Policy & Implementation Working Group Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 04 September 2013 at 1900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Wednesday 04 September 2013 at 1900 UTC. 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-policy-implementation-20130904-en.mp3
On page:http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#sep
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:
Holly Raiche – ALAC
Greg Shatan – IPC
Anne Aikman Scalese - IPC
Wolf Knoben - ISPCP
Chuck Gomes – RySG
Gideon Rop – Individual
Olga Cavalli - GAC
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Klaus Stoll - NPOC
Philip Marano – IPC
Maureen Cubberley – Individual
Avri Doria – NCSG
Michael Graham – IPC
J.Scott Evans – BC
Edward Morris – NCSG
Olevie Kouami – NPOC
Nic Steinbach – RrSG
Kiran Malancharuvil – IPC
Amr Elsadr - NCUC
Tim Ruiz – RrSG
Tom Barrett – RrSG
James Bladel – RrSG
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Sarah Falvey – in for Aparna Sridhar – BC
Marie-Laure Lemineur – NPOC
Brian Winterfeld – IPC
Kristine Rosette – IPC
Brian Beckham – IPC
Jeff Neuman - RySG

Apology: none

ICANN staff:
Tim Cole
Marika Konings
Krista Papac
Nathalie Peregrine

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Nathalie, let's go ahead and ask them to start the recording, please?

Nathalie Peregrine: Of course. Leah, could you please start the recording and let me know when you're done. Thank you.

Operator: This call is now being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect now.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, Leah. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the policy implementation working group call on September 4, 2013. On the call today we have Olga Cavalli, Gideon Rop, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Sara Falvey sitting in for Palmer, Carl Stultz, Edward Morris, Wolf Knoben, Chuck Gomes, Amr Elsadr, Tim Cole, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Maureen Cubberley, Michael Graham, Avi Doria, Mia Laura Lumier, Tim Ruiz, James Bladel, Brian Winterfeld, Alan Greenberg, Tom Barrett, and Sam Maranu. From staff we have Marika Konings and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. We've received no apologies for this call.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much. Over to you, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Nathalie. I appreciate that. This is Chuck Gomes. I'm one of the cochairs of this. Unless I'm mistaken my cochair is not on the call. Is that correct? Is -- ?

Speaker: He's waiting for an Operator to connect him.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Speaker: Or a conference specialist as they call themselves.

Jay Scott Evans: I'm here. This is Jay Scott.

Chuck Gomes: Welcome, Jay Scott. There's my cochair. I'm glad you're on. So, welcome. Welcome to everybody. This is the second call of the policy and implementation working group. And hopefully you've seen the agenda. Let me just first of all -- this is the first regular call that we've had. Is there anybody on the call that's not familiar with Adobe Connect and needs any tips on that? Because we would like you, if you want to speak and we welcome you to do that, to raise your hand in Adobe Connect. There are other features in there but I think as most of you know, you can agree to a point and some other things there but most importantly, if you'd like to speak, that helps the chairs in managing the queue. And I will ask my cochair and the two vice chairs to watch the queue in case I don't do a very good job of that and don't hesitate to let me know if I'm missing someone. And those of you not on the Adobe Connect, I understand that happens sometimes. You can't be on a computer. You may be on a cell phone or something, traveling, just speak up to get in the queue and we'll get you in the queue. Anybody have any questions on using Adobe Connect, let me know now. If I can't help you I'm sure others can. I'm not

seeing any hands or hearing anyone. I'll assume everybody's okay with that.

Let's go ahead and we've done the role call. My understanding and Marika will set me straight if I'm wrong, that we have SOIs on everyone except for Christian, Vulpe Dolmalango —- is that right, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, Chuck. That's correct. We have reminded him I think four times and we've given him a final warning that if we don't receive a statement of interest by Friday we'll remove him from the mailing list. So far we haven't received any response whatsoever.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And my compliments to everyone else for being so diligent and timely on that. That's great. So, again, thanks very much on that. Okay. I'd like to jump right in to agenda item two and note first of all that the GNSO council did approve Jay Scott and I as cochairs. This understanding is that the council does not need -- there's nothing that requires the council to approve vice chairs. So, they didn't do that. But we as a leadership team decided it would be a good idea to discuss that today. The two proposed vice chairs as you heard on our initial call are Michael Graham from the IPC and Oliver Kouami or Olivier Kouami from the MPAC. Both of them volunteered to work as part of the leadership team.

So, the first thing we'd like to do in that regard is just ask if anyone has any questions of them, any concerns you have about this kind of a setup because I think this is the first time it's happened like this. It is perfectly okay within the working group guidelines. And while you're thinking about whether you have questions for either one of the vice chair candidates or comments or questions about this kind of a leadership team and a working group, let me say that in our leadership meeting after our first working group call, we decided that it would probably be best if Jay Scott and I alternate the primary chair responsibilities for the working group, obviously according to our availability and in cases where neither one of us could be available then we would use the vice chairs.

At the same time assuming this working group is okay with the use of two vice chairs in addition to the two cochairs we would all four along with Marika and Mary, serve as a leadership team to prepare for the meetings, to set agendas, and so forth.

Somebody needs to mute their phone. So, please remember to do that when you're not talking. Sometimes there's other interference. But certainly if you're talking to someone else not on this call, it's really important to mute your phone. Again, star-six will mute it. Star-four will unmute it. Or some of you, like myself, may have muting capability on your phones.

Alright. So, that's how we plan to operate. We're planning on having a leadership call the Monday before each Wednesday meeting that we have so we can organize ourselves and make sure we're well prepared for each of the working group calls on Wednesdays. We did decide as

you hopefully saw in an email message to meet biweekly. So, every other Wednesday at this time. We examined adjusting the time and moving it up or back effected different people so we decided to do it at this time and if and when we decide to break out into some subgroups, we will encourage the use of some more favorable times to some other groups when they're formed for regions that this might not be as ideal a time for.

First of all, let me ask Jay Scott and Michael and Oliver to comment if I left anything out? Oliver?

Oliver Kouami: Yes. -- connect me --

Chuck Gomes: I couldn't understand you.

Oliver Kouami: --

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Now, let me open it up to the whole working group. Please raise your hand in Adobe or speak up if you're not in Adobe if you have any questions or concerns or comments about using two cochairs along with two vice chairs on the leadership team of the working group.

Marika Konings: Chuck, this is Marika. It's actually about an earlier point where I had raised my hand.

