Geographic Regions Review Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 15 July at 1200 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the
Geographic Regions Review Working Group on Wednesday 15 July 2009 at 12:00 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-geo-regions-20090715.mp3
 On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#july

Present:
Olga Cavalli
David Archbold
Fahd Batayneh
Carlton Samuels
Cheryl Langdon-Orr

Staff:
Rob Hoggarth
Bart Boswinkel
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies – *Please note Janis did send his apologies – I forgot to mention on recording*
Janis Karklins

Gisella Gruber-White: Good afternoon everyone. I'll do a quick roll call. This afternoon we have
Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Fahd Batayneh, Olga Cavalli, David Archibald, Carlton
Samuels, and from staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Rob Hoggarth, and myself,
Gisella Gruber-White. Thank You.

Dave Archibald: Well good morning or good afternoon everybody. I suppose I should remind
you as we are recording please give your names before you speak and try
and speak slowly. I failed on the first count. This is Dave Archibald.

My thoughts for this morning, really, is just to get you feedback on the draft
report - latest version that I sent round. I've had feedback from Fahd and from
Olga and I'll touch on that briefly as we go through. But that's all. Any other

comments, I suppose (unintelligible) let's go round everybody. Carlton I know you're there. Any comments? Have you managed to read the draft and have you any views?

Carlton Samuels: I've read the draft, Dave. I can't see anything that's left out. I believe the usage of the categories are appropriate. I see that we have one small addition which I totally support and that's about it.

Dave Archibald: Okay. I'm working backwards on my list. Cheryl are you on line or have you dropped off?

Gisella Gruber-White: Cheryl should be there.

Dave Archibald: But isn't speaking so let's jump to Olga.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I have - no, no I haven't dropped off. It just takes that long to un-mute. By the time they tell you that you've unmuted and have to re-mute again the conversation's moved on. Sorry about that.

Look, I pretty much echo what I just heard Carlton say in terms of the report. But I would point out that I've only seen the comments that Fahd's made. I haven't seen the others comments that have been made and so if you would please make a point of bringing my attention to those while I'm listening and driving along the highway - by the way I'm not driving. I have a driver who's driving me along the highway but I will now go back to mute.

Dave Archibald: Okay. This is Dave again. The - I should perhaps speak about the comments and also ask questions of staff. I had listed - or hadn't listed ICANN staff support on the front page because I wasn't sure who was officially on the list and who wasn't. I don't know - could you comment on that if we just go through that particular bit Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: Certainly Dave. I think it's appropriate to list me, Bart and (Pablo) as contributing staff members to that list.

Dave Archibald: Okay. The other - the majority of the other changes that have been talked about - I'm going to ignore the minor typo corrections for which I am grateful. However, the other changes are suggestions in the tables and for a couple of them I actually don't agree that we should change. Let's see. I'm trying to flick through my list.

The first one is just a spelling change which would be at Item 21 on Table 1 and it was a simple thing - change recognise with an "S" to recognize with a "Zed". Now I don't feel strongly about it other than these are direct quotes from the original documents. So if the original document had an "S" I think we've got to stick with it.

The second one is one that Olga brought up and really that is the same answer. It's in Table 2 and I'm looking for the exact page. It's where the...

Olga Cavalli: It's Table 2 - three, number three. Table 2 number three.

Dave Archibald: I missed it. Yeah. Here again it's a quotation from the original document and we've added in remarks and I think it was Rob that put this in, "It is evident that this document requires some additional editing by the drafters." I think it's rather an old document and they incorrectly have Latin America, including Caribbean with (unintelligible). Perhaps it was at that time.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. At that time but now it's (unintelligible)

Dave Archibald: At the time of writing we know it was but (unintelligible) again...

Olga Cavalli: At the time of - oh. Well, I'm not sure about.

Dave Archibald: Yeah. We're doing a quotation from the - from the original document and that's what the original documents says incorrectly.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Okay. My apologies.

Dave Archibald: No. No problem Olga. In fact one of my comments that I made when I sent out the draft was I wonder whether we should cut down Table 2 and perhaps just have one reference to the intercoordination policy two document. I think the rest is useful for us because I take the point that I think Rob said, it might be useful to look at the rest when we're having further debate. But I wonder whether it is unnecessarily long for this particular report and I'd be grateful for your...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. I certainly support the cutting down of the table. I think, you know, the less references that are not adding to the debate the better.

