

## **Framework of Operating Principles Cross Community Working Group TRANSCRIPT**

**Thursday 22 May 2014 at 1500 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-review20140515-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>

### Attendees:

Alan Greenberg  
Natalia Enciso  
Anne-Cathrin Marcussen  
John Berard - (Co-Chair)  
Alan MacGillivray  
Becky Burr - (Co-Chair)  
Avri Doria  
Ali Hadji

### Apologies:

Isak Jacobsen

### ICANN staff:

Mary Wong  
Bart Boswinkel  
Steve Chan  
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Started, you may now begin.

Woman: Thank you ever so much (Doreen). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the Framework of Operating Principles Cross-Community Working Group call on the 22nd of May, 2014.

On the call today we have Alan Greenberg, (Natalia Sezo) and (Justin Muckerson), John Berard, (Allan Macalvey) and Becky Burr. Avri Doria has just joined the room. We have an apology from (Isaac Jacobson).

And from staff we have Mary Wong, Bart Boswinkel, Steve Sheng, myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you John.

John Berard: Well thank you very much. This is John Berard for the record, and serving as co-chair of this working group from the GNSO. And my co-chair, my fellow co-chair, Becky if you wanted to introduce yourself.

Becky Burr: Hi Becky Burr from (unintelligible).us. I think John that we're interim chairs because...

John Berard: Right.

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: Currently as serving as, right, as co-chairs. That's correct.

Becky Burr: We can be good.

John Berard: Well I, you know, there may be some strategic value in that. I appreciate the participation of all of you who have joined us here this morning. Alan and (Alan), always good to talk to you guys. Thank you for being on the call.

What I'd like to do straightaway are two things. The first is to restate from the GNSO perspective why I think this is an important exercise, in fact maybe one of the more important initiatives that organizationally, from a procedure in process basis that the community can be involved in.

And it speaks to what I believe is an increased requirement for cross-training working groups at a time when there is an even performance across community working groups. And so the ability to create a framework of principles for their operation strikes me as being really essential for the work of ICANN going forward.

Having said that, I know that we have had expressions of interest from far more people than are on the call. But I do want not just to ask the people on the call to introduce themselves, but also to offer a bit of perspective as to what it is that brought them to this work so that we can each understand the other's motivations.

So I'll leave it to you Mary to do a roll call. And whether you want to do it by height, age, weight...

Woman: Not weight please.

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: Yes if it were weight I shouldn't have gone first anyways. So anyway (unintelligible) roll call over to you.

Mary Wong: Well let's be safe and go through the list of participants as they appear on the Adobe Connect screen, which I think is alphabetical. So if we can start with Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: I guess it at the curse of having a name that starts with A. Well I'm from the Large Advisory Committee. I am - have been for quite a while the ALAC liaison to the GNSO.

I've been involved in a good number of cross working groups of various forms, including the - one of the least successful and most tumultuous in terms of disputes over rules. The one on joint applicant support.

And probably the group - the situation that caused this whole discussion to start, that is we cannot have cross working groups without having rules even though the current history seems to demonstrate that that's not quite true.

So I have a very definite interest in seeing how this turns out. And I'm intrigued to - I'm tempted to hypothesize what the outcomes will be, but I want to do that right now.

Given that the potential for cross working groups with a large variety of different members, different groups participating in any given group, it will be interesting to see how we can come up with rules that will work ahead of time without knowing exactly what the rationale for any given group is or who the participants are going to be. So I think this is going to be fun. Thank you.

Mary Wong: Thinks Alan. And later on this call Bart will go through the typical life cycle of a working group, which might, you know, highlight some of the points you just made. If we can just move on now to the next Allan with two L's, (Allan Macalvey).

(Allan Macalvey): Hi. Can everyone hear me?

Man: Yes (Allan).

(Allan Macalvey): Okay just checking. Yes, so I'm - actually I'm with - I'm a relative newcomer to the community. Actually Bart asked me if I wouldn't mind volunteering my services, and I was pleased to do so.

So when I see him London, I'll have to figure out whether he owes me a beer for me having volunteered, or whether I have to buy him one. So nevertheless, I'm just here from a CC and a ccNSO and hope I can help.

