Transcript
GNSO Drafting Group on Cross SO/AC Working Groups
29 September 2011 at 19:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the **GNSO Drafting Group on Cross SO/AC Working Groups** teleconference on 29 September 2011 at 19:00 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-cwg-20110929-en.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#sep

Attendees
Jonathan Robinson
John Berard
Jaime Wagner
Wendy Seltzer

ICANN Staff
Margie Milam
Nathalie Peregrine

Apology:
Liz Gasster

Absent:
Rosemary Sinclair
Jeff Neuman
Tim Ruiz

Coordinator: Excuse me, I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being

                 recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You

                 may begin.

Jonathan Robinson: Right...

Nathalie Peregrine: Thanks (Karen). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the CWG call on the 29th of September. On the line today we have John Berard, Jonathan Robinson and Jaime Wagner on Adobe. For staff we have Margie Milam and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. And we have apologies from Liz Gasster.

I would ask you to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much, you may begin.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi, it's Jonathan Robinson. Thanks very much (unintelligible) for facilitating this and to John, my loyal colleague and participant. We - Jaime's asked if we could call his cell phone. Is that a realistic possibility? I guess I could Skype out to him.

Margie Milam: Oh, Jonathan, we'll get Nathalie to do that. Nathalie, can you follow up with the operators to do that?

Nathalie Peregrine: No problem at all. Thank you.

John Berard: See, she swooped right in.

Jonathan Robinson: Oh here comes Wendy, that's great. All right so I wonder if we should just hold (far) for a minute or two. But, John, essentially I, you know, just by way of a kind of apology and explanation I've been somewhat fantastically busy the last 10 days or so.

And I had really hoped to get this - it turns out these changes are so minor to the list and ideally get this approved on the list to submit it as a motion for the next GNSO meeting because I feel that sort of formally constituting this group and getting the motion under our belts was something that the - necessary and could easily be done.

Unfortunately we've missed the deadline by 24 hours or something; it was yesterday was the deadline. It may not even be 24 hours. So Margie is going to reach out to the - to the GNSO and see if they'll accept a motion late by one day.

And I - sometimes they rightly are sticklers for process given that (unintelligible) would like to get this done. I think it would enable us to have a better - a platform from which to work, A, on the next call and, B, at the Dakar meeting.

So I don't know - what I'd love to - even really the minor changes I've suggested are simply making sure that it's clear this is a drafting team not a working group. And I thought that was just slightly ambiguous from the way the charter was (unintelligible).

And also accommodating Jaime's point from the last meeting saying that we would concentrate on the effective chartering since that seems to be the key point. But ideally cover our functioning (unintelligible) the rest of the groups as well.

So I softened it very slightly just to - I don't know if you've got any thoughts or comments on that or if you feel it's acceptable as it stands. It's up on the Adobe now.

John Berard: Yeah, no my concern off our last call was that we were - we made it seem as if we were creating a cross constituency working group when in fact we are really just representing the GNSO Council as it seeks to figure out how it can operate in a cross constituency working group environment.

And so the notion of it being a drafting team is good. It is a GNSO-driven drafting team. So I'm fine with it. I mean, I'm looking at the...

Jonathan Robinson: Right.

John Berard: ...motions now before the Council. And I'm just - I'm just wondering - Margie, you've been at this longer than I have. Has anybody, I mean, looking at the United States Congress as a role model where they will attach all kinds of stuff to bills flying through the Congress.

Is there any chance that we could offer up this charter as a friendly motion to an unrelated motion?

Wendy Seltzer: This is Wendy and I've often thought that would be fun to do.

John Berard: Why are you laughing?

Margie Milam: No, I'm not aware that it would happen. And I can't, I mean, imagine that Stephane wouldn't like that and it ultimately it's probably his call. I just send - just so you know I did send an email to the chair's list to see if they, you know, if there's a way of just waiving the deadline for at least administrative motions. And I'll let you know if I get an answer before the call is up.

John Berard: All right .

Jonathan Robinson: Right so...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: Wendy, if you ever want to partner on something as anarchistic as that let me know, will you?