Chuck Gomes: Oh. You know what I need to do is I need to move -- let's see. I'm sorry about that. I'd scrolled down in the participants so I didn't see your hand. Thanks for speaking up, Marika. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: No problem. I put it in the chat. It's a minor correction about the confirmation of the working group cochairs is actually on the council agenda for tomorrow. It is on the consent agenda and I haven't seen any objections so far. I'm sure it will be fine. But I just wanted to correct that for the record.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Now, I am not seeing any of the chat. Is there a reason for that? Is everyone else seeing it? Is anybody else not seeing the chat besides me?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. Chuck, I had to refresh. Things went off and I refreshed the page and it all came back again.

Chuck Gomes: Let's -- okay. How do I refresh? I guess I need a lesson in Adobe myself.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I literally refreshed the whole page with the little refresh or recycle button at the top of the browser. That's what I did and it fixed me. Hopefully it will fix you too, sir.

Chuck Gomes: It's refreshing right now. Hopefully I can see the chat. Thank you, Cheryl. I appreciate that. Are you following me?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed, I am, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: That's a little private joke. Sorry about that. Okay. James?

James Bladel: Thanks, Chuck. James Bladel speaking for the record. I have a question for your and Jay Scott and staff. First, I should apologize because I did miss the last call. So, just a general question because I am sincerely scratching my head a little bit. I'd never encountered a working group with two cochairs and two co vice chairs. And I'm just trying to make sure I have a good handle on the difference between the roles and is there something particular about the subject matter of our work or charter that's driving this different structure or is it maybe just that the group is very large and it's going to take a lot of work and it's maybe too much for a couple of folks to handle? I'm just trying to get a better understanding of what I'm not understanding from this call. I don't think it's a bad idea. I just don't understand the difference between the different roles.

Chuck Gomes: Sure. This is Chuck again. Everybody, please state your name each time you talk for the sake of the transcript and the recording. It actually was a suggestion that was made in our first meeting. There were -- somebody needs to mute their phone, please. Thank you.

                             The suggestion made was that there were four people who volunteered for a leadership role. And someone -- I don't recall right now who is was suggested that there be two vice chairs. It wasn't done for any particular reason because of the size of the working group or expected tasks or anything like that. It was just suggested and nobody on the call -- I should word that in a more positive way. Everyone on the call seemed to be supportive of that. And then we as leaders met afterwards to see how we could do that. Because you're right, I don't think it's been done before. And so, we decided to use the vice chairs unless the group objects to that in a mostly behind the scenes leadership role but I'm sure there will be opportunities when we can rely on them for a more visible role. Does that answer your question, James?

James Bladel: Yes. Thanks. It does. I guess we'll all kind of play this out together. Like you said, it's the first time and I'm kind of looking forward to it. Maybe it's something we can borrow for future groups. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: You're welcome. It was a good question. Anyone else have a question or a comment? Is anyone opposed to this particular approach to leading the working group? Obviously we will get the feedback from the council after their meeting tomorrow but I'm just curious whether there's anyone who's opposed to this particular approach? If so, you can either raise your hand to speak, or just indicate a disagree in Adobe. Or speak up if you're not in Adobe. I'll ask the others -- Jay Scott and Michael and Oliver if I missed anything there? If so, please speak up and point it out or of course Marika. Mary I believe is in Singapore and will not be able to participate with us as far as I understand today. Is that correct, Marika?

Marika Konings: It is. She's actually on her way to the US.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Very good. I'm not hearing anything so we will go ahead pending comments from the GNSO council and proceed as we are right now until directed differently.

Now we go to the review of the Wiki workspace. I apologize in advance to those of you who don't need this but because there are new people participating we thought it would be helpful to do a quick overview on the Wiki site for the policy and implementation working group. You'll notice it's up on the screen. You're welcome to also log on to it separately if you like and you can manipulate it yourself. Marika and Jay Scott agreed to go through this and I will turn it over to Marika and you can take it from there.

Jay Scott Evans: I think I'm going to go first, Chuck. I don't know how many people have served on working groups before but I guess it was about five or six years ago we started using this tool which is a Wiki site which is like a webpage that is dedicated to the working group that can be viewed by members of the working group. It can be used to facilitate the dissemination of information within the working group outside of the list and outside of the telephone conferences and meetings. It also serves as sort of a repository for all information regarding the particular working group.

So, as you see here, we're in the GNSO tab and the policy and implementation working group homepage and over on the left rail is what we would call it at Yahoo!, the grayed out box, you see Marika is moving the cursor there now. It says there's the policy and implementation homepage. But then it's got sub pages. Meetings. When the next meeting is. It has our August 2010 meeting. I'm sure that's an archive of the notes that went on there. She'll show you here -- see? It shows you want our agenda was. And then you see the working group document drafts published. That link is blank right now. Of course we haven't published anything.

There's also a page that has our charter, that defines for you what's expected of us and what we're supposed to be considering, what our outcomes should be, what our deliverables should be. And then we have a section that has members. A mailing list archive. This is very good. This is where you can read everyone's statement of interest by clicking on the hypertext link in the list. And you'll see down at the bottom there's an archive for the mailing list. And then also there are background documents. This is another great resource. If you can't find something that's sent to you, you can look here. Those are sort of the board sections. But within each section there are tools that you can use.

You see also Marika's showing you the attendance logs. You can see who's been coming to the meetings. And who's shown up and what their percentage of attendance is and those kind of things. This is great so that the chairs and vice chairs can make sure there's broad community representation at meetings when we take decisions. There's also tool within each of these pages that you can use that allow you as a member of this working group to pass information along and to review information.

	For the ins and outs of that part of the Wiki I'm going to turn it over to Marika.
Marika Konings:	This is Marika. As Jay Scott explained, the structure is the structure we typically use for working groups when they get started. I think I'm hearing -- someone probably needs to mute their computer. Okay. I think it's better. But this review tool is here for you to use and explore and develop as you see fit. There's a function that let's you create additional pages. For example if you would decide to create sub teams you might want to create specific dedicated part of the Wiki for those groups to start drafting the information or posting information or call the attention of others to that.
	There's also a public repository for people that are interested in this group but don't necessarily want to become members or participate in the calls, they can go here and find what the working group has been doing. Eventually we hope as well to post here drafts so there's an opportunity for working group members to look at the draft and provide comments or post new drafts. Again, it's really up to you as a working group to decide how you want to use that.
	Some working groups use it more as a static tool, they can just go there and find the agenda for a meeting or find their documents or look at who the working group members are. Others use it as a more interactive tool and collaborate on the space in developing documents or elaborating on issues or discussions. I think at this stage you're probably all set up and able to see and comment on the site. If you want to have editing rights and play around, let me know and we can set it up if it hasn't already been done. A little word of warning as well. Of course if you start making changes, it is visible to everyone. So, please don't start deleting things or moving things around without an overall agreement from the working group. But again if you have any suggestions or anything you'd like to see added, we're here as well to help you with that and assist as needed.
	Are there any spec questions? I'm happy to -- there's a lot of training materials available about the Wiki. If you want to spend some more time diving into this and understanding how you can use the tool and how to work with it, we can definitely point you in the right direction.
Chuck Gomes:	Okay. This is Chuck again. Are there any questions? I see a hand. James? Is your hand up from before? Or is that a new hand?
James Bladel:	I'm sorry. That's an old hand. I'm taking it down now.
Chuck Gomes:	Thank you. Okay. One question I have, Jay Scott and Marika – and thanks for your excellent overview of that. What's the log in for?
Jay Scott Evans:	You can log in and you can then manipulate and edit certain things. Like I can log in and I updated my statement of interest you would see on August 22. I changed a few things. I added a picture. I changed some of the information regarding our applicant status.