Mary Wong: Thank you (Allan) and welcome. (Katherine).

(Katherine): Hello everybody. Can you hear me?

John Berard: We can.

Mary Wong: We can.

(Katherine): You can. Okay great. Well I'm also a (stp) person. I am working as a lawyer for the (just no) registries. And I'm really standing for my superior, and that's (Mai) but she's in the base right now. So she couldn't join. So I'm her stand in today.

We look at this work as a very important one. From a ccNSO perspective I think the corporation and the way forward for ICANN has to - it has to be corporation in a way to find working groups functioning better. So we are interested in helping as much as we can. And yes, provide our service.

Mary Wong: Thank you very much. And now Avri.

Avri Doria: hi, I'm Avri Doria. I'm a member of NCSG and of At Large. I'm currently on the GNSO Council. I think I've been in many cross working groups or what have you.

I think most of them have worked fairly well. Even the one Alan considers disastrous I think went well. So - because it arrived at a definite place. And I really think that they are a necessary solution to one of ICANN's larger problems of siloization. So I think it's a great idea. Thanks.

Mary Wong: Thanks Avri, and I'll skip over Becky and John because we've had your introductions. And then so now we are moving on to (Natalia). If you could introduce yourself briefly.

(Natalia Sezo): Yes hello. This is (Natalia Sezo). Can you hear me?

Mary Wong: Yes we can.

John Berard: Yes we can, yes.

(Natalia Sezo): Okay thank you. I am At Large member, and that this is my first experience in a cross (community) working group. So I can learn from all of you and help as much as I can. Thanks.

Mary Wong: Thank you so much. Nathalie, do we have anybody on the audio that is not in adobe?

Nathalie Peregrine: No we don't.

Mary Wong: Okay great. Thank you. So John and Becky, that's the people who are on the call today. And hopefully we'll meet some of - the rest of our participants shortly. But for now do you want to go back to the agenda and tell us why we're here?

John Berard: Well I think certainly. This is John Berard. I think that Alan and Avri have collectively described exactly I think why we're here. That the effectiveness of the organization to, as Avri put it, eliminate silos will continue to be a great need because the problems seeking solutions will no longer be confined to any one constituency, stakeholder group, SO or AC.

And as the community looks for communitywide solutions, there will be an increased requirement for cross community working groups. And ultimately I think that cross community working groups will be redesigned as working groups.

If you think about the fact that when digital watches became available, you had to come up with a new name for an old watch. And so the analog watch was born.

I think what's going to happen here is just the reverse. That the cross community working group will become the dominant format of working groups. And so therefore, it would be good if we could develop a set of framework of operating principles.

Alan's point about the joint applicant support, a cross community working group suggests something in focusing on outcomes perhaps rather than focusing on prescriptive elements might also satisfy some of the problems that Avri hints at where she talks about what are some of the advantages Avri insight when she talks about how we would have failed joint cross community working group can have a positive effect.

And so I think we'll be talking a little bit about that. So, you know, whether or not we want to focus on outcomes, you know, this is what (brought their) working group, a cross community working group should focus on what ought to happen, not exactly how it ought to happen.

And some of that is going to be dictated by the mission of the cross community working group. But clearly we need to make it easier for these groups to organize and launch no matter how contentious or easy the discussion is once that occurs.

So having said that, I mean I think Bart, you've got something you want to take us through that's (broad) to how a working group normally presents itself. And maybe that will help guide us.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. It's more based - and that this was the - so this is Bart for the record. So this is a presentation that's taking the ccNSO say response on the cross community working group principles from the GNSO a little bit further.

And that was the starting point for making that submission or response, or providing the response to the GNSO. So the way you should, say I look at it

and say the ccNSO has looked at it is say if you look at a typical working group or cross community working group, you can identify certain phases.

So you initiate either a working group or cross community working group. And then there is the phase of formation, the operation of the working group itself, closure and then follow up. So (want ends)?

And this could be again another cross community or working group set up in the submission or the response the ccNSO made. We highlighted some examples. And it's included in the material as well.

Now if you think of this say as the lifecycle model of a working group or cross community working group, then I think when you start one or when say that the community wants to start one is you have to address in the charter or in modeling what you need to do, you have to address all these phases.

