development Process that incorporates the new working group approach and makes it more effective and responsive to ICANN's policy development needs.

The primary tasks that we had were to develop appropriate principles, rules and procedures applicable to a new Policy Development

Process. And then once this new Policy Development Process is developed to come up with an implementation and transition plan so that we can immediately begin incorporating into the existing Policy Development Processes to the extent that's feasible. Or certainly apply them to any new one that the GNSO council decides to initiate.

A little bit about our approach. This team was formed in February of 2009 as a result of a report from the Board Governance Committee in order to revise our processes and procedures. We published an initial report back in May of 2010 that had 45 recommendations and identified a number of open issues that we needed some feedback on and then had an outline of what the new Policy Development Process would look like.

And just to take a step back. The Policy Development Process is critical for a number of reasons probably the most of which to a number of the contracted parties the registries and registrars is that is a mechanism by which to amend the registry and registrar agreements to basically force the registries and registrars to have to do things that fall within a limited scope of policy activities without the process of a bilateral negotiation between ICANN and the contracted parties.

So for example there have been many issues in the past that have been addressed through a Policy Development Process including things like originally the UDRP which we all know and love. And the, and most recently or some recent ones include addressing Domain Tastings and some aspects of dealing with deleted domain names and some Whois policies. So really this impacts all of us.

And what the goal is to really do is to try to get an informed decision making process so that we can make sure that whatever we come out with or whatever policies are developed through the PDP are done on an informed basis.

And so what we've done is we came out with that initial report, we extensively reviewed the public comments that we got and we got some very good lengthy, thoughtful comments on that.

And we've now published our final report for consideration, it's actually a draft final report. And we've included recommendations but we've also included some proposed changes to the ICANN bylaws as well as some new language for something that we call the Policy Development Process Procedural Manual.

And everyone should turn off their phones, like mine. Okay. So just a high level overview of the new Policy Development Process. The way we tackled our work is really to divide the Policy Development Process into really five stages.

The first one is for planning for and requesting what's called an issues report. That's really what kicks off the Policy Development Process and gets really the discussions going within the GNSO community so that we can narrow down the issues and comes up with a scope for a new Policy Development Process to address whatever the issue of the day is.

The second stage is once an issues report is drafted that the GNSO Council will then review this issues report and then decide whether or not to initiate a Policy Development Process.

Now taking one step back there are other ways to initiate the Policy Development Process directly. And that could be through a direct Board request to initiate the process or through a request from an advisory committee whether that's the ALAC or the Governmental Advisory Committee or the Security and Stability Advisory Committee to request an issues report to start this whole Policy Development Process.

The third element - so once the Policy Development Process or the PDP is kicked off at that point we, the current model is that the working groups will be created. And so what we addressed in this group was not necessarily the composition of the working groups but some things around how working groups are created, charters governing working groups and ultimately the work products of working groups.

Then we cover once the working group has finished its work the Council will then get the product of the working group back and there is some voting that takes place and ultimately hopefully implementation.

And we've created a fifth stage of the Policy Development Process which has never existed which is actually going back both individually on each PDP and examining whether that's been effective or not. Has it really addressed, has the solution actually addressed the problems? And the second component is taking a look at the PDP process as a whole and seeing if that actually works and if not whether some modifications are needed.

This is really a new approach of looking at all this and because this is new, you know, we're probably not going to get it completely right the

first time around. And so there needs to be some review mechanism in order to make sure that future PDP's are addressing the issues in the way and manner in which we need them to be addressed.

So the recommendations if we were to kind of generalize what kind of buckets they fall into you have some recommendations that really codify existing practices that for one reason or another have never been codified before.

We also have recommended some new approaches on things that we have not yet tried but things that we think will lead to a more informed Policy Development Process and hopefully more efficiency.

We've recommended some changes to the bylaws and we've also recommended that some of the things that are currently in the bylaws that are hard coded be moved into an operational manual.

The difference is that if you put something hard coded into the bylaws there's a very strict mostly inflexible way to amend those. And so they're really, for the contracted parties especially they're very meaningful in that, you know, there are some assurances since our contracts can be amended through this process that there's some predictability and certainty around that.

But for other items that we all recognize need some flexibility those are the things, the types of things that we have recommended at least in our final report be included in a procedural or operational manual.

