

**Policy & Implementation Drafting Team Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION**

Monday 10 June 2013 at 1900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Monday 10 June 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-20130610-en.mp3>

On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#jun>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

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

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, Michael. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening; this is the first meeting of the policy and implementation drafting team on the 10th of June, 2013.

On the call today, we have Eric Brenner Williams, Eduardo Diaz, Mikey O'Conner, Holly Raiche, Avri Doria, Chuck Gomes, Wolf Knobon, Edward Morris and Greg Shatan. We have apologies from Jill Titzer and Brian Winterfeldt, from staff we have Marika Konings and Julia Charvolen, Berry Cobb, Lars Hoffman, 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.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much there, Nathalie. My line has a bit of an echo. Nathalie, is my line causing that?

Nathalie Peregrine: I'll find out for you, Marika.

Marika Konings: Okay. I hope everyone can hear me okay. So my name is Marika Konings. I'm a senior policy director, supporting the GNSO and until we get 4.4, I'll be your chair for today, unless someone objects.

First of all, we'd like to welcome you and thank you for volunteering for this effort which is the policy and implementation drafting team which has been tasked by the GNSO council to develop a charter for a working group on this topic.

So our first (INAUDIBLE) is the role call and statements of interest. I'm quite pleased to report that everyone has completed their statements of interest and these can be found on our Wiki. I don't know if anyone has any updates you would like to make at this stage to their statements of interest. I'm actually assuming that most of them will be up to date as they were recently completed.

I'll just pause a second here.

So everyone's statement of interest is up to date and let me go to item two which is introductions. As part of the working group guidelines, all working groups and drafting team members are encouraged to provide a little introduction about themselves, giving everyone an opportunity to get to know each other a little bit better and maybe share any specific interests or skills or experience you have with regards to this topic that may be of interest for us to learned about.

So, in doing so, I would suggest that we maybe go through the list of names that we currently have on the screen and give everyone a chance to just say a couple of minutes or one minute- who you are and what your affiliation is and your interest in this group.

So the first one I have on the list is Carlos. I think Carlos has just joined. Carlos are you on?

I'm not hearing Carlos yet, so may we then go first to Eric and then we come back to Carlos when he's connected. Eric, are you on?

I can hear you now. Was that Eric talking? If people have problems unmuting themselves, maybe they can type into chat if that's the case. Eric, we can't hear you.

Mikey says he can hear Eric, but I don't hear anything.

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. I can't hear anything either.

Marika Konings: I think there may be a disconnect with the bridge the adobe connect. Nathalie, can you please check?

Operator: I do apologize, it appears that Edward Morris had disconnected.

Marika Konings: But we cannot hear the adobe connect bridge. Apparently people are speaking there and I cannot hear them.

Nathalie Peregrine: Michael, please make sure that the connect link is un-muted.

E Brenner Williams: This is Eric again, who can hear who?

Marika Konings: Yes, I can hear now someone speaking. Is this Eric?

E Brenner Williams: That would be Eric. Yes it is. I'm still talking to myself. I keep talking, if I had a phonebook I could read that.

Marika Konings: I can hear you now, Eric. I do hear an echo. Other people can maybe mute your phone.

E Brenner Williams: I hear an echo also and it's remote to me.

Marika Konings: Okay Eric, I think we can hear you well now, so go ahead.

E Brenner Williams: So now I can introduce myself. I'm Eric Brenner Williams and I really don't have anything to say, but I've been happy to debug the sound part of today's meeting. And now I'll mute and let the next person.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, Eric. Next I have Jordan on the list. I think Jordan just joined as well. You're just probably catching on, we're just-- everyone is giving a little intro about who they are and what their affiliation is and their interest in this effort.

Jordyn Buchanan: Sure. Hi. I hope everyone can hear me. I'm also using the adobe connect bridge. My name is Jordyn Buchanan. I currently work for Google and in particular, I am focused on the Charlton Registry which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Google, focuses on our new top-level domain program that is currently Applicant for '98 new top level domain.

