

**ICANN
Transcription
GNSO Drafting Team to Further Develop Guidelines and Principles for the
GNSO's Roles and Obligations as a Decisional Participant
in the Empowered Community
Wednesday, 30 January 2019 at 21:00 UTC**

Note: 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.

Adobe Connect recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p2ufy465s0s/>

Attendance of the call is posted on agenda wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/i5wWBq>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Operator: Recording has started. Speakers, you may now begin.

Terri Agnew: Great. Thank you. Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. Welcome to the GNSO Drafting Team call on Wednesday, the 30th of January, 2019. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge at this time, could you please let yourself be known now? All right, hearing no one.

I would like to remind all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I will turn it over to Julie Hedlund. You can begin, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks very much, Julie Bisland. And this is Julie Hedlund from staff. And welcome all of you and thank you very much for joining what, from this point on, we'll call the GNSO Drafting Team. It used to be called the Bylaws Drafting Team but we're not really drafting bylaws anymore. It now has the very unwieldy name of the GNSO Drafting Team to Further Develop

Guidelines and Principles for the GNSO's Roles and Obligations as a Decisional Participant in the Empowered Community. And I'm not going to read that out every time we have a call. So welcome to the Drafting Team.

And thank you all for your patience as we've gotten this started and made sure that we could get a good representation of folks from the stakeholder groups and constituencies. And we do really very much appreciate your commitment to this very important group.

So let me just read through the agenda and I will then ask if there's any other business that anyone would like to add. We'll start with roll call and introductions. Then we'll go to admin issues, chair selection, election, frequency of meetings, scheduling of meetings. Then overview of the scope of work, followed by the next steps, next meeting. And let me ask if anyone has anything they would like to add? I'm seeing some people who are typing. I'm not seeing any hands raised. "Nothing to add" says Heather, thank you, Heather.

Then let me go ahead and move to the first item of business. And we noted that we're not doing a roll call in the interest of time but we will have everybody's attendance captured. Let me ask with respect to introductions if there is anyone who has anything that they would like to say about themselves to introduce themselves? I think most of us know each other but let me just put that out there in case anybody has anything they'd like to say, not to put anyone on the spot.

I've got Steve DelBianco. Steve, please go ahead.

Steve DelBianco: Hey Julie. Hi, everyone. I wanted to note that as the setup for this drafting team indicates, it's kind of a follow up to that Bylaws Drafting Team that you mentioned earlier. And I just wanted to note that Wolf-Ulrich, Farzi, were on that team which was a fascinating exercise. And then Heather was Chair of Council when our team presented all of our findings for bylaws modifications

and some of the votes that went back and forth on that. So at least four of us plus staff are very experienced with the things we did last time and that may cause us to see this in a slightly different light and those of you that are new to this effort. And we'll try not to refer back with obscure references but rather try to explain it clearly.

The first question that occurred to me when this call came out was oh gosh, I thought we already did that work, right? So I had questions. I realized that you've laid out for us in this memo, you've laid out areas that need further clarifications, right? And the impression that I had was that Council has the power under its own remit and (policy) to do what it needs to do but I am on board if staff believes that we can add more clarity to it. So welcome all. Look forward to the project. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Steve. This is Julie from staff, and that was extremely helpful both as background and a reminder of the tremendous amount of work that many in this group had also achieved previously. And thank you, those of you who are adding in the chat as well. And I'll note too that for attendance purposes, Stephanie Perrin has also joined us. Thank you very much, Stephanie. Glad you could join.

So moving to Agenda Item 2, when we established the previous Bylaws Drafting Team, we did have someone who – Steve actually – DelBianco – who volunteered as chair. And so we'd like to ask if somebody would be interested in volunteering or nominating someone as a chair of this drafting team. It is a little bit easier if staff is not running the calls but is actually supporting a member of the group and it's also I think ideally better if staff is not running the group and instead – oh, Steve DelBianco, that's a really good idea. Why don't we do that? Why don't we discuss – I'm reading from the chat – Steve DelBianco's thoughts of discussing the scope of work before asking for a chair. Excellent idea.