Wendy Seltzer: I once moved (blob) but I didn't get a seconder so I've got to try that again before the Dakar meeting.

John Berard: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so Jaime is with us now which is great. Wendy is with us now so I'll just recap a moment there. Guys, I was as responsible as anyone if not solely responsible for not getting a revised - and the revisions are minor version of the drafting team chart up. I wouldn't mind if you'd take a quick look at it.

And unfortunately we missed the GNSO Council deadline which we picked up the discussion of. We're going to, with Margie's help, try and get this into the next meeting because I feel we're a sort of - we're a bit lame without this and I'd like to get it formalized, put through the GNSO and use the next call plus our meeting in Dakar to really make a little bit of progress on all of this.

So that's where it's at. So (unintelligible) whether we get the motion through or not - I'm sorry, get the motion posted for the next Council meeting, which is now seven days away, I'd like to just be sure I've got your support and/or comments on the drafting charter as it now stands.

And you'll see the redline version in front of you. I've really made it clear that this is a drafting team. It's a GNSO drafting team. It's not a cross community working group. And in fact it's not a working group although it will follow working group guidelines.

And second key change is that I've accommodated Jaime's point that we not entirely - I haven't restricted it to chartering but suggested that we see that as our minimum achievement - if you like a minimum threshold for success. And that's down as objects as in goals.

And then finally I guess I'd highlight although it's not strictly a change that under membership criteria we've kept it wide open. So although we haven't made this a cross community working group or cross community team as such we've made it wide open. And I feel this charter, if we can get it out, allows us to then advertise and bring people in either to the next call or certainly at Dakar.

So that's really what I'm trying to achieve in this. Any comments (unintelligible)?

John Berard: I'm on board with that. This is John.

Jonathan Robinson: Great.

Jaime Wagner: I am in full agreement. Jaime.

Jonathan Robinson: Wonderful Jaime. Thanks. All right, Wendy, I'll take silence as not disagreeing but by all means chip in at any point if you would like to. So (unintelligible) that we've now - we've effectively got a charter that we can put before the Council. And, like I say, this is Agenda Item 2 now; you'll see in your top right. If at all possible we'll put that in as a motion for the next meeting.

John Berard: Jonathan, this is John. Might I suggest seeing as how this is going to leak into Dakar Jeff Neuman is putting together the schedule for our meetings in Dakar. And it looks like we're going to be putting more emphasis on public comment perhaps even at the front end of the meeting.

And I'm wondering as he considers the items to post for public comment at the start of our public meeting if this notion of the cross community working group might not be a good one to include. It would certainly support the efforts of the small group of us working to reenergize those meetings.

It's an opportunity for members of the community to get involved ahead of things. And it is an issue that's not going away. And, you know, it's going to require the entire community to participate, sign off on or stand silent in front of.

So maybe if you could pass the suggestion along to Jeff that he include this in the public comment portion of the meeting?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah so that's a great a idea. And I think we touched on this in the last call. And what we talked about was that and/or a specific slot for the (unintelligible) meeting which was notionally - which we had sort of put forward for as the Thursday morning (unintelligible) we've got any further with that - a dedicated slot but...

Margie Milam: Yeah, Jonathan it's Margie. Yes it looks like I do have us in on Thursday morning from 8:30 to 10:00. And also just so you know I believe we'll be having another internal call with the GNSO leaders I think on Monday. So I can also raise this as a topic there if you'd like me to have that be an additional item for that public part of the GNSO Council meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: Well, you know, I was wondering - and I'd like some input on this from anyone on the call. But I was wondering whether these were mutually exclusive slots or whether there's a way in which we couldn't have both given how - a combination of how relatively important this seems to be and yet how little progress we've made to date.

My slight worry is that we'll end up with sort of repetition in both slots if they're that close together. But any thoughts or comments on how these might work together as - it helps taking John's suggestion and knowing now what we've heard from Margie that there is a slot set aside for us on Thursday morning. Any thoughts or comments about how these two might work together?

John Berard: Well I - this is John. I would think that the 90-minute session would be the more substantive of the two and that the public comment would be the more theatrical of the two. And I can accommodate those as, you know, complementary efforts.