And now taking it a step back and say may be that something this working group intends to do or could do is at least start defining some of these phases that are of a very, very high importance for a successful cross community working group.

And then whether either some principles or detailed guidelines or whatever, build them around them. So I'll run you through the different phases and highlight some of the elements, say based on the experience with a lots of these cross community working groups, some more successful than others, that have been addressed.

So as I said, so you start with the initiation of a cross community working group or working group. And I think what is important already is to first of all understand if there is a problem space, and what are the issues.

And then what is relevant because what you see normally, this is outside. This is where there is some, how would you - how should I express it, some



uncomfortableness around a topic or even you could take the example of the NPIA process.

You have to say there is problem space. And then your first question is, is this problem space within the limit of the SO or AC. Again, this varies very much per SO and AC.

And then based on that say identification, you start with the initial purpose statement of a potential group. Then - and I think this is often forgotten is whether the working group methods or the working group, is that the most appropriate means to address the issue.

And this is still in the initiation phase. The alternatives are a PDP, which in the case of the ccNSO is a very heavy-handed instrument. And it may include working groups, but in principle it's something completely different than a working group. Now there is some you could say, if I understand it correctly from a GNSO perspective, they're appreciated differently.

So then there's another alternative is SO or AC launches of working group. And advise observers and liaisons. I think some people on this call were - participated in the study group on the use of country names. And then that was initiated by the ccNSO.

People from other SOs and ACs were invited to participate as either observer or liaison. It turned out (unintelligible) was again through the ccNSO. And at that as a result you got now the cross community working group.

And then the next phase is invite the other SOs and ACs. It could be, again it could be you just need one or two other SOs and ACs because the space is so limited. You're talking about the problem space. It could be the whole community acting.

The good example of invite other SOs or ACs, OSOs and ACs is this particular working group itself, but also the BSSA. And then the question is (lot) launching the - and that's still in the initiation phase, say according to this say schedule or lifecycle model is launching of the drafting process itself.

And again there is a variances in practices. And this is refining if you could define a whole set of process and procedures around it.

So the next one I would say is more the formation. And this is more the administrative phase of the creation of a cross community working group or a working group itself.

It's first of all you should have a charter, a draft charter for submission. It could be done say in some cases that one SO has already, or AC has already adopted. And invite others. Or it should be adopted by all SOs and ACs at the same time. Again, that's something.

(Call) will volunteer participants. Again, note the different practices and the call for volunteers and participants. Nothing which is I think in the creation of this working group, but also in the creation of the cross community working group.

And IG is a real issue is the number of members observed as liaisons for SOs and ACs. Include a statement of interest, appointment of SO and then the real appointment by SO and AC according to their own rules and procedures. This is all part of the formation.

And then finally, appointment of co-chairs. And again, different practices across difference SOs and ACs.

Now, and I think this is where we have, again there is a large divergence in practices and procedures is how do these working groups and cross

community working groups operate. And it depends very much on I would say which of the SO and AC are participating in this actual working group.

I've seen them say work some very rigorous procedural driven ones and some which are very, they develop their practices over their work. And then they are more or less accepted by everybody, and everybody lives up to them.

So again, that's one of the, I would say topics that need to be addressed in the charter. And - which is relevant for a cross community working group is reporting on progress both of the participating SOs and ACs to the community.

The internal decision-making within a working group, and again there is different practices. For example, as most of you have participated in some of these cross community working groups, a different perception and method of dealing with consensus and the perception of it, and how far do you need to go in defining this definition of the co-chairs, operating procedures as well, say different practice - again, different practices.

And then finally some more the administrative parts is how do you deal with adjustment update of the charters, public consultations and final reporting what's the status.

Then closure, I'll say this captures again a very administrative phase. And again, experience has shown it can be cumbersome. But it's a very I think trusted way of dealing with both the working group, cross community working group, their deliverables and the roles of the participating SOs and ACs.

And that's more or less the decision-making of the participating SOs and ACs on the deliverables themselves. And I think this is say again, based on current experience. That's a basic rule that you see there.

At the end of the day whatever comes out of a working group needs to go back and feedback into the participating SOs and ACs for final support or endorsement or approval. And that's the closure of it.

