ICANN
Transcription
Policy and Implementation Ob Sub Tean meeting
Thursday 19 December 2013 at 21:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Policy and Implementation Ob Sub Tean call on the Thursday 19 December at 21:00 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-20131219-en.mp3

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#dec

Attendees:
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Alan Greenberg – At-Large
Greg Shatan – IPC
Chuck Gomes- RySG
Nic Steinbach- RrSG
Avri Doria – NCSG
Jonathan Frost – RySG
Tom Barett – RrSG
Michael Graham - IPC

Apology:
J.Scott Evans

ICANN staff:
Mary Wong
Marika Konings
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: I just need to inform you that today's conference call is being recorded. If you
                 have any objections you may disconnect your line at this time. And you may
                 begin.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. This is Chuck. And this is the Policy and Implementation Principles
                 Sub Team meeting for the 19th of December, 2013. I want to welcome

everybody to the call. And in particular a special welcome to Jonathan Frost who has joined the sub team. Welcome, Jonathan.

Jonathan Frost: Thank you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Just because you're new please don't hesitate to jump in especially if you can correct anything that Cheryl says.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bah-humbug.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry about that, Cheryl. Okay let's jump right in so that we hopefully use our time efficiently. Thanks again to Cheryl for sending the overarching principle. And so our agenda is, first of all, to discuss that overarching principle. Now is there anybody that's not in Adobe Connect today?

Okay so rather than take time to do a roll call, unless somebody really wants it really bad, you can look at the people who are on the call in Adobe and we don't need to go through that exercise.

So, Cheryl, do you want to have any...

Alan Greenberg: Chuck, it's - Chuck...

Chuck Gomes: ...comments before we get some reactions?

Alan Greenberg: Chuck, it's Alan. We really should have a roll call so the audio and the transcript has it.

Chuck Gomes: Oh that's true. All right so we have Alan and Cheryl and me and Greg, Jonathan, Michael and Nic are all on. Did I miss anybody? And Marika and Mary and thanks, Julie, for your help as well, from staff.

Tom Barrett: And, Chuck, this is Tom Barrett on the phone.

Chuck Gomes: Oh hi, Tom. Are you not in Adobe, Tom?

Tom Barrett: I'm not in Adobe, no.

Chuck Gomes: Okay good. Then speak up if you want to share something so that we know otherwise I'll be looking for raised hands in the Adobe window.

Tom Barrett: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks for letting me know, Tom. All right well, Cheryl, let me turn it over to you for any introductory comments or if you just want to jump in and have people comment on what you sent feel free.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Chuck. Cheryl for the record. And I'm all for the whole jumping in part but I did want to thank you for putting the razor to this because, as I said, it definitely needed pruning down. But I figured put everything in and then cut what we want out was one way forward. So there's a markup version on your screen.

I am very aware, however, that the words I used on the two bullet points, which were directly and shamelessly cut and pasted from Chuck's December 1 or December 2, if you're in my part of the world, email do need some modification based on our conversations last week.

So without suggesting, Chuck, that we get into wordsmithing in those bullet points other than to ensure that Marika or Mary have a proper updated version of what those bullet points would read like so we can pop it in there I don't think we need to go there. So let's just jump in and start from the top.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: And before we get into the detail - this is Chuck again - anybody have any general comments besides the thanks for - to Cheryl for doing this? Anybody? Just raise your hand or Tom, let me know. Okay then let's jump right in like Cheryl suggested.

Does anybody - did anybody not receive the redline that I sent of the version that Marika sent around today? Not hearing anyone I assume that you all either can see it on the Adobe screen or on a copy that you have of that.

So I'm going to flip over - I'll flip back and forth because I want to - it's hard...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...a little easier to read from a hard copy.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I just - if I may, Chuck? I just noticed Avri's just joined the room. And Avri's opinion on these words are very important to me so I'd like to just roll back a little bit and ask Avri, now she's joined us, whether she's had time to read the overarching principle statement.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Cheryl.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Avri is not on the call yet; she's only on the Adobe Connect...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All right so when she joins - pardon me - when she joins the phone bridge, Chuck, if you can roll back to that because I think her words of wisdom on all of this would be very useful indeed seeing as she's written, you know, volumes on all of this topic it would be smart to have her words in there as well.

Chuck Gomes: I agree. Thanks, Cheryl. Okay, this is Chuck again. And, Greg, glad to see that you're now on the phone bridge. And just glancing so hopefully Avri will be able to join the phone bridge as well.

All right so let's just start from the top. And as I flip over to the Word version that I have did - first to Cheryl but also for anyone to comment, in the second sentence I thought it was a minor change but make sure you tell me if it's not. I deleted the multistakeholder because I thought it was a little bit redundant and I didn't think it was necessary there. Is that change okay, Cheryl, first, but anybody else?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well from my perspective - it's Cheryl again - the answer is yes but recognizing this is a quote...

Chuck Gomes: Oh that's a quote too. I missed that. How did I miss that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: I don't know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, because you weren't paying attention but that's okay, Chuck, you do that.

Chuck Gomes: That's why there's quotation marks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So a deletion is fine as long as it's got dot, dot, dot in it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay now just a minute though. There is no - there are no quotes in what I'm looking at in the second sentence.

Alan Greenberg: The first sentence...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...the second sentence...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...is a total quote. The second one is actually a definition which, as you look to footnote 2, is from the ICANN wiki.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so you would suggest just doing a dot, dot, dot...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's exactly right. Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah and Marika or Mary, do one of you have the pen on this?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I can hold the pen on that one.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry about that, Chuck, but I'm also deleting but where we do delete we need to...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, no, no I tried to avoid - in one place, in fact, I even commented that I recognized it was a quote so I couldn't really change it but okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh no, you can change them just as long as it's done properly.