In fact it would be pretty interesting if the first person to comment at the public comment period was you, Jonathan, to talk a bit about where we were and then have people respond to it. I mean, I think that's pretty much what Jeff is

intending having somebody offer the setup and then comment on a handful, maybe two, three or four issues at the front end of the meeting. But...

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah that's...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: That would be my approach. I mean, I don't think - and I realize this is being taped. I think we - the public comment period is going to by design be less substantive than the 90-minute session on Thursday.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Jaime, I think I've just got your chats agreeing with that. So at least these are - I hope I haven't misinterpreted that - that these are complementary sessions. I like that.

And then see, for me, what's attractive about that as well we could - Margie can do as she suggests is raise this up with the - I'm not sure who that is, Margie, it's people organizing it. When you say the chair it's the vice chairs and the chair is it?

Margie Milam: Yeah and staff so we usually have meetings and we will have one before the - for planning for the October 6 meeting that we'll get on a call for an hour on Monday with Stephane and Jeff and Mary and then ICANN staff to kind of work out logistics. So that's why - I can raise it then.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. So I can see something shaping up then. It looks to me like there too we could run that, include that as part of the public comment. What day is that? Is that the Tuesday? No that Tuesday is stakeholder groups. What day would we be having that public comment session?

John Berard: That would be Wednesday at the open session.

Jonathan Robinson: So that's a day before the...

John Berard: Right.

Jonathan Robinson: ...the substantive session or as we called it there. So that would work really quite well. And then what I would suggest we do is we take - I mean, really I'd like to try to emphasize as much as possible to get this motion through would be great - to get this drafting team charter on and through.

Because that would - I mean, it's not - I guess it's not absolutely vital but it would (unintelligible) use the next telephone call which is the only one - other one we have before Dakar to really discuss - I'll post something and we can try and do something on the week beforehand - but to try and put some shape on both the public comment session, what we might want to say in that, and the Thursday morning session which I think could be progress. I would at least feel that we've made some progress then.

John Berard: Well now if Margie is successful and we wind up getting the motion approved on some expedited basis then maybe it takes it out of the public comment period...

Jonathan Robinson: Oh I see; I had misunderstood that slightly. I was thinking that we got the charter in place and then we took public comment on, you know, the issue rather than, you know, on feedback into the objectives and goals of the group on the charter itself.

Is that - my opinion is that save for the fact that it's only a GNSO work - drafting team rather than some kind of cross constituency group there's nothing particularly controversial about the charter.

Now the message I've got I think on balance is that the (unintelligible) the GNSO (could) even though there have been some voices saying well why don't you make it wider in the first instance because you're in danger of going down the GNSO route.

And - but I think it's a very wide open - when I look at the membership criteria we're absolutely unrestricted; it's just that ultimately the output is that of the GNSO drafting team. So I guess that firs session can be one of two; it's either input into the charter or input into the work of the group itself, the drafting team itself.

John Berard: Right. Jaime, just - Margie when you say we could invite representatives are we talking to the open session? Yeah, exactly. Yeah, certainly for the Thursday morning session. I mean, for me that's - and in a way that's why I'm so keen to get the drafting team charter out because I feel it sort of empowers us then because if you look at our membership criteria we're saying a publication (unintelligible).

So we could really - just give us a little bit of momentum to start to advertise participation at either the public comment session or the drafting team meeting on the Thursday morning.

Jaime Wagner: Well I just realized that I was talking on mute.

Wendy Seltzer: Wendy Seltzer with a...

Jaime Wagner: I think the - Margie's idea is excellent. We could invite - make a strong point of openness in this invitation. This is Jaime.

Jonathan Robinson: Jaime, just to be crystal clear so I don't misunderstand anything are you talking about to the Wednesday session or the Thursday session or both?

Jaime Wagner: I'm - the Thursday session; the closed - the more closed one I think - well we could invite - I think we could invite to both the leadership of other SOs and ACs. But I don't think they will be able - the reality is that our open session didn't get much attention. And generally the open session is the end of the communications - the end of the meeting.