As you are dealing with different SOs and ACs, there need some - needs to be some rules of conflict as well if one disagrees or two disagree and three want to move forward or agree, how do you deal with this.

Again, as I said deliverables and then the communication between the working group and the SO and ACs is an element that needs to be documented as well so there are no surprises for participating SOs and ACs, and for working group members for that matter if something, say especially around closure.

And then formal closure or exits rules, say when does the working group close? Is it on adoption of a final report? Is it on adoption of - or is that when something has been submitted to another entity?

What is probably as important as well, exit rules for one or two of the SOs and ACs is they think the work has been completed. What do you do then? So in order not to be bound by a decision or as an alternative, to block progress.

And then finally, and I think - and that these are elements that you see within some of the SO or some of the working groups, charters and cross community working group's charters. Obviously what will happen post-closure? Is there a follow-up action? This could be in the final report or as part of the recommendation.

It also could be say who, for example, if there is an outcome or the output of a cross community working group, is a report to be submitted to the ICANN Board or to ICANN Staff? Who is going to do it?

Is the working group itself have to endorse support? Or is it a joint letter from the participating SOs and ACs? I've seen both. But it's something to take into consideration when moving forward.

And then if required is monitoring review implementation of recommendations. Again, you see this as - I see this as part of the life cycle of a model post-closure. You could address it in the charter, but you couldn't - it could be part of the deliverables as well.

That was my brief overview of the lifecycle. Any questions?

John Berard: Bart this is John. More than just questions from the folks on this call, I'd love to hear reactions because each of you is deeply experienced in working groups so much as individual, but also joint and cross community.

You know, we hope that we can, coming out of this meeting - out of this first call, which I would like to keep this 60 minutes as we had promised. I would like to come out of this with an idea of what our roadmap ought to be. Not so much committed to a timeframe, but a sequence of what we should be considering and how one step might lead to the next and ultimately to the development of this framework of operating principles.

So Alan, if I could ask you, because I know that you're kind and merciful, to begin the discussion? What reaction to you have to what Bart has said and how we - how it points and how we might proceed?

Alan Greenburg: Thank you, John. I'm not sure kind and merciful is the words a lot of people would apply to me.

John Berard: Well you are Canadian aren't you?

Alan Greenburg: I am Canadian.

John Berard: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenburg: Thank you.

I basically support what he said. He's identified a lot of the issues. I think it may be useful at this point to review some of the - I made reference to the JAS working group earlier. And by the way, if - for what Avri said, I didn't say it was disastrous. I said it was tumultuous. The outcome is quite different from the process that was - the problems with the process.

John Berard: Right.

Alan Greenburg: I'll identify a couple of the problems that we had with that, and hopefully they are problems which this working group will setup processes or rules to minimize the tumultuousness should they happen again. And the possibility is certainly - it is certainly possible that the situations will happen again. The question is can we deal with them better than we dealt with them last time?

And there were a number of different problems. One was that the group was chartered with an original charter which was completed to a large extent. The work product was submitted to the chartering organizations, one of which approved it, and it was passed onto the Board. There was some very tight time constraints, and that was done very quickly, and it was done prior to the GNSO having the opportunity to review it and agree with it or not.

And the fact that the Board ended up seeing it before the GNSO had had that discussion was quite an issue.

The second part of the problem was that there was a general belief among at least some of the players in the group that a second phase needed to be carried out, and the group was therefore rechartered to carry out the second phase. The group proposed the charter. It was agreed to by the ALAC. When it went to the GNSO, there was very strong opposition in the GNSO.

And the GNSO essentially came out with a completely different and virtually orthogonal rechartering process or - new charter, the two of which did not mesh at all.

And after much discussion and an awful lot of gnashing of teeth, let's say, (it declined), we ended up coming up with a single charter and a subset charter, the subset of which the GNSO supported. The superset that the ALAC supported. And, the process went through with the understanding that any recommendations would be delineated based on whether they were addressing the subcharter or the full charter.

As it turned out, the report was fully approved by both groups with no reference to the division of the charter when the product finally came out, but the creation of the charter generated huge amounts of ill will - the rechartering generated huge amounts of ill will and an awful lot of work that probably could've been avoided with some more careful thinking about how to do this.

