

**Policy & Implementation Working Group Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION**

Wednesday 21 August 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 21 August 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-20130821-en.mp3>

On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#aug1>
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Holly Raiche – ALAC
Greg Shatan – IPC
Anne Aikman Scalese - IPC
Wolf Knoblen - ISPCP
Chuck Gomes – RySG
Gideon Rop – Individual
Olga Cavalli - GAC
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Jeff Neuman – RySG (Council liaison)
Klaus Stoll - NPOC
Philip Marano – IPC
Maureen Cubberley – Individual
Avri Doria – NCSG
Michael Graham – IPC
Eric Brunner-Williams- Individual
Becky Burr – RySG
J.Scott Evans – BC
Edward Morris – NCSG
Olevie Kouami – NPOC
Nic Steinbach – RrSG
Kiran Malancharuvil – IPC
Brian Beckham – IPC
Amr Elsadr - NCUC

Apologies:

Tim Ruiz – RrSG
Tom Barrett – RrSG
James Bladel - RrSG

ICANN staff:
Marika Konings
Lars Hoffman
Julia Charvolen
Glen de St Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Tonya). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. And welcome to the first meeting of the Policy and Implementation Working Group Team today on the 21st of August, 2013.

On the call today we have Gideon Rop, Olga Cavalli, Alan Greenberg, Jeff Neuman, Klaus Stoll, Philip Marano, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Maureen Cubberley, Wolf Knobon, Avri Doria, Michael Graham, Eric Brunner-Williams, Chuck Gomes, Becky Burr, J. Scott Evans and Holly Raiche.

We have apologies from Tom Barrett, Kiran Malancharuvil and Tim Ruiz. From staff we have Marika Konings, Lars Hoffman, Glen de Saint G ery, Julia Charvolen and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Becky Burr: Hello. Becky Burr here.

Jeff Neuman: Hey, Becky. Everyone, this is - hello, everyone and welcome. This is Jeff Neuman. I'm the GNSO Council liaison so the Policy and Implementation Working Group. I guess that makes me the interim chair until we can elect a more permanent chair, which hopefully will be later on in this meeting now that there have been some volunteers, some gracious volunteers or other people that were volunteered and people who have subsequently accepted.

This is a very large group for a working group and I think that's great. I think it's good to see a lot of participation. There's certainly a lot of interest in this

subject. There was a lot of healthy debate over the last several months on this subject. And I'm sure there'll be healthy debate going forward.

So I've put out a revised agenda that I sent around maybe about 18 hours ago or so. And I'll go through that agenda. Does anybody have any additions? It's being displayed for those of you that are on Adobe on the right hand column. Does anybody have anything that they want to add to the agenda?

Marika, you have something you want to add?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Nothing to add but on the first item basically that there's still some outstanding statements of interest so just to encourage people that have not done so yet to complete their statements of interest.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thank you. I was going to get to that. So statements of interest should be filed by everybody as soon as the group starts. I will admit I have to make a couple updates to my statement of interest but everybody, please, get those in as soon as you can.

So what we thought we would do and what usually happens on the very first call of a working group is that we go around the group and just introduce ourselves, where we - if we're representing a particular stakeholder group or constituency or participating as an individual just to state that and maybe some interesting, you know, what you're interested particularly in this group and any skills or anything you feel like you can add to this group.

I'll start with myself. My name is Jeff Neuman. I am the Vice President of Business Affairs at Neustar which means I'm responsible for the Registry line of business including the new gTLD implementation. I am also a member of the GNSO Council from the Registry Stakeholder Group and serve on the Registry Stakeholder Group ExComm.

In this group I'm just participating; I'm not an official gTLD Registries group representative. I'm participating as a Council liaison which means that I may offer some of my own personal views but in general I will leave the Registry Stakeholder Group views to the other Registry Stakeholder Group members that are present in this group.

I am very interested in this subject. This has been kind of a subject that I've been paying attention to for a number of years. I think that this really gets to the root or the heart of the multistakeholder model and I think that it's important to preserve the bottom up process in policy development but I also strongly believe in the making sure that implementation does have a multistakeholder process associated with it as well.

So with that I think the easiest way would be to go kind of in alphabetical order from Adobe and then I'll hit the people on the phone. So the first one is Alan. Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: That's not fair.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry.

Alan Greenberg: All right. I basically - I'm Alan Greenberg. I'm on the ALAC Advisory Committee. I'm the ALAC liaison for the GNSO and a working group groupee. I guess I have feelings very similar to Jeff. I think the original source of this working group, when the topic tended to be policy versus implementation is and was a complete red herring.

I think the issue is developing processes so we can have multistakeholder input as long as there is substantive decisions to be made which will affect those stakeholders and separate the implementation from - to the - separate what we used to call implementation and make it - that is where there's no direct input and make it just the mechanical part of the implementation.

And I look forward to coming up with terminology which will allow us to say that clearly without stumbling. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Alan. Next on the list - and I apologize for any names I may not pronounce correctly but is it (Amr). Are you on the call?

