

**GNSO Working Group Newcomer Open House session
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 17 December 2013 at 14:00 UTC**

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.

Coordinator: You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much (Tanya). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GNSO Working Group Newcomer Open House session on 16 December 2013.

On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, Chris Dillon, Cintra Sooknanan, Emily Emanuel, Klaus Stoll, (Michael Paypoutanan), Theo Geurts, (Appapultra Jaunanrite) and anonymous guest who signed in with the password.

From staff we have Lars Hoffman, Marika Konings, Glen DeSaintgery and myself Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all too please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Nathalie and welcome everybody. This is a big day. This is the first time that we've ever done something like this. I think we're going to go for about an hour. And we have quite a lot of ground to cover.

But this is a session for you as newcomers. And so in a minute we're going to give you the opportunity to sort of shape what happens here.

But I thought first I'd just cover some tips and tricks and the mechanic stuff before we even get into this. And I don't know (Peter)'s in the chat - we were going to mention that when you sign in as a guest it's a good idea to put in your whole name rather than the password and (Peter) beat me to it.

And so that's one of the tips and tricks is that while I'll be doing a lot of talking today you do want to pay attention to what's going on in the chat because it's often interesting. In my case more interesting than me and so do pay attention there.

A couple of other things one of the things that you may not be aware of is that you can start a private chat with somebody on the list. And by doing that get some help or get a question answered or something like that.

If you just hover your mouse over any of the names in the participants list or the host list you'll see a little list of choices pop out and one of those is to start a chat with that person

That's a great way if you - if you're confused or have sort of a mentor that you're working with to carry on a conversation right along with what else is going on.

Another item is that because many working group calls have a lot of people on the call it's a really great idea to mute your phone line when you're not speaking.

We were talking a bit about the most interesting background noise that we've heard in Marika mentioned that (Cheryl)'s husband snoring was probably the winner.

I like sirens. But in general because these calls have a lot of people on them it's a good plan to mute your phone when you're in here with us.

Another thing I want everybody to try right now is if you're truly a newcomer I'm looking down the participants list and for example Lars Hoffman is not a newcomer so he doesn't get to do this Lars is on the staff.

But for those of you who are truly here because you're newcomers I want you to raise your hand. And the way you do that is up at the very top of the screen there's a little icon of a person that's raising their hands. And if you just click on that that raises your hand.

And I want all of you newcomers to do it because I know that there is sort of a breaking the ice first time for everything to do there.

And we have another person testing all the other stuff which is what the next thing I was going to do but before we get done with the hand raising I want to teach you a trick.

Let's say that Emily wanted to be at the end of the queue. And she is at the front of the queue. But she sees that Klaus, and (Keith), and Cintra have and she wants to hear what they say before she speaks.

If you raise your - if you lower your hand by clicking on that thing and then raise it again you jump to the back of the queue.

And that's a way to have the last word but it's also the way to defer to somebody else who you want to listen to. And so there is the first sort of insider trick of the day.

And the next one is the one that (Rudy) was doing which is if you click the little downward gizmo that's right next to the little hand person up in that

same menu you'll see that not only can you raise your hand but you can also express a little emotion about what's going on.

So you can do applause, (Pinan) I'm going to goof up the pronunciation of your names but there we're seeing people doing cool things.

And Cintra is saying speed the heck up Mikey. And that's exactly what those are for. It's very helpful as especially as the person that's leading a call to see that sort of feedback.

And it's also great to give people some feedback on what they're saying, or to agree, or to disagree. As a working group chair if somebody would click the disagree button the little red gizmo I want to show what that looks like and (Peter) did it, (Keith) did it especially in a conversation where we're trying to get to consensus that's an indication that you're not comfortable yet with where we're at.

And it's sometimes easier to express that feeling that way then it is to get in the queue and speak. So I as a working group chair tend to really see that.

And will inevitably come around to you and find out what's on your mind, what sorts of things we can do to understand the issue that you've got and so on and so forth.

So there we are. We're done with the mechanics and now on to the show. Thanks for all for participating.