And if - we had predicted ahead of time that there was going to be kind of problem.

So it...

John Berard: So one of the problems (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: That hopefully we could avoid by thinking about this ahead of time.

John Berard: Right.

So Alan, let me see if I can characterize what you're saying is that maybe one of the - an approach that we might take is to identify the problems that have previously existed and begin to build a - the framework based on building solutions for those problems.

Alan Greenburg: I think that's correct, and I think what we're going to build is going to have to be flexible enough to address situations that we're not predicting right now. The fact that the work product that came out of the first version of that group had a very tight time constraint, that is the Board was making decisions, you know pushed one of the groups, the ALAC, to act very quickly. And, the GNSO could not or chose not to do it that quickly.

And I think that's possible to happen in the future also, and I think we need to allow for it and make sure that we have words that cover it.

The other aspect is I think the rules that come out of this group, and again here I'm making a prediction, are really going to need to be flexible enough -- I said this during the chartering process, so it's not a secret -- they need to be flexible enough that based on the needs and based on the constituent subgroups, the rules can - are malleable enough that they won't act as constraints when they shouldn't be constraints.

John Berard: Yes. Thank you for that.

Avri, could I ask you to weigh in on this?

Becky Burr: Avri's on mute.

John Berard: Was that Becky?

Becky Burr: Yes.

John Berard: You want to have a whack at this then?



Becky Burr: Well, I actually think that Alan's comments were spot on. Flexibility is critical, but you know the lifecycle steps that Bart's presentation highlighted are you know pretty good discipline. You know, sometimes the charter maybe more or less elaborate, but I find a charter is always good as a starting point so that you know what - you know, you know what you're talking about. You know what you're tasked with doing.

Charters can be amended as you go on, but you know they are I think - the ccNSO always starts with one, and I think that makes life easier.

John Berard: So this I John Berard again. So if we were to conflate -- one of my favorite words -- Alan's point about solving problems that we can identify as existing, and Bart's five stages of a working group, sort of like the seven stages of grief I guess, the initiate, form, operate, close, follow-up. If we were to identify problems from past practice that are linked with each of those five elements, the chartering to initiate, the membership to form the principles by which it operates, how to close them, and then how to follow-up, we might have an initial approach at a work plan if we were to combine those two. Does that makes sense, or am I off base?

Becky Burr: Makes sense to me.

John Berard: Avri, are you back from being muted? I'd hate to hear that Avri's been muted.

Avri Doria: Oh, I do fine with being muted. I'm happy to spend lots of time muted.

No. And in fact what I wrote is I thought - I really liked the five stages. I thought they were very, very well defined and definitely resonate -- to use of the words lately -- with me quite well.

And I definitely believe the charter's laying out what you're going to do.

Is that - now, I - and if everything can be called, you know, find solutions. But sometimes I think it (unintelligible).

No, yes. There's an outcome. Another one of my favorite words of the last couple weeks. There's an outcome that is the analysis seen from multiple perspectives.

But, I don't think it necessarily has to be limited to getting a specific piece of problem solved. It can be noticing that there is (unintelligible) and going on in multiple silos but using different language and using different points of reference and such.

And someone noticing that, "Hey, you know, we should really come to a point of having some notion of common language and at least understand the respective viewpoints, having done that rooting in common language.

So - you know, so I guess I'm not quite as strict on what's in the charter in terms of defining, but it definitely has to be something that you can define clearly.

And, I think taking those five stages into account, you need to look at the chartering milestones against those. And I think one of the things that we do badly in our working group charters is milestoneing. And milestones should be easy to change when necessary, but they really need to be there as targets to aim for.

And I think especially in cross-communities where everybody's got a radically different set of priorities and calendars that you really do need a fixed you know set of dates to project towards that are also agreed in a charter type manner.

So basically, agreeing. Just a long way of saying, "Sure. Yes. I agree with that."

John Berard: Thank you, Avri.

I want to make sure that those who are participating in this who I don't know as well as Alan, and Avri, and Becky, and Bart, and Mary have an opportunity to participate - to offer their comments. So are there any other reactions from the other members of the call?

Okay, well that's good I guess, right? I mean my - I will take your silence in this instance as assent so that we can move on.