And that's one of the issues that we're putting out for comment, you know, did we get that right? Are there things that really should be in the bylaws that we put into the manual or the other way around? You

know, what areas do need the kinds of flexibility and what areas may not need that flexibility. And so that's something that's out there for comment.

If I go to the next slide. Some of the key recommendations on each of the stages. So for an issues report, you know, in the past the development of an issues report has been very much an ad hoc process. You know, the GNSO Council gets together and to a very low threshold decides, you know, this is something that we want to address.

Whether it's something on Whois, whether it's something on registration abuse, whether it's something on the UDRP it's a very low threshold that it takes in order to start the formal process. And so one of the things that we wanted to do was to have a template to organize that to make sure that, okay, this is the type of information that we believe we need or the Council believes it needs in order to start the complete issues report and Policy Development Process.

In addition something that's never been done before. Usually in the past when there's an issues report it's drafted by staff, policy staff and Marika to my left is a member of the policy staff. They pretty much go into their silo, they draft the issues report and then they spit it out to the council and then the council decides whether or not to initiate the Policy Development Process.

The problem is some of these issues are very large in scope, some of them there's not very good instruction from the council on what issues we think need to be addressed. And so, you know, staff often times has a very tough, they have a tough time doing this, right?

You basically say for example we want a policy, an issues report on the UDRP and it's pretty basic, right? But to give staff an assignment saying we want to review the UDRP is a pretty daunting task.

So one of the things we've introduced is a way to either have workshops or seminars or other types of sessions to get some information so that we can narrowly craft an issues report. And then a publication of a preliminary issues report to ensure from, or get feedback from the community to see if we got that right.

Is that really what the community wanted addressed? Is that too broad? Is that something we'll never ever be able to do in any kind of a reasonable timeframe? And so these are the types of things that we've addressed in our final report.

And one of the other things that's always been, for those of you who've been involved in this for a number of years there are very strict timelines in the bylaws as to when all of these things need to happen.

So today in the bylaws if we were to say to the ICANN staff or to GNSO Council say we want an issues report on the UDRP they have 15 days to turn that around and as you can imagine that's not a simple task at all.

So we've obviously introduced more flexibility into that process so that, you know, it's more reasonable for staff, it gets more feedback from the community and when we do go into the formal Policy Development Process we do so with our eyes wide open knowing the tasks that we need to address.

So for the initiation of a PDP some of the recommendations or the key recommendations we had were to require a charter for a working group. This may sound pretty, like a pretty obvious statement that any work group that's created has a charter that covers its work and governs the scope. But believe it or not that's never been anything that's been codified.

And in fact prior to several years ago working groups never really had charters. They kind of had instructions maybe from the council but never any kind of charter. So that's something we're requiring along with some elements that we recommend be included in the charter with the flexibility we need recognizing that every issue can be different.

We've also introduced the concept of actually having dialogue between the council and advisory committees especially when it's an advisory committee that's requested this issues report.

So for example a couple of years ago the At-Large Advisory Committee had recommended an issue or had asked for an issues report on Domain Tasting. And that was a very helpful recommendation and we initiated the PDP immediately.

And so that's, while it hasn't been used that often it's something - and it's only been used by the ALAC. We've never actually got a request for an issues report by the Governmental Advisory Committee or the Security and Stability Advisory Committee or the Root Server Advisory Committee. But there is a mechanism at least built into the process for them to do so.

There's always been an option however for the council to reject an issues report or I should say to not initiate a PDP even if it's requested by an advisory committee. And we've introduced a concept of making sure that there's dialogue between the advisory committee and the GNSO if that in fact is the case.

We've also done a few things with public comment periods in the final report that can all be detailed there all with the goal of making sure we get the appropriate community feedback but not necessarily bogging down or having an inflexible approach as to when public comments needed to happen.

One of the more controversial subjects that we tackled was this notion of what is scope for a Policy Development Process. Now a few years ago there were a number of subjects where, that were introduced that some had argued well we can't do a PDP on that because that's outside the scope.

And there is in the bylaws a difference. If something is "in scope" then there's a certain threshold that the council needs to obtain when voting to initiate a PDP. There's a higher threshold if it's determined to be out of scope.

And there was always this disagreement or debate I should say between the contracted parties, non-contracted parties to say what does it mean to be in scope? And the final report, the report of the work team recommends that in scope means that it's in the scope of the GNSO and ICANN but not necessarily in scope of the contracted parties.