And for those of you who are not newcomers (Rudy) is raising that in the chat. Let's have all the newcomers get out of the hand raising mode and now all you old timers all you folks who have been on a working group before raise your hands so that we get a list of perspective mentors.

And those of you who are new should take a look at this group of people and if you know anybody in this group of people take a mental note that these are the sorts of folks that undoubtedly are more than happy to help you along, answer questions, participate in a private chat.

We're getting a little echo because somebody is using their Adobe room and microphone and their not - great job. That was very speedy microphone muting. Kudos to whoever was that quick.

Anyway there's a list of folks who can help us along if you need help. You can take your hand down and it's now off to the show and thanks for putting up with all that.

So here's the picture of me for those of you who have heard me on the phone a lot but never seen what I look like. This is a picture I really like that was taken at the last ICANN meeting.

I'm a retired guy. I'm a registrant. I'm a complete fan of working groups. And I represent the ISPCP the ISP constituency on the GNSO council.

I - I've hung out on a lot of working groups and chaired a bunch as well and if you ever see me with all that stuff around my neck at a ICANN meeting I can tell you stories about every one of those pieces of flair that I've got on. And I'm happy to wear yours as well.

I want to do the same for the policy team that many of us have spent a lot of time on the phone with but never seen because we haven't been to a ICANN meeting.

So just a really brief interjection of David Olive who is the person who runs that whole group, Marika Konings for whom I committed a terrible error when I wrote the press release about her describing her as the lead guitar player in an international rock band.

I - that was actually not correct. She's actually the rhythm guitar player and lead singer in the band, along with being a brain surgeon, and taking care of us here in the ICANN policy environment.

Glen DeSaintgery wrote is the first and pillar of the ICANN GNSO Policy Support team. Glen goes back before the beginning of ICANN and is a mentor to many of us including me.

Mary Wong who was on the GNSO Council has been in all sorts of different roles and is fairly new to the policy staff but a really old hand at ICANN and in policy in general.

Julie Hedlund who comes from my region of the United States and can thus speak Minnesotan and we can help you with that if you want to learn how.

Julie is very cross constituency. She supports the GNSO. She also supports the SSAC. And I think several others. So if you're ever wanting to do cross constituency questioning Julie is a really good resource.

Lars is the guy that's doing the heavy lifting on several of the current working groups. I haven't quite figured out the silly thing to say about Lars yet.

I'm trying out Lars Hoffman that's Hoffman Lars Hoffman martini shaken not stirred. I kind of like that from his picture.

Berry Cobb who is a veteran of a bunch of working groups and then switched over to working on the policy staff.

And last but not in my world the person at the end of the list and the bottom of the bottom of process which is where I hang out is the most important.

Nathalie the person he keeps these calls organized. As you can see by the number of people on this call and the quality of the call this is no mean feat.

And Nathalie and I have had a great time sort of figuring out new things to do and getting this stuff working.

So a round of applause to all of the policy staff and I really wanted you to see their faces because many of us never see each other's faces here.

Here's where we're headed. Our goal is to have this be a pretty informal session, answer your questions, provide you some resources and at least the beginning of things to do to find your way around. There's no way we can cover it all but we certainly want to get you started.

And then because this is a pilot we'd really like to hear from you how this went, things that we could do better, et cetera, et cetera. So that's sort of the sort of the agenda for the day. That's the goals anyway.

Here's the agenda. We're sort of through the tips and tricks part. We're going to do a little bit more of that. Then we're going to talk sort of from top to bottom sort of the foundation of the reason why we're here which is the consensus policy part of ICANN.

We'll talk a bit about the policy development process itself. We'll talk a little bit about the standard methodology for decision making which in shorthand is the consensus part of the decision making.

Plus anything else that you would like to talk about that's what that last thing is for.

So I am going to just plunge in but if somebody could sort of keep track for those of you who want to add something to this list just let us know in the chat.

And I'll try and keep track but since I'm do most of the presenting I may get distracted. And if I do hopefully somebody else will give me a nudge.

Don't be shy about sort of sticking your hand up and giving me a nudge. Don Blumenthal has got his hand up but I'll bet that's a vestigial hand.