(Amr Elsadr): I just joined.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, so what we're doing is - I apologize, it's probably not fair to put you on the spot. We're just introducing ourselves...

(Amr Elsadr): Okay.

Jeff Neuman: ...and, you know, if we represent a particular group or if we're just here as an individual and just to say just a little bit about why we're (unintelligible).

(Amr Elsadr): Okay. My name is (Amr Elsadr). I'm from Egypt originally but studying in the north of Norway in Tromsø right now. My background is in e-health and tele-medicine. I'm doing a master degree in that right now over here.

I'm a member of the Non Commercial Users Constituency, NCUC. I have been a member of that constituency since late 2010. I'm relatively new to the ICANN PDP. I'm a member of a Thick Whois PDP Working Group; I also represent NCUC on the SCI. And this is my second working group.

I guess I should probably mention and I should probably update my SOI on this but I'm starting to do research for my master's thesis and that will be on how DNS policy at ICANN might or might not affect the future of e-health and tele-medicine. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thank you very much. Next to Avri.

Avri Doria: Hi. Avri Doria. I'm a member of NCSG. I'm a member of ATRT 2. In NCSG I'm on the Policy Committee at the moment though I'm not participating here as per se an NCSG representative. I may occasionally preface arguments by this is my understanding of where we might be at or etcetera so I will be going back and forth to NCSG on various issues.

This is an issue I care a bunch about; I've thought about; I write about. And in terms of multistakeholder participatory processes and, you know, how to make it work correctly within ICANN so that at no point do we not have a participatory process. I guess that's about it.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Avri. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jeff and thanks for being the interim chair and the GNSO liaison. I represent VeriSign in policy matters in the ICANN world and elsewhere. Do that in - especially in the Registry Stakeholder Group. The Registry Stakeholder Group has not yet identified a primary representative to this group but that will be done. At the same time there will be other members participating and any of us probably will communicate Registry points of view and questions so you'll hear from us more on that later.

I don't want to - I won't repeat what others have said but I think this is a critical work and I guess the best illustration of why it's so important is the Board rationale and the independent review decision that they made recently and stating basically that if it was implementation they didn't have to go back to the GNSO. Now that's my own paraphrasing; I'm being a little unfair but I think that illustrates the importance of this group. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Chuck. EBW, which I believe is Eric, correct?

Eric Brunner-Williams: That's correct, Jeff. Thank you very much. I'm Eric Brunner-Williams. I'm participating in an individual capacity. I've been involved in the

policy and implementation of name to address mapping since the host table period at SRI.

I think the implementation versus policy distinction is - unfortunately loses the importance of time that is we originally had the idea that we would have some degree of competition and one could argue that any form that that takes is mere implementation of that policy decision. But of course we've been struggling with that issue for the better part of 15 years. So that, I think is sufficient. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Eric. Next on the list is Edward Morris.

Edward Morris: Yeah hi, Jeff. This is Edward Morris. I come from the NCUC where I'm on the Executive Committee. And I actually held a pen for the reconsideration motion Chuck was just talking about. And my interest in PI became quite intense when I read what we got back from the Board; it was a bit of a shock. So hope we can all make some progress on the issue and actually define what these terms mean.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you. Gideon.

Gideon Rop: Hey good evening, people.

Jeff Neuman: Really.

Gideon Rop: Okay this is Gideon Rop and I'm pretty new to the working group; this would be my first working group. I follow up with what happened at ICANN and all the working groups and what happens in the ALAC. And I'm happy to be here and I hope that (unintelligible) contributes in this undertaking. Thank you very much.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Welcome, Gideon and it's good to have you here and we always welcome newcomers. And I know it could be tough here but you have a great

bunch of people on this group and I'm sure any one of them will be willing to help you out through this process.

Greg, you're next.

Greg Shatan: Hi, this is Greg Shatan. I'm a member of the Intellectual Property Constituency. I've served on several working groups over the last several years but finally made it to my first real ICANN meeting just a couple months ago in Durban.

My interest in policy and implementation, you know, extends to, you know, the importance of those concepts or maybe the spectrum of those concepts and how, you know, it relates to the multistakeholder process and what the ICANN Board and staff do and how various stakeholder groups interact with them.

I would say, however, that I think that the concern about what the Board had to say or what the request for reconsideration ruling had to say is probably a little bit overblown. But nonetheless, you know, that doesn't make this topic any less important or, you know, our understanding and recommendations on how policy and implementation and multi-stakeholderism and ICANN Board and staff-ism all interact. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Greg. Holly.

Holly Raiche: Yeah, Holly Raiche and I'm Chair of APRALO and a member of ALAC. Perhaps most relevantly I was chair of the drafting team that developed this charter that we're all working toward.

Just a comment on where we got to. We started off thinking we needed to define policy versus implementation and we moved on a bit, as Greg will attest, to saying it's perhaps more important to understand what processes

are involved and to ensure that the relevant stakeholders - and that maybe everybody, often is everybody - are involved where something impacts them.