Then why don't we do this, I'm going to switch Agenda Item 2 with Agenda Item 3 and because the frequency of meetings may also be an item that we might want to consider after we've talked about the scope of work. So I will do that right now and I see there's support for that idea as well.

All right, well let me start by going to just an overview first, which will give you some idea of the work. And then I'll proceed to the more detailed document, which we won't go through in all of its detail, it's really quite detailed, but we'll hit some highlights on that as well to give you a sense of the scope of the work.

So I have put the overview into the Adobe room and I've unsynced the document so you can move it yourself. You will have seen this because this is the information that was sent in the welcome message but there are a few points that staff would like to highlight and bring to your attention as we discuss what this group will do.

So as you know, there were – there was the drafting team that drafted changes to the bylaws as well as changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures. And those were adopted. There was a – they took – the GNSO Operating Procedures initial changes happened fairly quickly but they were tied to changes in the ICANN Bylaws which required a fairly lengthy process to achieve in that as part of the new empowered community rules the change – any changes to the bylaws have to be notified for a certain period of time for the empowered community to review.

That happened. They also had to go out for public comment. That happened. So it was not until this past – last year, May, that the bylaws were adopted after which then the GNSO Operating Procedures also had to be adjusted to link to the various bylaws changes. When that happened then staff produced the other document I'll show you here which is an analysis of templates as well as possible guidelines that the GNSO might need in order to – in order to act as a decisional participant in the empowered community.

So from May until December, there was a call for the GNSO Council to decide how to proceed, whether to do a drafting team or to form a otherwise some kind of group within the Council to work with staff on possible guidelines. And it was decided by the Council that instead that they would reconstitute the drafting team format which is why we are here today.

So staff had provided quite a detailed list of areas where the GNSO acts as a decisional participant in the empowered community. Many of these activities don't require any new procedures or can be addressed with simple templates. And in those cases where templates can be used, staff has drafted those templates. They can be modified. They may indeed be modified when a particular action is taken because it may be hard to see exactly how they'll apply until we have an action in front of the GNSO.

But staff did draft the templates but found that there are some cases where guidelines might be needed where it would be helpful and in fact I think important for staff to get input from the GNSO from – in particular from the stakeholder groups and constituencies on the form of those guidelines, what's needed or not.

And so where the staff identified guidelines or principles are in the areas you see here under the In Brief section of the document before you. And I'll just read these out, I know you can read them as well but generally they relate to accountability and review, the independent review process relating to initiating an IRP, representation in an IRP, payment, decisions to make a claim for Council consideration. There are also some possible need for guidance relating to the Customer Standing Committee. Oh, and thank you, Steve, let me go – Steve DelBianco, please.

Steve DelBianco: Julie, just because rather than read them all right now, I want to look at them all for sure, but if we just stop on the first one and run through an example of the way in which our prior (unintelligible) would need to be expanded to be

more specific, that's what I'd be interested in. So in the chat, for those of you who didn't know, this is what drafting team – the prior Bylaws Drafting Team recommended for this item, for Article 4 4.3. We said – oh I somehow lost the document. But...

Julie Hedlund: Oh.

Steve DelBianco: We said that there were no new procedures or changes in the GNSO that were needed. And that the action requested – hey you found it. Fantastic, thank you. We said that things would just go before the Council as a motion the same way the Council always does motions and the threshold for approval would be a simple majority vote of each house which we believed was for Section 11.3(i) of the ICANN Bylaws on the default voting threshold. So here we were, Wolf-Ulrich, Farzi and I, thinking we solved 4.3. So Julie and staff, tell us what more needs to be done than what it was we recommended last time.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Steve. And this is an excellent way to proceed. Thank you very much. So I'm going to – I'm actually going to unsync the document and we're at Article 4 4.3. And so – and the way this document works is anything highlighted in green is something that we feel, you know, as agreed to by the drafting team beforehand, that is already taken care of, excuse me, and in current procedures.

Where staff thinks there may be – and I say “may” – may be additional guidelines needed is – so if you look at the second column it says, “The GNSO will need to develop further details for the process to decide to be an IRP requestor. For example, how would decision to initiate an IRP is reached, not just the threshold but what it covers, presumably it would need to cover at a minimum the basis for the dispute and the harms to the GNSO in reasonable detail, who would represent the GNSO, who would pay for representation, how would a claim that is supported by the GNSO be put forward.”