If it's not I'm happy to call on you Don but that was probably left over from the old timers thing and as I suspect it is true.

And (Rudy) - (Rodi)'s picked up on another - (Rudy) sorry picked up on another thing which is another great thing to comment on in the chat is the graphics.

So he's commenting on, you know, what's the goal? Well there's the goal. And sometimes the graphics give pretty hysterical and the comments in the chat due too so there you go.

All right tips and tricks. I've got a little propaganda slide that I want to put in here right at the beginning which is showing all of us and all of the roles that we play at ICANN.

And I have played almost all of these roles now because I've been here for quite a while. And I still play these roles.

So sometimes I'm a leader. Sometimes I'm a student. Sometimes I'm an expert. Sometimes I'm a recruiter.

And one of the things that I'm quite interested in seeing us do better is matching people up so that when a newcomer like some of you is even thinking about joining the ICANN community this is before the stage the you are all at but they have a person that they can talk to a real person to talk to about what ICANN is about what they might be able to get out of it.

And these roles up at the top sit on top of a lot of information. We have a lot of documentation, a lot of structure, a lot of outreach of material, we have policies, et cetera, et cetera to navigate and to find our way through.

And part of what I'm hoping we can start to do with this Webinar and other initiatives is to team people up to match people with more experienced people in a given area and do a better job of navigating this huge pile of information resources that we already have. So that's just Mikey's propaganda of the day.

I'm assuming that we are distributing this slide deck to everybody that's on the call. If were not Nathalie or that's correct she says it may be post a link to this deck to the end of the chat if people want to be following along on the slide deck or looking ahead. This is not a slide deck that suffers or a presentation that suffers if you're looking ahead.

And see this is the kind of stuff that makes working on a working group so cool is that Nathalie is so fast and so accurate. And that happens all the time in all the working groups across all of the ICANN staff.

So I'm mostly in many cases just going to alert you that these pages are in the deck. I'm certainly not going to take you to these pages.

I do have a personal preference for the GNSO 101 materials page. That one's a place that I go really often to look things up, to find examples, and so on so I'll just highlight that one.

Another one that we've been working on for years and is really helpful is something that Chris Chaplow started. And it's the acronym helper. And that's on the homepage of the GNSO.

We do speak in acronyms all the time. You can see on this page itself the number of acronyms. And so that's one I'll point at.

Another one to highlight is the fact that we do a lot of social media we the ICANN community. And I think we've got a list of those coming up in the deck so I won't dwell on those.

And then finally the one that you may not be aware of at all is that if you have a question that the policy staff can answer the easiest way to get a hold of them -- and Nathalie this is where I was thinking you could paste that email address into the chat - there's an email address that's gnso-secs@icann.org - - tada, there it is, that goes to Nathalie and her colleagues.

And then they act in the role of directing your question, or comment, or issued to the right place. And this is a fabulous way to get information in a hurry. And as you can tell they're amazingly responsive. So that's another good tip.

And with that I think I'm going to pause and we're going to chop the recording off and then turn it right back on again and just take questions on that fast section that I went through and then carry on to the next session.

So has anything come up that you want to explore a little bit more in this first bit that we've been through either the hand raising part or the actual slide deck itself?

Okay I'll carry right on. The next thing that we wanted to describe to you is sort of the core thing that the GNSO does.

And that is that the registries and registrars of the DNS are bound to ICANN by a whole series of contracts. And there's a link to the page that describes them all.

And you'll be astounded at how many there are. There's something on the order of 20 or 30 contracts I think on that page.

And it's not just the GNSO, registries, and registrars it's also has to do with the numbers part of ICANN and the protocol part.

ICANN is a collection of contracts. And the really interesting invention in the ICANN model that was invented back in the late 90s when ICANN was formed is that there is this idea of consensus policy that's arrived at by the process that you're joining and then flows directly into those contracts without having to modify the contracts.

So the way we describe that -- well I'll do the background part first -- is that I was sort of getting ahead of myself there you can see that in these original agreements there was this bargain that was made between the registries and registrars where they agreed to comply with these policies given a couple of caveats.