Dave Archibald: Okay. Anybody else?

Olga Cavalli: Dave this is Olga.

Dave Archibald: Yeah?

Olga Cavalli: Perhaps we could add it as a footnote with a link or something like that. Maybe Rob could construct something and not include it in the main text but have it if we need to read it for our work.

Dave Archibald: Yeah. Yeah. Indeed. How do you feel about that, Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah that's a great idea. In fact I think if I'm looking at it correctly on my screen we have the link on the heading there, and so that might work and then we would just have the initial entry with the recognition that it needs to be edited further by the drafters.

((Crosstalk))

Dave Archibald: Yeah. Bart, you may comment.

Bart Boswinkel: No, it's fine I think. And then maybe going back to your original point with the - say the - where you quoted from the original text, just to avoid any confusion just include say, a note somewhere that - say "The quote, description I've used is a direct quote so whatever mistakes are there it's from the original drafters."

Dave Archibald: Yeah. Yeah. We did actually specify that in Table 1 but didn't actually repeat the comments in Table 2, I think. We put it in Table 1...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Or do it just at the start of - as a general introduction note so you don't have to repeat it all over again because I think if you look at Table 1 - Table 2 as well it's all "description of views" and that's from the original document.

Dave Archibald: Yeah. It is, yeah.

Bart Boswinkel: And that's from the original document.

Dave Archibald: Okay. That sounds good. Who haven't we - that's all I've got on the amendment apart from corrections to a couple of typos. Fahd, a lot of that came from you. Have you got any other comments?

Fahd Batayneh: No I think the draft is quite good. Straight up to the point.

Dave Archibald: Good.

Olga Cavalli: Dave?

Dave Archibald: Yeah?

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga.

Dave Archibald: Yes?

Olga Cavalli: I have a comment. The GNSO as you may know - it's under restructuring, it's under restructuring process and there is a document that it's proposing some changes to the ICANN bylaws in regards to the GNSO confirmation. It's still a document that's not defined and it's - maybe Rob could help me with this.

We had a conference call a few days ago so it's still under reconstruction. But I just sent to you a brief reference that it makes about geographic regions. I am not sure if we are able to consider that. If it's relevant or not. What do you think, Robert? I also copied to you. It's Article 10 when it says about the generic name - the GNSO confirmation and it talks about - there is a very small reference about geographic regions.

It says, "Stakeholder groups should, in their charter, ensure their representation on the GNSO council in as diverse as possible and practicable, including consideration of geographic - geography, GNSO Constituency, sector, ability and gender."

That's all the reference that we have in this document about geographic diversity or regions or whatever. Is it worth to consider or not? Perhaps Rob could help me in thinking about this and what to do.

Dave Archibald: Olga. Sorry. Can I butt in and make my comment, Rob?

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Dave Archibald: I did have a look at that when I was doing the latest review and you will see that - you will remember that at the end of Table 1 I had added in the draft of the various state or the group charters...

Olga Cavalli: Yes but this is amendments of the bylaws.

Dave Archibald: I appreciate that. My view of this one was that it didn't actually reference the geographic regions.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Dave Archibald: It talked about considerations of geography and it was an instruction to the
                  stakeholder groups. Within the stakeholder groups then - we've picked up the
                  more definite references which I think are a response to that instruction. Now
                  that's my view but it's only one view. So Rob perhaps you could comment.

Rob Hoggarth: I think - this is Rob. Dave I think that's a good point. The bylaw amendments,
                  Olga, that you're referencing do talk about sort of the implementation I guess
                  or the potential implementation to the extent that you felt strongly that you
                  wanted to incorporate that dialogue into the paper.

                  And consider this, Dave, it might be something to note in the issues section
                  potentially from an implementation perspective. That - my hesitation is
                  somewhat driven by the fact that while this is being discussed still in the
                  GNSO it's not, you know, been approved yet by the Board and so that's why
                  I'm struggling a little bit with this as well. It does reflect the views of the
                  council as it voted but, Olga, as you know, the council is still discussing how
                  to report that vote.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Because it wasn't supported by all of the constituency. So I think it should -
                  there should be some reference.