Meaning that in the contract that the contracted parties have whether it's the registries or registrars that a narrow set of policies that a, that could be called a consensus policy meaning that certain policies can be imposed or forced onto the registries and registrars.

But there's a whole wide side set of policies outside of that that we call the picket fence that can be addressed by a PDP but not necessarily made into a contractual commitment. It could be best practices, it could be recommendations to ICANN staff, it could be, you know, new a gTLD process, right? It could be a whole set of information that have nothing to do with what is imposed on the contracted parties.

We've set some recommendations around working groups, some public comment period changes. We've made sure that we have - in the past there's been a debate as to whether working groups work only on policy issues or do they also work on implementation issues?

So for example in Domain Tasting there was a set of policies that came out that talked about certain things that should or should not happen. And when it came down to implementing those the question came up as is that something that is properly, that a working group of, you know, policy people from each of the constituencies or stakeholder groups should comment on? Or is that really something more for ICANN staff and maybe the contracted parties?

But, you know, we've basically recommended that because the working groups are working so closely with the policy issues that while it may not be mandatory it's actually a good thing to get working group input on the implementation issues to help guide staff. And again that's not a be all or end all. It's not that ICANN staff has to take that

recommendation or the Board has to take that recommendation but it's certainly good guidance for the future work that's being done.

And finally, you know, one of the things for the working groups we have there is that, you know, we allow for and this sounds kind of silly but it actually happened in several in at least one or two circumstances where there was no mechanism in the bylaws to actually stop a PDP once it started. So you kind of started this train on it's tracks and there was no way to stop it.

And there were several PDP's that have been done in the past where either people have lost interest in the issue, the issue actually resolved itself after some years or, you know, it was something that was overtaken by other events. So we now built in the mechanism to terminate a PDP prior to actually delivering a final report.

The voting and implementation which is always one of the more highly debated subjects, you know, for this we decided to not recommend any of the changes to the bilateral structure or bicameral structure that's in place for the two houses of the GNSO being with contracted parties and non-contracted parties. But we have added some thresholds on some elements of the PDP where those have been missing in the past. And we've also have new procedures for the delivery of recommendations to the Board.

Now for those of you that have been around you know, or you may know that when there's a final report, when a GNSO Council approves a policy to send it up to the Board in the past it, while that report has gone to the Board the staff has actually taken it upon themselves to draft a report to send to the Board to be more of a summary or

highlighting the key points maybe also pointing out differences in opinion of stakeholder groups or constituencies.

That report has never been seen by the actual working group that worked on the issue or the council that approved sending it to the Board and that's been a problem. It's been a problem because in the working groups we're not sure of what the Board actually sees. We're not sure if staff got it right.

Now we know and love staff and they're totally capable and, you know, most of the time they do get it right. But the community does deserve some accountability and transparency on reports that are delivered to the Board.

And one of probably the strongest recommendations that this working group put out is that all summaries that go to the Board should be, must be drafted by either the council or the working group that was working on the issue and literally limits the confidential treatment of anything that is sent to the Board to only those issues that are really deemed to be confidential or privileged, you know, for example maybe some attorney-client communications by general council staff to the Board.

But everything else the community has a right to see what goes to the Board to make sure that the Board is getting all the appropriate materials to make that informed decision. And that actually is a big change from the way things have gone on and certainly something that we believe is in line with the Accountability and Transparency Review Team's recommendations and certainly what ICANN really should be all about.

And as we talked about before, you know, there's some recommendations around reviewing an individual PDP and the entire PDP process once the policies have been implemented.

So there are a couple issues that we kind of wanted to throw out to the audience and have some members up here that maybe can express some of their views on some of the issues that we really have not finalized in the report but certainly are open for feedback. And, you know, those are the types of things of, you know, what really should be in the bylaws? What should be in the PDP manual itself?

So again it's the issue of flexibility and perception. Perception being something in our bylaws certainly is perceived to be much more important to the community to lock down than those in the operational manual.

The operational manual is something that the council could change and while the Board has oversight it's really only if the ICANN Board finds an issue that they're really going to step in. Whereas something in the bylaws that has to be approved by a certain percentage of the Board of Directors and so those are much more serious changes.