So I think it would - we would - I would like to stress the invitation for the (unintelligible) Thursday meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay Jaime, I'm with you on that. Just to - and a point of clarification first; as far as I understand it this open session is being pushed to the front of the meeting now particularly to - or specifically to improve participation in the open session.

But nevertheless I'm with you and very supportive in agreement making the Thursday session as open and well publicized for its openness as possible.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah. But I don't know if I made myself clear. I think we should invite leadership and membership to both sessions but stress the invitation to the Thursday meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I did make yourself clear. And I'm certainly in agreement with you on that. Well as far as I'm concerned - I know that's a short call but that covers what I was hoping to achieve.

Wendy Seltzer: Can I jump in with one thing?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Wendy and then Jaime.

Wendy Seltzer: So I'm looking at the drafting team charter as it is on the screen here. And I wonder whether our objectives and goals could be clarified where we say the CCW DT aims to develop a common understanding. Among whom do we intend to develop that common understanding? Is it among GNSO or is this itself a cross community team? And pardon me if I've missed previous clarifications to that.

John Berard: No - this is John - I think that's a good one to make, Wendy. I mean, I think our work here is to - is designed to give clarity to the GNSO point of view.

And once we do we would intend to offer it up for comment from the entire community in hopes that it could be the basis for the ultimate policies on how cross constituency working groups should/could be undertaken.

Jonathan Robinson: Well how about this, guys...

John Berard: Is that okay, Wendy? I mean...

Wendy Seltzer: I agree with that. And so I would put in a common understanding within GNSO...

John Berard: Okay.

Wendy Seltzer: ...to that objective.

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: I would also then add that it's our hope that once gained that we would offer it up for community-wide comment in hopes that it could serve as a framework for real cross community working group policies.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I thought, John, you said some words a moment ago that I found attractive because really you had said - and I think it's sort of what Wendy wanted to achieve as well.

If we could say something along the lines of this: The drafting team aims to - for some reason I'm not feeling particularly eloquent - but essentially gel the GNSO perspective as a basis for developing a common understanding. So we make it clear that although we're only working with the GNSO perspective we very much see this as a step in the direction of a broader community common understanding.

It's not - it doesn't presume that where we get to is the common understanding but it's the first step in developing that.

John Berard: Well - this is John again. I can't deny what I said because it's on tape which I guess also gives the opportunity to play it back and maybe steal some of it. Margie, Nathalie is that something that we can call upon you to do in terms of making that adjustment? Do you understand what we're saying?

Margie Milam: Well the problem is I think it may take a little bit of time and we wanted to get this done right after the call. So if you want to play with the words...

John Berard: Okay.

Margie Milam: ...now and, you know, give me language that's probably the best thing to do.

John Berard: All right. What piece is - what part of this document...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: ...are we needing to change, Wendy, or adjust?

Wendy Seltzer: So...

John Berard: Mission and scope?

Wendy Seltzer: ...I'm looking at objectives and goals and in particular I think that adding - limiting the scope that we start with to GNSO will actually help us to get work done here without sort of constantly going up to the meta level of do we have the right participants to hold this discussion and...

John Berard: Right.

Wendy Seltzer: ...I think if we can find the unified view among GNSO then that's an excellent place to start building consensus with other groups. And so I think...

Jonathan Robinson: So, Wendy are you - would you be happy with what I suggested which is along the lines of the drafting team aims to clarify the GNSO perspective as a basis for developing a common understanding of us?

John Berard: Jonathan I hate to step on...

Wendy Seltzer: Yes.

John Berard: ...that but the way you've said it makes it seem like we're going to decide what to do and then it's going to be imprinted on everybody else. So...

Jonathan Robinson: Okay which is clearly...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: I think we are - if I look at the mission and scope the GNSO cross community working group drafting team will be responsible for developing a GNSO approved approach to working with groups jointly chartered by other ICANN supporting organizations, advisory committees along with - as well as the GNSO.

