

GNSO Council AC Chat Transcript 21 January 2016

Marika Konings: (1/21/2016 19:05) Welcome to the GNSO Council meeting of 21 January 2016

Carlos Raul: (21:51) Hola!

Julf Helsingius: (21:52) Evening!

Valerie Tan: (21:54) Bonjour!

Julf Helsingius: (21:55) Guess I should do it in Finnish - Hyvää Iltää! :)

Nathalie Peregrine: (21:57) @ all, we are hearing a little bit of static on the AC audio, if you have not yet done so, it might be advisable for you to dial into the audio bridge.

Nathalie Peregrine: (21:58) thanks James!

James Bladel: (21:58) I was muted, btw. :)

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): (21:58) Good <time of the day> everyone !

Nathalie Peregrine: (21:58) It's just the AC connection, nothing to do with individual equipment :)

Jennifer Standiford: (21:59) Hello All

Julf Helsingius: (21:59) This interwe thingy is great - when it works...

Julf Helsingius: (21:59) interweb

Carlos Raul: (22:00) fine

Nathalie Peregrine: (22:02) Susan has just joined the AC

Marilia Maciel: (22:03) I am here Glen

Marilia Maciel: (22:03) Just on Adobe

David Cake: (22:03) I'm here, but apparently adobe failed. I'll ial in.

Stefania Milan: (22:03) my microphone is enabled

Marilia Maciel: (22:03) We could her you Stefi :)

Edward Morris: (22:04) Did adobe fail you, David, or have you failed adobe?

Nathalie Peregrine: (22:04) Please remember to mute your AC mics when not talking, thank you!

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): (22:04) Dave, Adobe is asking for a lamb to be sacrificed before it works for you.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (22:05) Hi all, I just joined. Apologies for my tardiness.

David Olive: (22:06) welcome everyone. regards. David

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): (22:07) Item 7 will get all the time we give to it, so I prefer moving with 4 and 5 first.

Amr Elsadr: (22:07) @James: I don't recall you seconding the motion on the RPMs review. Apologies if I missed that. I probably should have let you know I was going to withdraw that motion.

Philip Corwin: (22:08) @Rubens--It will get all that, and more...

Marilia Maciel: (22:08) The link to the motion on the Charter for the Working Group on New gTLDs Subsequent Procedures is pointing to the wrong doc. Could we get the right link?

James Bladel: (22:09) @Amr - I was planning to second the motino when it came up on our agenda. No longer necessary. But thanks for thinking ahead.

Marilia Maciel: (22:10) My mistake, I copied the wrong url. My apologies.

Philip Corwin: (22:12) My apologies...wrong IGO item

Donna Austin, RySG: (22:12) Will Public Interest be a High Level topic in Marrakech?

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): (22:13) Minor issue: some action items list council members that are no longer council members (Jonathan and Thomas)

Donna Austin, RySG: (22:14) @Rubens, there are some items that Jonathan and Thomas agreed to maintain even in their absence from the Council.

Donna Austin, RySG: (22:15) @James, I think Marika just answered my question.

Marika Konings: (22:16) We can update it to your name, James, no problem

David Cake: (22:19) fine by me

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): (22:19) I don't know if this page is current about TLG, but I think Dave was referring to these folks:

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): (22:19) <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/tlg-73-2012-02-25-en>

Mary Wong: (22:20) The WG submitted its Final Report to the Council on 8 Dec 2015.

Marika Konings: (22:21) Just to note that we'll add the link to the Final Report to the motion so it is part of the record.

Stephanie Perrin: (22:23) Stefania is unable to type or speak at the moment

David Cake: (22:23) Stefania is having technical problems but votes yes

Stephanie Perrin: (22:24) (I guess you got that in stereo)

Amr Elsadr: (22:24) Confirming David's comment above regarding Stefania.

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC: (22:25) Years!

James Bladel: (22:27) At least 1.5 years...I may have exaggerated that point.