So there's that issue. And again this is out now for public comment, the public comment periods ends on April 1. We're expecting all the stakeholder groups and constituencies to weigh in on this. But certainly anybody who's interested in these subjects should also be, should weigh in. And I don't know did I mentioned the, of course the At-Large, the advisory committees as well to weigh in. So I don't know if anyone's got any comments on that.

Okay. I can jump to the next subject which is really clarifying - now this is kind of esoteric but it's in the bylaws and is actually very big issue for contracted parties that was discussed.

So what it says up on the screen is it's clarification of Provision 13f in relation to the Board vote. And I know you all have the bylaws memorized so that should immediately click and you all know what that is, right? Getting some blank faces here.

So that provision basically says if I go back a step, when the council proposes a policy to the Board, when it approves a final report if the council approves something by a super majority vote then the Board is limited on what it can do. It can either accept the report and the recommendations but it may only reject the recommendations if the Board has, if it's two-thirds of the Board that can reject a recommendation from the GNSO Policy Council.

And at that point in time it's not that the, it's not that the recommendation dies it just goes back to the supporting organization to try to cure whatever those defects are. However there's a strange provision and I call it strange because it's never been invoked before but it could potentially have impact on registries, registrars and frankly the rest of the community.

So it's clear that if there's a super majority vote, a super majority of the council it goes up to the Board, the Board has certain rights and obligations and responsibilities. But then in 13f it's got this provision that says in any case in which the council is not able to reach a super

majority a majority vote of the Board will be sufficient to act. So what does that mean?

It's never been tested before because things have not gone up to the Board with only a majority of the council that have impacted. Well here's the impact, the impact is that the registries and registrars have contracts, the contracts state that if something amounts to something called a Consensus Policy -- capital C, capital P then that can be used to amend our contracts.

So basically the registries and registrar is saying however the community wants to amend our contract if you can obtain a consensus in the community we have to abide by that. It's really pretty scary for anyone entering into a contract to leave that open for people outside of their control to actually amend their contract.

So does this mean this 13f which says that if the GNSO Council has not reached a supermajority which means it could be a majority, in theory it could be a minority so a majority of the Board is sufficient to act. So does that mean that the Board can then force the registries and registrars to adopt a policy even if there was never a super majority to council?

Some have said yes that's what it means. Registries and Registrars not surprisingly have taken the opposite view saying no, you know, how could anything but a super majority of the council be considered consensus? And therefore if that's not consensus how could that amend our agreement?

So it's a very controversial subject to a number of people in the community. Again we're lucky that it's never happened but we could certainly foresee situations where something gets up to the Board without a super majority of the community or of the council voting in favor of it but yet the Board still wants to use it to amend the registry and registrar agreement.

So I don't know if I want to turn it over to, you know, maybe some people if there's no one out there maybe some people on the council or on the, sorry on the working group, work team. Or maybe people in the audience want to talk about, you know, their views on this issue but it's one that we're certainly soliciting some feedback.

So is there anyone that wants to brave it and come on up to the mike and or Alex or Wolf, Tatyana, Paul? Okay, so it's that controversial no one wants to speak about it. Avri come on, I know when I need a comment I know I can trust and count on Avri.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri Doria, always ready to jump into a controversial subject. Yeah I've always thought that the interpretation of it was rather clear. And that that meant that it could be sent to the Board and they could certainly act on it whether the PDP related to something inside the picket fence or outside the picket fence.

I think a PDP that relates to outside the picket fence is there any doubt? I don't think there is. So I think the only question in coming up

on 13f would be issues related to contractual conditions. So already we're making a differentiation that the bylaws doesn't make.

The bylaw says they can act and PDP's come both in inside and outside picket fences. So since they can act and since there's no differentiation between inside and outside I believe the interpretation has to be that they can indeed approve, they need to approve by a greater vote than they did if the GNSO sent it up with super majority.

The GNSO sends it up with super majority a minority of the Board can approve the GNSO's recommendations. If it's sent up without super majority they need their own majority to approve it and so there is a difference in that process. So as I say it's a controversial topic but that's sort of the view I have on the other side.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So we have Avri, that's Avri's view and now I'm going to turn it over to the point counter point to James.

James Bladel: Don't leave Avri. So this is James Bladel, I'm from GNSO registrar and also a member of this working group. Sorry I was a little late. So - but I think this is a really interesting, fascinating as Avri and Jeff has indicated a controversial area.