Chuck Gomes:	Now, if you updated -- this is Chuck again. If I update my statement of interest, is that updated everywhere my statement of interest appears on the ICANN site? Or just for this working group?
Jay Scott Evans:	Chuck, I think it's an active hypertext link. If it's appearing via hypertext link, it would just go back to this same page. It would be updated. If it's somehow been blocked and copied, of course it would not.
Chuck Gomes:	Thank you.
Marika Konings:	This is Marika. Just to add a thing, Jay Scott is right there. The statement of interest are hosted on a different part of the GNSO section and what we do is link directly to there so if any updates are made it directly comes through. Just to note as well on the log in, currently it's set up that all external viewers can see the page but once you log in that's when you can actually -- specific rights are granted to working group members or registered users. All registered users are able to for example comment on pages. Our working group members will also be able to have editing rights and I think Cheryl's already asking for some of those weekends for those that want and are watching for example the -- it allows you to watch the pages so you'll see when updates are made on that, you'll get an automatic email notification that tells you that an update has been made and shows you that update. So, if everyone's happy with that we can add you with editing rights to those pages. If you have any questions we're happy to answer those as best we can.
Chuck Gomes:	Thanks to both of you. This is Chuck again. If someone doesn't have log in credentials will they be prompted to give those when they click on log in?
Marika Konings:	As all of you have completed statements of interest you should have log in credentials. If you've forgotten those, I think there is a procedure to get those but I think it's easiest probably to let the GNSO secretary know and they'll be able to point you in the right direction. But in principle, if you have a complete statement of interest it means also that you have log in details because that was needed for you to complete that.
Chuck Gomes:	Thanks. Any other questions or comments? I forgot to give my name again. This is Chuck. Again, it's really important for the transcript. And also for the recording. Alright. Well, if there are -- Amr?
Amr Elsadr:	Hi. This is Amr. I'm just wondering should we as a working group decide now whether the members of the working group should have editing rights to the Wiki space or should perhaps staff update the Wiki space based on what we agreed to as a group? I'm just asking this to avoid maybe just chaotic editing to the Wiki space.
Chuck Gomes:	Thanks, Amr. And it's a very good question because especially with the size of this group, that could result in some confusion. Now, let me ask a question of Jay Scott and Marika. Can we restrict editing to certain sections? Or is it just all editing rights or none?

Marika Konings:	This is Marika. I think you can restrict editing rights but it's basically at the parent level. So, if you give editing rights at the parent level, the sublevels would also automatically have the same rights. I think you can restrict it by pages but it probably will make it complex to do it that way and I think someone needs to mute their line. And I mean -- I'm trying to think what we've seen in other groups. Not many working group members are probably active in editing unless they're working in subteams possibly. We do take responsibility for those sections such as meetings, adding working group documents. I think that's something that the working group may not need to worry about. But again, it's more comfortable for staff to do those updates. Or maybe it may be something we revisit. Because it may be useful if you start creating subteams or you start using the Wiki as a place where people start collaborating on certain documents or comment or information they want to share. At that stage I think you do want to have editing rights. But then we can of course add them on a case by case basis as well as needed.
Chuck Gomes:	Thank you, Marika. Alan?
Alan Greenberg:	Thank you. ALEC uses Wikis a lot to develop documents and work on things. What we found work best in theory even if you gave everyone editing rights, go back and look at the archive and see who changed what when, it's a relatively complex process and what we found works best is to designate one person as the pen holder for the text that is being developed and then everyone else uses the comments underneath. You don't need editing rights to be able to comment. And that seems to be able to be a way where you can both track who said what and still maintain some level of reasonable control over the document so it's not changing when no one's looking. If we get to the point where we're developing documents on the Wiki.
Chuck Gomes:	Thanks a lot, Alan. Those sound like reasonable suggestions. A question for you, Alan. Do you allow general editing rights like updating SOIs for everyone and I'll leave it at that.
Alan Greenberg:	Anyone who has an SOI has editing rights over it. That's in the design of the SOI part of the Wiki. But that's not part of our working space. That's, as Marika said, that's part of another part of the GNSO working space which our membership list simply points to.
Chuck Gomes:	Let me put you on the spot since you have had good experience with this. Marika, if I understood her correctly, suggestion that we play this out, that it hasn't been too much of a problem in her view and staff's view in other working groups. Do you agree that that's a reasonable approach for right now? And then deal with it as issues arise?
Alan Greenberg:	I think so. In general GNSO working group haven't developed content on the Wiki that we've used. Mailing lists and documents passed back and forth with staff normally taking control of the document. There have been exceptions but in general that's how it's work. If this group especially once it starts working in subgroups, wants to use Wikis then as I said, certainly at large has some experience which has worked well and we also know a

number of things that have not worked well, specifically when you let 12 people start each editing the document themselves. Technically it works fine but tracking who's doing what gets a little bit complex.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. Thanks, Alan. Amr, thanks for asking this question. Are you comfortable proceeding as Marika suggested? In other words we will leave it as is now and as needs arise deal with them? Is that an approach that you think sounds okay at this stage?

Amr Elsadr: Yes. This is Amr. That's fine by me. Whatever the working group decides is really okay with me. But my concern was just the large number of the members of the working group and I'm guessing that this is going to be a pretty busy working group with quite a few subteams and I think it might be a good idea to not waste too much time trying to chase things around on the Wiki space and more time developing policy. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Thanks, Amr. Does anyone object? Anybody at all in the working group object to approaching it as Marika suggested? Not seeing any hands or hearing anybody, I'll assume that that is correct and we'll proceed like that. But please speak up at any point if you see that we've got a possible problem that we might need to react to. Thanks again to Jay Scott and Marika for going over this. And as I think it was Marika that said please feel free to ask staff if you need any assistance or have some questions and so forth.