Chuck Gomes: All right.

Jonathan Frost: Well if it's not within quotations you're not really asserting that it's a quote; you're asserting that it's a paraphrase. So it seems like it could be okay if it's not within quotations. Not to nitpick over something small.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. And for the transcript - and I'll try to do it too so you'll hear me say my name a lot - this is Chuck - make sure you identify yourself and also for the recording if not - unless you're identified by - I may call you out and then you don't have to repeat your name I don't think. So as long as it's clear who's speaking that would be great.

So my next question then was in that next - in that second sentence - and, again, you're referring to the quotation so maybe we can't really do it. But I noticed that the way it's described it doesn't include individuals. Now we include individuals in the next sentence, which may be okay but I'd just like to see what people think on that.

Alan, go ahead and then I'll come back to Marika.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, some people's definition of civil society includes individuals other people's don't. So I think we need to make sure we're inclusive and not have people reading it as excluding individuals.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And thanks, Alan. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I was just looking for a confirmation on the previous point if we're going to change something or not because I heard now two different things whether we needed to add in dots or not or...

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. This is Chuck. And do people have a preference? Do you want to do dot, dot, dot or - because it's a description and not a direct quote just make the change. Anybody want to...

Alan Greenberg: I mean, technically it's not just omission, there's also replacing it with "a", I would just leave it as it is right now.

Chuck Gomes: As...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan speaking.

Chuck Gomes: Without the dot, dot, dot you mean, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I would leave it exactly as it's on the screen.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. Alan is the superior pedant; trust me.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I know, but I'm an opinionated pedant so I don't have to be agreed with.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Marika, are you good now?

Marika Konings: Yeah, I'm good. And if you - basically if we go through the points just, you know, confirm at the end of the conversation what you want changed or added so I'm clear on what...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, understood and that's good. Okay Chuck speaking again. So what's the thinking on individuals? Anybody want to - I mean, do we need to add them there? Is it okay to add them there or does the next sentence cover it sufficiently as far as people are concerned?

Alan Greenberg: I'm trying to read it carefully. It does say the primary stakeholders. It's Alan speaking.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Does that mean that we - that a individual couldn't be a primary stakeholder?

Greg Shatan: This is Greg. I think - and apologies for not raising my hand in the bridge but...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Greg Shatan: ...I think that end users, you know, are kind of a - unto themselves in a sense. I mean, yes they are often considered part of the civil society definition but I think that that - they're also one person businesses too. So I think individuals in the sense of end users, in the sense of kind of the ultimate person sitting with their head in the screen kind of, you know, should be called out specifically. That's my personal view.

Chuck Gomes: So would it be okay then to eliminate the "...and government organizations..." put a comma there and then put, "...and individuals"?

Greg Shatan: I think so. And I wonder whether we want to mention academic institutions separately from - or in addition to research institutions. That's often considered a separate group...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...academic institutions?

Greg Shatan: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. This is Cheryl and her (unintelligible) chorus in the back.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan speaking. Remember we are saying, "...bring together primary stakeholders such as..."

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: It's not...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's not exclusively.

Alan Greenberg: ...listed as an - as the complete list and definitive list.

Greg Shatan: Yeah, I think this is like the list in the Spanish Inquisition sketch of Monty Python. We don't necessarily keep that - need to keep adding to it.

Chuck Gomes: Was that Greg?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, that was Greg.

Greg Shatan: Yeah, it's me.

Chuck Gomes: I know your voice pretty well but I wasn't too sure on that one so.

Greg Shatan: Yes, yes I don't think we should add a ruthless devotion to the pope to the list but...

Alan Greenberg: Why not?

Greg Shatan: I digress.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. Okay, Chuck speaking again. So it does say, "...such as..." but I think we have to be sensitive in this because it is a - principles that we're going to want the whole community to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...buy into readily. And somebody - some individuals are liable to bring it up so...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...I think it's better to be...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here, Chuck. I think we - Cheryl here. I definitely think we need to build and brace this approach here. I'd rather gild the lily than miss something out here.

Chuck Gomes: So we added two things, right? Individuals and academic institutions?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Cheryl.

Avri Doria: And not the pope?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I just note - and not the pope, Avri, no. And now that you're on the phone bridge, Chuck, if we can roll back so Avri has an opportunity for...

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Cheryl.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: And Avri...

Avri Doria: ...my mouth shut.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no, no.

Chuck Gomes: No, no, we're not going to allow you to do that, Avri, unless there's some really good reason which I doubt. This is Chuck speaking again. And Cheryl

requested - before you were on the audio - that you express your reaction to the overarching principle that she drafted.

Avri Doria: I'd have to be good and have read them first.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You don't have to be good.

Avri Doria: Well I have to read them first.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's Cheryl here.

Avri Doria: And I've been too immersed in reading other stuff, I apologize.

Chuck Gomes: That's okay. This is Chuck. Avri, just go ahead and take your time and read it. We'll come back to you in a little bit. And I think it would be good with your experience and expertise it would be...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...very good - I agree with Cheryl - to get your reaction to it...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...before we go too far.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: In the mean time, I was just reading that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...Avri's in a position to be a primary editor of any of these words because she's got the expertise.

Chuck Gomes: So - this is Chuck again. The next sentence says, "A stakeholder refers to an
individual, group or organization that has a direct or indirect interest or stake
in a particular..." - I thought it made more sense to say "issue" instead of
"organization." Am I missing something there?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I agree.