So we really moved on from trying to work on definitions, which we realized would be very difficult to come to, to actually looking at what processes are available and how to make sure that everybody's there. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Holly. And I do want to thank the drafting team for the work that they've done. And when we talk a little bit about the background and what this group will do if you all can keep me honest and interject when you have some additional comments and thoughts that came through the drafting team.

If I can go then I'll skip myself. Okay, Michael Graham.

Michael Graham: Thanks. Michael Graham. I'm a member of the IPC and International Trademark Association. I'm a practicing attorney with a number of clients who have domain names or have applied for the new gTLDs. I'm also as of September a adjunct faculty at DePaul School of Law where part of our exploration is on the domain name system and the ICANN process.

I have served on one working group and that was on the Consumer Trust Metrics Working Group and found that stimulating and fascinating and also one that tested what could be done realistically. And through that experience and participating in ICANN and the various speeds by which different decisions have been made and the ways it have been made become interested in this whole area of how policy is developed and then applied in the real world.

I suppose my personal concern is in finding ways that in this increasing size of both the number of domain names and the importance of ICANN in the Internet ecology the whole system can support the multistakeholder process without paralyzing the application of the process and actually getting things done.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Michael. Nic.

Nic Steinbach: Thanks, Jeff. This is Nic from name.com, involved in the Registrar Stakeholder Group. This is my first working group although I have been fortunate enough to go to a few ICANN meetings. The personal interest in this is definitely coming from looking for a consistency and efficiency standpoint from a registrar perspective. So this is my first one, really excited to kind of dive in and looking forward to working with you guys.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Nic. (Olivier)?

(Olivier): I'm (Olivier) (unintelligible). I'm NPOC member and (GTS) member (unintelligible) and I'm a newcomer on this working group as - Policy and Implementation Working Group (unintelligible) Africa and present Africa issues on this working group please.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you. Olga if you can hear us hopefully?

Olga Cavalli: Hello, everyone. Hello, Jeff. My name is Olga Cavalli. I am from Argentina. Presently I am the GAC representative for Argentina. I'm also a university teacher. I was GNSO Council member for four years. I participated in several working groups.

And I am very interested in this working group especially in the - reviewing the implementation processes and delineation of the process related with the stakeholder model. I think it's very important. I won't repeat what others have said. I'm very happy to meet many old friends from the GNSO working groups and Council so I'm happy to participate in this working group. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Olga. Your connection - it was a little quiet so I'm not sure everybody heard you. But hopefully we can get that technical issue fixed. But welcome back, Olga, it's good to see you back in working groups.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Phil, you're next.

Phil Marano: Hi. Thanks, Jeff. This is Phil Marano. I'm a trademark and Internet governance attorney with Katten Muschen and Rosenman in Washington DC. An IPC member and an international trademark...

((Crosstalk))

Phil Marano: ...member. I work with Brian Winterfeldt who's also on this working group and is a representative on the GNSO Council. This is my first working group but I've been attending ICANN meetings for several years and participated indirectly on a number of policy matters including several of the more spirited policy and implementation discussions recently covering things like IOC/RCRC special protections and the clearinghouse Strawman solution.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Phil. I'm assuming - Becky, I think this is you, you're next.

Becky Burr: Which is me? Am I confusing? This is Becky Burr. I'm the Deputy General Counsel and Chief Privacy Officer at Neustar. I've been involved in many working groups and a lot of discussions about policy and implementation. And I'm looking forward to this.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Becky. And Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Thanks, Jeff. My name is Wolf Knoben. I'm Vice Chair of the GNSO Council still and I'm also involved in the SCI, the Standing Committee of Improvement and implementation and was involved in the drafting team of this charter here.

I'm with the Internet Services Provider and (unintelligible) Providers Consistency and as I'm a member of that I did not get any specific directive from that constituency on how to deal with the matter here. So I personally I'm interested in - as I'm - I was working with policy and implementation on Council as some of you did as well. I'm interested what we really did wrong in the past - is there anything we did wrong (unintelligible).

Woman: Hello?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, that was interesting. Wolf, are you still there?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, I am. Did you hear me?

Jeff Neuman: I heard except for the last two or three seconds.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, so the last thing was, you know, I'm very open to all opinions as I'm - was working on the Council with policy and implementation and I'm curious about what the - in the past did wrong and how we can improve. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Wolf. Anne, I notice you're now on Adobe so...

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thank you. I finally got in. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Great, if you want to go next.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Sure. This is Anne Aikman-Scalese and I am a member of the IPC. My involvement has been - was in the past as an alternate on the GNSO Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation and I recently became the primary delegate.

And my first ICANN meeting was San Francisco in I think it was 2010 and that's actually where I first became interested in this topic because I remember sitting in a room where Jeff and Marika and others were reviewing

the changes to the PDP manual which I thought were fascinating. I don't know, it was a lunch time meeting and there were a lot of, you know, a lot of people out to lunch but it's a topic that I've always been interested in.

My interest in this particular working group is mostly in the direction - I guess partly I was here because I'm primarily a transactional attorney in addition to being a trademark prosecution attorney.