Mary, what else do we need to do today in order to begin to put together a draft of this work plan that we can circulate and begin to get everybody contributing to?

Mary Wong: Thanks, John.

So I put a few notes in the note pot to the right of the Adobe Connect screen that's - tried to capture some of what Alan, Avri, and others were saying. It seems that there was some agreement that the framework presented by Bart on the lifecycle, the different phases could be the essential framework. So a couple of things come to mind.

One, does this stuff - the various working groups that we've compiled is on the screen here. I know that you and Becky had spoken previously about possibly getting some feedback from the Chairs of some of these groups...

John Berard: Right.

Mary Wong: To this group, especially those in this group who may not have participated or have been familiar, so that we can draw on the lessons learned that Alan had started. So maybe one thing we can do is agree on which of these groups we might try to get feedback from.

And secondly in terms of the work plan, if we use Bart's framework, the obvious possibility is to do that I suppose somewhat chronologically. So to take Phase I, identify the problem there and try to figure out at least some kind of baseline rules for each phase.

John Berard: Is there - this is John Berard again. Is there anybody with a suggestion as to which of the previous cross-community working groups we must or ought to include on our - the list of those that we - from whom we seek insight?

Alan, based on your comment, I would assume you would think that the JAS working group is one that we should...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenburg: I'm not sure we need to seek insight, but I think we need to learn from it.

The other one at the other end of the spectrum, although the final outcome's more questionable in some people's minds, the process that followed to create at the DSSA was remarkable at the other end of the extreme. That is the need for it was believed viscerally by the work - the groups that started it, and the chartering process was done unlike virtually any other one in that the Chairs of those groups got together and came up with something and it went to all of the chartering groups, and none of them even attempted to make any changes.

An almost unheard of process.

So I think there are things to be learned from a number of them. Those two certainly are among those that we have to look at, but I - you know, I don't think it's limited to that. Thank you.

John Berard: Any other suggestions from those of you on the phone?

Alan makes an interesting point about the - how the chartering is done for DSSA, and it may have some influence on our thinking because if leadership can create - can collaborate on the charter, then maybe there's a - maybe that is an approach that we should recommend.

That might be easier done in some SOs and ACs than other SOs and ACs, but if - there's no reason why recommendations that we might make need to be perfectly suited for each if the goal here is to create a positive outcome.

Anybody else?

We've got hands. Where are the hands. I don't see any hands.

Mary Wong: Avri has her hand up.

Avri Doria: Yes, mine.

John Berard: Avri? Okay.

Avri?

Avri Doria: And I wrote it, but there was - and I was on it, and unfortunately - and I'm not remembering the name of it at the moment, but I'll find it rather shortly in my email because I have all of that - is there was a joint group between the GNSO and the SSAC on internationalizing resource records or internationalizing Whois information that took the first exploration at that issue before it got all formalized and more. That was really a understand the issue type group. I thought it went really well and it produced its products quite well. So I think that's one.

If it's not in the list, and I don't immediately see it, I think it might be worth taking a look at even though we might have to reach to, you know, different

staff members who aren't part of this group, like (Julie) and stuff. But I think that was a good group.

John Berard: Mary, do you think you can run that down?

Mary Wong: Yes, John. And Becky and Avri, yes, I've just found it. That was the working group - it was a joint working group on internationalized registration data, and I don't - I think that there was a previous report, so I will track it down because I think a number of those folks are now on a different group, so we don't want to confuse the two IRD groups.

I think Avri's talking about the working group rather than the new expert working group that's been formed, but we will track it down and include it in the table.

John Berard: Okay.

And Alan, are you (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Exactly. I think that expert (unintelligible).

Alan Greenburg: Yes. It's Alan speaking.

I just want to comment on something you said in reaction to what I said. And you said should we perhaps propose that leadership should be involved in setting these charters? And I think it worked well in that case, but that was almost a coup that was being staged and plotted, you know, based on the history of why they created - why they were created in reaction to something the President and CEO did, which was objected to strenuously by a large part of the community.

It worked in that case. It's probably not the right model for other cases, but that's just the message that I was trying to send on flexibility. And how these things come about is going to, to some extent, indicate how its lifecycle unrolls.