Chuck Gomes: You agree, okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, I agree. Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody disagree with that? Okay. All right. And then I - there are other
things I think are minor edits but feel free to change them. "For which
possible action has the ability to influence the stakeholder's actions,
decisions and policies to achieve results." Any...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just noting what's happening in the - Chuck, Cheryl here - in the Chat,
Chuck, not the Chuck Chat.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You've got Nic and Graham putting - Nic and Michael - I've really been on
too many calls - Nic and Michael putting in suggestions.

Chuck Gomes: I'm looking at that now.

Michael Graham: This is Michael. And I was wondering at first the significance of primary and
then when we move to the next sentence I was wondering really the
significance and necessity of the "such as" clause since we are defining
stakeholder in the following sentence that it seems to me that we can simply
use stakeholder or primary stakeholders, whichever we want to use, leave
out the "such as" to cooperate.

The "such as" then is within the definition that comes in the following sentence I think. And by leaving out - there's a legal concept: Expressio unius exclusio alterius which means if you state one thing and leave out something you meant to leave out that something.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Graham: ...want to avoid that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Michael. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I think the word "influence" in the third to last line of that paragraph is wrong.

Chuck Gomes: Okay hold - hold it a second there, Alan. This is Chuck.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Let's go ahead and stick with Michael's issue.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, sorry.

Chuck Gomes: And then we'll come back to that.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, my hand was up before Michael gave his thing so...

Chuck Gomes: Sorry about that. The - what do people think about Michael's suggestion to totally remove the "such as" clause including businesses, civil society, etcetera? Anybody opposed to that? Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I - okay my hand is now up for this topic.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I think at some level we're agonizing over this a little bit too much. I think we -
                 for the purposes of this discussion - and we're not trying to definitely define
                 multistakeholder, you know, for the larger Internet governance discussion,
                 multistakeholder has to include anyone who has an interest in or will be
                 impacted by...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Impacted by...

Alan Greenberg: ...decisions. And then we can give some illustrative examples and make it
                 clear that they are examples.

Chuck Gomes: So back to Michael's...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I'm not trying to wordsmith it here but I think we want to give the concept of
                 what we're doing such that we are not accidentally omitting some class; we're
                 saying it is an all-encompassing - should be an all-encompassing definition.

Chuck Gomes: So this is Chuck. Don't - doesn't the next sentence accomplish that?

Alan Greenberg: It may well. I just think by leading off with the examples we run the risk of
                 setting a mindset which is maybe incorrect.

Chuck Gomes: So you're - this is Chuck. You're supporting leaving the examples, the such
                 as clause?

Alan Greenberg: Yes but I think...

Chuck Gomes: And that's okay; I'm just clarifying.

Alan Greenberg: I'm trying to see where the such as clause is, sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Second sentence.

Avri Doria: Yeah, you could replace the such as clause.

Alan Greenberg: I'm saying leading off with - leading off with it as opposed to leading off with a - trying to get the global definition first sets - sets the incorrect set of expectations. I think the such as is fine but I think first you have to define it and simply saying is an, "...organizational framework which brings together people such as..." without defining the more general case of who it brings together is the problem.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Michael, your hand is going up and down. Would you like to respond?

Alan Greenberg: He's waving.

Michael Graham: Yeah, well I put it down only because I guess I reversed my own thought at the sound of wordsmithing but I do think it's wordsmithing in trying to make this fairly clear as leading into overarching principles.

I agree with Alan. I think making that as broad as possible is probably very good at the front end of this. And I think that was one reason why I was thinking perhaps "such as" might be either taken out or might be moved down into that next sentence so that it's clear, you know, individual group or organization such as, blah, blah, blah, blah.

And I also do like the suggestion - and I forget the exact word, direct - where you were suggesting either the ability to effect or to be affected by decisions in defining stakeholders.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Alan, I'm going to remember - keep your hand up please for the original thing you wanted to talk about there. But, Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, okay. Looking at this sentence first of all it was really hard to read. It really should be two sentences.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Avri Doria: And the first period I would, you know, break at the first comma and, you know, after "...or policymaking." And then another sentence that would say, "At ICANN the model has included historically..." or "...at ICANN the model has included, you know, the following primary stakeholders..." or something like that because you don't want to presume in this definition that you're defining it for everyone.

That probably relates to some of the comments I'd make on the first two sentences when we go back to that. But so I would keep that first sentence first, the general stakeholder - or multistakeholder model is a organizational framework. I would say a participatory organizational framework or structure which is of the process of governance or policymaking which brings together the primary stakeholders, period.

"At ICANN these stakeholders have traditionally been..." and, you know, do something like that.

Chuck Gomes: Is anyone - Cheryl, you're agreeing with this as well as what was said earlier I take it?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep, I will take it down when I stop agreeing with things, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay good.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So anybody - I personally - this is Chuck - I personally like that suggestion. Anybody who doesn't like it? Okay now let's make sure that Marika has it.

Avri Doria: And I added one word and there were two spots where you can add this word. I added the "A multistakeholder model is a participatory organizational framework..." or perhaps better yet, "A multistakeholder model is an organizational framework or structure which adopts a participatory process of governance or policymaking." But you want that word "participatory" in there I think.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm happy with that, yeah.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, this is Chuck. Me too. Thanks, Avri.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: The - and now let me go back to Marika. Marika, have you captured those changes?

Marika Konings: Yes I think I do. Let me just read it back to you. So the second sentence would read: "A multistakeholder model is an organizational framework or structure which adopts a participatory process of governance or policymaking." Stop. "At ICANN the model has included the following primary stakeholders..." and then I guess it would be...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And insert them all including individual members and academics...