“And so these details could be in the form of separate guidelines which could be added to the GNSO Operating Procedures even as a new procedure or perhaps as an annex or even as a link to a document outside of the procedures themselves.”

So the staff action – the action that staff has captured would be to work with the drafting team, if the drafting team feels it’s applicable, to develop proposed guidelines for initiating IRP representation and payment decision to make the claim for the Council consideration.

Yes, so there is a motion template related also to these procedures, Steve. So in the case where – in the case where we – so for example there’s a motion template relating to determining the decision to initiate an IRP. So for example, the motion would cover what needs to go into the, you know, the basis for the dispute and so on. And there’s actually a form, an online form, that needs to be filled out as part of that initiation process. So yes, in many cases there are motion templates also associated with some of these actions as well.

But this is an instance where staff thought that some add guidance might be necessary and hence...

Steve DelBianco: Right, I was asking...

Julie Hedlund: Yes, please go ahead.

Steve DelBianco: Julie, one particular question, when a template gets approved, does the template carry the same weight as a bunch of text jammed in the GNSO procedures someplace? So if the template indicated the minimum requirements for the resolution, if the template indicated the voting thresholds, that template then, is that the same as having procedures and allows us to do the work in one place rather than two?

Julie Hedlund: That's a really interesting question, Steve. And I'm not sure I know the answer to that given that current procedures don't have templates and templates have typically I think been used as just an informal guidance so that they don't have to be incorporated in the procedures in which case they also would not have to be, you know, codified in that respect and they could be changed without, you know, without having to have the procedures approved because as you all know that that can be a lengthy process as well.

And I apologize if I'm sounding a little scattery but I got kicked out of the Adobe Connect room so I'm in the process of getting back in.

So our sense is that there are two pieces to this. You could have the guideline - the guideline could be part of the procedures or you could decide that the guideline doesn't have to be part of the procedures and you could also then have a template associated with that guideline, which is the way we've laid out this document actually indicating where we think that there's, you know, a guideline that might be needed.

And let me bring up the document again because it fell off for me. And I'm just looking at the chat now that I've missed it. Farzaneh is saying, "I wish we had the first draft template. Is there a URL to bylaws as a PDF, not as a webpage?" And I'm seeing some other typing going on. Let me pause there and see if that - if what I said was helpful at all with respect to some of the guidance that staff has provided with Article 4.3 as an example. Yes and to Maxim's question, I don't think there is bylaws available as a PDF.

And I see Steve is typing. Got several people typing so I'll just wait. That's correct, so what staff had suggested here, just to go back a little bit - this is Steve DelBianco's question in the chat, "We're only addressing yellow areas." So, yes, so the three categories here are guidance and principles. So guidance or principles for the GNSO to complete a particular action or

actions. These fall within the existing processes and procedures, but where additional details and steps are deemed to be helpful.

And this is where staff can also help with additional drafts. The other items are templates or actions that don't require specific guidelines or templates. Those are green and are considered completed. And Steve, let me go to you.

Steve DelBianco: ...how you manage the chat and the Adobe at the same time. But you used the word that I don't see anywhere, you said, "guidance and principles," and gosh, that caught my eye right away and I don't see principles in here because frankly if Council, when it votes that (unintelligible) which of its principles to apply, I didn't think there are or were written principles that would bind and restrict what Council can vote on whenever these powers are invoked. So what did you mean by "principles"?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, thank you Steve. That's a good question. And actually I would say that perhaps our use of the term "principles" is imprecise in this instance and that we don't mean principles, we mean probably more guidance or procedures, which we probably should have used. I don't think, and I'd have to look, but I don't think any of the areas that we identified really fall into the category of setting a principle under which the GNSO would operate. And I fully agree...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...with your point that that..

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: Julie...

Julie Hedlund: Go ahead.