Now, I'm going to make a comment to my cochair and the vice chairs. Sometimes I'm not very good at keeping up on the chat. So, if you see something there that I don't catch that needs attention, please jump in and let me know. I sometimes do it better than other times. But I would appreciate and the same with Marika and Mary when she's on if you guys just don't hesitate to interrupt me if I'm missing something that's there.

Alright. Looks like some good chat going on in terms of editing. Let's go to item four and our leader's report. We suggested 1.5 weeks ago that everyone review not full documents. Eventually you should be familiar with all these documents but particular portions as we start out our work. What I want to do is go through those one by one and see if there are any questions about those documents.

The first -- the one major document is the working group guidelines. And there were just a couple sections there we called to your attention that I would like to find out whether anyone has any questions. The first one was the working group members responsibilities. That's section 225 of the working group guidelines. Are there any questions on those? I think they're pretty clear but I certainly want to give opportunity for discussion if that's needed. Okay?

Not seeing any hands or hearing anyone, the next section of the working group guidelines that we highlighted was section 3.4, the individual group behavior and norms. Any questions or comments on that? Okay.

Then last of all the working group charter which we will focus on a lot throughout this process. Any questions or comments on the working group charter? I think probably most of you know if there's something that's not included in the charter we do have the opportunity to go back to the council if it's a significant change from what was in the charter and request that that be added to the charter. That's always an option we can take if we need to and we'll deal with that when we get to that point.

Jeff Newman is our GNSO council liaison. We will certainly rely on him if we need to ask questions of the council or communicate to the council and so forth. We do have other councilors on here as well. But Jeff is our primary liaison there. Okay. No questions on the charter?

Then the next item on the agenda under agenda item four is the issue of sending an invitation to other SOs and ACs. I'd like to just share that Jonathan Robinson, the chair of the council, already sent before the drafting team on this topic an invitation to all the SOs and ACs and made the call for volunteers which many of you responded to.

Now, as far as an invitation now that we've started our working group to all the SOs and ACs, a question I have for the working group is whether or not you are comfortable with the leadership team developing those and sending those out? We're willing to do that. But at the same time if there's strong preference for the full working group to be involved in that, obviously we would keep you informed but also if we need some sort of a time period when the working group can provide feedback before we send the communications out we can do that as well.

Let's start with Avi?

Avi Doria: Thank you. Avi speaking. That last one is what I would endorse, the idea of you guys working on it and then just doing a sanity quick check with the group, something like a 24, 48 hour speak up if you object type of review. So, somewhere between all of us getting into the nitty-gritty and working it with you and you all just sending it when you think it's ready, just sort of a sanity review of the group is something I would advocate. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Avi. This is Chuck. I appreciate that. Jay Scott?

Jay Scott Evans: I've already started working on a draft and it's -- because we are also required in the charter to seek input from them on the questions. That's in the charter. So, it would try to be a dual document, one that invites them to participate but also invites their input on those questions. So, I'm hoping to have something to circulate later today or first thing tomorrow.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. I assume we'll take a look at it first as a leadership team and then put it out to the whole group?

Jay Scott Evans: That's right. I will circulate it to the leadership team either today, before close of business today our time or tomorrow. And then, Chuck, we can discuss it and once we're comfortable then we can send it to the big list.

Chuck Gomes: Sounds good to me. Thanks, Jay Scott. I appreciate that. Holly?

Holly Raiche: Yes. Hi. Holly Raiche for the transcript record. I'm a little bit confused. I looked at the length of the list and I'm not sure we need anybody else unless we actually go through the list or have the leadership team go through the list and see if there are any particular big gaps of people. I've sort of done that and I'm not sure that there are. But I think the important thing now would be to get comments rather than more membership. So, if we have work to be done, I think that's the time to go through the various lists and get more comment. I just don't think we need more people.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Holly. And as Jay Scott I think indicated, this is more than just communicating that the working group is open and if there are other people that want to be involved. I understand the concern about the size of the group. That's legitimate. But we do need to keep it open. That's important. But also there will be times when for example we have a public policy issue that we would really benefit from some feedback from the GAC. And so we want them to be aware of what's going on that we will periodically be reaching out to them on areas where they think that they may have some input that would be helpful to our work.

Holly Raiche: I agree with that. I was just -- I think making a distinction between getting more members now rather than the very important task of making sure everybody's contributing as they should over time.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Holly. One of the things that it appears at least to me and the rest of the leadership team is it looks like we have as far as especially within the GNSO and the ALEC we have quite good representation across all the SGs and constituencies as well as the ALEC. So, that's a really positive sign. We don't necessarily need to reach out to any particular group like that and encourage participation. But there are some SOs and ACs that are not participating and maybe they will elect not to participate and that's okay but we want to make sure they're aware. Thank you. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Chuck. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Yes. While I hear what Holly says, I also think it's terribly important to recognize that GNSO working groups are open and remain open. The mechanisms that are enshrined in the guidelines have all sorts of protections to make sure that we don't go back to the beginning if new people join throughout the process. I'm not overly concerned. Even if you have huge groups and we have had huge groups in the past, you end up with a core small number of workers anyway.

That said, the reason I put my hand up, Chuck, is to say I fully endorse the concept of the leadership team putting together the draft and getting it out to the working group and asking for it promptly back but I'm just keen to make sure we're aware of any timeline limitations and indeed any opportunities. For example, should you wish the CCNSO council to consider such a missive from us, then next meeting and indeed the only meeting they'll be holding in September is on September 10. I just wanted to put that date forward.

Chuck Gomes: That's very good information to have. Thank you, Cheryl. So, we really need to get this task done with a couple of days lead time at least before that CCNSO meeting date. Thanks for that.

Another thing with regard to other SOs and ACs, one of the things we as a leadership team thought would be a good idea because we have a GAC member participating as an individual in this working group already I reached out to Olga Cavalli who's on the call today and asked her if she would be willing -- and I'm going to word this very carefully. Listen to my wording. Hopefully I will do it properly. If she would be willing to serve as an unofficial informal liaison with the GAC. Those words unofficial and informal are intentional. We don't want to step on anybody's toes.

The formal liaison role that the GAC used to have on the GNSO council was dropped and there were a variety of issues there that we don't need to hear but Olga kindly agreed to that. And so assuming that in our letter to the GAC in particular we'll bring that up and ask whether or not they're comfortable with that, understanding again that it's informal and unofficial but it would provide maybe another channel of communication.