One is that those policies couldn't unreasonably restrain competition. And so sometimes we'll tiptoe around that issue a bit in a working group.

And then secondly that the policies have to relate to there's three basic areas. They have to be issues where we want to be completely uniform or at least as uniform as we can across the registry and registrar population.

There are some parts of the contracts between registries and registrars that don't have to be uniform. And those parts are negotiated separately.

But there are certain parts that do. And that's one of the things that this consensus policy that we work on is aimed at creating.

The other part that's something that's very close to my heart on this one is the technical reliability and stable operation of the Internet. Sometimes that's

the acronym shorthand for that is SSR Security and Stability and reliability. And those are issues that I'm particularly interested in.

The other two are the second one is sort of confusing. It confuses me sometimes. But sometimes registries and registrars have policies of their own.

And we want those policies within the registry and registrar to be consistent in the way that they implement the rest of the stuff that we create in this consensus policy process.

And then finally there's the resolution of disputes regarding the registration of names. And that process is actually ongoing right now.

We have a working group running on that that's called the IRP Inter - Registrar Transfer Policy working group that's a series of working groups that's been running for something on the order of five years. And we're just drawing to the end of that. Just in time to probably started again.

So people will say that this is an issue that's inside the picket fence. And I will confess that it took me three or four years to get up the courage to raise my hand and ask what people were talking about? What's this picket fence thing that you keep talking about?

And what this is talking about is this consensus policy part of the contracts between the registries and registrars.

So in a way that describes this differently but tries to get to the same thing there's basically a socket into which we insert consensus policies.

And that socket appears in all of these contracts. And the things that appear within that part of the contracts are the consensus policies. That's what's inside the picket fence.

We can do things outside that but we can't mandate compliance with those in this consensus policy way. So that's the distinction.

Jim Galvin's on the call. Holy cow a senior person from the SSAC and correcting me yes you're right Jim in the chat he's saying it's Security, Stability and Resiliency. I always get that wrong. And he's exactly right on that.

Okay there's a little further reading. It's the graphic I think is especially accurate. It's not that bad but it's pretty close. And so do rely on the old timers to help you navigate the stuff.

And Marika has got her hand up. And then we'll pause the recording again and take other questions but Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Thank you Mikey. And if we could just move one slide back just one thing I wanted to add here on the last bullet point.

And that indeed it's correct that ICANN cannot mandate registry and registrar compliance with policies that don't fall within the picket fence through consensus policies.

But there may be other ways in which ICANN could implement those for example - providing incentives to contracted parties or possibly individually negotiating with contracted parties on implementing some of these.

So I just wanted to add that caveat is maybe as well one of the outcomes eventually of policy development discussions.

Mikey O'Connor: Terrific thanks Marika. And with that I think we'll do the thing with the recording again Nathalie where we just chop this one off and then open it

right back up again and see if there are any questions on this part of the presentation before we go on.

Christmas reading that's another stalwart (Maria). (Maria) I am so sorry I always mispronounce your second name. Anyway there we go no questions there going once, going twice, all right we'll carry on.

So now we start to talk about the process is itself that you are beginning to participate in. And again this is a Mikey O'Connor propaganda slide that says that there are all sorts of things that I love about this model.

It's the primary focus of it is the working groups that you see across the bottom but, you know, this is an international model that is being looked at very hard across the world as a very interesting and exciting and innovative way to manage a complex problem.

One of the other things that I like about working groups is that this is where anybody in the ICANN community and even people from outside the ICANN community can participate directly in this process. It's very open.

That means that it's very deep and very diverse in terms of its policymaking which is another thing that I find just completely delightful.

There is a volunteer administrative layer on top of that the constituencies of the council. And then there are other stakeholder groups and advisory committees that you can see right across the top.

And then at the very top very distant from my perspective on all this is the Board of Directors. Riding alongside of this is of course the staff that does such a great job of taking on the issues and helping us get through them and implementing them.