Dave Archibald: I understand your hesitation but can I be more specific? The way it is written
                  at the moment just talks about considerations of geography. It doesn't say,
                  "In-line with ICANN's geographic regions." So my point here is, let's say we
                  decided there were going to be 12 regions instead of five.

                  The fact that we had changed it from five regions to 12 isn't going to be
                  impacted by this statement nor is this - you know, they're talking about

geography in here. It doesn't say geographic regions. You're trying - in the charter's they talk about regions. This statement doesn't.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Just wanted to have this in mind because I have been trying to find new references for geographic regions in all the GNSO process and this is the only thing that I felt could be related.

Dave Archibald: The only one. I think it's very evaluative to bring it up. I don't think we need to put it in and that might solve your dilemma about the statement anyway.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Great. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Dave this is Rob.

Dave Archibald: Other views on that please. Yeah.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes. This is Rob with a follow-up comment. You're notes on that may inspire you, Olga, to either raise the issue back within the GNSO. If only because I wonder if from a drafting perspective the folks who suggested - discussed this particular item really meant consideration of geographic regions, or whether for purposes of compromise they just edited those lines to say geography instead. So that might be a drafting issue within the GNSO that we'll need to look at a little bit more closely.

Olga Cavalli: Rob if I may I'm not sure if you were in all the telephone calls of this document. I proposed to arrange a draft, a small drafting team about - specifically about geographic regions but it turned out to be a text that didn't get in the whole document.

Finally the GNSO didn't put in. It talks specifically about geographic diversity and regions and all that. But I will bring the issue again.

Rob Hoggarth: Well that's a very good - and this is Rob again - that's a very good point Olga and in view of that then perhaps that does lend much more credence to the Chair's remarks to leave it out. Thanks for reminding me of that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Dave Archibald: This is Dave. Just to perhaps close off of that. My thoughts here with the lists in Table 1 is that these are there so that we don't miss out on a possible consequence of doing something to - if you like the definition of geographical regions. In this case with the present wording I don't think any changes that we might do to geographic regions would impinge upon that statement as it's written.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Dave Archibald: Okay. Who haven't we spoken to? Who's been silent in the background? Anybody not express their view?

                  Well, where do we think we are then? We can do one more quick draft out to the group once I've included - corrected these small typos and we've readjusted - adjusted Table 2 and then we're good to go to public consultation? Is that what I'm hearing?

Carlton Samuels: This is Carlton. I can't think of anything else that should be covered in the tables. I really can't think of anything

Dave Archibald: You'd be good to - if it just went to Table 2 you'd be good to go?

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Dave Archibald: Olga.

Olga Cavalli: That's fine for me. With all the - these two comments. Yeah.

Dave Archibald: Yeah. Good. Fahd?

Fahd Batayneh: Yeah it looks good to me.

Dave Archibald: Okay and Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. Yes. Absolutely. Yes. But I do want to - I definitely support those small editorial changes that Fahd has suggested which we (unintelligible) that concept is...

Dave Archibald: Okay. Good. Has anybody got anything else? Or are we going to save (unintelligible) money...

Bart Boswinkel: Just one thing I haven't seen - this is more a question to the group. Is the group aware of the timelines of say, posting the duration of the public comments and taking into consideration and trying to produce, say, the next phase prior to the Seoul meeting in order to catch up? (Unintelligible) the process itself. So more the schedule of the process.

Dave Archibald: The supposed closure date was second of August. That clearly isn't going to be - I'm sorry I'm looking at the time schedule that is on the wiki which is probably not the best one to be looking at.

Bart Boswinkel: No.

Dave Archibald: Rob can I revert to you?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir. If you recall the publication schedule that you guys agreed to in Sidney that I published after that meeting, your expectation and hope was that we would have this posted, I believe, by the 20th, 21st of this month. That would allow you to be done with public comment toward the third week

of August which would still give you time for drafting I think four, five or six weeks, and then posting prior to the Seoul meeting of the interim report.

So I think we're still on schedule as far as that is concerned. The only other aspect of the publication schedule that I would like to confirm with the group today is, is that you agreed that once we reached this stage - which was not final approval understanding that you still perhaps wanted to do one last round of review on the document - was that I would proceed with requesting the translation of the document at this stage where you were near final version, so that we could get the translators going on this with the intent of publishing the draft altogether, in other words, all six U.N. language versions at once.