Obviously on more official communications we'll do it between the cochairs and the whatever supporting organization or AC that is involved but I thank Olga for agreeing to serve in that capacity. We didn't want to suggest it if she wasn't willing. So, that's why we asked her first. Any questions or comments on that? Okay.

I think then we can move to the next item on there. It's very brief. I did send a message to Jeff Newman for council consideration with regard to whether or not the council would like to suggest to ICANN board members that they are welcome to participate. They can of course participate as a regular member of the working group but also if they'd like to observe. We'd welcome them to do that. That is what the leadership team felt was really a council decision, not a working group decision. So, Jeff followed up with that and the council -- it's in the council's hands now, how they want to handle that.

Okay. Moving on to the big task we have early on in our work. And that's the development of a work schedule. Thanks to Marika's work, she distributed a mind mapping I guess a map from that that will be put up in Adobe right now. For those that aren't on Adobe, hopefully you saw it and can follow maybe along with a copy that you have. But I would like to turn it over to Marika to talk about the mind mapping tool and how it works and then go into how this would help us move towards developing a work plan and ultimately a time schedule as well. Marika?

Marika Konings: Thanks, Chuck. This is Marika. Some of you may be familiar with this tool or approach as it's something that's actually been introduced or credited to Michael Connor to some of the working groups that have been running it for awhile and it has proven quite successful for working groups at the start of the process to use the mind mapping as a tool to facilitate free flowing brainstorming on how to approach or tackle certain issues while at

the same time being able to use this tool to structure that and eventually come to a work plan from which you can derive your milestones and the path that needs to be delivered.

So, what I've done is basically tried to translate the charter that we have into a mind map as a kind of starting point for the working group to look at. Again, this is just a tool that you may find helpful. If the working group feels this won't help you in getting your work plan developed you can definitely consider other approaches. But as I said, other working group have used this and have used it quite successfully in structuring their thoughts and approaches.

Basically how I've done this and the version you actually see on the screen now is a little bit different than the one I sent you because following our call yesterday with the chairs group I realized that the order of the subjects may make more sense the other way around. So, I've reorganized it here. The concept is still the same. So, if you have it printed out you can still follow it by the headlines. It's just in a different order on the screen.

Basically where it starts at the top is the basic information, what's the project about and other information. And then it goes into the basic requirements. Some of these elements were already outlined in the charter. Some of these follow from some of the discussions we had with the leadership team. Again this is a starting point. We can build on this. The idea is we would outline some of the basic requirements the working group would need to meet in order to actually start this work. So, it talks about what are the basic documents you'd need to look at? What are the basic materials the working group would need to understand in order to start tackling these charter questions? Also looking at what are other projects or working groups that are actually looking at potentially similar questions or may have recommendations that may relate to the work we're looking at. Again, here are some of the ones I'm aware of.

And then as well I think it's a point that comes through as well, are there any external experts or external information the working group may need to look at that at a higher level takes it out of the ICANN context but looks at the broader debate of policy implementation. Because of course the ICANN world is not unique as to where this debate has been held. Are there any other frameworks or documents we may be looking at or diving into or experts we may want to talk to that would set the stage for our deliberations. So, again, I think this is something we can hopefully build on. There may be other areas people may think we need to look at first before we drive into the other parts.

So, if you go down, you see the working group tasks and again all of this is basically copy and paste from what is in the charter. I think the idea would be eventually that we're able either to divide those tasks into parts of the basic requirements, sharing elements such as the reaching out in the beginning of the process which we're already doing which is probably a basic requirement, a starting point. But then again the information we get from there will have to go back to the relevant charter questions we're

looking at. There may be others that need to be added here. Ideally we're able to map those tasks to the relevant charter questions which are listed below. I haven't started doing that yet because I think that's a task for the working group to start debating. The idea would be that with the task you identified, those basically lead up to coming to some kind of conclusions or recommendations for each of these charter questions. It may be the case of a charter question we're able to identify what is the information we need to gather to actually answer that charter question or who are the people we need to talk to or how do we approach that? For example again here, I think this is where you would come in with we need the subteams, so we create a subteam. If so, how do we structure it? Do they develop a separate work plan? How do they report back? I think all of that can be captured here and ideally at the end of the brainstorming process we'd be able to capture it all and translate it into a work plan. Basically once we've done this it should become clear what are the different tasks we need to complete for us to be able to give order to answer the charter questions we've been given.

Once we have that overall picture I think we're actually in a position to draw from that and develop a work plan with assigned tasks and milestones and use that as then our guiding document as we do our work. What typically happens then throughout the process is at the end of the working group deliberation we go back to the mind map and say -- Okay, we're at the point where we've completed our work. But did we cover everything? Again, from my experience with other working group, that's been successful as well in going back and saying -- Oh, actually we missed an important element or we missed a certain question that we said we would look at and we actually didn't.

So, it allowed us to look back and check with what we initially set out to do and how do we think of doing that and have we done so and did we check all the boxes? That's a little bit of the idea behind the mind map and as I'm now sharing my screen I'd also be able to actually as far as adding things as we start discussing. I'll do my best to capture and move things around but you have to be a little bit patient with me as well. I'm not as well versed in this as Michael is. And I'm doing my best in certain cases it may be that I'll need to go in after the call to clean up things, draw things back and forth so I can then provide you with an updated version after the call that you can look at and review.

I think that's basically the update on the mind map. Maybe just wanting to note as well what I have up is indeed mind mapping software. I think there's free software available for those of you interested in playing around with this or using this. What I'll always do is export this as a PDF document so anyone can review it as well. It just means it's more static and you can't play around with it but it allows you to see all the information and provide any feedback as you feel appropriate.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Marika. Before I open it up to questions or comments, let me point out those of you who have been in lots of working groups, you already know this, but for those that are new, the ICANN policy staff is a tremendous resource and they're invaluable in the work of

working groups. Some of us go back to when we had no staff support for the working groups and then we had one person. And the policy support team is fantastic and a critical part of us being able to accomplish the work that's in front of us.

Now, that said, let me open it up to questions or comments of any nature related to the mind mapping tool itself or how we would use that to develop a work plan, any concerns about that, or support for that. I personally think it gives us a nice avenue for moving forward on developing a work plan but maybe everybody else disagrees with that. This is a working group where all of you have input. I'm opening it up right now for discussion on that. Anne?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Hi, Chuck. This is Anne. I'm with IPC but I'm working on this in an individual capacity. This is my first working group. Thank you for your patience. My question is about what I guess what's called the deliverables. In our initial tasks we are to develop a time table for the deliverables and for those who really have experience in this process, would they consider the deliverables are the answers to the first five points? How would you get in this initial task of developing a time table for deliverables, how would you get a lasso around that issue?