My interest in this largely relates-- is much more theoretical and I've been following the policy's implementations (INAUDIBLE) for awhile, with a degree of frustration, I will call it. And I formerly served on both the GNSO council and as the chair of the WHOIS in the WHOIS task forces and mostly just sort of theoretically interested in making sure that we get a reliable and consistent transition from the policy making process to the registry process. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, Jordan. We also have David Cake and Javidor Fala, but I don't think neither of them are on the call. The next one I see that's on the list and also on the call is Eduardo Diaz.

Eduardo Diaz: Hello, this is Eduardo Diaz. Hello to everybody. I have been involved with the ICANN work since 2007 in various roles. I've worked in the non-com and some working groups within the North American RALO and now that I'm a member of the ALAC representing RALO.

This is my first time in a social working group and my main interest is understanding this issue of implementation and policy which is very interesting. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Eduardo. Next I have Avery.

Avery Doria: Hi, I'm Avery Doria. I'm participating from the NCSG and my interest in this issue is that it is one of the primary issues that plagues ICANN at the moment. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Avery. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. Chuck Gomes with Verisign and coming from the registry stakeholder group; I've been involved with GNSO and ICANN since their inception, quite a few different working groups, and look forward to working with you all. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Chuck. Wolf-Ulrich?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. Hello, my name is Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. I'm the GNSO council and the CIPCP constituency and my interest is generic, let me say it; because I am counselor and from the GNSO council there was this item policy implementation heavily discussed already so I wonder-- I'm a little bit wondering why we don't have more counselors at the time being here in this group. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thanks (inaudible); and next I have Cheryl on the list.

Speaker: Cheryl is not dialed in yet, but she assumes that most of us have met or worked with her- her own policy matters, and if not will catch up and my interest echoes- all of this regarding this matter of policy and implementation and I'm active in a few parts of ICANN- she said.

Marika Konings: Next I have on the list Edward Morris.

Edward Morris: Yes, Hi Marika. I'm Ed Morris. I'm coming in from the NCSG. Like Eduardo, this is my first working group and I actually got into this issue by holding the panel on the NCSG reconsideration launch in which most of you know about and to me, if we don't get this right, we might as well fold up the tent and go home. Because- for ICANN to have legitimacy, you really need to cement the multi-stakeholder process and the bottom-up approach at all levels. So I look forward to working with everybody to make sure that happens.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Edward. It means no pressure on us. I see it. Next we have Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Hi, all. This is Mikey O'Connor. I am also a member of the ISPCP, along with Wolf-Ulrich and I'm not as much of an old-timer as Chuck, but I've been awhile, and participated in a lot of working groups and like many of you, I'm really interested in making sure we get this right. I think this is a really important issue and look forward to working on it with you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Mikey. Next we have Holly.

Holly Raiche: Hi. Can you hear me?

Marika Konings: Yes, we can.

Holly Raiche: Okay. Holly Raiche. I'm chair of APRALO. I'm also a member of ALAC. This is not my first working group. Hi, Mikey. But in my real life in teaching law and doing a whole bunch of other things, policy and regulatory are very much my specialty so I'm very interested in this area. Thanks very much.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Holly. Next on my list I have Tim Ruiz.

Tim Ruiz: Thanks. Tim Ruiz with goDaddy.com and also the registrar's constituency and so my interest is from a registrar's perspective. And as everyone has noted, this question of policy versus implementation is a really important issue and so having a really good charter to kick that

work off I think is very important and that's why I wanted to be on the team.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Tim. Next I have Gregory Shatton.

Gregory Shatan: Hi. This is Greg Shatton from the IPC. I've participated in a couple of working groups previously with a number of you and also a recent drafting team and charter preparation exercise for the IGO/INGO working group, so I understand the importance of getting charter right for this important working group. I look forward to working with all of you. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Greg. Jill Tipster sends her apologies for today's call and I don't think Brian Winters nor Gem Wolfe are on so maybe we can just briefly go back to Carlos and apology Carlos if you were speaking at the beginning and we didn't hear you. But please go ahead if you're on.