Mary Wong: (22:27) Councilors may be pleased to note that the IRT to be formed (if the Board also adopts the PPSAI recommendations) that the IRT that will then be formed will, by the specific wording of this resolution that just passed, be operating in accordance with the new implementation principles approved by the Council following the Policy & Implementation WG recommendations recently.

Stephanie Perrin: (22:28) that will be interesting to watch

Philip Corwin: (22:32) Agree with Paul that 2nd level notation could create confusion

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): (22:33) I think Paul would prefer to have such notation to add clarity.

Amr Elsadr: (22:36) @Phil: First level = Top level?

Carlos Raul: (22:37) makes sense Phil

Heather Forrest: (22:38) that's fine

Philip Corwin: (22:38) @Amr-Yes

Stefania Milan: (22:38) @Glen. sent you my number

Philip Corwin: (22:38) 1st, 2nd/top, bottom ;-)

Marika Konings: (22:38) Staff can update the charter as suggested by Phil to change the heading to 'Rights Protection Mechanisms'.

Marika Konings: (22:39) and maybe James can note for the vote that it is an adoption of the charter with that specific change so it is on the record and we can circulate the updated charter immediately after the call

Glen de Saint Gery 2: (22:39) Thank you Stefania, we are calling you

Stefania Milan: (22:40) @Glen: thanks much!

Marilia Maciel: (22:40) Thanks Mary, yes.. very helpful

Edward Morris: (22:40) Great explanation Mary. Thanks.

Donna Austin, RySG: (22:43) The language in the charter states: Second-Level Rights Protection Mechanisms: Proposing recommendations directly related to RPMs is beyond the remit of this PDP. There is an anticipated PDP on the "current state of all rights protection mechanisms (RPMs) implemented for both existing and new gTLDs, including but not limited to the UDRP and the URS...". Duplication or conflicting work between the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP and the PDP on RPMs must be avoided. If topics related to RPMs are uncovered and discussed in the deliberations of this PDP, those topics should be relayed to the PDP on RPMs for resolution. To assure effective coordination between the two groups, a community liaison, who is a member of both Groups, is to be appointed jointly by both Groups and confirmed by the GNSO Council.

Donna Austin, RySG: (22:44) Does the phrase: Duplication or conflicting work between the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP and the PDP on RPMs must be avoided. If topics related to RPMs are uncovered and discussed in the deliberations of this PDP, those topics should be relayed to the PDP on RPMs for resolution. address the concerns?

Philip Corwin: (22:45) What we want to avoid is having the same issues addressed by two separate PDPs

Philip Corwin: (22:45) It's hard enough to get consensus within just one PDP

Heather Forrest: (22:45) Not necessarily - there is less re-work of the Subsequent Procedures charter if we leave RPMs in

Amr Elsadr: (22:45) @Donna: I thought that did the trick. I'm not sure I understand the issue right now. Must be missing something.

Mary Wong: (22:46) Note that the potential RPM PDP - as currently scoped - does not include mechanisms like the Legal Rights Objections. To the extent that the LRO process is

considered by the COuncil to be a "RPM", that would still (under the current formulation) come within this New gTLD PDP rather than the potential RPM PDP.

Mary Wong: (22:46) The draft charter for the RPM PDP is in the Final Issue Report. Let me provide the link.

Heather Forrest: (22:46) Mary makes a very important point.

Mary Wong: (22:47) Draft RPM charter: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/new-gtlds/rpm-final-issue-11jan16-en.pdf>

Amr Elsadr: (22:47) Ouch.

Heather Forrest: (22:47) RPM PDP only deals with second level, while Subsequent Procedures deals with things that some of us characterise as top level RPMs (LRO, etc)

James Bladel: (22:47) wow

Carlos Raul: (22:47) wow

Keith Drazek (RySG): (22:47) Yikes

Carlos Raul: (22:47) that was LOUD

Mary Wong: (22:47) @Heather, except for PDDRP

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): (22:48) LRO review is really a best fit for the new gTLD review PDP, so current state in this regard looks fine to me.