Marika Konings: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...business, civil society, academic and research institutions, nongovernment organizations and individuals. Should that be nongovernmental organizations or - because now it says nongovernment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Governmental.

Avri Doria: That would be nongovernmental.

Alan Greenberg: You need a reference to users also because individuals simply say they're speaking on their own personal behalf and the concept of representing users or representing the interests of users has evolved into being an important part of our model I hope.

Chuck Gomes: And that's not covered by individuals? This is Chuck.

Alan Greenberg: I don't think so.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Okay.

Alan Greenberg: If I'm participating I'm part of At Large I'm not participating truly as an individual.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you. This is Chuck.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I thought you were an individual member of At Large.

Alan Greenberg: I happen to be but that's a different issue.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Avri and Alan. Okay. All right anything else before we move to Alan's next - the point why he raised his hand originally?

Avri Doria: You want me to go back and tell you why I don't like Sentence 1?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Let's do that, Avri...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, yes. That's a good thing.

Chuck Gomes: ...it would be good since we're going through them in order.

Avri Doria: Okay. I think the quote is fine. But it's not a true statement to say, "...since its inception." ICANN has been evolving so perhaps since its first days ICANN has involved, you know, or has evolved into a structure that embraced, you know, or something. But it's just - if we say that it's been that way since Day 1 lots of people are going to shoot up and say no way. It was a private sector-led organization.

Chuck Gomes: So this is Chuck. Thanks, Avri. What if we just deleted the, "...since its inception..." and start off with a quote?

Avri Doria: That's fine. Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, that's fine.

Avri Doria: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks.

Avri Doria: And then we can get out of the evolutionary history so, yeah, that's fine then.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And did you have any further comments at the beginning?

Avri Doria: No.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks. I just want to make sure.

Avri Doria: No the quote said - and starting it off with a quote - I'm not going to amend the quote.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Understand. I would like to but that's all right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's a quote.

Chuck Gomes: I understand.

Avri Doria: Well you can always do the little square brackety things and take...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: That's right, I was mostly being facetious. This is Chuck.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: And Alan we're - you're up.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'm looking at the sentence - the last part of the sentence - the very long sentence - which starts with, "A stakeholder refers to..." but I'm not agonizing over that first part. I'm looking at what comes just after that; actually it's the middle part.

The phrase which reads, "In a particular issue with - which possible actions have the ability to influence stakeholder's actions, decisions and policies." First of all the part saying, "...in a particular issue which possible action has..." is an awkward phrase and I don't know what it means. And second of all the word "influence" is, I believe, incorrect. It's - because it's not only influence it's impact, it's have an affect on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Affect. Affect is better?

Alan Greenberg: If you're making a decision which will end up governing how users use something it's not influencing their - it's not their ability to influence, it's you're impacting them. But I'm saying that in the context of the previous phrase, I don't know what it means so I think that sentence needs some reword period.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. So I have some - I struggled with this sentence as well, that's why you saw some changes that I threw in there. And so my challenge then to any of you, and Alan in particular, is to try and see if we can fix the wording.

Now I don't know if we need some help from Cheryl in terms of...

Alan Greenberg: Chuck, it's Alan.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Before you start do we still need it given what we've done to the previous sentences? Do we need a "...stakeholder refers to..."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Maybe not.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Let's talk about that. Now, Marika, did we get ahead of you? I see your hand up.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I'm actually trying to get clarification on the previous point on the individuals. Are we replacing "individuals" with "end users" or are we adding "end users" to the whole sentence?

Chuck Gomes: I'll let Alan answer that. I think it's both but I'll let Alan...

Alan Greenberg: I say both and put the users first.

Chuck Gomes: Okay?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Thanks, yeah, I got that.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, thanks. And - sorry, again, I'm jumping back and forth from Adobe Connect to the Word document so sorry didn't...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm totally supportive of deleting bits. I'm always happy to have less words in a statement. If it doesn't contribute anything new individual or particularly productive let's take it out.

Chuck Gomes: So we're taking out after issue?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anybody object to that?

Alan Greenberg: Well but do we need the, "...a stakeholder refers to..." given that what we are - Marika, maybe...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no, sorry...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...you can take your sentence, what you have right now, and put it into a Chat
box or something, you know, the Chat box or a text box that we could see?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm happy to take it out...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...from, "...a stakeholder refers to..." because we've already extended the
top part a little more and take it all the way down to the quote on the
multistakeholder process.

Chuck Gomes: Okay this is Chuck. Cheryl, I didn't understand. So...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...in that sentence?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nothing. I would remove everything from, "...a stakeholder refers to..." to
the words, "...achieves results." I would remove that whole problematic
sentence.

Chuck Gomes: Well this is Chuck again. And I guess I'm not ready to accept that because I
really like, "...a stakeholder refers to an individual, group or organization that
has a direct or indirect interest or stake in a particular issue."

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If it's not clear, Chuck - Cheryl here - if it's not clear it shouldn't be there.

Chuck Gomes: Well I'm - think that's clear. The part that was unclear is what followed it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: But I'm open. What do other people think? I thought that - the first part of that sentence adds value but if people don't think so we can drop the whole sentence.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri?

Alan Greenberg: Okay, it's Alan. The previous sentence which Marika has now put into the agenda text box - I think that's where it came from - Marika, is that right?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes, correct that's the revised sentence.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, okay. Okay so - and that's preceded by the quote. Okay, "At ICANN the model has included the following primary stakeholders..." and we now list them. Now we want to go ahead and identify, you know, why were these considered stakeholders. Is the grab bag they paid the most money?