Steve DelBianco: ...if you – Julie, if you meant to say procedures and guidance, I’m completely on board. The word “principles” that’s what caught me that I don't see it in the document and I think it was just a bad word choice. I think we're good.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I think it’s a bad word choice. Thank you, Steve. And thank you for pointing that out. So I could move to another example if you like, for example, under the Section 17.2, CSC composition appointment, term and removal. So there is already a small group, and this is something that we can coordinate with the ccNSO with respect to work that they have already done because there’s an overlap of process with ccNSO and there may be some additional procedures that we might want to then adopt as part of the GNSO Operating Procedures.

So this is one actually where probably the work can just be done with some coordination between the staff supporting GNSO and ccNSO to make sure that we're consistent with respect to work that may have already been done on the ccNSO side since I know that they have been taking a lead in this area. And so if you look at the second column there’s quite a number of bullet points with respect to this item where there is coordination. And that goes also for the other Section 17 items, again, where there’s coordination so Section 17.3 and 17.2 as an example.

Yes, and Heather is noting, “The ccNSO group is extremely organized.” Yes, we should consider what they’ve done. And I think that’s part of what we're trying to convey here, Heather. Thank you very much.

And Steve DelBianco is saying, “I count only 15 yellow paragraphs we need to address. Seems like a relatively small amount of work for us to do.” That is the staff sense as well. We did try to determine as much as possible where we felt that the current procedures covered – provided the guidance, pardon me, needed – procedures or guidance needed for the actions of the GNSO as a decisional participant and really just tried to pull out those items where there might be additional clarity needed.

And I'll note too that staff anticipates providing initial drafts of the guidance and/or procedures for the drafting team to review. So we're happy to take a first cut at what we think might be helpful in the same way that we've done with the templates and then to present that to the drafting team to review and discuss. It might be similar for some of you who might be familiar with the way that the GNSO Review Implementation Working Group operated where by staff did research on the various aspects of implementation of a particular recommendation and then brought that to the working group to review and then once approved we'd just add it to, you know, sort of an approval report that then could, you know, go up to the GNSO Council to review.

And so I'm just trying to get back to the chat here. Maxim is saying, "As for principles we might refer to GNSO Operating Principles for the Operation and Procedures document." I don't think there are principles per se in the Operating Procedures, Maxim. And Heather Forrest, "To Steve's count, there was six dot points with points on the initial document in the Adobe. I think we should push for a fairly efficient work effort. You guys know how I feel about keeping things moving." We do, Heather.

And Farzaneh is saying, "I think it's a good idea staff provide first draft." "7.1 and 7.2 from Operational Procedures," it's Maxim saying. I'd have to – don't know that off the top of my head, Maxim. If you'd like to speak to that, please feel free. I feel that I'm talking too much here. Oh, I'm sorry, that's right, you're not connected. So other examples are the petition process Section 2.2 for specified actions. Oh and we are checking on your point, Maxim.

Again, so we did already make a change to the Operating Procedures that reflects what you see here. And we also have the motion template, but what staff had identified was developing proposed rules for submitting petitions and in this case this would be another case where we would try to be consistent with the ccNSO guidelines including identification of specific issues, questions, via consultation with this drafting team and also

stakeholder groups and constituencies, who are represented on the drafting team to ensure consistency in the rules.

And thank you, Maxim, for openness, transparency, term limit, et cetera. Okay and that's the – those are the principles governing stakeholder group and constituency operations and charters. Thank you for that, Maxim.

If no one objects I'll just go to another example here. Again, relating to petitions, oh, but instead of talking I'm going to recognize Heather Forrest. Thank you, Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Julie. And thanks, everyone. I just thought maybe we could clean up the point made by Maxim. I don't understand the work of this group to be developing any new principles. We may well have principles that govern our work. These are overarching principles that govern how the Council operates, that govern how the various constituent parts of the GNSO operate, but I don't understand that it's our role to develop new principles. I would understand our role to be to develop new procedures in line with those principles and supported by those principles. So that's my understanding of where we are and unless others disagree hopefully we can close that point. Thanks, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Heather. And this is Julie Hedlund from staff. And I would say absolutely agree that it was never the intention for this drafting team to develop principles. And staff didn't mean to suggest that by our – in our poorly chosen word principles in this document. And yes, the focus would be more on guidelines or procedures. Noted, Maxim. So then as another example, purpose of the petition is to act as a liaison so, I'm sorry, identify its representative for the purpose of the petition to act as a liaison and how it will provide direction.