I'm interested in seeing how we can develop more smooth and effective working relationships and the balance between the GAC policy advice and our working group working on the communication between the Board and the GNSO.

That topic interests me not so much as a fight over what's between policy and implementation but just, you know, continuing communication. This is probably more echoing Alan Greenberg's idea and comments that we need a smoother more effective working policy and implementation machine at ICANN and how can we, you know, promote that with balancing all the interests. That's my interest in this working group.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Anne. And on the phone Maureen.

Maureen Cubberley: Yes, hi. Thanks, Jeff. I'm Maureen Cubberley. I'm a Canadian living in Canada. And I'm participating as an individual in this working group. I'm not aligned with any stakeholders other than that amorphous group that wants good governance everywhere.

My involvement with ICANN started, wow, back with Mike Roberts, a venerable name in ICANN history. I was working with the DotCA registry before it became CIRA. And in I guess about 2000 I started attending ICANN meetings.

I have served on the GNSO Council as a Nominations Committee Appointee and have done some work in the past that was back - well I guess my involvement ended around 2006, 2007 and prior to that I participated in the ccNSO in the early days of contractual negotiations.

And these issues were present then and they seem to have taken on even more life. I'm very interested in working in this - on this working group. My background has been in working with organizations as - on both sides of the Board table, as a CEO and director and often a board chair. And what ICANN is facing now may appear to be unique to ICANN but I'm not sure it really is.

I would like to second what Avri said about ensuring that involvement continues to be a key principle. And at the same time one of the issues in the charter really caught my attention, which was one of the questions about considering policy and implementation as components or elements on a continuum rather than as a binary concept or a concept and opposition; something to that effect.

And I think that that's something that I would really like to be involved in exploring. So thanks for the opportunity and I look forward to working with all of you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Maureen. And I have J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Hello. This is J. Scott Evans. I, for years, was involved in the leadership of the Intellectual Property Constituency. I am a Head of Global Brand Copyright and Domains at Yahoo Inc. I am also Yahoo Inc through its subsidiary Yahoo Domain Services, Inc is also the owner and applicant for the DotYahoo and DotFlickr applications.

I am now a member of the Business Constituency or rather I should say Yahoo Inc is. I am also a officer at the International Trademark Association and a member of the Executive Committee there. I was chair of their Internet

Committee for several years and served on that committee for about 10 years.

I was a member of the drafting committee that put together the UDRP. I was a member of the Implementation and Recommendation team that put together the RPMs that are being implemented through the Guidebook for the new gTLD program.

I have worked with many members here on working groups. I chaired the Working Group Guidelines Working Group. I have served as the primary representative for the IPC on the SCI, the Standing Committee on Improvements. I was a DNSO, Domain Name Supporting Organization, representative for the IPC back in the early iterations of ICANN several bylaw iterations ago.

I'm interested in this topic because I think it's one that's plagued both the GNSO, the Board and the GAC for many years and it - the organization is maturing to a point where there needs to be a coalescence and a consensus around how this is going to be handled, whether it be through definitions, whether it be through processes or however.

And I'm excited that we've got such a large group of people interested in this and I hope we can do some great work.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, J. Scott. Is there anyone on the phone that I did not get to? Okay hearing none. Marika, since you're our primary staff person I'll put you on the spot. Why don't you talk about yourself?

Marika Konings: Sure. Hi. So my name is Marika Konings. I'm the Senior Policy Director and GNSO Team Leader. I've been with ICANN since 2008 and have supported many PDP working groups since then as well as the working group that - or the work team that looked at the revised GNSO PDP which Jeff was a chair

at the time and as well worked with J. Scott on the GNSO Working Group Guidelines.

So I'm also very familiar with some of the topics that are being discussed here and together with some colleagues was also the main author of the staff paper that we published on this topic. And very much looking forward to the discussions (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thank you, Marika. I'm getting a little bit of kind of weird noise but I don't know if everyone else is getting that too? Yeah.

Marika Konings: Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible) that's coming from if someone could look at that. Well welcome, everyone. It's a great group of people and we'll get to know each other well over the next several months and we'll see how long this takes us to finish our work.

And I know that there are a bunch of people that are listed on the chart that is up on Adobe. We have about 32 volunteers so far. I'm sure that number will go up; it will go down over time. But this is a good core group of people.

So I'll go into a little bit of background and then talk about what this group is going to do really mostly taking from the charter, go over a few things from the working group procedures and guidelines that J. Scott was referring to, the group that he chaired, a little bit about the roles of the chair and other positions and then we'll talk about the election of officers of the group and then next steps.

So Marika has now put the charter up on the screen for those of you that are on Adobe. And just a little bit of background, you know, this topic really came up or I should say it's been a topic that's been in the background for a while

but really started bubbling up from the new gTLD implementation or implementation of the new gTLD program.

And there was definitely an increased focus on which topics that were being addressed were actually policy versus which topics were implementation. And then different processes and procedures that were applied depending on what the issue is classified as.