A stakeholder refers to individuals, groups or organizations that have direct interest in or dependence on - again I'm not trying to wordsmith. But, yes, I think at that point going into what the criteria was for including someone or something as a stakeholder or not is relevant at that point.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, hi. Avri speaking. I actually think that the sentence is almost fine as it is. I just think it's in the wrong place. And it should possibly be Sentence 3 and the other sentence that lists - so in other words we've gone for, "...a multistakeholder organization is an organizational framework or structure which adopts a particular process of governance, policymaking."

"A stakeholder refers to an individual or group or organization that has direct or indirect..." or whatever we've changed the words to, "...or a stake in a particular issue for which possible action has the ability to influence the stakeholder..." well and then that ending (unintelligible) the problem.

And then after that - oh my battery is running low - and then after that you could put at - the one we've got now which is that ICANN, you know, "...the model has included the following primary stakeholders." And so you've done the general...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That makes sense.

Avri Doria: ...and then you've gone into the specific.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. That makes sense but you definitely need to fix the end of that...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes, the end of that ending gets messed up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody - is there anybody that doesn't like that change? And, Greg, did you want to talk to that or something else?

Greg Shatan: Something related but not exactly.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So anybody object to that change understanding that we've got to do a little fix at the end? Okay, not seeing any objections there how do we fix the end?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We ask Alan and Avri to write it?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Cheryl. Well while some people, including Alan and Avri in particular since they were named out, to think about how we could fix that let's go ahead and go to Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Chuck. I guess, you know, looking at this and how it's, you know, mutated over the course of the last half hour or so I now question kind of the accuracy of the, "At ICANN..." sentence or wherever it ultimately lands since, you know, the list doesn't really line up with kind of the ICANN stakeholder groups.

You know, for instance, you know, there's no reference here to registries, registrars, ISPs, they're kind of all rolled up into sort of in business and then intellectual property, you know, is always - is somewhat of a separate stakeholder or at least a constituency in the sense it's not exactly business but it's close enough.

And then I don't know if individuals and end users are really the same or different and whether ICANN has really recognized academic and research institutions as a stakeholder group separate from civil society or they seem to get rolled into civil society as for that matter do nongovernmental organizations seem to get rolled into civil society.

And, you know, governments, whether governments are considered a stakeholder or something, either better or worse or at least different than a stakeholder, is also kind of a, you know, eternal ICANN question. So I think by putting, "At ICANN..." at the beginning of the sentence, at least as it goes

to the model of ICANN, the reality of ICANN is that these are all, in some way stakeholders or part of a stakeholder group or spread across stakeholder groups.

But the model, you know, has kind of chopped up the groups into both - into a list that's both - that's different than this that makes this list both over-inclusive and under-inclusive.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Greg. And before I go to Alan it sounds to me, with what you're saying, that we're back to Michael's point that maybe we don't need to list them. But then again Alan saw the value of that. Alan, do you want to talk about that?

Alan Greenberg: I want to talk about something related but I would appreciate you getting in, yes. I can't help but feel we're trapped in an Internet governance discussion of which there are multi ones going in parallel.

For the purposes of what this working group and this sub team of the working group is here for I think it is sufficient to take this whole paragraph and put in square brackets, "Define multistakeholder here..." and go on to the substantive work that we need to do on the rest of this paragraph and then on the principles that we're looking at.

I don't think there's anything to be gained by us coming up with a definitive definition and explanation of multistakeholder at this point in time. And call me...

Chuck Gomes: So...

Alan Greenberg: ...call me a troublemaker or there are some ruder words for that but...

Chuck Gomes: Okay troublemaker. I would like you...

Alan Greenberg: I know, you don't like the ruder words.

Chuck Gomes: ...to clarify me - I would like - Alan, please clarify for me what you just suggested.

Alan Greenberg: I'm suggesting that we take the whole paragraph preceding the bold letter GNSO Policy and Implementation Processes and put in square brackets, "Define multistakeholder model - the ICANN multistakeholder model here," and not worry about it today.

Chuck Gomes: So - sorry for being slow. This is Chuck. But so leave the paragraph alone except putting in some brackets that say define...

Greg Shatan: I think we're getting - if you don't mind if I interrupt, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Greg Shatan: It's Greg. Now I think what Alan - we're kind of getting stuck at the - outside the doorframe here when we really should be inside talking about, you know, more substantive stuff.

                   You know, Tavern on the Green, which is a well known restaurant in New York, apparently their reopening has been put back several months largely because the owners couldn't agree on the style of the silverware and the plates to be used in the restaurant. In retrospect, should they have been so damn concerned about the silverware and the plates? No, they should get some people in the restaurant and serve some food.

                   So I think we need to get to the table and talk - and get to something more meaty. I think we all know essentially what is meant here and wordsmithing this to exactitude is something we can kind of come back to. But if we really, you know, get to the meat of the issue now I think we'll kind of all be - not that

this isn't without some value but I think, you know, in terms of relative value the fact that it's first doesn't mean that we should spend our time on it first.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg. So what if we just deleted that last sentence, "At ICANN..." I'm kind of back to what I think Michael was suggesting early on that I'm not - and it avoids the issue of whether we're inclusive with the way or - ICANN is structured or not. Is there really enough value to that last sentence to help us? And I'll throw it out to the rest of you.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Excuse me, Chuck, it's Alan. What last sentence are we talking about here?

Chuck Gomes: "At ICANN the model..." I'm looking in Adobe Chat the agenda window. "At ICANN the model has included the following..." And then we list a bunch of things.