Carlos: Okay, Marika. Hi, how are all-- I am trying to learn this interesting thing. I am in the issue. For me in order to join this drafting team, I was an ALAC member for four years, GNSO for two years. I tried to learn in the (INAUDIBLE). Maybe I can give some comments in some opportunity. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, Carlos. And I think that covers all members that are on the call today. In my notes from this meeting, I'll definitely encourage those that we're on today to as well send a little introduction to the list for others in case they would like to do so.

So now moving on to the next item on the agenda with is principles of transparency and openness and this is basically just a reminder, as it is required by the GNSO working group guidelines that all GNSO working groups and drafting teams are open for anyone to participate in, as long as they submit a statement of interest and make sure that they keep it up to date.

In addition, all meeting lists are publicly archived and all calls are recorded and transcribed unless decided differently by the working group or drafting team itself. So I think that just covers item three. I don't know if there are any questions about that.

If not, moving on to item four, the election of drafting team leaders; as noted here, normally a chair is selected at the first meeting of a drafting team or a working group. And a drafting team may select to have co-chairs or vice-chairs as they prefer. I haven't seen any statements of interest to take on this role on the list. I've seen I think Mikey and Chuck both indicated that they would welcome a newcomer maybe taking on this role as a learning opportunity, but that they stand ready to support and provide advice if needed.

So I think I would just like to open the floor and see if there is anyone interested to take on that challenge.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolute silence.

Marika Konings: Mikey? Sorry, was someone speaking?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl. Just saying absolute silence, but Mikey jumped in-- thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, Cheryl was doing the- don't everybody talk at once trick.

Marika Konings: Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I think I just want to say and words on the call, what I think Chuck and I were both saying on the list which is-- and I sort of want to recount my own experience. But the way I got sort of started in working groups was chairing a drafting team and getting an awful lot of help from people who are on this call; folks like Kim and Chuck and others. And I thought Chuck really had a great idea and I just wanted to sort of amplify it. This is the sort of work that sort of does itself. The people on the call are going to be very engaged and it's not like you're going to-- as chair of this team, it's not a very long process and it's going to move along I think really well. And so I just sort of wanted to expand on my terse little yeah-like Chuck said in the list; and encourage somebody who maybe is thinking that they'd like to try this out but don't really want to take on the full long chair of a working group yet.

So I'm sort of saying- please do consider it and I don't think Chuck and I are the only ones who will help. I think there are an awful lot of people on this call who will lend a hand and if you get into sort of a puzzler- will certainly help you get out of it. That's all.

Marika Konings: Yes, and this Marika-- just to emphasize as well that staff is also here to support whoever wants to take that role and then we typically help chairs in preparing the agendas and chatting in the background to make sure that we keep track of action items and help reduce the workload for chairs as such.

Holly? Please go ahead.

Holly Raiche: I'll un-mute myself. It might help if you-- or might somebody like Mikey who's been chair of a lot of groups; what kind of time are we talking about to commit to doing this and what kind of help do we get so that before we say yes, we think okay, I can do it. I have the time, or I don't. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Mikey, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: I see Chuck in the queue. Why don't we let Chuck talk first? I always feel like I talk too much on these calls. I'll drop back in the back.

Marika Konings: Okay, Chuck, please go ahead. Chuck, you may be on mute or at least I can't hear you.

Chuck Gomes: I am thank you. I just fixed that, sorry. First of all, if you've looked at any of the materials that Marika distributed, a lot of the foundation for developing a charter is already set in place. So staff and the GNSO as a

whole have already-- the basic framework of a charter is there. Most of the procedural guidelines, maybe all of them, are already established in GNSO procedures. What we really have to do as a drafting team is identify what issues we want the drafting team to work on and produce a charter based on that.