It is - the GNSO policy can then serve as a platform for a cross community discussion. So rather than saying we're going to cook it up and you guys are going to eat it we're saying we're going to cook it up and you can order it if you like.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah, this is Jaime. May I jump in? John, I think we already have the platform as we have the - our platform to approach working groups in general. It's for the GNSO working group and this is the very platform from where we are starting.

                  So I would say that what we would bring now is not a new platform but a GNSO perspective of what would be - well we cannot say that we will say to others which is the common understanding. But we will bring that - our perspective of what should be or would be a middle common understanding. This is the idea I understood from what Jonathan was saying.

Jaime Wagner: Hello.

John Berard: Yeah, I'm here.

Jaime Wagner: Hello.

John Berard: Anybody else?

Jaime Wagner: John...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: I apologize. I just popped something on the chat. Is that what we're talking about, developing a GNSO-agreed approach?

Jaime Wagner: I think that's...

((Crosstalk))

Jaime Wagner: ...agreed approach, agreed perspective. What we will try to bring to - we will
                 bring to the discussion of a contribution that is GNSO. The platform from
                 where we are starting is the working group charter that we already have in
                 place; the working group organization, I mean, the GNSO working group
                 organizations.

                 Do you think that the fact that they deal with policy matters impedes in some
                 way its applicability to this platform to cross community working groups,
                 John?

John Berard: Say it again, Jaime? I apologize, I'm a little bit further away from you tonight,
                 I'm in Canada so...

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

John Berard: As I said I'm not sure I understood your point.

Jaime Wagner: I mean, when you say the word platform that we will try to bring a platform I
                 think we already have this platform in place that are the - the papers on
                 working groups - GNSO working groups and they will function (unintelligible).
                 We have all that very much in place.

John Berard: Right.

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: But the one thing we don't have, Jaime, is a way to sensibly integrate the
                 work of some organizations that are designed - constructed to offer advice
                 and organizations that are constructed to offer policy. And so there are - so
                 that when you enter the cross constituency - cross community working group
                 arena there are multiple platforms.

What we're talking about is what is a common base from which we can then customize a cross community working group. So I agree there is the GNSO working group platform but I'm not sure that taking that as it is is the best first step in what I view as a far more political process than I would wish of convincing people that, you know, we should all play better together.

And I do think that there's a fair bit of politics that this subject has gotten caught up in.

Jaime Wagner: Understood. Wendy, you've got your hand up. Is that...

Wendy Seltzer: I withdraw my suggestion for an amendment. I think we had something that we were all agreed upon; why don't we just leave it as is?

Jonathan Robinson: I really appreciate you saying that; it's very pragmatic. And ultimately if we've got a slim chance of getting this through - getting this published as a motion. And perhaps we can revisit this. If not - but the question is do we tweak this at all now? And I appreciate why you're willing to withdraw and it's good of you to do so.

But I guess what I would reach out to yourself, Wendy, Jaime and John, and just say, look, are there some very minor tweaks we can do both for the sake of making it clear to Margie who's going to have to redraft this and also simply because it's a 13th hour submission at this point that may or may not even get on the table. So...

Wendy Seltzer: I guess I would say why don't we try now with what we have and we can revisit it if we don't find procedurally that we can make the motion at this time.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I could live with that although I would also be equally happy to certainly exchange (unintelligible) perspective on the objectives and goals. We don't deal with the mission and scope then in changing it but at least we've gone some way to accommodating your initial suggestion.

I don't know how, Jaime or John, if you could live with that as a sort of pragmatic small change to make now.

John Berard: So repeat the small pragmatic change.

Jonathan Robinson: Under objectives and goals, John, I'm suggesting we replace the drafting team aims to develop a common understanding of cross SO/AC working groups with the drafting team aims to develop a GNSO-agreed perspective of cross SO/AC working groups.

John Berard: I'm definitely good with that.

Jonathan Robinson: And that's...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...recorded on the chat. Jaime, can you live with that minor change?

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. And then we're not doing anything with the mission and scope which frankly having heard you guys I think could do with a tweak to that. (Unintelligible) we've got at the moment and try and get this out as a motion and as Wendy very sensibly suggested not we then might do some further minor amendments to the mission and scope as well.