Alan Greenberg: Oh, okay I see. Sorry, I hadn't gone that far back.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I've dropped out of Adobe at the moment so I'll just have to jump in as required but...

Chuck Gomes: You know, this is Chuck again. Thanks, Cheryl. We're a small enough group that I'm not - at least myself I'm not bothered by people just speaking up as long as we try to do it sensitively in letting others finish what they're saying so if you want to do that that's okay anyway because we are a small group and everybody's really respectful of the rest so I'm not really too worried about it.

But, Michael - Greg, is your hand still up?

Greg Shatan: I keep trying to put it down and it keeps going back up again. I have nothing to say.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay, all right. Michael, go ahead.

Michael Graham: I was just going to say that I'm a firm believer in footnotes and I think that phrase, "At ICANN..." etcetera would be a wonderful footnote to this.

Avri Doria: Good idea.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: ...fine tune it after we fine tune the text.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, comfortable with that. Absolutely.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: All right so put that as a footnote and it needs to be fine tuned especially addressing I think what Greg raised earlier with regard to that where - with regard to it doesn't exactly fit the structure of ICANN. Again, following Alan's suggestion - and I don't think we have to fix that right now - anything else on that first paragraph? Let me look back at the Word document real quick that I can read easier.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: This is Marika.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Just a question. Are we still leaving the sentence of stakeholder in there now that we've moved this part into the - as a footnote? Do we still need that? So basically what I have now is that the paragraph would read, "ICANN has

embraced the multistakeholder model as a framework for the development of inclusive global Internet governance policy. A multistakeholder model is an organizational framework or structure which adopts a participatory process of governance or policymaking."

"A stakeholder refers to an individual, group or organization that has a direct or indirect interest or stake in a particular issue which possible action has the ability to influence a stakeholder's actions, decisions and policy to achieve results." And then that's followed by two footnotes, the one that was already there referring to the ICANN wiki and then the other one that now reads, "At ICANN the model has included the following primary stakeholders..." etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

Chuck Gomes: So this is Chuck. Thanks, Marika. And I don't think we ever really firmly decided what to do with the sentence that starts out, "A stakeholder refers to..." I kind of like the first part of the sentence and thought the second half, which now says, "...for which possible action..." etcetera is there that part is difficult and I thought the first part did add some value.

What do others think on that? Should we throw out the whole sentence which someone suggested. I'm suggesting we keep the first part and throw out the last part of the sentence but what do others think?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alan has his hand up but this is Cheryl. I thought Avri's suggestion of keeping it, tidying up the end and moving it up in the order so it's a higher sentence was a valid one.

Chuck Gomes: That's right. Thanks for reminding me of that, Cheryl.

Avri Doria: This is...

Chuck Gomes: Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I would suggest we preface this paragraph with something in italics or square brackets saying this definition needs to be refined and go on and talk about the substantive issues we're here for. We've already gone through 3/4 of an hour of the meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Any objection to that? What I'd appreciate, though, this is Chuck again, if people would, on the list between now and January when we meet again, try to come up with some fixes so that we don't spend most of a call just wordsmithing.

Avri Doria: This is Avri with a question. Do we have this document in any place that's editable or is this just a Doc file that we're passing back and forth?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Happy for it to be put up on a wiki so it can be edited online.

Avri Doria: Just curious because, I mean, at the moment I don't think there's much value in continuing to wordsmith but I do think if somebody just sat in a quiet room for 20 minutes wordsmithing it they can get it to come out better. And I think the idea of a footnote was great.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Here, here on that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Avri. And thanks, Cheryl. I'm fine with that. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I can post the version I have now directly after this call on the wiki. And I don't know if people prefer that I copy the whole language into the wiki or just post the Word document there so people can, you know, change it and post it back.

I think the challenge is with actually having the text in the wiki that it's more difficult to see what people actually make changes or if they want to add comments I think you can only actually add it at the bottom and not necessarily do it as, you know, you can do in a Word document you highlight

the text you want to talk about and then make the comment. But, you know, either way people think works - what works best we can make that happen.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. All right so let's go on in the document then because considering that what Cheryl proposed is supposed to be an overarching principle I conclude from that that it has impact on the rest of the principles that we're going to list.

The next little paragraph says, "The GNSO policy development process enshrines the concept of a robust bottom-up consensus-built MSM and to that end the following overarching principles apply." Any - is that kind of transition sentence okay? I didn't have any concerns with it but there - I don't think. Let me look at my Word document because I can't see well enough to...

Michael Graham: This is Michael. And maybe for Avri to consider, I was wondering as I read this whether or not two of those terms should be hyphenated, bottom-up and then consensus-built.

Chuck Gomes: That seems fine to me. Avri, are you okay with that? This is Chuck.

Avri Doria: Yeah. The usage is so variable that we should pick whatever we're comfortable with trying to make the standard because...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...certainly bottom-up does seem to sometimes show up as hyphenate. And the other one was top-level or was what?

Alan Greenberg: Consensus-built.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Consensus-built.

Avri Doria: Consensus-built. That I've never seen as a hyphenate before so we'd be inventing that. It's really - it's a bottom-up built consensus; it's not a - but anyway that sentence is also difficult to parse.

Michael Graham: Yeah, Avri, it's Michael. Maybe a comma before that - before "consensus" would make it clear. That run on between the two it was difficult to understand until I read it maybe three times.

Avri Doria: Yeah, yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Chuck, it's Cheryl here. I think what's happened here is we've established the sub committee of three to do the titivating and drafting. The primary pedants on this seem to be Michael, Avri and Alan. And that would get back to us early January, that's terrific.