Now that also, there's also some good work that's already been done on that because the staff paper on the implementation-- policy versus implementation, contains a nice list of questions that feed right into the charter; so what we really need here-- it's not a huge effort. It's someone who will coordinate the team in what should only I think take a few weeks, maybe a month, depending on how frequently we meet, to refine a charter. A lot of our work, I think, will be done online and then we can confirm it in some telephone conferences like we're having now.

So again, I think we're talking about maybe a month at the most, unless we meet only once a month. And the foundation is already there, even a lot of key questions are already there; we just have to add a little bit to that and it should not-- I think an important point; it should not be controversial in developing a charter. It's not our task to talk about the issues, but rather define the issues that the working group should discuss thoroughly and get input on. And I'll stop there.

Marika Konings:

Thanks, Chuck. And to echo Chuck's words, I think that's exactly right. For those of you that had a chance to look at the charter template and that's something we'll get to under item five; you'll see that most of the areas are already predefined or can be filled with relatively standup language that also has been used for other efforts. I think the key questions are already in the first two sections which are like the mission and the objectives which indeed need to spell out which are the questions the working group will need to address. And as I said, the call for volunteers already identified a number of those and Chuck already mentioned that the staff paper also identified others.

So I think the real effort is indeed about the draft and trying to identify and making sure as well that the scope is focused enough for a working group to be able to address those questions. And as I said, it all depends on how often the draft team wants to meet. Typically, groups meet once a week. I think in this case, you may want to have a look at the different council meetings that are upcoming, so you may want to set yourself as a target the publication deadline for that-- so you have a focal point to go for and have your work determined by that deadline.

Mikey, please go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor:

Hi all. This is Mikey, again. A lot of the stuff I was going to say has been covered, but just to pick up some stuff from the chat Cheryl mentioned that I think one to two and a half times the meeting times was a good testament for what chairs usually put in and I think that's about right. Chuck is right. This is pretty short. And I think the other thing that Aubrey brought up is that often the drafting team chair is persuaded to become the working group chair. But I think this working group-- we might have

one drafting team chair, but maybe some co-chairs on the working group. You know, I wouldn't feel like signing up to be the drafting team chair would be any kind of commitment beyond that, if you enjoyed it and wanted to carry on, I'm sure that that would work out fine. But if you'd like to step back, that's also going to be an option as well.

So-- and Chuck is right, too; that as a chair, it's not like you have to write this. The staff is amazing on support here. This is more of a conducting the band, rather than playing all the instruments kind of job.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Mikey. Holly?

Holly Raiche: All right, I'll put my hand up, but you've all got to live with the fact that you're going to have to adjust to Australian time and it's not going to be any earlier than five in the morning. That would be my one condition.

Cheryl: Which is this time now for us; Holly, you should make it clear. I realize we are working on the other side of the known universe.

Holly Raiche: We haven't fallen off, but we're working on it.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Holly. Because I think when we set up this call, that they view was to have it as a weekly standing call and we did ask people to indicate whether this would work, so hopefully that will accommodate your request.

Holly Rice: Thank you.

Holly Rice: I guess everybody else is happy with the time. As long as Mikey finishes his nap early, I'm happy.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm here. Don't worry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Mikey never naps. He can fit them in during a meeting if need be. Don't worry about it.

Marika Konings: So Holly, thank you very much for volunteering. Are there any other people that would like to put themselves forward as tentative for the chair role?

Are there any objections to Holly-?

Who was speaking?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It was Cheryl saying- God, no. Just go with what we've got.

Marika Konings: Okay. For the record, we will put it out on the mailing list as well to give everyone an opportunity that wasn't on the call today to express their views or state any objections they may have so, I think we can have a formal confirmation at the next meeting, if that's okay for everyone.

I don't know Holly, if you want to dive straight in and take it over from here- or if you would prefer me to run through the items for this meeting and take over the helm at the next one?

Holly Raiche: I think I'll let you finish this particular meeting and after this meeting, I'll take over. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Okay. Thank you, Holly. If there are no further comments or questions on this particular item, I think we'll move over to item number five which is- the items for review. So I hope you all had an opportunity to look at the background materials I sent you and the recommended readings. I think several of you have already been involved in some of the past efforts that have taken place around this topic.