And we'll note that one of the things that staff also tried to do is in – across some of these cases there – it's likely to be similar or exactly the same

guidance and that if there is an action where the GNSO is to select a representative or identify a representative then it's likely that the same process can be used in each instance in which that needs to happen. So we will also then try to streamline as much as possible so as not – so as to have consistency but also so as not to have a lot of different, you know, procedures or guidelines that really apply to the same type of action.

And I'm pausing there as I see others are typing. And Heather, please.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Julie. I wonder, could you take us back? I think you've done an excellent job and Steve has to drop off (unintelligible) Steve. Steve has to drop. Could you bring us back, Julie, to the initial document that had the six points on it?

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely. Let me do that right away here. One moment.

Heather Forrest: And I think that – it gave a really good summary like you've got us into the detail and I think the examples were very helpful. It certainly helped me to better understand what the scope of our work is and I suspect we're unsynced, either that or I've just moved everyone's screen.

So as I see it we have various points there in relation to 4.3, so the first point says Article 4, Accountability and Review. It highlights 4.3. We have the CSC provisions there under 17.2 to 17.3. We have the IANA Naming Function Review provision under 18.2. We have Community Forum Participation under 1.3.

We have the petition process under 2.2, which is another example that Julie just gave. And then the call and removal process for the NomCom director. So I see that as if we're able to do that and taking into account the examples that Julie's given us, we've got sort of six discrete buckets of work. Yes, they're all related but I do think these principles are sufficiently discrete.

I would like to think back to my earlier point that we get – we can conduct this effort in a fairly efficient manner. I think that's possible largely because we have so many people from the original Bylaws Drafting Team on this group who have quite a bit of experience.

So I would suggest that we use these three things in our work. And Julie, before we let's say in terms of maybe I'm jumping ahead but next steps, can we align our next meeting with or in advance of our next meeting can we get our hands on anything that the ccNSO has already done?

I know from having worked with them as Chair of the Council, that they in fact, they're not just well organized, I was being very diplomatic for the GNSO, like they have things drafted. They're much farther ahead than we are on this kind of stuff. So the sooner that we can see what they have the better. And that will give us a bit of a litmus test on whether these six points are indeed the six points we need to look at. We might find that there's a few things that are missing, we might find that some of these are redundant. But this seems to me to be the way – to be a sensible way forward. Thanks, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Yes thank you, Heather. This is Julie Hedlund from staff. And that's an excellent suggestion and yes, absolutely, staff can get the materials from ccNSO and what they've already done. And we certainly can see whether or not we can use any of those in our drafting and some of which may – we may want to borrow wholesale, as they say. Yes, we'll take that action. I'm just looking here.

The Google Doc – so I'm seeing that there is difficulty accessing the Google Docs that we have. I'll have to check the setting on those to make sure that those are set to be viewed. I thought they were but I will check that. And I apologize for that. Yes and absolutely we can make read-only access, Maxim. Absolutely.

So is there anything else that people would like to discuss on the scope of work? We've noted the action item for getting the materials from the ccNSO and we also could do some other drafting as well but I think that's a good place to start to see if we can have some efficiencies already in place.

And Farzaneh, please go ahead.

Farzaneh Badii: Hi, I'm sorry. I think this microphone is really bad. If so, if you cannot hear me or the quality is bad just let me know, I will go back. So I just wanted to say that okay I understand that there – the first point that you wanted to work on was procedures or templates.

But I wanted to also know if you have a specific question as to how this should be done or you know, kind of like if you can also provide the questions that we came across from us so that we can kind of like focus better on what you have questions about, or as I suggested, perhaps we could also get – see like a first draft of one of these bullet points, I don't know, we could try (unintelligible) or something. And then when we see the first draft then we understand that there was a (unintelligible) in the – looking at the ccNSO processes also a good suggestion. I support that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much. And I don't think I quite caught all of that but I think that yes, we definitely can do a draft of say for instance just starting at the top looking at Article 4, the independent review process guidelines and start with that so that the drafting team can get a sense of what we might be looking at. And with the second item, the CSC, I think there's a significant amount of work there under the ccNSO so we can gather that and see to what extent we may already have materials that we can use or borrow for that item as well.