Heather Forrest: (22:48) Understood Mary

Amr Elsadr: (22:48) Thanks Heather.

Heather Forrest: (22:48) It just seems like we have RPMs spread across these 2 PDPs

Heather Forrest: (22:48) Some we're calling RPMs, some we're not calling RPMs but they function like RPMs

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC: (22:48) I think we are stuck because we are not looking at these 2 charters side by side.

Edward Morris: (22:49) Good point Paul

Marilia Maciel: (22:49) Agreed Paul.

Mary Wong: (22:49) Maybe it would help to note that the potential RPM PDP ****only**** (as currently scoped) cover: TMCH (including sunrise and claims notices); URS; PDDRP and the UDRP.

Heather Forrest: (22:49) Can I make a suggestion for a way forward?

Marilia Maciel: (22:49) Heather made a fair point that will be hard to solve without the second charter.

Edward Morris: (22:49) Agreed Marilia.

Amr Elsadr: (22:50) Although the RPM issue report doesn't specifically cover 2nd level and top level, it does say "all RPMs in all gTLDs". Maybe a clarification can be made in the RPMs issue report?

Mary Wong: (22:50) The draft RPM charter is in the Final Issue Report, starting on page 30.(Annex A)

Amr Elsadr: (22:51) I was dropped off the call. Can I please get another dial out?

Nathalie Peregrine: (22:51) yes Amr

Heather Forrest: (22:51) I'm not trying to defer the vote -

Amr Elsadr: (22:51) Thanks Nathalie.

Heather Forrest: (22:51) Just a quick change that gives us the flexibility on RPMs going forward

Heather Forrest: (22:52) @ James - yes, exactly, flexibility

Stephanie Perrin: (22:52) lost sound

Mary Wong: (22:52) Suggestion - per Heather, make clear in this resolution that the RPMs that are being referred to the RPM PDP are those scoped by that PDP.

Heather Forrest: (22:53) @ Mary - I think it would also be helpful to include flexibility that the RPM PDP could be folded into this Subsequent Procedures PDP

Heather Forrest: (22:53) So one single PDP

Amr Elsadr: (22:53) @Phil: Does that also apply to the PDDRP?

Mary Wong: (22:53) There is a sentence in THIS charter (being voted on) that says "Duplication or conflicting work between the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP and the PDP on RPMs must be avoided. If topics related to RPMs are uncovered and discussed in

the deliberations of this PDP, those topics should be relayed to the PDP on RPMs for resolution."

Amr Elsadr: (22:54) Yes Mary. Thanks.

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): (22:54) Amr, PDDRP is scoped to the RPM PDP, and this sounds very sane to me.

Heather Forrest: (22:54) Just not clear to me why we need 2 PDPs. We run into timing and coordination issues beyond simply overlapping content

Amr Elsadr: (22:54) @Rubens: That's what I thought too.

Philip Corwin: (22:54) @Heather--I cannot agree to the concept of the RPM review being folded into this one

Jennifer Standiford: (22:55) The first task of Working Groups is usually to review the charter and to see if any amendments need to be made. We should consider to adopt this charter and move this to the Working Group as their first task

Nathalie Peregrine: (22:55) @ Stephanie, do you need us to dial out to you?

Philip Corwin: (22:55) 2nd level RPMs deserve their own focused consideration

Heather Forrest: (22:55) @James - agree - no need to decide on merger now but let's put the flexibility in there

Mary Wong: (22:56) It would be preferable for record purposes to have it spelled out in an additional Resolved clause, yes

Keith Drazek (RySG): (22:56) I support finding a way to move this forward today.

Amr Elsadr: (22:56) I believe Jennifer's suggestion is a good one. That combined with some work on the RPMs PDP issue report should do the job.

Marika Konings: (22:56) just to agree with James that amendment to the motion directing certain changes and/or considerations would be cleaner than trying to modify the charter

Donna Austin, RySG: (22:57) Can we include an additional resolved clause: The GNSO Council notes the potential for overlap and duplication with this PDP and the RPM PDP. The Chairs of both WGs will work together to understand where these issues are and address as necessary.