So first of all, I would like to start off by emphasizing and several of you did point to some of the current ongoing discussions that this effort is not intended to address any of those. This is really-- the intent is to have a forward-looking approach, looking at certain questions in view of developing certain proposals for processes or procedures that may address similar discussions or issues in the future.

So I think I would really like to make sure that that's clear- that's it's not expected that anything that would come out of here will directly affect some of the items that are currently being discussed or disputed within the community.

Secondly, I also want to make it clear that what you see here in the call for volunteers and as well the discussion that we had at the GNSO council level and the GNSO as a whole, I think it's quite clear that the GNSO has identified a number of issues that are very specific to the GNSO or questions that they feel are very specific to the current GNSO processes and procedures.

Of course that doesn't take away that there are broader questions and broader issues that may need to be addressed. And of course this effort doesn't preclude at all any other groups, either developing issues themselves or of future cross-community working group taking off. I think that's all within the broader discussion and that would not be precluded by this effort.

But the objective of this effort is really looking at some of the questions that are specific to the GNSO council and I think as well if you look at those four questions, the idea will be as well that potential recommendations would actually result in changes to either the GNSO operating procedures or sections of the ICANN bylaws that relate to the GNSO; at least that's how I understand how the GNSO council has framed it and what the focus is; again, noting that this does not preclude any other efforts from looking at similar or broader questions, but currently that's not the focus of this specific drafting team.

So just to reiterate; the questions that were pointed out in the call for volunteers itself, are noting that the council expects that the subsequent

working group would provide recommendations on the following. Number one, a set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy and implementation related discussions.

Number two, recommendations on a process for providing GNSO policy guidance; and I think this relates to as you know, there is by defined process for developing policy which is the PDP- the policy development process. But currently the GNSO doesn't have any other mechanisms to provide advice if it relates to issues that are not subject to consensus policy. So the only formal mechanism the GNSO currently has is going to be PDP, which as many of you know, can be a lengthy process and has very firm steps and procedures within itself.

So the question is- should there be a more flexible process that would qualify for those questions that are not subject to consensus policies? And why the GNSO is asked for input or would like to provide input to the Board.

The third question is a framework for implementation-related discussions related to GNSO policy recommendations. And four, further guidance on how GNSO implementation review teams are expected to function and operate. As several of you will know, the concept of a GNSO implementation review team is captured in the PDP manual, and some guidance there is provided on what the role or function of such a review team should be. But there is very little additional information on how such a group should operate or how the interaction should take place with staff or at which point in time, for example, public comment would need to be carried out or if there is any reporting back to the GNSO council on the status of their work.

So the question there is- should there be further guidance included that would help guide that part of the work?

So I think that's it from the perspective of the call for volunteers. We'll then move to the actual template. I hope many of you had the chance to look at the GNSO working group guidelines which are actually in section six; outlined which are the required elements of a charter, which you can also see in the template.

Holly, I see you have your hand up. Is it still from before or do you have a question or comment now? Her hand went down; it was from before.

So what you see on the screen is the working group charter template. I said this was developed on the basis of the working group guidelines that basically dictate what elements a charter should contain. And as you note, some of the information is already pre-populated.

So the first part just talks about the working group identification- so noting when the group formed, which resolution was the basis for that and if it's already known the working group chair and some of this information is filled in after the date, when of course your information is not known yet at the time of the submission of the charter.

And then section two; I said I think that's really the heart of the charter and where I presume there will be most of the discussion will evolve around; which is the mission purpose and deliverables.

So the first part talks about mission and scope- so here like a (INAUDIBLE) mission statement is characterized by specificity, breadth and measurability. It's also as well about the objective and goals and sometimes it may also include deliverables and the expected timeframe in which it is expected to be delivered.