And one of the things that I am always lobbying for is events like this where we welcome newcomers, we clarify how you can get to being effective in participating in working groups.

We don't want you to be left with the impression that this is completely up to you that there are helpful resources available and helpful people available.

And then one of the other things that I'm very interested in is leadership development where we identify leaders early and we can provide them with tools and resources to move into leadership roles either in constituencies or working groups or on up the line.

So, that's sort of the context into which this process plays. Remember that this is essentially the process by which policies eventually find their way into the picket fence, into consensus policy, and so it starts, and here I'm going to test out my cool new toy of the day, which is this arrow. There it is.

So it starts with the request for an issue report and that, the threshold to start an issue report in the GNSO council is relatively low, and that's intentional. An issue report is you'll see in a minute, is really to design - is designed to see whether the issue is even appropriate to go through this process or whether it should maybe go somewhere else, and also to broadly frame the issue.

Then, you know, as the process unfolds a bit and eventually we form a working group, there is a cycle of public comments before the working group really gets underway. There's also a request that goes out to the community of ICANN for comments. Then the working group works hard and that's probably where you all are at in the working groups that you're working on now.

Much of this top green bar is probably done or is underway, but the working group really gets to work preparing its initial report. Once that's out, it goes

back to the public for comment, those comments get folded back into the initial report, not very often does it go out again but on occasion it might, and then finally it goes to a final report where the GNSO council deliberates and there are varying views about what the council does at this stage.

My view is that the council's job is not to second guess the working group. If the council finds a problem with the results of the working group, it's my view that's shared by some but not all on the council that the work should go back to the working group, that the working group is where the rigor and the consensus is developed whereas the council's view is different. It's A, not a consensus body, it's a voting body; and B, it doesn't have nearly the depth of understanding of the issue that a working group that's worked on something for six months to a year has.

There's some debate about that, so I want to let you know that there's some debate but in general that's what happens. In general, the GNSO council approves these reports because in general those reports come to the council with a very high level of consensus. The council then recommends that this go to the board. There's yet another public comment period just to make sure.

Then again there's some discussion as to whether if the public comments and the board raise an issue with the working groups' results, what should happen at that point, and again, I'm of the view that it should go back to the working group. Again, there's some debate about that so just to show you my biases.

Then there's a big piece of work that's done primarily by staff but sometimes with what's called an implementation review team that's comprised of members of the community, very often people deeply involved in a working group will also volunteer to be a part of the implementation review team during implementation because again, that's where the knowledge is, that's

where the understanding of the nuances are, and eventually then it migrates into the policy itself.

And that in about three minutes is a very high-level review of a process that now I'm going to just turn slides over very quickly for you just to let you know that they're here and maybe we'll raise some questions for you. So there's a short version of that process that you saw where at first we're scoping and then we write a report and then we deliberate and then it's implemented.

This is where we make the choice about whether this thing falls in the picket fence. This is the process that the essentially initial report, council, board, lots and lots of people get involved and it ultimately winds up in a final issue report. Then it moves on to the council where the council makes its decision. This is the work that you will be doing or are doing or have done, and you can see that there's a lot going on there.

The council takes a look at the work of a working group and decides whether to adopt it or not and I like the way this is drawn because when it's not adopted it goes back to the working group. In this language the council's encouraged. I tend to wag all my eyebrows and say strongly encouraged, but there is sort of the possibility of a deadlock and an infinite loop and so there are ways to break that.

It goes on to the board and tada, there's the final implementation and then the implementation (unintelligible) before. These are things that go into the mix, and again, this is essentially just another way to state the process that we had going before and I'm going to turn my little arrow off, and some more reading. One of the interesting things to read is the ICANN bylaws on this topic.

I know that bylaws generally don't make great Christmas Time reading to use (unintelligible) analogy, but the bylaws are very specific about the way that working groups work and so it's often helpful to really understand that when

especially if it gets to a tricky bit on a working group. Surprisingly that's a place that people go look. I think that's it, yes, that's it. So I think we'll do the, cycle the recording again and then carry on from there.