Avri Doria: Although in this case I think you could possibly solve it by just replacing the word "built" with "based".

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry, I didn't catch all of that, Avri, could you repeat that please?

Avri Doria: My last one was in this case you could probably at least temporarily fix it by replacing "built" with "based". " A robust, bottom-up, consensus-based MSM."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: Not only is a good suggestion but it actually makes sense whereas I'm not sure consensus-built multistakeholder model makes sense.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Do you realize that based is agreed to so let's just do it.

Avri Doria: Yeah, it might be a, you know, linguistic difference.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Let's do it. Based. Done.

Avri Doria: Yeah, cool.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks. Now that kinds of brings us back to where we ended last week with Principle Number 1 almost so I guess we should look at the two bullet points first which were just my first cut at these.

The - and they were really kind of subsets of Principle 1 which was that both our - the bolded text there, "GNSO policy and implementation process must both be based in the ICANN multistakeholder model..." we spent most of our meeting last time talking about that. And I think we did decide that the next two kind of fall under that.

But - and it's a little bit different for policy versus implementation. Where are people at with regard to the wording of that bolded text there? Because there was some discomfort with it in our last call. So it says, again, if somebody can't see it, "GNSO policy and implementation processes must both be based in the ICANN multistakeholder model." Is there - are people okay with the wording of that?

Avri Doria: Not completely.

Chuck Gomes: And they weren't last week. This is Chuck. Thanks, Avri. So that's why I'm raising it.

Alan Greenberg: Chuck, it's Alan.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, first of all the word "both" can be read two different ways there. Is it both policy and implementation or is it saying - or is it an incomplete sentence

saying they must both be based - must be based on both something and something? I think the "both" was referring to policy and implementation.

Chuck Gomes: That is correct.

Alan Greenberg: And I think we could survive without the word because I think it adds confusion by putting "both" in there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So just, "...must be based..."

Alan Greenberg: Must be based.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fine.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Having said that I have a level of discomfort with the word "must" followed by "based" because "based" says there must be underpinnings but the details may vary. And "must" is very prescriptive. And I'm coming at this from a point of view of looking at how does ICANN, which is charged with doing specific things in the world, go forward if and when on some important issues we are not able to come to closure in the, you know, the make nice world of working groups?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Are based...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: That would, you know, and Cheryl and I have had discussions on autocrats before and I think we tend to agree on occasion they're needed. You can still base things on a multistakeholder model and the input provided by those

stakeholders where the final decision is made, you know, the adjudication may not be made within the multistakeholder - the lower levels of the multistakeholder model.

So I'm happy with the word "based. "Must" perhaps lends a connotation that I'm feeling less comfortable with.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Chuck, Cheryl here. Can we just say, "...are based," Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: Are based - I'm okay with that. Anybody - let me flip back over to the Adobe, sorry. Okay, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I had other issues with the sentence that probably make it even worse, Alan. Because...

Alan Greenberg: Excuse me, Avri, I will point out that what we have there now is not really a sentence because the "to ensure" does not follow but go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, that too. But first of all we've already sent the beginning of we're all talking about policy and implementation but we're now seeing another category of process be created called the administrative. And so, you know, if we just talk about that. So I worry about a, you know, we tightly define policy and implementation; we'll find everything we care about moving under another heading.

So I would prefer to say, "All GNSO processes must adhere to the ICANN multistakeholder model." Period. "To ensure..." you know, in fact I would go, "...all ICANN processes including policy and implementation processes must adhere to the ICANN multistakeholder model." Period. "To ensure that this occurs..." and then go on there.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck...

Avri Doria: So I go for - I think I'm going in a different direction of strengthening the must as opposed to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What Alan's suggesting.

Avri Doria: Exactly.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. So when I drafted that - and no sacredness to the drafting that I did. But I was really going back to discussions we had in the drafting team. And there seemed to be pretty good concurrence that, you know, just because something moves from policy to implementation, whatever that means, the multistakeholder process doesn't stop.

Now the details of it may change but it's still multistakeholder. So that was my intent when I drafted that. Personally, I like what Avri just drafted. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Well Marika had her hand up though.

Chuck Gomes: Okay Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. You know, I don't disagree with the sentiment that Avri was expressing. But I do want to make sure that we're clear that we're focusing here on the GNSO aspect. And I know there has been some sensitivity in the community that, you know, this effort is not necessarily looking at the broader picture, but this is really focusing on the GNSO aspects of policy and implementation.

So maybe that's something to take into account as well as we define these principles and it's something, for example, that the definitions team has been trying to do to really make sure that the definitions are specific to the GNSO

realm of policy and implementation not to go beyond our scope at this stage. So that's, you know, something just to point out.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, Marika captured part of what I was going to say that I think the wording that we've been using - or - is that we're defining GNSO processes, whatever. They may be - once we finish our work they may be generalizable but that's a process that comes after we come up with something not presuming it. So from that point of view I agree with what Marika said.

I'm a - not seeing it in front of me I think I was a little uneasy with what Avri said implying that every aspect of anything related to gTLDs has to be multistakeholder-ish. It has to respect the multistakeholder model but not everything is multistakeholder.

Avri Doria: That's why I said must adhere to the process. However the process is defined, if we define a piece of the process that isn't, fine. But it has to adhere to the defined processes and they're all part of the multistakeholder model.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I - as I said, I don't have it in front of me but...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: ...I'm a little bit uncomfortable with that because that could be read by some people as every process must have multistakeholder aspects to it and I don't believe that is the case.