So if you guys are comfortable with that, that's how I will proceed. I will request translation of this document of the translators and then if you go ahead and recirculate a final draft. Particularly giving Zahid and Janis, (Paul), and Adil a final opportunity to review and comment on the document we should be in pretty good shape for getting this posted next week.

I don't think - you know my concern would be with the length of some of the tables it might take a little bit longer. So I'll move with utmost dispatch to get the translators rolling on this.

Dave Archibald: Right. But if you can put a note on it that perhaps they leave Table 2 to last as that's the one that we're likely to change the most and I hate for them to have to translate all that and we only put in a reference.

Rob Hoggarth: Excellent point.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah and maybe - and given the schedule that's why I asked what you might want to include as a reference in the document itself to the closure of the public comments.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah. If I look at the final charter in Annex A we indicated that the expectation public comment on initial report commence in July, close in August, with a minimal duration of 35 days.

Dave Archibald: Yeah.

Rob Hoggarth: I don't know if that addresses, Bart, your...

Bart Boswinkel: It's just if you look at the executive summary these are the four questions. What you want - probably want to insert in the document itself is, "please submit your comments by the end of" or "public comments will close at, a specific date.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah. The only challenge there - this is Rob again - is that we won't know just - and this is unfortunately not completely in our control - how quickly the translators will finish.

                  Because once we get the final approval from the working group members I will advise the translation team, our managers within ICANN staff, to provide a red lined version, if you will, to the translators. And then it's just a matter of when they - when we get that final bit of feedback and my understanding is, you know, some languages we get back much more quickly than others.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: And so we know have that precise date until we get them all in. So that would be my only hesitation about trying to put a specific date. We could perhaps leave a placeholder for the link to the public comment forum to this charter.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Rob Hoggarth: And that may be the way to do it. Then at the end we can just ask our Web admin team to insert the appropriate link in the document and that would give readers the appropriate notice.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Yeah. That's good. Now - but then you've got it closed so submitting or publishing it for public comment - because now it is a request for public comment but it doesn't know, doesn't show you where to comment if you don't have the document in front of you.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes that's correct. Dave I can provide some suggested language on that in the appropriate spot.

Dave Archibald: Okay. I'd be grateful.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. And maybe include - that's just, again this is just a suggestion as well, say, include something about the working group progress, say what is the next step.

Dave Archibald: Yeah again, we can do - I don't have a problem with that. I didn't bother, if you like, because we had got the charter on the end which sort of...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Okay then it's fine. Yeah, you're right. So don't put too much process language in it.

Rob Hoggarth: And this is Rob as well. Dave what I will endeavor to work with you on is most - well all of the policy team public comment forums that go up are accompanied by an announcement document that gets posted on the main ICANN Web page.

And we can put a lot of that information in that announcement that I'll coordinate with you and that we can share with the team and with the working group members more as a heads-up as opposed to having everybody

wordsmith the announcement. But we can incorporate all of Bart's thoughts additionally in that document.

Dave Archibald: Okay. Sounds good. Well my time scale is on this then. I think we should try and - I will try and tidy up as much as I can of this draft and perhaps work with you, Rob, on Table 2. Get that back out to the group certainly no later than Friday? This is Wednesday.

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob. You're setting your own - you're generally setting your own deadline so I'm sure the group would be approving of whatever deadline you set for yourself.

Dave Archibald: Okay. So I will try and get everything out to the group for final approval by Friday at the latest. So if you can come back as quickly as you can we can then proceed to getting it out for public consultation on time and that would be good.

Rob Hoggarth: Great and I will request the translations today of the present document and then we can provide any final red line version to the translators when you get final proofing and substantive comments from the group whether that's Monday or Tuesday of next week or a little bit later.

Dave Archibald: Okay. Thank you very much. In that case I think we can call it a - I can say good morning, you can say good evening or whatever.

Man: Yeah.

Dave Archibald: Thank you all and I look forward to our next call.

Man: Okay.

Dave Archibald: Which we're not arranging at this time.

Man: Have nice day.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Bye.

Man: See you everybody. Bye.

END