Chuck Gomes: Marika? Would you like to respond to that?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. From my perspective, I think the deliverables are the recommendations that provide responses to the charter questions. So, indeed, the five questions. I think everything we're set out to do should lead to a response or recommendation in response to those five charter questions. But again that's from my perspective. Others may have other views on that.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. Anne, did that answer your question? Or did you want to follow up?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I guess deliverables meaning -- Marika's saying answer these five questions and what is your time table for answering the five questions? Is that what's being said?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. If I can add to that, I think the work plan at least in the PDP working groups the work plan is intended to outline to the council when they can expect to receive an initial report and when they should get a final report. I think it should outline for our own purposes we would likely make that more detailed and say -- Okay, these are the different steps we've identified that we need to accomplish in order to get to those recommendations that would go into the reports or we estimate that by this deadline we would publish an initial report. Think from a council perspective, they're mostly concerned with when they can expect to receive those milestones. I think for the working group, we may want to be more specific in trying to build up that -- especially if we identify certain tasks or surveys or work that needs to be undertaken. If we can put timeframes on that, it will allow us to map that to the deliverable off that first major milestone which is likely to be an initial report unless of course

you're looking to publish or something different before that, have a different format of communicating.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Okay. It's Anne again. Chuck, if I may, my comment with respect to that and the time table and the prospect of deliverables, it seems with respect to these five questions we have to determine as a working group if they are dependent in time on one another. In other words, is developing something in response to two dependent on completing one first or not? Are they interdependent in time sequence or can they be worked on separately.

Chuck Gomes: Absolutely, Anne. This is Chuck again. You're right on target. And note something -- I'm going to call attention to one thing in particular that Marika said that's really important to realize. She said that we will break this out into more detail. So, we have the five charter questions. We have some tasks that are listed there now that came out of the charter but our work plan will probably have even more detail as we refine that. One of the things the leadership team talked about yesterday is that some of the questions and some of the tasks overlap a little bit and you raised a really important point that we need to identify the interdependencies of those tasks and make sure they're built into our timeline the best that we can early on in the process, understanding that we will -- this is all going to be fairly dynamic. It doesn't mean that we can't make modifications along the way as we learn things or if we find out one task takes longer than we anticipated or one gets done more quickly. Thank you very much for a very good interjection there.

Gideon? Are you on mute? We cannot hear you. Well, while Gideon's checking his situation -- are you there, Gideon? Note that Marika responded to Anne with regard to something that can be built into mind map there. I'll call your attention to that for those that are not on Adobe. She said that that's something that can also be built into the mind map to show that one charter question is dependent on an answer to the other. I assume, Marika, that that could be done, show dependency between tasks as well, not just questions? Is that correct?

Marika Konings: Yes. That's correct.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Not hearing Gideon, I'll come back to Gideon if he's able to speak later. Let's go to Maureen. Maureen? Are you on mute?

Maureen Cubberley: Hello? Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: We can. Thank you.

Maureen Cubberley: It's the mute button. Thanks. It's Maureen Cubberley for the record. I think what we have here is it's a really good list of what we need to accomplish. It's very much what we need to accomplish and I'm looking forward to seeing it develop into the Eastern direction, off to the right-hand side with the details on how we're going to accomplish it. So, I'd suggest that what we need to do is look at first of all that question about whether things can be done simultaneously or whether there's a dependence that would

suggest a sequence. And then just look at each of these and what the implication of how much work is involved in each one and attach the timeline after that. I think that until we look at the scope of each of them, it's hard to establish a timeline. Maybe there's a step in between what we have now and establishing a timeline and that is getting a sense of the scope and depth of each one of these, what to do and figuring out how to do.

Chuck Gomes: Excellent points, Maureen. Thank you. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I guess I just wanted to step back for a moment. If this were a PDP then the outcome is clear. The outcome would be one or more recommendations should we choose to make any recommendations at all. This is not a PDP. This is a group that would put together to try to at the highest level understand the issues and then figure out once we understand the issues of policy and implementation what do we do to make things work better? And the charter questions that -- the group that put together the charter worked very hard to try to come up with what I'll call a laundry list of things that we probably need to discover or need to talk about.

I think at this point there's still some initial work to be done so that we understand what the overall territory looks like and what are the major division points in policy and implementation? We've already talked a little bit about a third one that divides what's currently called implementation. As we understand the topology better, I think the scope of what we're going to do may change. I wouldn't get too hung up on putting detailed timelines in. For those of us who participated enough in other working group, things change anyway as we go along because the things we think are simple become hard. We just didn't understand and sometimes vice versa. I wouldn't get too hung up on detailed timelines at this point. But lay out the overall scope of what we're trying to do and things get refined as we go forward.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. He's sure right that things will change. We do have a responsibility to provide some estimated timelines but we don't need to get too far ahead of ourselves in that. That will be much easier as others have said once we have a better feel how we're going to organize our work and a lot of the other issues that people have raised.

Let me go back to Gideon. Gideon? Are you able to speak now? Okay. Can't hear him. So, Gideon, hopefully you can at least communicate what you wanted to say, if you can hear me, on our working group list if not in the chat, in Adobe so that we can hear what you have to say. Anyone else want to comment or ask a question on this issue?

Marika Konings: Just to note that I've already started taking some notes based on the comments made so far so you can see me adding those to the basic requirements section because I think that's what a lot of those comments are related to. But if you see I'm putting something in that you weren't saying or put it in the wrong place, just put it in chat or send me a note and we can update accordingly. But I'll do my best to keep up with the

conversations and add things in as they're being suggested so hopefully at the end people can review what was in the conversation and think about what is still missing.

Chuck Gomes: I was counting on that, Marika. Thank you. You do a great job with that. Okay. Holly?

Holly Raiche: Yes. Thanks. Holly Raiche for the transcript record. I'd like to support what Alan said because being part of the original charter group that developed the charter, some of the deliverables, it's really a response, may simply be we have answered this question in the following way because it is in the following documents. Or we don't think that question is appropriate. Or this question is too complex. It needs to go to a PDP. Because what we were asking is really high level, which was really about policy, about implementation, about who does what when and how it might be done better, I think that the deliverables are going to come in a variety of sizes and shapes. So, I absolutely support Alan in saying if we makes things too tight we actually haven't accepted the fact that the original questions --

Chuck Gomes: Speak a little louder, please?