In section-- other sections I think are more performance sections and as said, I think some of that information is already prefilled in and some of it I could take one of the recent charters that has been adopted and we can maybe use that as a basis for this charter because it talks about membership criteria, the group formation, dependencies and resolutions, working group roles, functions and duties; noting that statements of interest are required, the role of policy staff.

Section four talks about the rules of engagement; again, this is predetermined by GNSO working group guidelines, unless the drafting team would decide to deviate from that. But if so, it would need to request permission from the GNSO council to do so, as it's preset. And there's a section which basically lists that the charter document history, which is usually-- which is only used typically when there are changes made to the charter over the course of a working group's life.

So I think if you move further down in the document, you'll see all the different templates and sections. If the group thinks it's helpful, I'm happy to share some of the recent working group charters that have been adopted. That may give you an idea on how some of the missions and scopes and objectives and deliverables have been framed.

It may be worth pointing out that I think most of the recent ones are actually PDP working groups. So they may have certain elements in there that are really specific to those groups, but I think that still may give you a good idea of how it's typically done and what the appropriate level of detail can be considered.

And I see several people commenting in chat. That will be helpful, so I'll definitely do so. Chuck? Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes:

Thanks, Marika. I'm going to throw something out and if people object to it, please feel free to object. But rather than us spending time reviewing several charters and picking from them, I personally would be very comfortable if you Marika and your team would just create, based on the template, a draft charter on all of the fairly generic elements of it and making some decisions in terms of where things are applicable to this charter and not; and then we can start from that and make changes rather than us spending time as a drafting team, comparing different charters and picking and choosing. We can still do that, but I think we would be able to get right down to the meaty part of our work much quicker if staff

was willing to create a draft charter that we can then build on from that point.

And I'm talking again about the fairly generic parts of the charter. If that could be ready before our first call next week, then we could-- or our second call I guess; we could then refine any of that and really get down to the important part of our work. So if anybody objects to that, please speak up, but that would be my leaning.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Chuck.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I see Mikey in the list, so if you can put me in after Mikey, please.

Marika Konings: Will do. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Hi, this is Mikey. I just want to second what Chuck says- and sort of aim this a bit at Holly, too. And that is that way down at the bottom of this document where there's that-- I think it's on page one of the actual form-- there's really only two boxes in this form that we really need to work hard on filling in; it's the mission and scope and the objectives and goals. If we can sort of narrow down on those and I'd even be willing to see if staff could sort of hack out a first draft of those two boxes for us to edit on. I think we could move pretty quickly then.

I think that all too often we sort of get bogged down in the pro forma stuff and we're exhausted by the time we get to the really meaty discussion. And clearly, those are the two that we'll really want to refine and I think the other thing that will be interesting is how much really disagreement there is amongst this group when it comes down to it. I think we're all pretty much on the same page. So it would be interesting to see if we could really quickly get to even a draft of those two things.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Mikey. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks very much, Marika and of course with the wonderful lag from Australia, my hand goes up after I've interrupted. I do apologize for that. Look, I want to echo what the gentlepeople before me have said, what we can probably do is put in sort of a best of breed set of text here, but clearly recognize two things.

First of all, it is then of course up to each of the drafting members to have looked at some of the alternate texts that Marika will be distributing or putting links up for or whatever, and get comfortable; particularly if they haven't been in a drafting team before. As to the fact that it is this group that is developing the charter and that it is clearly therefore when others look into our work, not a staff-led effort, because that in itself causes problems if that is how people perceive it. And obviously we all know it's not the case, but it's important that justice is done as well as it's being seen to be done and so you need to all remember that there is a very good reason for how the-- development of a charter and the work group process is designed. It might seem in some cases a bit detailed and arcane but there is method in the madness, which I'm sure everyone will

agree with me on one thing- it's we're all part of the madness to put the rules together.

And the other thing I just wanted to mention too is we also need to remind everybody at this point, the difference between the charter being drafted and the group actually following us which is the work group activities; and just as long as we don't get tempted to get bogged down into the weeds, and look at this template as your guideline, we should be able to get this down in a timely and efficient manner. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Cheryl. Holly?