And in order to facilitate some of the discussions of this, you know, dividing line if there was in fact a dividing line, ICANN staff did - developed a draft framework that is included in the charter - or I should say the link is included in the charter - which I really encourage everybody to read.

And it talked about a number of steps and criteria that might facilitate dealing with similar questions in the future. And also that staff paper identified a bunch of questions that should be considered by the community and as well as some improvements.

So, you know, what the charter says in the background section, which I think is important, it says that while developing a bright line rule as to what is policy or implementation while that may not be possible the hope is that by developing clear processes and identifying clear roles and responsibilities for different stakeholders it will become easier to deal with these issues on a going-forward basis and for, you know, ensuring broad participation and involvement.

So following a number of discussions by the GNSO on this very topic we had - the GNSO Council had called for a drafting team to put together a charter. The charter was drafted and is now the one that you're looking at which was approved by the GNSO Council at the last meeting in - I think it was approved at the last meeting in Durban.

Holly Raiche: Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: And so we're left with this charter. So as the charter talks about, you know, what this group is really responsible for doing is for developing a - at least this is the initial set, right, is for developing a set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy and implementation related discussions taking into account existing GNSO operating procedures.

Two, is a process for developing gTLD policy perhaps in the form of policy guidance - that's a new term - including criteria for when it would be appropriate to use such a process. For developing policy other than a consensus policy instead of using the GNSO policy development process in the bylaws.

A framework for - excuse me, a framework for implementation related discussions associated with GNSO policy recommendations. Four, a criteria to be used to determine when an action should be addressed by a policy process and when it should be considered implementation.

And, finally, further guidance on how GNSO implementation and review teams, as that is currently defined in the PDP manual, are expected to function and operate.

There are a lot of terms in there that not everybody may be familiar with. There's a reference to a PDP manual which we should probably have a link - I'm not sure if that link is in the charter as well but we should have that link there to talk about that.

The - so for more information on what, you know, what these mean if you go to the charter there's a link that Marika had sent around earlier in the emails to that charter. And then just to give a little - dive a little bit deeper really the recommendations are expected to provide a clear understanding of the potential goals and end states of the PDP and any alternatives to the PDP.

It should improve the collection documentation of gTLD related policies and best practices created by the GNSO. Provide a better understanding of the transition between policy and implementation stages with expected outcomes from each.

Provide a framework for implementation work that is predictable, consistent, efficient and timely. And that includes appropriate multistakeholder feedback and also includes guidance on how feedback from the policy apparatus is needed in the implementation process. And finally to include mechanisms to adjust policy in response to learnings from the implementation work.

That's, in general, what the recommendations - the expectation of the recommendations coming out of this group will be. As this group works - does more work there could be additional recommendations, additional questions that the group wants to examine but this is really just to kick the discussion off.

As far as working group procedures and guidelines there is a document called the GNSO Working Group Guidelines. Again, that's the group that J. Scott had chaired. There's a link in the charter to that. But essentially ICANN working groups are expected or will use - or do use, I should say - transparent and open processes.

Meetings of the working group are recorded and the recordings are made available to the public. The mailing list that we've set up is a mailing list that is archived and publicly available. And working group members are expected to submit statements of interest as you all have been doing. Thank you very much for that.

And the group uses a collaborative tool, a wiki tool - although I'm probably naming that wrong - but that - you all have a link to from Marika. And, again, the group is expected to follow all of the Working Group Guidelines.

In the guidelines, kind of moving on to the roles, there are several roles that are laid out in the guidelines. There could be additional roles that are created. If that's the intention I know Michael Graham had sent a note earlier to the group saying that he was interested in possibly a vice chair position.

And while that vice chair position is not one that is set forth in the Working Group Guidelines that doesn't mean we can't, as a group, create one or define it for this group; it's just one that's not in the guidelines at this point in time.

So in the Working Group Guidelines the working groups call for a chair or co-chairs that are normally selected during the first meeting of the working group, which hopefully we will select that shortly although it doesn't - you know, if there is more discussion that's needed or time that's needed then we can always have a follow up or address that on the follow up call.

The working group can have co chairs and vice chairs if it wants to have that. You know, that's up to the working group. The - once selected, just to go over what the chair is supposed to do, the working group chair needs to be confirmed by the GNSO Council.

Purely - usually purely an administrative matter usually put on the consent agenda. It's not something that - the GNSO Council doesn't normally - and hasn't second guessed the working group in its - or working group selection of their chair, vice chairs, co-chairs, etcetera.

The role of the chair is really to call meetings, preside over working group deliberations and manage the process so that all participants have the opportunity to contribute and report the results of the working group to the GNSO.

It's supposed to ensure representational balance on any sub teams that are created throughout the work of the working group, if any, and ensure that

there's outreach to attempt to use good efforts to get that representational balance.

The chair is expected to enforce ICANN standards and behavior that are documented in the Working Group Guidelines. And ultimately the chair is tasked with - or co chairs - are tasked with designating levels of support for policy positions.