Holly Raiche: Sorry. The questions being asked are really very high level and more about the processes and how that might be done better. So, the deliverables aren't the usual kind of final report with recommendations. I guess that's a test that the leadership group is going to have to come to terms with. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Holly. I appreciate that. I want to come back to a couple things Alan said, especially for those that may be newer to the GNSO and the working groups in particular. Is there anyone who needs a little more explanation in terms of what happens to the output of working group in the case of a PDP versus a working group like this that is not a formal PDP. If you need more explanation on that, please raise your hand or speak up. Otherwise I'll assume everybody's okay with that particular issue. But it is an important issue. Then I'll make another comment after I give opportunity for that.

                 Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Yes. Hi. This is Amr. I'm relatively new to the process so I wouldn't mind an explanation. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. This is Chuck again. Let me start it off. Others are welcome to jump in on this. A lot of you understand this pretty well. In registry and registrar agreements, they are required to implement consensus policies and there's some limits around what the policies can cover, there's something called a picket fence and so forth. But if there's a consensus policy and what happens with the consensus policy, a working group recommends the policy. The GNSO council then if it approves it sends it on to the board. It doesn't become a consensus policy until the board approves it.

Once it becomes a consensus policy then the registries and registrars within whatever timeframe seems appropriate depending on the complexity of the implementation are required to implement that consensus policy. But the -- and there's a PDP process, as you know, that's in the ICANN bylaws, in the appendices I believe and there are working group guidelines, et cetera. The working group guidelines don't just apply though to PDPs. In this case, the GNSO council didn't initiate a -- it initiated a working group but it's not a policy development process as Alan indicated.

So, now I'll come back to that and talk about that. The work of the GNSO involves more than just developing consensus policy. This particular issue -- I guess I'm really jumping ahead to my additional comments -- is that there's been a great deal of ambiguity in the ICANN community with regard to whether there's a line between policy development and implementation and what staff can do in implementation, if it's implementation instead of policy. I won't go through all that. A lot of that's dealt with within the charter as a background for this working group. This particular topic is extremely important even though it may not be classified as PDP in the formal sense, we will follow working group guidelines just like PDPs do.

And I believe -- it's not so much a matter of registries and registrars implementing what comes out of this working group but the whole community and the way we work together and how things are done in the future when policies are developed and need to be implemented.

I'll stop there and give it to Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks, chuck. Maybe just to add to what you're saying because I think it's a good explanation, that the expected outcome of this working group is not contractual obligations on registries and registrars which you would chose a PDP to come to consensus policy. The outcome you may see here looking at the questions at hand may be potential changes to the PDP manual or to the bylaws or maybe other kinds of recommendations that may be shared with the board or other parts of the community or setting up processes.

And those have -- those changes, if there were changes, for example, to the operation procedures, they don't have to go through a PDP to enact those. It only needs to go through certain steps, post comments, GNSO council would need to adopt them with a majority. The board has oversight over those potential changes. There were certain facts that would need to be followed for the GNSO to act on such recommendations or for those to be implemented. They're of a different nature than consensus policy recommendations that need to go through PDP.

And in fact I can add one thing. I had a private chat with Gideon and he asked me to convey his comments as he wasn't able to speak up. He has some issues with the microphone. His comment was that the charter on line is good for the group to understand the tasks at hand. I believe the

	timing of the deliverables should be customized and set down so those timelines can be achieved.
Chuck Gomes:	Thank you for sharing that and thank you for the very well worded addition to the comments on our working group and its relationship to PDPs, et cetera. That was very well said. I appreciate that. Avi? You're next. Avi? Are you on? There you go. Oh. You no longer want to speak? Okay. Alright. If you do have a comment, please feel free to speak up. Amr, does that help give you a better understanding?
Amr Elsadr:	This is Amr. Yes. I think I do. My main question, what I was really wondering about was the difference between a PDP working group and this one. I think you and Marika both answered the question pretty well. Thank you. I appreciate it.
Chuck Gomes:	Thank you. I very much appreciate you bringing that up. In my own opinion and I think it's validated by the interest in this working group, this is a very critical issue that we're dealing with in the ICANN and has the potential of having impact in years ahead and helping the whole community, certainly the GNSO but also the whole community do things even better in the future. So, I think even though this isn't a formal PDP, this is one of the most critical working groups for quite a while and will have huge impact in the future. Anybody else want to comment on that? Okay.
	Is there anybody that's opposed -- strongly opposed to using the mind mapping software and approach with lots of staff help in developing our work plan? Please either indicate that you disagree in Adobe or speak up or share a comment. Okay. I think it looks like we're all on the same page. We obviously have a lot to learn and a lot to do in this regard.
	We only have a little over ten minutes left in our call. As the next step then, let's talk a little bit about basic requirements. You'll see that in the mind mapping thing and is it possible to enlarge the mind map so the basic requirements are easier for people to read?
Marika Konings:	I'll try zooming in but as an alternative you can use the full screen option. That may help.
Chuck Gomes:	Okay. Alright. If you need to, use the full screen option. I know the problems with doing that, you can't see some of the other stuff that's going on, but another option is if you have a printed copy of this you can look at the basic requirements. The question I have for the group is this. As far as basic requirements does anyone see anything that might be missing in the basic requirements? I'll allow time for thoughts. If it's quiet for a minute, I want people to focus on that because you didn't know this question was coming. Anne?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes. Thank you, Chuck. Am I unmuted?

Chuck Gomes:	You are.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Oh, good. Okay. It's Anne Aikman-Scalese. I can ask, I did not actually have time to study this and with a question is anything missing from the basic requirements, I don't honestly think that I can personally answer that question on this call right now in this meeting. I think I would personally need time to study it.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine. In fact, in most cases when we deal with something, we will allow for follow up and additional time as needed. So, we will come back in our next meeting after we get rid of the administrative issues that are rife in the beginning, this is probably where we will start. But I at least wanted to get people thinking about it today so they will do what you just said is needed and be prepared to continue this discussion on the list and between the meetings and in our next meeting two weeks from now. Excellent point. Thank you very much for that. And thank you for enlarging the basic requirements in Adobe for those who are in Adobe. Alan? You're next.