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC: (22:57) I'm not comfortable leaving it up to the WG. We should get clarity.

Marika Konings: (22:57) Correct again - a PDP WG can always come back to the Council to request changes to its charter.

Amr Elsadr: (22:57) @James: +1

Carlos Raul: (22:57) can't hear

Mary Wong: (22:57) The language I had in quotes? Yes.

Carlos Raul: (22:57) better now txs

Philip Corwin: (22:58) just lost my phone line

Amr Elsadr: (22:58) The charter is pretty clear on duplication of effort, and the role of the community liaison between the two PDPs.

Heather Forrest: (22:58) @ James - yes, spot on

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): (23:00) Perhaps we could add "If the foreseen RPM PDP doesn't come about, the WG is instructed to get back to the Council for further instructions on how to move forward, possibly with charter amendments. "

Mary Wong: (23:00) The Council can also amend the potential RPM charter to have a similar, or even clearer, statement.

Heather Forrest: (23:01) Not at all intended. I can try to draft a Resolved clause

Susan Kawaguchi 2: (23:01) @Phil I brought the council's attention to the language Mary posted in the chat Mary Wong: There is a sentence in THIS charter (being voted on) that says "Duplication or conflicting work between the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP and the PDP on RPMs must be avoided. If topics related to RPMs are uncovered and discussed in the deliberations of this PDP, those topics should be relayed to the PDP on RPMs for resolution."

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): (23:01) That would leave flexibility but still maintains Council prerogative.

Carlos Raul: (23:03) This sounds to my pretty mch like Ed Norris mail today on the accumulative resultls of 1+10+11

Heather Forrest: (23:03) New resolved clause: 4. Issues relating to RPMs not addressed by RPM PDP shall be addressed by this PDP.

Carlos Raul: (23:03) you can work separately, but you have to consider the impact togehter

Amr Elsadr: (23:04) I believe that a combination of Mary's suggestion and Jennifer's earlier suggestion to task the WG to review the charter should do the trick.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:04) Agree Amr

Jennifer Standiford: (23:04) The PDP is already initiated, all we need is the charter.

Marilia Maciel: (23:04) Heather's suggestion good too

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC: (23:04) +1 to Heather's proposed flexibilty resolved clause

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): (23:06) "forthcoming RPM PDP", perhaps.

Heather Forrest: (23:06) Agreed - "anticipated" or "forthcoming" RPM PDP

Donna Austin, RySG: (23:06) Thanks Heather, support the new clause.

Julf Helsingius: (23:07) Sounds good!

Heather Forrest: (23:07) This leaves the flexibility there for the two PDPs to sort this out in detail

Jennifer Standiford: (23:07) Thanks Phil

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC: (23:07) Heather's resolved clause creates a home for homeless RPM issues that the other PDP doesn't address. Otherwise, they could be left out in the cold. Thanks Heather!

Mary Wong: (23:07) "Anticipated" may be preferable to "forthcoming" since the Council hasn't yet voted on the RPM PDP.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:08) Agree on "anticipated"

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): (23:08) Coin toss ?

Jennifer Standiford: (23:08) anticipated

Philip Corwin: (23:08) Agree as well. Although it's 99.9% certain we will launch that RPM PDP

Donna Austin, RySG: (23:09) anticipated or forthcoming works for me.

Stephanie Perrin: (23:09) Sorry for the confusion Glen, I am still here....just had a temporary sound blackout

Susan Kawaguchi: (23:09) Thanks all!

Stefania Milan: (23:10) yes

Stefania Milan: (23:10) can you hear me?

Julf Helsingius: (23:10) yes

Heather Forrest: (23:11) Glen you forgot me - heather is yes

Donna Austin, RySG: (23:12) Thanks everyone

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC: (23:12) Happy to

Edward Morris: (23:13) I agree James

Amr Elsadr: (23:13) Are we going to discuss the reasons for the withdrawn motion, or will we be doing that on-list?