Holly Raiche: The one comment I would make is there were plenty of comments that were made before this meeting. I'd like to see some of those issues in there anyway and I do think it's fair enough to give people an opportunity between now and the next meeting to at least put in a sentence or two or three of what they perceive as the charter should be so that we're not actually having you just draft what you think. I would very much support what Cheryl says- which is this is our working group. There have been, as I said, some inputs. I noticed that we don't have anything from ALAC. I will correct that. But we do have stuff from the business community and we do have stuff from the NCSG. We do have stuff from other people. I would hope that all of that winds up somehow in the mission and scope and the objectives. And again, just give people a week to say anything else that didn't say during the comment period so that can be reflected in the really critical bits which is the mission and scope and the objectives. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Holly. And I put myself in the queue just to note that there was also a session in Beijing where several groups participated including the ALAC and I actually took some notes from that session. The recording and the transcript is also available, but I'm happy to share the notes of that session if people would like. Just take into account that it's my personal notes that I've taken with my hat on as looking at this issue. So that may be as a helpful background to that.

And just to note, from a staff perspective, no problem at all in providing a draft on boxes three, four-- well four is already completed or partly completed; and then the last one. I don't know if it will be helpful as well, based on the call for volunteers, if we already put some language in the mission, scope, objectives, goals and deliverables and timeframes just so you have something to work from; or whether you prefer to leave that for now and first look at the materials that are out there and start maybe drafting or discussing next week. It's really up to you to decide.

Holly, your hand is up-

Holly Raiche: Now my hand really is up. I think it does help people if there are a few words to start with and as you say, look at stuff in comments and so forth that would help; but I would hope that is anything is other than a starter; it's just that I find in writing or doing other stuff, if there are words there, they are so much easier to add to or to edit; but let's just see this as a

starter and invite people. If you can get that out in the next day or so, it will invite people to come forward with their own ideas and that would be really helpful. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Holly. And just to note, indeed, the idea would be-- I would probably just take what we have in the call for volunteers and use that as a basis as that's something that's already-- has been reviewed by the GNSO council and discussed; and indeed, working group or the drafting team can of course add or change as they please. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika and thanks, Holly; not only for volunteering, but for your comments. I want to be real clear. I wasn't suggesting that staff creates the missions or the objectives and goals or the deliverables and timeframes. It's okay to put some generic stuff in there if it is generic. It is this drafting team that will do all that and I think the suggestion that any of us that have things that we want to contribute to those sections and can do it before our call next week; that would be fine.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Chuck. And this is Marika. I can get something out probably in the course of tomorrow and as I said, I can keep the first part very general, based on what other charters have done. So that may then give a basis for others to provide further input and edits. I think Jordan has already suggested as well that he has some ideas and so I think we'll hopefully be off to a good start by having that basic information there and then the other sections, as said, will be based on what is in existing charters, because as you said this is really indeed the task of the drafting team to really make sure that the mission and scope and objectives and goals and deliverables and timeframes are as the drafting team feels that it should be.

Several of you have asked in the chat what the timing would or should be, and as I said before, this charter will need to be approved by the GNSO council before a working group can be formed. We have a meeting coming up this week, so that's too late to get it submitted for that. But the next meeting will take place in Durbin. The cutoff time for submission of documents and motions- because--well also we have I think a couple of council members in this group; we will also need to submit a motion adopting the charter- is the 7th of July. So I think that basically puts us a month away.

So again, it really depends on how quickly the working group can come to agreement on these first couple of items, whether we are able to make that deadline. You may want to decide whether you want to set it as a goal or not and maybe just to know that the next meeting after that is actually not until September. So from a timing perspective, it would be really timely if it would get done by July, assuming that the council would go ahead and is in the position to adopt a charter; it would mean that we could straight away take off the working group and we would not have to wait until a council meeting in September.

But as I said, this is flexible and there is no fixed deadline for that. So maybe we can just set that as a tentative deadline and just see how far

along we get this week and then on next week's call see whether or not we're able to make that deadline.