I certainly wanted to consider the possibility that acts to be defined as removing consensus policies or striking them as well as creating them but that's a longer discussion perhaps. But I think that right before I was leaving for, to go to the airport to come to this meeting there was a paper put out by ICANN staff in response to our questions and Margie I think submitted that.

I wonder Jeff is it appropriate to - I mean do you have more slides? Are we taking the meeting of course if we were to ask staff maybe to just give us the highlights of that, of their opinion on that? Because it couldn't be a third position on this issue.

Jeff Neuman: So it's funny you say that it just so happens we have Margie Milam here to address that very issue.

James Bladel: I think I find it interesting that, you know, all of the people involved in this are here and it's otherwise a fairly empty room. So I just want to applaud the diehards that are here, you know, to talk about the PDP policy. I know it's not the exciting topic of the week.

Margie Milam: Okay, yeah ,it's a really esoteric issue. We wrote about two, three pages on it so it's hard to go through it all in a few minutes. But the gist of it is when you're looking at consensus policies you look at the bylaws but you also look at the contracts.

So - but whatever's in the bylaws isn't going to change what is in, you know, how the contract is. You have to basically comply with both of them. You look at the contract, you look at the bylaws and there's various differences in definitions of consensus policies in the various contracts.

And so Avri was correct in the sense that when you're talking about whether the Board can act it's related to, you know, anything not just consensus policy. The issues could be broader coming out of the PDP, you know, the PDP process.

And then the other thing I think I wanted to note from the memo is it's different to summarize and, you know, is posted on the list for the work

team is that you have to read that section in connection, in context. And it's really talking about when you read it in context at least this is the way that we looked at it you have to, it's talking about when, what the Board does when it gets a recommendation from the GNSO Council and it depends upon what the vote was at the GNSO Council level.

And so the way that this reads if there is a super majority vote then there's a higher threshold that the Board has to approve the or not approve the GNSO Council recommendation. If they go against the recommendation it's a higher threshold if there was a super majority.

If there's not a super majority then they're simply saying that if you're going to approve a GNSO Council recommendation and there was not a super majority then you don't need the higher, you don't need a high threshold to go against the GNSO Council recommendation. And that's the interpretation that I got when I went, when we took a look at this.

And so if you read the memo we actually made clarifications on how that could be read. Because Jeff is correct it is very broad in the way it's written and it's not clear what the intent was when that was originally drafted. And so there is actually language to clarify, you know, the intent and how it would read, you know, with respect to the thresholds that are there.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Margie. And just to add like in the new TLD agreements and some of the existing agreements some of them differ because not everyone was signed on or around the same time. But it's interesting to note that consensus policies are those policies established pursuant to the bylaws. It's very circular.

So if you have the bylaws that are not very clear and you have an agreement that points to a bylaws that aren't clear then one could in theory without it being clarified could interpret, could make the interpretation that Avri has and some others that consensus policies do not need a super majority of the council.

And I think if people realize that - I'll, you know, I'll take my Chair hat off put my registry hat on. That's very disturbing, right, from a registry perspective to sign up to a contract that could be amended by the community is scary enough. No offense to the community it's just, you know, in certain operations you need stability and predictability when you enter into a contract.

But then to basically sign up to an agreement where it's not asserted you need a consensus of the community which at this point is measured by a super majority of the GNSO, if you don't even need that then you even have less predictability and stability and security.

And so for those operating new TLD's, you know, you really need to - this provision needs to be clarified because when you enter into these agreements they can be changed and you want to know how they can be changed because they can affect your business, they can affect your operations.

And we're seeing now even, you know, there are disputes going on now into registry operations that if you go to the ICANN Web site you'll find them, some disputes going on as to what, how much ability ICANN has to regulate.

And so this is something that, you know, taking staff's input and certainly taking the views of each side is something that I believe it's our obligation as the work team and ultimately when we send it to the council it's something that we need to clarify.

Margie Milam: And I think we said that in the memo that we think, you know, that if there's any ambiguity it should be clarified. So I mean and I think that we're consistent on that front.

Jeff Neuman: So Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah thank you, I wanted to comment on two things. One, as you pointed out and so I wanted to point out again it doesn't appear all that ambiguous to me. I take the fact that if there's something specifically in your contract that says consensus policy in relation to you means two-thirds of the GNSO then certainly that would be a prevailing condition that you'd have to deal with.