So I hope that addressed what you were requesting. I wasn't quite sure what you were requesting as far as questions. There are questions identified or areas and bullet points identified in the – within the more detailed document that sort of form the basis of possible guidelines, so for instance, you know,

what does the GNSO need to do to select a representative to an IRP, for example and so on and so forth. So we have tried to identify those as well so I don't know if that's helpful. I'm just going to pause there. I see we have some folks that are typing.

Let me ask if there are any other questions relating to the overview of the scope of work? And, Maxim, thanks also on the Google Docs we just as a cursory glance we do see some that are not marked as open for access so we'll make that change.

And I see Heather Forrest saying, "That directly (crossing) of our point 18.2 but the action item coming out of the most recent Council meeting was the IANA Function Review composition. Yes and the proposal of the ccNSO to manage deficiencies." Exactly where the ccNSO is not able to fill all of the roles as they are meant to do and I think they're asking for an exception. No, sorry, Heather. I obviously read the one thing without reading the next.

Might ask if we could move to the administrative issues? There's more people typing so I'll hold off for a minute. Okay, I see that that's comments about the issue with the ccNSO on the IANA function so.

So on the administrative issues, I saw passing on the chat that before he had to leave the call Steve DelBianco nominated Heather Forrest as chair. Do we have any – and I see support for Heather if she accepts. Stephanie is seconding that motion. Strong support from Wolf-Ulrich. Heather, please go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Julie. You're just delighted because you get to quit talking. Look, I am – I'm flattered, I have no objection. I actually think it might be a sensible thing particularly for the folks that served on the drafting team, the initial drafting team. I think it's helpful if they're able to express the full range of their views and not have that, you know, chair neutrality on them. So I'm more than happy to herd the cats if you folks would like me to do that. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Heather. This again is Julie from staff. And I see that there is 100% support for you. And so we will note that you are now accepted as chair of this group. We will send a note to the list, I think everybody's on this call now, but we'll send a note to the list as well just so that it is on the record. Then thank you very much for that, Heather.

And let me ask about the frequency and scheduling of meetings. When we ran the Doodle poll for this particular time and day coming out on top we did ask if people could consider this time and day might be – might work as a recurring time. And right before I go to that point I see that Maxim is asking about a vice chair for matters for administrative nature. What do folks think about having a vice chair? And is there anybody interested in the vice chair if so? Heather, please go ahead.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Julie. Please don't misinterpret my comments as not supporting the idea of a vice chair. I'm more than happy to have that. But I would like to think that we can get this work done fairly quickly. I think the answer is probably going to hinge on what time we're going to have the call, you know, if you're going to want to have the call at – this is the only problem with me, right, is my time zone issue is a bit much. If this is a time that works for everybody that's brilliant.

If we move it, you know, to a time that's in my dead zone then I think it's probably a sensible thing but in that case you probably ought not have me as chair. So I suppose the short answer is I'd like to think that we get this work done so efficiently that we really don't need – we're a small group, I'm happy to tap someone on the shoulder if I need help with something. So happy for you guys to consider but that's my thinking here. Thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much, Heather. And I'm just looking at the chat and it seems that there's general agreement that this is a small enough group that a chair should be sufficient. I think in general we're getting – let me ask the question

again because we're getting some comments in the chat as far as this time and day. I see some people are saying that this time of day could work. Maxim, the problem with doing a Doodle every time is that it's very hard for people to plan. If we can have a recurring meeting then people will have it on their schedule.

And yes, we can cancel or we can change if there's a problem, but it's a lot easier for members if we can find a stable time or if not one time maybe two that we can toggle between but I think they would both need to be times that would work for Heather. So an alternate day perhaps for some. And yes, and I think these meetings never have to be longer than one hour.

So I am seeing that Erica was saying a different day would be ideal to avoid an overlap with ATRT 3 meetings. Most people are saying this is a good time although this is one hour later than he can usually do. Let me – I think that Thursdays at the same time or Tuesdays also were times that were offered and that didn't work as well in the Doodle poll. And Wolf-Ulrich is saying not Tuesdays please.