Amr Elsadr: (23:13) I know we're a bit tight with time.

Mary Wong: (23:13) @Amr, since the motion has been withdrawn, that may not be necessary.

Stephanie Perrin: (23:13) can you give us back the ability to enlarge text please

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC: (23:14) I would be interested to hear why the RPM PDP was withdrawn.

Amr Elsadr: (23:14) @Mary: I had suggested including it as a discussion item. Was just wondering if we would be doing that.

Mary Wong: (23:14) @Stephanie - sorry; as this is now switched to a shared screen, it will be hard to make the text any larger.

Stephanie Perrin: (23:14) thanks I have full screened it.

James Bladel: (23:15) Amr & Paul - Good idea. But in the interests of time, we should tackle this item first and circle back to he withdrawn motion.

Glen de Saint Gery 2: (23:15) For your information, Thomas Rickert has joined the call

Amr Elsadr: (23:15) Sure. Thanks James.
Thomas Rickert, CCWG Co-Chair: (23:15) Hi all!
Mary Wong: (23:15) Welcome, Thomas
Rubens Kuhl (RySG): (23:15) Hi Thomas!
Edward Morris: (23:16) Welcome Thomas
Stephanie Perrin: (23:18) do we have scroll capability?
Nathalie Peregrine: (23:19) It is a screen share so no scrolling possible, Stephanie
Stephanie Perrin: (23:19) ok, the link to this document is available on the workspace, correct, or are there fresh changes
Marika Konings 2: (23:20) this version includes the changes that have been suggested on the mailing list in the hours leading up to this meeting.
Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:21) The CCWG charter provides for Chartering Organization review and approval at this stage of the work. It *could* have covered the last round as well, but the Co-Chairs, agreed to a public comment period.
Amr Elsadr: (23:21) May we please see the language on rec#11 on the screen?
Marika Konings 2: (23:21) @Amr - we will go there when we start discussion recommendation #11
Julf Helsingius: (23:21) Do we have a link to the text?
Amr Elsadr: (23:22) OK. Thanks Marika.
Marika Konings 2: (23:22) as noted, this is the same version originally circulated by Mary + the edits that have been circulated on the mailing list.
PAUL MCGRADY - IPC: (23:22) James, perhaps, but not if the parade wraps up while we are running our own comment period.
Mary Wong: (23:22) @Julf, do you mean the letter? No - though the original draft was sent to the Council list. What you see on screen is that draft plus changes (marked up) that reflect suggestions made by Councilors on the list.
Amr Elsadr: (23:22) @James: We could run a GIP (GNSO Input Process)? One of the new processes we haven't yet used.
Amr Elsadr: (23:23) Although that may be a lengthier process than we may need it to be now.
Julf Helsingius: (23:23) @mary: ok, thanks!
Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:24) Every public comment period requires analysis and addressing the comments. When does it end? At what point does the report get sent to the CO's for approval? At some point, the COs need to represent the community interests.
Stephanie Perrin: (23:24) can you distribute this document to the list, that way we can read it,
Julf Helsingius: (23:24) yes, please!
Edward Morris: (23:25) +1 Keith
Marika Konings 2: (23:25) will send it now, but note that further changes may be made as part of this discussion.
Edward Morris: (23:25) Agreed James.
Julf Helsingius: (23:25) Thanks, Marika
Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:26) The CCWG has absolutely considered and addressed the public comments submitted at every stage.
Marika Konings 2: (23:26) sent
Philip Corwin: (23:26) Would also note that nearly all public comments on the Proposal came from entities active within Chartering Orgs
Philip Corwin: (23:26) third
PAUL MCGRADY - IPC: (23:27) What if there are material changes like last time?
Carlos Raul: (23:27) can we get scroll rights please?
Edward Morris: (23:28) @ Paul. At that point we'll have to fight it on the CCWG.
Nathalie Peregrine: (23:28) @ Carlos, Marika is sharing her screen to be able to edit the document live, there is therefore no scrolling capacity
Marika Konings 2: (23:28) All, I've sent this version to the Council list so you should have it in your inbox shortly.