Just to note, I have tentatively requested a time in Durbin for the drafting team. This is just in case we don't make that deadline and the working group does see a need to meet or benefit from face-to-face time. I think that currently tends to be scheduled for Thursday morning from 7:30 to 9:00 as I know it's early and you don't really like these early meetings, but it's typically the only time that we can get working group members or drafting team members to a working group meeting because of other conflicts. But as I said, this is just a placeholder, should the drafting team come to conclusion before that, we can just cancel that meeting or if people feel it's not necessary even if we don't meet the deadline of the 7th of July. Cheryl?

Cheryl:

Hi, thanks Marika; Cheryl here. Look, I'd keep the placeholder for the Thursday morning in Durbin. But I would certainly aim for us to have documents in and for discussion by the 7th of the July. It might be close of business 7th of the July, but it should be 7th of July. It's essential in my view that this is going live by the Durbin meeting; that the Durbin meeting is actually an opportunity for the work group itself to start getting its initial legs to begin to take the charter and then move on. I would like to think that in that week between documents going in and Durbin sort of finishing, sorry two weeks there; that it could be planned that assuming the charter would be accepted, that a call for work group members would be going very shortly after Durbin, so work can start between the end of Durbin and that important August/September time isn't lost.

I think this is (INAUDIBLE) important getting some type of inflammatory topic to linger and it's really up to us as a drafting team to just- you know, if it takes two-hour calls instead of 90 minute calls, so be it. Commit yourselves for every one of the following days of the week at whatever time it is at the moment and let's just do it. Thank you.

Marika Konings:

Thanks, Cheryl. I think I should be pointing out as well that July 7th is a Sunday and July 4th is a holiday so we probably realistically need to get done by July the 3rd; which means we have three calls, unless of course we decide to schedule more. But as some people have suggested, hopefully we're able to do a lot of work in between calls and on the mailing list. As I said, I hope to be able to send you a first draft tomorrow so that it would almost give you a week to send suggestions and edits to the list prior to the next week's meeting and hopefully we can resolve a lot of issues through the mailing list. (INAUDIBLE) Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

The reason why I would ask staff to work on a public holiday, but I'd point out that of course that it's only an American public holiday. We have international staff and as Holly and I know, there are very few times in the last several years that our Australian national holiday hasn't been devoted to GNSO working groups, so I think you need to see if we can meet for four weeks. Thank you.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think I haven't seen many Belgian holidays recognized either, so I'm happy to work on the fourth of July-- just joking. So hopefully we'll get done before that date, though. But as I said, I think at the moment we're-- well for Mikey every day is a holiday. (INAUDIBLE)

Speaker: And he works every day nevertheless.

Marika Konings: So we're approaching the end of our hour and I think we covered item five. As I said, I'll circulate the notes from the session in Beijing. I did also post I think already the transcript and the recording of that session, as well as the staff paper and I think that was probably it--- and the link to the public comment form. Hopefully, everyone will have a chance to review that if you haven't done so yet.

I think with regards to work done; I think we've set ourselves as a deadline to have this done at the latest by the 7th of July, but we'll see how we progress.

With regards to item seven; I think we also discussed and hopefully agreed to continue on this schedule so we would have our next meeting at the same time, same day next week. I don't know if there is anything else people want to discuss.

Cheryl is suggesting that we book for 90 minutes, with a possible extension for 30 in the calendars. Does anyone have any objections to that? So we would run the call for 90 minutes? Most of the people are saying good idea-- and then we can always finish early as Cheryl says-- so okay, so we'll schedule the next meeting for 90 minutes and hopefully we'll be able to get a lot of work done between now and then.

So are there any other questions, issues or topics people want to raise before we finish a little bit early, even?

Well, thank you very much and (INAUDIBLE).

Holly Raiche: People are typing- let's keep.

Mikey O'Connor: They're all typing. Thank you. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We're all so thankful.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much Michael. You may now stop the recordings.

END