But if it says defined as consensus policy I think that we're defining the consensus policy as being not only the super majority of the GNSO but the combination of GNSO super majority, majority and Board requirements for approval/disapproval. That it's those two things together and that there basically is a binary condition on defining the consensus policy.

It's either super majority of the GNSO when the Board doesn't have a super majority that negates it or its majority of the GNSO when there's at least a majority of the Board that supports it. And it's a binary case there not a single case that defines what consensus is and I think it's

really quite clear. Unless as I say the contract says no, no, in our case it's only the GNSO that determines consensus of community. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thank you Avri. Anyone else with comments on that? Mary come on up. Mary Wong.

Mary Wong: I'm just here to torture Jeff. No. I've been thinking a little bit about this issue and I think you're right, it's kind of complicated, kind of arcane and I think many members in the community who haven't been paying attention really just get bogged down and lost in the details and some of them do even when they're thinking about it. At the same time I think it's kind of important.

So a couple of things. One is I think for everybody else as a reminder that the PDP process can include things that are consensus policy and things that are not consensus policy. Just as within the voting thresholds and bylaws there are different levels of voting like super majority or not.

And with respect to PDP recommendations that impose contracting duties on contracting parties that's a specific requirement as to what that super majority meant. So that adds to complexity but I think my general point leading on from that is that it all needs to be looked at in context and that is one of those contexts.

The other context and I actually had to pull up the bylaws because it's really, really hard to remember what it says is that when you're talking about 13f which is the specific subsection Jeff that you brought up here and I think one of the questions is what does it mean when you say that the Board can act?

When I look at the context of this and then I went up to 13, oh gosh let me look at this, 13b and 13c, right, because 13b talks about what happens when there is a GNSO super majority vote. Then the Board shall adopt the policy et cetera, et cetera.

Then 13c says in the event, wait, not 13c I'm sorry. Oh yes, and 13c says in the event the Board then determines to go against the super majority vote then it has to do certain things like give reasons. The key here is that in 13c the word is in the event the Board determines not to act. So I think your question with 13f needs to be looked at in that context in that the word act also appears in 13c.

I personally think that probably a broader interpretation is better but maybe for now the suggestion would be and I think it is a question as to whether we've heard back from the Board or whether they want to engage in discussions with the Board maybe even past Board members as to their understanding before moving forward. And can I comment on something else or should I come back later?

Jeff Neuman: Does anyone else want to comment on 13f? Okay then sure your...

Mary Wong: It's not on your slide.

Jeff Neuman: It's not on my slide? Okay.

Mary Wong: But it goes to I think one of the recommendations and you mentioned it earlier as to what are the sort of proposals that the PDP team can come back with? And I think it includes best practices and so on and so forth. And I think this comment is not just for the team which I think

did a great job pulling this stuff together. It was long overdue and I think it makes it a whole lot clearer than it used to be but also for the rest of the community.

And I think for those of us who have participated in different groups and teams and so forth at times especially if you are dealing with new comers to these groups and to ICANN who volunteered for the work it's really hard to explain to them what the outcomes ought to be.

So to the extent that there is clarity say in the manual as to the different kinds of potential outcomes an inclusive list, not necessarily an exhaustive list I think that would be very, very helpful to the members of the community who volunteer for these groups. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Mary. And I think we went into some detail or probably more detail in the preliminary report and I think we can maybe just bring some of that back to put that in. I think it's a good suggestion.

Okay. Some other issues that we're dealing with as well is, you know, we talked a little bit about beginning with this transition. So now that we have this new process we have several PDP's that are going on now. And so we got to figure out how easily to take all of these new rules and apply them to the new process to make sure that, you know, these recommendations are being carried out.

But, you know, and the good news here is that the recommendations aren't, they don't really go to the structure of how PDP's are, how you're to vote on a PDP for example. So it's not like we're changing thresholds. So that a PDP that was started, you know, six months ago that only had a certain percentage of votes would now be somehow

invalidated, you know, we're not doing any kind of those major changes.

Most of the changes we have are real helpful changes to ensure that there's, you know, informed decision making and, you know, we choose some best practices on how to make sure that, you know, the groups have the tools that they need in order to make...

Coordinator: Thank you for calling the digital replay service.

END