Carlos Raul: (23:28) Danke

Mary Wong: (23:31) Perhaps the Council, in this letter, can consider deleting the phrase in question (whether it says "as well as" or "reflective of" the larger community), since this letter is for responding to the Proposal.

Mary Wong: (23:32) As James notes, any Council agreement/belief on the need for public comments can be sent separately, possibly if it becomes clear(er) that there will be a Supplementary Proposal that is likely to have substantial changes.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:32) How about this language as a way forward? "...the GNSO Council expects also that it and other Chartering Organizations, and possibly the larger community, will have an adequate opportunity to review and comment on the Supplemental proposal..."

Edward Morris: (23:32) I like that Keith. +1.

Philip Corwin: (23:33) Good suggestion Keith

Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:33) I take Paul's point that, IF we get major changes, a broader comment period might be required. I don't think that is likely. So my proposed language leaves open the possibility without saying it's a requirement at this time.

Thomas Rickert, CCWG Co-Chair: (23:34) Paul, the US jurisdiction issue was already in our 1st draft report published in May last year.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:34) I also acknowledge that I have been heavily involved in the CCWG for 22 months, so I'm a bit in the weeds.

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC: (23:36) @Thomas, does the CCWG believe that the last version did not contain major changes? If so, I think that is even more troubling since the CCWG may not be understanding how materials those changes were and may have a similar opinion about changes in the next version.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:37) ...and who determines what's material?

Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:38) The larger community is represented largely by the Chartering Organizations.

Amr Elsad: (23:38) @Keith: Exactly. My guess is that someone will always believe there are material changes after any public comment period.

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC: (23:38) Point taken Keith.

Julf Helsingius: (23:39) Just lost sound on the phone line

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC: (23:39) OK to strike my proposed dependent clause about materiality.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:40) Thanks Paul. I think it's a good compromise.

Edward Morris: (23:40) Perfect

Wolf-Ulrich Knob: (23:40) I agree

Stephanie Perrin: (23:40) I agree with Wolf, "overall" is a vague term, this is much better

Thomas Rickert, CCWG Co-Chair: (23:41) Paul, according to the charter it is in the CCWG's discretion whether or not a supplemental draft needs to be issued. Hence, the question whether changes are material or not has to be discussed by the group. Note that where we are now is the result of an evolutionary process. Hence, I think it is appropriate to call what we are doing refinements.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:41) This proposed change from the RySG was just to ensure accuracy with the RySG comments submitted. I'm not looking to change anyone's mind on the substance.

Edward Morris: (23:42) I'm fine with it, as well.

Philip Corwin: (23:43) @Keith--my understanding is that the three Ry conditions were added to Rec 11 this week. Correct?

Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:44) I think this is a very clear, concise and informative communication to the CCWG.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:44) Yes Phil, that's my understanding.

Edward Morris: (23:44) Thanks Wolf-Ulrich.

Philip Corwin: (23:44) Thx Keith

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC: (23:45) Can we scroll down?

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): (23:45) Thomas, if could comment on what are the co-chairs expectations for responses from chartering organizations in them being only yes/no, or allowing conditionality on changes or conditionality between recommendations.

Mary Wong: (23:46) @Paul it's still a screen share - let us know which page/section you'd like Marika to show on the screen.

Julf Helsingius: (23:47) I don't know how to capture the concern about the 1-10-11 interconnectedness that Ed described

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC: (23:47) Mary, can you send me the PDF?

Thomas Rickert, CCWG Co-Chair: (23:48) Rubens, I am not sure I fully understand the request. Are you looking for me to respond to these questions now or for the co-chairs to get back to Council in writing?

Mary Wong: (23:48) @Julf, there are cross references to these recommendations here and there, e.g. see Rec 10 at the bottom

Mary Wong: (23:48) As well as the opening sentenc of Rec 1

Julf Helsingius: (23:49) @Mary: Agree

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): (23:49) From you, informally, but referring to your perception from the overall co-chairs expectations.