John Berard: Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe just for the record, around the DSSA, I agree with Alan that say - and this goes back to the initiation phase I have identified. The initiative to start thinking about it and launching was from the say - I would say from the leadership of the SOs and ACs.

However, what happened as well, and probably that was a good thing, is that there was a drafting - a charter drafting small, informal working group formed as well from different SOs and ACs, and I know Julie Headland and I used say the experiences from the GNSO/ccNSO working groups and combined them in the charter, and that was worked around by this charter drafting committee.

And after they'd done their work, and that was in two, three weeks, then it was submitted to the participating SOs and ACs.

So you see, that's - so you see the combination. It was driven by the leadership of the SOs and ACs. There was a small drafting committee, and then it was pushed up to the participating SOs and ACs.

John Berard: Yes. Yes.

All right, we have just a few minutes left in this hour. We haven't heard from everybody. It's not mandatory that we do, but I just wanted to make sure that people who had something to say would have the opportunity to. So is there - are there any other folks on the call that want to offer a point-of-view as to

what you've heard so far today? And, were you - the direction you think we should be taking?

Okay. Having said that, when, Nathalie, do you think we'll see the transcript of this call?

Mary Wong: This is Mary, not Nathalie. But, I believe that the...

John Berard: Oh, I'm sorry Mary.

Mary Wong: No, not at all.

I believe that the transcripts are usually ready the day of, if not the day after, and the recording very shortly after that - the day after, or at most two days after. So what we will do is obviously post all these recordings and transcripts to the Wiki space, and there's also a ccNSO web page for this, and I will send a note, or Nathalie will send a note to the group when all that is ready.

Because John, I assume you're asking the question because - I don't know, you want to assign homework?

John Berard: Well in fact, I wanted to make sure I had some way to check the notes that I've taken, because sometimes, you know as the old song goes, a man hears what he wants to hear and disregards the rest.

So, I wanted to make sure that any decisions that we make are based upon the reality of the transcript and not the fantasy of what we think we might have heard.

But I also want to encourage everybody to review it because we will be trying to instigate on the list a work plan and timeframe, and schedule, that can help us get to where we want to go.



I'd like us to have a second call before London so that when we do meet in London, it can be on a substantive basis. And so Mary, when do you think would be a good time for us to reconvene, understanding that we need some time to have an online back and forth to create the preliminary documents for us to consider at that second meeting.

Mary Wong: Right.

So given the attendance and given that the call for volunteers is still out, so we may have more people joining us, but particularly given I guess the somewhat artificial pressures of London, it may be best to try for a meeting in the first week of June, which would be two weeks after today. So, that would allow us to have some on-list participation.

What we can do as staff is set up a - send out a Doodle Poll for a day and a time for that first week in June, and bearing in mind John and Becky that at some point the group should also decide on a few things. One is (unintelligible), but let's leave that aside for a second.

The more pertinent point is the frequency and the days and times for its meetings probably after London.

John Berard: Okay.

So two weeks from today would be June 5th.

Mary Wong: Yes.

John Berard: So - I mean - and that first week - I think that does make sense. And maybe the 4th, 5th, or 6th makes most sense because it actually gives us a couple of real weeks to do - to construct something meaningful online.

I think Monday the 2nd or even Tuesday the 3rd might be too soon - too quick. But, I'll leave that to the Doodle Poll.

Becky Burr: Yes, it makes sense to me.

John Berard: Yes.

All right. Well look, I appreciate the - you all participating, especially those who are you know taking a stab at working groups for the first time. You may be the people who are ultimately most helpful because the rest of us may be a little bit too jaded. So, I look forward to your help.

Becky, final words?

Becky Burr: Well, I - yes. I think this is actually - could be a real contribution to the ICANN community if we can get this right.

John Berard: Right. There'll be statues of all of you in front of the ICANN office in LA.

Becky Burr: No. We can't stay in ICANN's favor for long enough (unintelligible)...

John Berard: All right, well thank you all, and thanks very much to you, Bart, for putting that deck together. Very helpful. Mary, thank you for keeping us on the rails.

Mary Wong: Thanks John and Becky. Thanks everyone.

Man: Bye now.

Man: See you guys soon.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Coordinator: Thank you very much. Now you may now stop the recording. Thank you.

END