But this is a good time to pause for questions as well. A little edgy when I get no question - oh good, (Ahmer's) got a question. Go ahead, (Ahmer).

(Ahmer): Hi Mikey, this is (Ahmer). Thanks for the presentation. It's going great so far. My question about the PDP process (unintelligible) diagram that you showed a little earlier about that where something that came up on one working group called previously, and that is when an issue report is published that this automatically means that there will be a PDP following that, and I went over the bylaws at some point and I felt that the language there does not necessarily suggest that and I'm confused about that point.

So I was wondering if you had more insight on this. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: It's a great question and I got distracted while I was going back to that slide, so Marika or somebody smarter than me, if you can make that sidebar thing go away, I can't figure out how - oh, maybe this is how. There we go. Never mind. An issue report is the first step of the PDP process but you're right. It does not always result in a PDP and that's for several reasons.

One reason is that the ICANN staff in reviewing the topic may come back and say, "This topic is not appropriate for the PDP process that puts policy into consensus policy." You know, it may be that this is not something that meets those criteria that we talked about before, about uniformity or the need to have it implemented exactly the same way across all registrars and registries, so on and so forth.

But the other thing is that once an issue report arrives back at the council, the council has to decide whether to launch the PDP and this is still up to the discretion of the council and so it's generally true that an issue report

precedes a PDP but it does not necessarily follow the PDP always happens. Marika's got her hand up, and that's just for those of you who've never worked with me and Marika on a working group before, that generally means that I've either missed something or misstated something.

So, over to you, Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Mikey. This is Marika. Maybe just to add as well that as part of the issue report, what staff typically does is first prepare a preliminary issue report, which is while community input is solved. So through community input that may also be information we see that either indicates that, you know, maybe the information we have on why PDP is necessary, is not valid, or an issue may already have been addressed in other means.

Or indeed as Mikey says, you know, we may recommend that it's not the appropriate path to take to do a consensus policy but there may be other mechanisms to address the issue and for example, the recent issue on metrics and reporting, for example, the council decided that it would actually be more effective to just do that in the form of a non-PDP working group instead of a formal PDP, which of course is a much more formalized process and allows for less flexibility than if the council would decide to do it through another mechanism.

I think one other important thing to point out is that the voting threshold for requesting an issue report is slightly lower than for initiating a PDP. So it may also be a reflection of the support there is of the council level to actually address the issue, so basically if you have the same - if there's a very low threshold or very few people actually support it, the request for an issue report and may still result in a request.

But if the same few people actually vote for the initiation of the PDP, it may not be sufficient to actually kick off the formal PDP process so that you may

see some differences in that as well. So that is indeed, as Mikey said, not every issue report necessarily kicks off a formal policy development process.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Marika. (Ahmer), as you - I see that Klaus is in the queue but is your question a follow-up? If it is, I'll take that first.

Klaus Stoll: Yes it is, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead.

Klaus Stoll: I was wondering and you might guess the complex to why I'm wondering this, but I was wondering if two issue reports are somewhat interrelated could at some point a decision be made perhaps by council or maybe by staff to sort of combine the scopes of two issue reports into one PDP? Is that possible or is that something that is not generally done? Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh. That's a good question. I've never been through a situation like that so I will either be a guy and make something up that's plausible or if somebody who has more knowledge than me wants to jump in. My initial impression would be that when things are in the issue scoping stage, when they're in this early stage, things are considerably more flexible. Primarily what this is is a period when an issue's being defined, a preliminary description of the boundaries of the problem and its relevance are being described, and so my initial thought would be, and as a councilor and maybe you would feel the same way, (Ahmer).

(Ahmer) is also a member of the GNSO council. I might be pretty receptive to the idea of combining them if they're compatible. But if they're not compatible, you know, maybe not, but that's my first guess. And I'm not seeing anybody leaping forward with this one, so I think we'll let her go from there but great question and we'll see if we run into it. Klaus, go ahead.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you, Mikey. By the way, I (unintelligible). Mikey, another difficult one. In all my dealings with ICANN and working groups, I had always one question nobody answered to me. What is actually the (unintelligible) in which the issues can be scoped? What is the boundary for an issue scoping report or for an issue or where is it? That's for me the question. I see Marika has immediately put your hand up. Maybe she can give me an answer. Thank you very much.