Examples of those are whether certain positions have full consensus, consensus, strong support, minority views, etcetera. All of these terms are defined in the Working Group Guidelines. And there are appeals processes if anyone disagrees with the decision or decisions of the chair or co chair.

The chair is intended to be a neutral role. And so if that ever comes into question then you have the right to raise that as working group members to the chair or co chairs or there's a role of a GNSO Council liaison, which is my role.

And it's my job to report to the GNSO Council on a regular basis on the progress of the working group, to assist the chair or co chairs as required with, you know, help on operational and procedural rules or anything that - any questions that you have in relation to the charter or the mission of the group and basically assisting if there are any issues that come up.

And I'm expected to be neutral. I'm expected to monitor the discussions of the working group and assist and inform the chair and the working group as required. So if you - if I do not engage in that well or you have any questions you can raise that to the chair, the co chair, you could always raise it to me and ultimately it will get raised to the Council if that's what needs to happen.

As working group members that's probably - not probably - definitely is the most critical role of all of them. You're expected to contribute productively and drive the work forward. If you represent a constituency or stakeholder group

you're expected to make sure that the views of your respective group is being heard by the working group.

And ultimately, although much of the work generally tends to be done by staff, working group members are expected to assist where possible in drafting of the policy positions and certainly helping out in any way that you can.

And another extremely important role is the role of ICANN staff - Marika's role. Her role is defined in the Working Group Guidelines as serving in both a secretariat role, which is, you know, for logistics and setting up the meetings and making sure the agendas are posted and doing all this wonderful stuff.

But equally, if not more important, is the policy support function for really providing the working group assistance in a neutral manner including drafting if required and she is expected to - or ICANN staff is expected to reflect faithfully the deliberations of the working group.

From my own experience in working with ICANN policy staff it is - they are extremely invaluable, I would say, to the process and have been, you know, really carry on the bulk of the work - very appreciative of all the work that ICANN staff actually does much of which is behind the scenes and you won't see it but a lot of it you will.

The last role that's defined in the Working Group Guidelines is the role of experts. The working group may choose to call on experts if it desires on certain subjects. And there's a process for obtaining that expert advice and opinion so that's something that's a tool that I will say is not often used by working groups or it's certainly not often enough. I think that can play a valuable role in the process.

So with that, sorry for the long contribution there, but we're expected to cover all of that. Are there any questions on the Guidelines, the roles of working group members, the chair, etcetera, staff?

(Olivier): I have a question. (Olivier) from (Global).

Jeff Neuman: Sure. Yes.

(Olivier): I would like to know how many working group are you - will be created?

Jeff Neuman: So this group is a working group; it's only...

((Crosstalk))

(Olivier): How many - yes, how many working group do we have?

Jeff Neuman: Well this working group may elect, at some point, to create sub teams or smaller working groups within the overall working group. That is to be decided by the group itself. There's no preordained number; it may be zero, it may be 10, there's no set number.

But if your question is more general on how many working groups does ICANN have; a lot. I'm not sure exactly how many there are.

(Olivier): (Unintelligible) I would like to co chair one of the working groups.

Jeff Neuman: Okay well - we have not yet decided as a group that we will be creating sub working groups. Are you volunteering for a chair of this group as a whole? Is that? Okay I might be having some audio issues. I see (Amr) has his hand up?

(Amr Elsadr): Yeah, hi. Thanks. I have a question about the working group wiki page. Typically I could access working group wiki pages without - Confluence

without having to log into Confluence. That has not been the case for this working group. I think it would be helpful to have open access to the page because it's especially helpful when sharing documents that the working group drafts with our constituencies or stakeholder groups. Is that - was that done on purpose or will it change, I'd like to know? Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Sure. Marika has her hand raised so, Marika, can you help with that?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Thanks, (Amr), for pointing that out. I didn't realize the leading principle all GNSO wikis are set up like that that anonymous viewers can view and access all the information; it's only working group members that can actually edit information. So I'll look into that because it was definitely intended to be an open space where anyone can view what the working group is doing and see all the information that is available there. So thank you for pointing that out.

(Amr Elsadr): Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Any other questions on the charter, on the roles, on the wiki? Okay so with that I note that we have 10 - I don't remember if this was scheduled for an hour, hour and a half? I can't recall. Marika, do you...

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. It's scheduled for 60 minutes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So we have 10 minutes left to talk about election of a chair, co chairs and next steps. I will say that there have been a couple - and I've not looked at my email in the last hour or so so I know that there were some nominations for chair.

So I know I saw - Michael Graham had sent a note about interest in a vice chair. I - J. Scott has volunteered. I know that Chuck Gomes. Is there anyone else that wanted to be considered? Sorry, I'm trying to flip back and forth

between email and Adobe. It sounds like - so it sounds like - is there anyone else? So I have J. Scott, I have Chuck and Michael Graham.