Mary Wong: (23:49) @Paul, did you mean the PDF of the table on the screen?

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC: (23:49) Thanks Marika!

Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:49) I support Ed's suggestion.

Thomas Rickert, CCWG Co-Chair: (23:49) OK. I will stand by to respond.

Marika Konings: (23:50) I've made the proposed change by Ed

Marika Konings: (23:50) but you will no longer be able to see it 'live' as you now have the pdf version up on the screen

Mary Wong: (23:51) Since the comments to Rec 10 refer to 1 and 11, it may make sense that the comments to Rec 1 include a reference to 10 as well as 11.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:51) The linkage is real. Thanks to Ed and James.

Edward Morris: (23:51) THanks Mary

Julf Helsingius: (23:51) OK, that takes care of my concerns

Philip Corwin: (23:52) It's the unholy trinity

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC: (23:53) @James, sounds like a plan

Edward Morris: (23:53) Full support James

Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:53) I think that makes sense James.

Julf Helsingius: (23:53) +1

Donna Austin, RySG: (23:53) Agreed James

Philip Corwin: (23:53) Sounds like a plan

Valerie Tan: (23:53) Well said, James

Amr Elsadr: (23:53) I was dropped off the call. Hoping I'm not going to miss anything crucial in the last 5 minutes.

Edward Morris: (23:53) I'm happy Amr.

Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:54) We should try to send it tomorrow. My understanding is the GAC is also planning to submit something tomorrow.

Edward Morris: (23:54) +1 Keith

Philip Corwin: (23:55) Yes, on Supplemental it will be a binary choice, Yes or No

Keith Drazek (RySG): (23:56) Amr got dropped

Thomas Rickert, CCWG Co-Chair: (23:56) Bye all!

Amr Elsadr: (23:57) I'm back on now, but similar to Suzan, I would like to defer this to a later time. :)

Amr Elsadr: (23:57) Thanks James, and apologies.

Marika Konings 2: (23:59) Please note that the issue report is 'Final'. The Council is asked to consider initiation of the PDP and a charter. Any changes to the approach or scope should happen in the charter.

Philip Corwin: (1/22/2016 00:00) If we had kept RPMs on today's schedule we'd need a 4 hour call

Edward Morris: (00:00) Well put Amr. Agree.

Marika Konings 2: (00:00) @Amr - that is for the Council to consider as part of the charter. The Issue Report scopes the issue and includes a staff recommendation (which the Council is free to ignore, for the record ;-)

Philip Corwin: (00:01) That RPM Charter will probably engender some considerable debate

PAUL MCGRADY - IPC: (00:01) @James, great call! Thanks!

Susan Kawaguchi: (00:02) Thanks James!

Stephanie Perrin: (00:02) When will the RPM be back?

Edward Morris: (00:02) Thank you James

Philip Corwin: (00:02) Good work today Councilors!

Rubens Kuhl (RySG): (00:02) Thanks all, bye!

Mary Wong: (00:02) @Stephanie, next call - 18 Feb

Stefania Milan: (00:02) Thanks all, bye!

Stephanie Perrin: (00:02) Thanks Mary!

Amr Elsadr: (00:02) Sand storms here all week!! :)

Marika Konings 2: (00:02) @Stephanie, per the PDP Manual the Council is expected to consider initiation of the PDP at the next meeting.

Heather Forrest: (00:02) Thanks everyone - blizzard sounds awful, I'll take summer

Amr Elsadr: (00:02) Thanks all. Bye.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (00:02) Thanks and bye!

Julf Helsingius: (00:02) Thanks everybody!

James Bladel: (00:02) Thanks all!

David Cake: (00:02) Thanks all

Valerie Tan: (00:02) Thanks everyone!

David Cake: (00:03) Glad we went to Washington in January last year not this year! Take care.

Marilia Maciel: (00:03) bye all!