Alan Greenberg: It's not something missing but I would suggest the last item, understanding the overall territory which I was making reference to even though I couldn't get the word territory to come out of my mouth really is the first one and I would almost divide it into two because if you look at the history that led to this group being formed, there has been a real lack over the last dozen years or so on ICANN even though we've been using the term policy on a very regular basis. We have never taken the trouble to really understand the relationship, what each step is composed of and certainly the implementation which includes a whole variety of different tasks. We've never really tried to understand. So, I would put that essentially near the top of our thing. We could certainly look in parallel outside but I think we need to understand what we're talking about in the ICANN context and that has to be done early in the process, not late in the process.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. Before I respond, I want to welcome Jeff Newman to the call. Thanks for joining us, Jeff. I know all of us have conflicts. We glad you're getting the tail end of this. Certainly if you have any questions, there are several of us who will bring you up to date as need. Alan, what I want to do is -- I appreciate those suggestions. Anybody disagree with Alan's suggestions? They look pretty good to me. But feel free if you think you would approach it differently. Just speak up. Otherwise we will assume that all of you on this call are comfortable with what he's suggested. And keep in mind this is all very dynamic. It's not as if we're at the end where we're ready to send something to the council. There will be lots of opportunities for modifications as we go forward. Alan? Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I just thought, when I look at my own thoughts on this and I can trace it based on a number of notes I've written within at large and the GNSO, the overall issue was so lacking in precision when we started that at every stage, every time a discussion has been held, we've gone a little bit further and sometimes we've backtracked. I suspect -- I like making predictions at the beginning of a process when we have no real way to understand how it's going to go through -- that once we really understand and come up with some precise terms, our problems are going to be a lot

easier to address. We're not there yet but I think part of the challenge is making sure we're all using the same words in the same way and we may find the task is a lot easier once we come down to that stage. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. Maureen?

Maureen Cubberley: Hello. Yes. Maureen Cubberley. I have a question, not for an answer now, but to add to our list of questions. And it's regarding basic requirements, the little box taking into account projects running concurrently that may relate, et cetera. Given what I've heard, it sounds like they're going to relate, that the mandate of this project is broad enough that it's going to have an impact across the board. So, my question is are we looking at whether or not these projects relate in how they're progressing now and the work that they're doing or in the impact that the work that's been undertaken in those four projects might have on our work or -- and there's a third or -- is what we are doing going to in some way change the work they're doing or change their outcomes? Three part question.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. This is Chuck. Before I turn it over to others, what do you think on those three questions?

Maureen Cubberley: Who are you addressing?

Chuck Gomes: Maureen.

Maureen Cubberley: You're addressing me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Maureen Cubberley: Again, it's been awhile. I've been involved in PDP but not in a working group like this involved in an overreaching mandate. I guess my confusion level is probably well-established. However, I think that given what you've said about the importance and scope of this work and what I understand you to say is the outcome which will have an impact on everything ICANN's doing from a policy implementation process in the future, I don't see how those four can not have an impact. I'm wondering if we need to have a separate group to work on those things specifically to look for where the implications might be in a back and forth way because I think it's a separate body of work that needs to feed into what we're doing.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. I'm counting on Marika capturing all that. It's very good contributions. Now, before we've got a queue here, I'm going to, because we're just about out of time and I want to stick to our 90 minutes to respect people's schedules, I need to ask everybody to be fairly brief. Keep in mind we're going to continue this. I'm not asking you to put your hand down. I'm just asking you to be brief. Especially if anybody wants to respond to Maureen briefly. Marika? Did you want to respond to that? You had your hand up before?

Speaker: Chuck, Marika is just dialing in right now. My hand was to respond to
                    Maureen.

Chuck Gomes: Anne, Michael? Did you want to respond to Maureen?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you. This is Anne. Just trying to respond quickly, I was really
                    talking more about a point about taking into account the projects running
                    concurrently and I had a question about the project that is running with
                    respect to developing GAC participation policy earlier in the process so
                    we don't have these conflicts developing so much between policy
                    development and GAC policy. Is that one of the other concurrent projects
                    that could impact our work?

Chuck Gomes: Absolutely. It is.,

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I think it should be listed. And responding very quickly to what Alan was
                    saying that when we define what policy is and what implementation is
                    what these terms really mean that a lot of our problems will be solved, I'm
                    probably in the camp that feels that that may be a goal that could be an
                    elusive goal in the sense that it seems to me what we're really talking
                    about is how to get a smoother working relationship once policy begins to
                    be implemented because issues arise when we start talking about staff
                    implementation but there seems to be a policy aspect to it and of course
                    the bylaws say that staff thinks it's implementation that the GNSO writes a
                    letter to the ICANN board however what's really happening is we're
                    seeing and saying in part because of the way the whole GAC process
                    works and other decision making processes that we want GNSO to
                    continue to that input on things that strike them as policy through the
                    implementation process. I personally feel that is far more important in
                    terms of the decision making process and operating smoothly than
                    defining per say what is implementation, what is policy. It's just the
                    continuing -- it's the timing of the matter and it's the continuing inputs in a
                    legitimate, valid way with from GNSO, not just GNSO council, by the way,
                    but I think as I mentioned was in the charter, I think it was more of a
                    timing issue than it is a definitional issue.

Chuck Gomes: Okay., Thank you very much. We're about out of time. I'm going to have
                    to ask you to give a 30 second comment and you'll have more time to
                    speak next time when Jay Scott is hopefully leading this call. Michael?
                    Are you on mute, Michael? Can't hear you. Michael Graham? Are you
                    there? Okay. We'll come back to Michael. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Two quick comments. One to respond to Anne, I don't think I
                    said once we define them all the problems would be solved. I think I said
                    something closer to once we have definitions that we all using the same
                    terms, the discussion will be a lot easier and the whole issue that you
                    raised of staff is implementing things and we think there's a policy aspect,
                    that's the problem. We're using the term implementation right now as a
                    grab bag for a lot of different things. And I think that's one of the
                    problems. In terms of what Maureen was saying about other groups,
                    there's overlap in this group between this group and pretty much every
                    other activity that's going on. So, I don't think we need to formalize the

relationship. I think as things evolve, there will be natural information being traded back and forth.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Holly, you get the last word.

Holly Raiche: Thank you very much. Two things. First, to support what Alan had said, from my understanding -- and this was because I was on the working group that formed this charter -- we are not going into the actual making any other particular inquiry except to look at the process being used and to look at those particular inquiries or processes that impact what we mean by policy, what we mean by implementation and to say to Anne, we actually had this exact same discussion and a lot of other. This group is a lot broader than just GNSO and GAC. That's my understanding and I think that of the whole drafting team.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Holly. Okay. We're a little over time. I want to bring the meeting to a close. Somebody's not on mute there. So, somebody trying to speak there? Can't understand. Okay. I want to thank everybody for good participation on this call. Please continue to participate on the list. And we'll pick up from here in our next call two weeks from now and look forward to continuing to work together. Have a good rest of the week. Thanks again.

Marika Konings: Thank you.

END