So Wolf and then Avri. And I should also point out, again, it's possible to do co chairs. That may be something that the group prefers and that maybe what Wolf and Avri are commenting on so Wolf. Wolf, I don't know if you're on mute.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Hello? Can you hear me?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Yes, now we can hear you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Thank you. So well I have just a question with regard to the chairs and or vice chairs because well I'm happy that we have a lot of candidates for that. But we should be at first in agreement that we should have vice chairs. I think that's the first thing we should talk about that. So I'm in agreement to do so but formally I would say - I would raise this point. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Wolf. I think that's a good discussion item and we seem to have people in the queue so, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thanks. This is Avri speaking. I would recommend that we've got, you know, three good - three good steps of volunteering. I would recommend that we go with two co chairs; we've had two people complementary, you know, putting themselves forward. I think having both of them as co chairs would be good.

And I think having a vice chair who has volunteered to be a vice chair to work with them would be good. I think that this is going to be a very wide ranging discussion. There's going to be a lot to track.

And so I think having a good group working with the secretariat, Marika and all the policy people, on this one would be a strength for the group. So, you

know, unless there are others that really want to volunteer to do it I think we've got a good group of volunteers. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Avri. Michael.

Michael Graham: Well, and I agree with Avri. I think Chuck and J. Scott would be excellent co chairs. My only interest in putting my hand up as a vice chair was that I am interested in assisting. I think this is a wide ranging enough and important enough topic that having the experience of J. Scott and Chuck up there and others who are on the working group as co chairs would be excellent.

And simply offer my assistance either as a vice chair or, you know, if that becomes problematic just in supporting them as may need be I will hold my hand up for that but I think they are both excellent nominees for the role.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Michael. I actually, as the GNSO Council liaison, I second your statements. I think having - my personal opinion having co chairs and a vice chair for this large of a group makes a lot of sense. And I think, you know, I think we have excellent candidates that have volunteered.

So does anyone - I'm just scanning through the Adobe - does anyone have - does anyone have an issue with having two co chairs and a vice chair? Let me start with that general question first. Okay, it doesn't look like anyone's got an issue with that. Great.

And then let me ask about the people that have volunteered. So I can relinquish my role which is something I'm looking forward to doing as the interim chair. So does anyone - I should ask this by a call - sorry, Chuck, you got - you want to make a statement? Chuck? Chuck, can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Oh, there you go, Chuck. I can hear you now.

Chuck Gomes: Can you hear me now?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I was talking but I wasn't being heard. Okay. I wanted to point out that (Olivier) disagreed with this approach I believe. He had his - unless that was a timing issue, he had put up a disagree mark on the Adobe Connect so you might want to find out - call on him to see what his concerns are.

Jeff Neuman: Oh, thank you, Chuck. I didn't see that. (Olivier), do you have any concerns with this approach?

J. Scott Evans: You might ask him to do it by Chat.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, if you're not able to do it by voice is there a way you can type something in? Okay well I'm not hearing an objection. I think - let me ask again on the candidates that have been put forward by a show of hopefully those on Adobe can put a checkmark for two co chairs being J. Scott and Chuck and Michael Graham as the vice chair if you could indicate by a showing of a checkmark that would be great.

Okay, it seems like it's filling out well. Does anybody - for those of you that are on the phone and not able to communicate on Adobe - does anyone have any objections with proceeding in that manner with J. Scott and Chuck as co chairs and Michael Graham as a vice chair?

Maureen Cubberley: Jeff, it's Maureen here. I have no opinion - I mean, no objection. I do have an opinion. I think it's a great combination. And I heartily support it.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thanks, Maureen. Okay so it looks like there's support out there for it so congratulations to J. Scott and Chuck and Michael. I will submit your

names to the GNSO Council for their confirmation at the September 5, is the next GNSO Council meeting.

In the interim you are a provisional co chairs and a provisional vice chair until that's approved. In order to note put you all on the spot for the next agenda item I'll cover the - this topic of the next meeting.

The - generally working groups - and I'll let the chair make this - the chairs and the vice chair - make a recommendation at the next meeting. But generally there are meetings every couple of weeks usually at the same time so that people can get it on their schedules and it's consistent.

If - we'll send around emails but it seems to me that if we can arrange for this time on a going-forward basis - I don't know if this is too late for those in Europe and they just made the one-time accommodation. So, Marika, what - do you propose sending around another Doodle poll or should we just ask if this is a good time and then see what kind of response we get?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. From the staff perspective we prefer to stick with a time instead of having Doodle polls after every meeting. So unless a lot of people indicate that they can't make it but, you know, I think this is by far the most popular time and date looking across the different dates we provided. So maybe we can just continue on this as a weekly schedule and basically review in a couple meetings whether, indeed, we are (unintelligible) or people are indicating that it doesn't work or consider rotation for example.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks, Marika. Anne and then Chuck.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thanks Jeff. It seems to me we might have had some audio problems where I believe that (Olivier) was volunteering as co vice chair. Now we didn't discuss - based on what I see in the Chat - we didn't discuss whether it was appropriate to have two vice chairs or not. But what I'm seeing

- and in fact there are audio problems is he did intend - it says, "Yes, I'm volunteering as co vice chair."

Hello?