Mikey O'Connor: Yet bet, Klaus. And then I have some ideas, too, but first over to Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. This is actually we tried to clarify in the previous revision of the policies on the process and why we talk about the scope. It's basically GNSO scope is within ICANN's mandate and more specifically within the scope of the GNSO, so relating to gTLD policy. So in theory, anything relating to gTLD policy or gTLD subjects would be in scope for the GNSO to consider. However, you need to take into account that it's only required to do a PDP if that topic specifically or the intended outcome of the issue is consensus policy.

If it's not, there are other mechanisms you may want to consider, although there have been instances as well where the council would initiate a PDP even if the subject is not intended to result in consensus. In principle, the scope is within ICANN's mandate and more narrow within the GNSO scope, which is limited to generic top-level domain related issues.

Marika Konings: And then I'm going to add something to that, Klaus, which is that's the scope decision that says, "Is it appropriate or not?" And that's actually a relatively easy decision to make because there are fairly crisp boundaries between what's inside the picket fence and what's not.

But I think a broader question that at least I was hearing you answer is yes, but how do you scope the work of the PDP? How do you decide what's inside and outside the scope of the work? Presuming that it's all within the broad

GNSO (unintelligible) and I think there are two places that that happens. One, I think it happens in the issue report where the staff draws some rough boundaries around the outside of the issue and that's based on, among other things, some public comment.

But then another time that the scoping gets done is when the charter for the PDP is being drafted by the drafting team, and so for example we have a drafting team going right now on this non-PDP process around metrics and reporting, and one of the things that I think is important for a drafting team to do and then the council to revise is the scope part of that. So, it depends a bit on what you meant by your question, which answer is the one that's the best but I think they're both relevant. And back to you, Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Both answers are great. Thank you very much. So, what I take out of it might a good idea or a part of recommendation, first of all, if you have an idea for PDP or for just for issue report to go and talk with staff, talk with people who got a little bit more experience, and to find out what works and what doesn't work before you actually put all the (unintelligible), that's what I take from that one.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that's right. I think one of the things that works well in the context of this whole process is broad collaboration and broad agreement at each stage of the game. I think where the GNSO gets into more difficulty is when we are basically voting, if you will. We're building blocks of votes and we're trying to win a vote. I think that's a harder task, and so to the extent that an issue report can be requested with broad support across lots and lots of constituencies and stakeholder groups, I think that's really helpful.

And I think that each step of the game, it's helpful to have broad support. And especially in the working group cycle. I as a working group chair have a habit of lingering perhaps a bit longer than some chairs because I am trying very hard to work out the disagreements in the working group rather than have a

showdown at the council. That to me is not a good way to make policy. So there's a little editorializing on top of that.

Anything else, Klaus? Or is that hand left over? I'm presuming that's a leftover hand.

Klaus Stoll: (Unintelligible) I had to mute. Thank you. No. That's fine. Thank you very much. It's extremely helpful. Thanks again.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Alright. Anything else on this section? If not I think we'll cycle the recording one more time and then get into some fairly detailed stuff about working groups. We'll see. We're getting fairly close to the top of the hour so I'm going to go pretty fast but I still want to - this is important so we'll see. Alright.

So, the working group guidelines is a very detailed document that was developed twice. The first draft was developed very early in the life of ICANN and then it was very extensively revised in the late 2000s as the result of a board review of the GNSO, which by the way, the GNSO is about ready to do again. So, the review resulted in big revisions to the guidelines.

We are really only just now completing the first PDPs under those guidelines just barely in time to review it again. There's no way that I can do justice to all these topics but you can see that this is a document that will be very helpful to you as a newcomer in understanding the work process, the actual details and rules and responsibilities in the working group process, and this is one of the things that I really strongly encourage you as newcomers to ask others about.