Margie, are you able to pick that up from the chat and just simply substitute that?

Margie Milam: Sorry, so you're doing it in the mission and scope section, is that correct?

Jonathan Robinson: No under the objectives and goals where we said that the DT aims to develop a common understanding. We're changing that to aims to develop a GNSO-agreed perspective.

Margie Milam: Oh, okay sorry; I was in the wrong place. Yeah, that's fine, I can do that. And that's the only change?

Jonathan Robinson: Well personally I'd like to say I would still like to keep as a basis for a common understanding. And I don't know whether that's (awkward) but I sort of want to make it clear that although we're working on the GNSO perspective it's really trying to (unintelligible) and start the process for a common understanding. But if - I don't know if others can live with that.

John Berard: So where would you put it?

Jonathan Robinson: My sentence would then read, aims to develop a GNSO-agreed perspective as a basis for a common - as a - and maybe as a starting point for a common understanding.

John Berard: Right that can serve as.

Jonathan Robinson: That can serve as...

John Berard: Right, a basis.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...common understanding. All right let's work with that then.

John Berard: Well having said it I guess I'm going to have to vote for it eh?

Jonathan Robinson: Well I'm going to write this into the chat so that you can all see it. Are you on the chat, John? You are aren't you?

John Berard: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: So just bear with me one minute while I write this in. So a GNSO agreed
                 perspective that can serve as a starting point (unintelligible). Is that what you
                 said, John?

John Berard: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: That. We've lost Jaime. He doesn't appear to have audio. So I think that
                 that's probably as far as we can go without really making any major revisions.
                 Let's just look at the mission and scope and make sure that that's acceptable
                 and if so I suggest we work with that for now.

                 I'll just read that through once more and make - I don't know if - has everyone
                 got that in front of them? The mission - the documents in front of you I think.
                 We're all on the Adobe.

John Berard: Yeah, I have it Jonathan.

Wendy Seltzer: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: So we're saying we'll be responsible for (unintelligible) chartered by the
                 ICANN SO and ACs along with the GNSO and effectively function and
                 produce meaningful and timely reports.

                 On look it's - the thing that's likely to be cause - likely to stick in anyone's
                 throats there is that we are developing a proposed framework and others
                 might say well why aren't you developing it with us? Well we are because
                 we're reaching out and making it as inclusive as possible.

                 So I think we are - I think you're right, Jaime, I think we're pretty much done if
                 providing you, Wendy and John are happy with that. I suggest we go with the

(unintelligible), see if we can't squeeze it into their GNSO agenda as we've said as a proposed motion for the 6th. And if not we can further tweak it.

But if we are we'll use the next call then to shape up the Dakar meetings. And by then we should get some input from Margie as to whether this is going to be (unintelligible). I'll probably drop Jeff a note as well to let him know what we've gotten to.

Is that a wrap or is there something else...

Margie Milam: No. Yeah, Jonathan I have one more change to request. If you look at the deliverables it says we're going to deliver a report by Dakar which was ambitious when we first developed this charter. But I think that's no so likely now.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes I'm sorry; that's a good point. So in fact I had changed that on a personal edit I had made. So that's well spotted, Margie, thank you. So which section is that?

Margie Milam: It's called Deliverable and Timeframes. It's right at the bottom of Section 2. And it says the CCW DT is expected to carry out the activities identified in this charter in order to produce a report for the GNSO Council by the ICANN Dakar meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: Oh right...

John Berard: So just make that a status report.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I'd be happy to put a status report to the GNSO Council by the ICANN Dakar meeting. And a report by the yearend.

John Berard: No, no we might as well - let's just do one step at a time here, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: All right.

John Berard: My view. Wendy, what do you think?

Wendy Seltzer: Sure.

John Berard: Yeah. I'm all in favor of running before I can walk except in this case.

Margie Milam: Okay so I'll change that to status report.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. It just seems a little weak but if that's the view I'm a little bit of a
                    novice at this game so I'm happy with either a status report or removing the
                    ICANN Dakar meeting and putting it at the, you know, a report to the GNSO
                    by the end of the year.