Jeff Neuman: Sorry about that; I was talking - I was having my own mute problems - or audio problems, I was talking on mute. I didn't see that on the Chat so thank you for pointing that out. So let me - I will - does anybody have any comments or questions on that? I mean, I don't have any issues with that. I don't know if I want to throw that question to the new co chairs and - but it certainly sounds like (Olivier) would like to be a vice chair as well. It is a large group. Does anyone have any thoughts that they care to express on that?

Anne Aikman-Scalase: I'm losing audio and...

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, no nobody was speaking. So what I will do is - so let's take this - let's take this back. We have our two co chairs so we have J. Scott and we have Chuck. Maybe we can make this the agenda item - the first agenda item for the next meeting because we're already running over.

So what I will do is I will submit the names definitely for the co chairs and then I will say that there have been two volunteers for vice chair and we will clarify at the next meeting the going forward basis.

What I'm going to do is also propose that the next call be in two weeks. I'm not sure we need to start meeting weekly yet although the co chairs may choose to change that. I know we're ending vacation time so hopefully two weeks it's the beginning of September, I think. People should be back from vacation.

So I will propose this time for two weeks from today. The very first agenda item will be the vice chair issue and then the co chairs will take it from here.

So two weeks, not next week but two weeks on Wednesday at the same time. Is there any questions before we end, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Just...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Just a suggestion, Jeff. This is Chuck. I think it'd be good if even the four of us, including the two vice chairs, would have a call or two and begin exchanging things before that meeting. So, Marika, if you can help us schedule that and get each of us our contact information if we don't have it. I have most - I think I have most everybody's. And just a suggestion so if there's no objections by the other three people I think that would be a good idea.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I think that makes a lot of sense. Greg, did you have a question?

Greg Shatan: No just quickly wanted to suggest, you know, consideration of having calls either more often or longer calls like maybe 90 minutes because an hour goes by really quick. The IGO/INGO Working Group is doing two-hour calls every week which is maybe a little too grueling. But given how meaty and kind of intellectual this subject is I think that we should, you know, have time for kind of, you know, good hearty back and forth on the call. So just a suggestion. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Greg, I think that's an excellent suggestion. And I will ask that the co chairs and co vice chairs talk about that as well. And why don't we - just a following on that recommendation, Marika, can we set up the next call in two weeks for an hour and a half? And then I will let the chairs and co vice chairs decide whether to use the full hour and a half or to make a - and whether to do calls every week or every other week.

Okay? I thank everyone for...

Brian Beckham: Yeah, I'm sorry, it's Brian. Can I quickly make a comment? I'm sorry I didn't get a chance to introduce myself earlier. I just wanted to say if this is going to be something that happens every week for an hour and a half or two hours I'd like to propose that the call be moved up in time if that's not too much to ask.

It's getting into the evening in Europe and I think, you know, on a monthly or biweekly basis it's okay but if it's going to be every week for two hours then that might eat into people's schedules a little bit.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, Brian. That's Brian Beckham. Chuck and J. Scott, Michael and (Olivier), you have that question before you so you can consider that and make a recommendation to the group. I want to thank - is there anyone with any last comments? Holly?

Holly Raiche: Just a last comment. If you change the time too much I'd like to point out that Sydney time is going to be difficult. And if you start changing it it's going to move from what is difficult to what's fairly impossible. So please don't change the time or if you do please send out a Doodle not for every call but just for a Doodle for when people are most comfortable. And remember you're got to accommodate Australia as well. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: I think that's an excellent point. Thank you for - Holly, for bringing that to our attention. Okay any last comments before? Oh I got Michael and Chuck. All right.

Michael Graham: Well, it's Michael. I was just going to ask very quickly, Holly, if we did expand the time to 90 minute would it be better to run 90 minutes later than now or begin half an hour earlier?

Holly Raiche: Look, I'm sitting in Boston right now. I'd have to go back to Sydney, figure out what time it is and then figure out what time it's best. So a Doodle, I think, on the basis that a 90-minute call would really give not only me a good time but it

would let other people in on just settling what time is best for them and then we just don't Doodle again; that becomes the time for the call.

Michael Graham: Good idea. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. I'd like to request that staff provide us as the co chairs and vice chairs a list of the time zones for the members of the group so we could just look at that.

Holly Raiche: I think it's wacko.

Chuck Gomes: I think that would be very helpful for us.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. That may require basically people sending us a note where they are because for some people I know but I don't know for everyone where they are based or stay. If you can send me a note that would be helpful.

Chuck Gomes: As best you can, Marika.

Jeff Neuman: So co chairs and co vice chairs I'm giving you your first difficult issue to work through, the first of I'm sure many. But thank you, everyone. I know we kept you over a little bit for a few minutes. The next call will be two weeks from today at least tentatively scheduled for two weeks from today for 90 minutes.

And I want to congratulate the chairs and co chairs and I look forward to taking my backseat and working as a working group member and as a liaison. So thank you, everyone, for the call.

Holly Raiche: Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Tonya), you may now stop the recording.

END