It takes a while to sort of understand, the writing is dense, it's not easy, but it's important, and it will be a very helpful set of guideposts when you're in the middle of one of these things and have a question, especially about the

process. So this is sort of a big recommendation to take a look at that document and - a couple of things that I really want to highlight.

Probably the most important thing is that there is something that we call the standard methodology for decision making and the short version of that is this is the level of consensus within the working group. And this is documented in those working group guidelines, and these are the rules under which a chair operate. It's the chair's responsibility for making sure that this process works well and that it's clear and ultimately the chair makes the call, makes the choice as to what level of consensus the working group is at.

Those designations are at the bottom, so if everybody in the working group is in agreement, then we have full consensus. If the issues have been heard and dealt with to the satisfaction of everybody in the working group, even though there is disagreement, that's consensus. So for example, I'll pick on Avri. She's not on the call today, but Avri and I are often working hard in working groups to arrive at an agreement, and there will be times when we will say to each other, "Okay, you've heard my issue, you understand my issue, you've explained to me why that course is not the best for the working group. I agree and I participate in the consensus even though it's not my view."

That's consensus. The next level is strong support but a significant opposition. So, let's say that Avri and I go down those tracks. Pick on Avri again, and we get to the point where we say, "No, I really disagree and I'm not willing to participate in consensus. I want to make it clear that there is significant opposition." And so the chair will call strong support but significant opposition. So Mikey disagrees, Mikey may or may not write an issue or a minority view but it's not consensus, it does not go to the council with consensus.

And then finally a very valid outcome of the consensus process is that people do not agree. There is divergence. And again, with that I think a minority

review is required whereas with the strong support, that significant opposition, that does not require. And that is one of the most important points that I want to make for all of you newcomers and old, and that is that a perfectly valid outcome of a consensus process is no consensus.

This is not a bad thing. People are not evil if they cannot arrive at consensus. There may be an issue for which consensus cannot be arrived at and one of the most interesting parts of the policy and implementation working group that's going on right now is going to be the discussion of well, what happens when through valid work and good faith efforts, a working group cannot arrive at consensus.

Some of the outcomes in the past after that has been arrived at have been pretty unsatisfactory in my view. And so I want to really emphasize -- this is a personal thing -- that it's okay for a working group not to arrive at consensus. That's very important for people to realize. So, I think - oh, and then here are some resources again. Certainly not going to hit these too hard, just to let you know that they're there, but you can see that some of the things we talked about are provided in the deck and with that, we'll chop off this part of the recording and open it up again for questions in general.

And the reason I'm sort of hesitating that I thought we had a list of social media places to hang out, and maybe - yes. Quick question, yes, we will send you the presentation and maybe Nathalie can post the link to the presentation right here in the chat so that you can - oh, Nathalie has already emailed it to you. So, there we go.

We're very close to the top of the hour, we started a couple of minutes late, and I am perfectly happy to go long but I do want to honor your calendars. (Keith) is asking, "Do working groups have their own social networks on Twitter and so forth?" One of the things that I totally overlooked is each working group has its own wiki and each working group has its own email list, which is a form of social media for the working group.

But one of the pieces of social media that doesn't exist is essentially a place for people like us who are participating in working groups to hang out with each other and ask each other questions. There is ICANN Social, which is a good place for people across ICANN. Lars has put in the Twitter - oh yes, that's right. There's the GNSO Twitter feed ICANN underscore GNSO. That's probably started with a pound.

There's the wiki pages that are found where Marika linked and also those are referred to from the GNSO page, gnso.icann.org. I'm not sure we got that link in there, we might want to put that in. So (Keith), it's kind of yes and kind of no. Not - there's never enough social media in my view, so if people might feel the need, I'm all ears and I would certainly participate.

It's one minute after the hour and it seems like - Klaus, I'm assuming that's an old hand and if it's not, by all means jump in but I'm assuming that's left over from before and seeing no other hands, I think we'll call it a day. I want to thank again Nathalie for having the idea, Marika and Lars and Glen for putting all this together. All of you for coming, newcomers and old. I hope it was helpful and with that we'll sign. Thanks a million.

Man: Thanks, Mikey.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Great job.

END