Chuck Gomes: And of course - this is Chuck. We talked about that last time quite a lot and like I pointed out just because we say it it is in the multistakeholder process doesn't mean that it's the same process for each action that's taken.

Avri Doria: Exactly. Yes.

Alan Greenberg: No, no, I understand. But I'm sort of in the business of setting expectations. And there may well be aspects as I think we discussed in this group earlier of the true execution part of implementation which are not necessarily - do not necessarily have a multistakeholder peanut gallery, you know, overlooking every particular part of it.

Avri Doria: And I fundamentally disagree with that.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Say that again please Avri.

Avri Doria: And I say and I fundamentally disagree with that. I think there's no part of what ICANN does that doesn't have a multistakeholder aspect.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck. And I lean the same way as Avri on that because let's take the execution - the term "execution" like you said, Alan. Just because that's something that we can have staff go off and execute doesn't mean it's not multistakeholder.

I mean, if the GNSO in its policy development process has clearly defined something that needs to be done then implementing that - now I do believe that, you know, the policy body should confirm that it indeed was implemented properly but just because you don't have the whole community involved in the implementation in the execution doesn't mean it's not multistakeholder. And you seem to be assuming that if it says multistakeholder then the whole community is involved in everything.

Alan Greenberg: I'm basing it on comments that I've seen over the last few months of people critiquing something that aren't bottom up multistakeholder because, you know, they didn't involve a decision process from the bottom.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks, Alan. And that's why - and we're going to have to stop here because we're out of time. But that's...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...that's why we go on then and have the two sub bullets and maybe others.

Alan Greenberg: Isn't this a 90-minute one?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's a 90-minute one.

Chuck Gomes: It is?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. No, our Monday call on definitions is 90 minutes. This one...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh is that 90? Okay. They're getting blurred.

Chuck Gomes: So let me suggest, Avri, would you, on the list, put your rewording...

Avri Doria: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: ...of that out and then let's have some comments on that.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And maybe we can just use the same comment method that we've been using. If that doesn't work we can be a little bit flexible there. But let's put it in there and let's talk about that. And hopefully in our next call, which will be in January, are we thinking in terms of the 9th on that one, Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think it's up to you whether indeed you want to set a time -
                    I'm looking at the agenda. I think the last week we actually met a little bit
                    earlier than this time but whatever I think is most convenient for the sub team.

Chuck Gomes: Well if we go the same...

Marika Konings: ...or if you want to do another Doodle poll.

Chuck Gomes: ...okay this is Chuck. If we go with the same day, a Thursday, then we could
                    go with the 3rd but is that a little bit early after the holidays?

Avri Doria: That would be the 2nd.

Chuck Gomes: Second, thank you.

Avri Doria: Friday's the 3rd.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, do people want to meet on the 2nd? I can; I don't know if others can.

Avri Doria: Yeah, it makes no difference to me but for a lot of people it may be the first
                    day back to - in the offices to work.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: For me it's all the same, you know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think the - did you say the 8th or the 9th was it?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Be the 9th; the working group meeting is on the 8th, right?

Avri Doria: Right, working group on the 8th, this on the 9th. Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well let's do the 9th but let's do it for 90 minutes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Jonathan Frost: Yeah, agreed.

Marika Konings: Do you need a Doodle poll for the time?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no it can be the earlier time...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...if that suits everyone.

Marika Konings: Yeah, because if it's 90 minutes I wouldn't mind if it's a little bit earlier...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, well make it the hour earlier but for 90 minutes.

Avri Doria: The hour earlier?

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: It would be 20 UTC, right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Avri Doria: I can't do it the hour earlier. I have...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...from 19-21.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well then it's going to be the same time because this is 21 today.

Avri Doria: Right, that's what I mean. I get off another meeting just as this one starts.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: It's not an ICANN meeting, it's another meeting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no, no that's okay. Well I think having Avri's contribution is too valuable for it to go earlier. We need her involved.

Marika Konings: It's fine for me leaving it on 2000 UTC if that works for everyone else.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I think that's going to be one of the - just have to do it that ways.

Chuck Gomes: I can live with that. This is Chuck. So we'll meet on the 9th, same time, same day of the week.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: For 90 minutes, terrific.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Anything else before we wrap up for today? I'm sorry for going over but...

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. What time did we just decide on?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Twenty-one hundred.

Avri Doria: Same time.

Alan Greenberg: Pardon me? Twenty-one hundred?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Twenty-one hundred.

Alan Greenberg: Oh I thought someone said 2000 and then said the same time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I did and...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Okay fine.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's now 2100.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Again Avri will put that on the - that wording on the list and then we have a team of three - sub team of a sub team of three that is going to work on the wording of the overarching principle. And hopefully we'll have that information well in advance of our next meeting and can maybe wrap up at least for this stage the overarching principle and then be ready to work on the first principle there on policy and implementation. Anything else?

Alan Greenberg: I think that's optimistic since we haven't actually gotten to it yet but let's try.

Chuck Gomes: Haven't gotten to what yet?

Alan Greenberg: Nothing, never mind. I'm just being snarky.

Avri Doria: Optimism. We'll reach for it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right. A little optimism is okay as long as it's not excessive. All right thanks, everyone and...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...have a wonderful holiday. I appreciate everybody helping on this.

Avri Doria: Enjoy your Solstices, your Christmases, your whatevers.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm going with Solstice, Avri, but you know that.

Avri Doria: You going to Solstice, anybody doing...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Why do you think I'm doing...

Avri Doria: How about Kwanza? Anybody got Kwanza.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: At least Hanukah is already gone so I don't have to throw it in the mix.

Michael Graham: Merry Christmas everybody.

((Crosstalk))

                              END