                    But if you guys think that that's the right thing to do just put a - it just seems
                    like a - not a very strong deliverable from the group. But if that's - because
                    (unintelligible) at the Dakar meeting and how do we encompass that work
                    without having another charter?

John Berard: Well what it says is we're expected to carry out the activities identified in this
                    charter in order to produce - well okay so maybe the problem is in order to
                    produce. So we're expected to carry out activities identified in this charter
                    period. A status report will be offered to the GNSO Council by the time of the
                    ICANN Dakar meeting.

                    It doesn't - this way we allow the definition of status to be as big or small as
                    we like. Keep in mind the substantive meeting is going to come after the
                    public meeting so...

Jonathan Robinson: Correct.

John Berard: ...even if we're fabulously successful we're still not going to be ready to report anything final on that Wednesday.

Jonathan Robinson: No. And so, John, you would rather we didn't put anything (unintelligible) sensible to put in and a final, you know, something like a final report will be delivered to the GNSO by X or we should keep away from that?

John Berard: Well, you know, look, if everything breaks right the status report we offer in Dakar could be the final report. So the word status just means what it is not, you know, whether it's preliminary or final. I mean, I realize that we're splitting a bit of a hair here but, you know, I think it serves everybody's purpose if we do.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. I'll take your advice on that. That's great. So, Margie, did you get that? We've got period after charter and then a status report...

Margie Milam: Yeah. Yeah, sorry, I disagree with that because at some point we're going to have to have a writing and there's no way we're going to, you know, have a writing in Dakar. And this section of the charter is intended to talk about the end product whatever that is.

If we don't want to set a timeframe it could be just, you know, a report to be published after Dakar and you don't have to put a specific, you know, end date. But I think rather than having to think about, you know, doing amendments to the charter later on I think we should anticipate that there will be at least one written report.

John Berard: All right, when is the next community meeting after Dakar? Is that Toronto or Costa Rica or what?

Margie Milam: That's Costa Rica in March I believe.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: John, (unintelligible) love to put a stake in the sand. I've already been bitten once in this particular project. So I would like to go with Margie's suggestion and say that we will say a final report will be delivered after Dakar or, you know, keep it without a specific - keep a deliverable in there but not a date.

John Berard: Well realistically is it 60 days after Dakar, 30, 90?

Jonathan Robinson: We could say by the time of the next public meeting.

John Berard: Well now the Dakar is the end of October and the next public meeting is November, December, January, February, March - five months later that's a long way off.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah which is why I originally thought of - before the end of 2011 was my original - I thought that was a reasonable timeframe to give us.

John Berard: Well I can live with that.

Jonathan Robinson: Any objections?

Wendy Seltzer: No.

Jonathan Robinson: Hearing none we'll (go after that).

Margie Milam: Oh, Jonathan, sorry, can you repeat that? I missed that. What did you guys agree on?

Jonathan Robinson: Margie that the deliverable and timeframes now reads the DT is expected to carry out activities identified in this charter. Full stop. A status report will be

- a status report to the GNSO Council by the - or at the ICANN Dakar meeting. A final report will be prepared by the end of calendar year 2011.

Margie Milam: Okay. Okay got it.

Jonathan Robinson: Or a final report to the GNSO Council by the end of 2011. I mean, whatever, you know, wording covers that intent. But the intent is a status report at the Dakar meeting and final report by end of calendar year.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: Great everyone. Thanks very much for your time. Yeah, bye Jaime and thanks again. I know this is a little (unintelligible) incremental progress and if we can possibly slip this charter in to the meeting and get it voted on that would be a little further notch and give us a good platform to work in Dakar from.

John Berard: All right, Jonathan, thank you for pushing forward on this.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I appreciate your input as well, John. Okay thanks for staff as well...

John Berard: Wendy, talk to you soon.

Wendy Seltzer: Thanks a lot.

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: Bye Margie.

Wendy Seltzer: Bye, bye.

((Crosstalk))

Margie Milam: Thanks.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, Operator. You may now stop the recordings.

Coordinator: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you.

Nathalie Peregrine: Bye-bye

END