May I ask if there's a preference for – or whether or not Thursday at this time could work, if that would be preferable for some? Or is it best that we try to stick with this for now and see how it works? Yes, and that's true, Thursdays also have – both Tuesdays and Thursdays have EPDP. I'm wondering if I should suggest that we stay with this time for now and see how it works? This time and day I should say. Okay, let's try and see. Time is good. Just seeing Erica's typing. I know, Erica, you'd have – Erica's saying "Happy to catch up after" if she's the one missing. And Heather's saying "Fine today at this time."

Okay let's stay with this. It does work for our chair, which is very important. And it looks like it works for most people with perhaps some – Erica may need to do a little catch up. And so how often would you like to meet? Weekly or biweekly? Happy to go with whatever you think works best for you all. And Heather, please.

Heather Forrest: Julie, would you like me to take you out of the hot seat? You're technically not in the hot seat anymore.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, Heather. Please do.

Heather Forrest: No worries. No, we can end your suffering. Okay, so let's see then, make sure I don't screw up. We need on the agenda we've reversed Items 3 and 2, we've done the chair selection, frequency and scheduling of meetings. In light of the six points I think we probably want to take a little bit of time to review the ccNSO materials. I'd like to set an action item of getting the ccNSO materials, confirming against those materials that the next – or that the six points that we see here on the DT to develop further guidelines and principle document that that aligns with those documents and the work done by the ccNSO.

If so, what I'd like to propose is that the next time we meet we talk about whether these are the six points that we need to discuss, whether there are any missing, where any of these six is unnecessary. I suspect it's not going to be the case that it's unnecessary, so I would suggest that that's what we do for our next meeting. Let's assume, for the moment, we can come back to this, let's assume at the moment that these six points are what we need to do.

I'm very conscious of the fact that the GNSO is not exactly resource-rich right now with the EPDP going on. And given that a number of our participants here are participating on the EPDP, the last thing I want to do is burden those folks. I'm not suggesting that our work is secondary or anything like this but I do think we need to be very respectful of the major body of policy work that we have going on, not just EPDP but our other PDPs as well.

So I'm going to suggest to you that we try and deal with each of these points in a week – in one call rather. So that suggests to me six substantive calls.

With that in mind I'd like to suggest – I realize I'm making pretty bold suggestions here – I'd like to suggest that we meet fortnightly, every two weeks. Let's have one call to revisit the scope of work and evaluate whether these are the six points you want to do. We'll then set a schedule following that that's fortnightly calls after that to deal with each of these points.

If we need to add to this list of points then that will push our work effort out. If in the balance when we look at things in preparation for our next meeting, we determine that there are – there's more here than meets the eye, based on what the ccNSO has done, then we can revisit that. But I think my initial proposal, I'm doing this could, I have to say, my initial proposal would be let's meet again in two weeks' time for one hour to review the ccNSO work that presumes that we can get the ccNSO work sharply although I'm fairly sure that we can do that. I'm sorry to give staff a quick turnaround but I'm quite sure that that can be done, and go from there.

And Maxim, to your question about whether we have a timeframe, I'm not aware that we do. I have been aware – painfully aware for the last 18 months that the ccNSO is very well ahead of us which maybe I always think in the back of my mind isn't such a bad thing because it gives us something to look at. But we, as Julie says, the sooner the better.

I will say this, the Council was perceived potentially – I was always aware that the timeline that I put on things last year was perceived as being a bit slow but I thought it was necessary to take the time for Council to actually understand the bylaws.

Many of you guys really understand the bylaws and how they affect the GNSO from your work on the CCWG. And a number of the councilors were not in that position and I thought it was important to give the Council that time to really understand the bylaws. And I think we're reaping the benefits from that so although we were a little bit slow in the first round of effort that then led to your work in the drafting team. I think we are reaping the benefits from

that. So I'm not too worried about the fact that we're behind but it, you know, as with all these things the sooner we do this the better. Doesn't mean rush, it means do a decent job but let's not goof around.

Does anyone object to that? Let's have a call, assuming we can get the materials from the ccNSO, have a call in two weeks' time and, Julie, you've got your hand up. Forgive me. Go.

Julie Hedlund: And this is Julie Hedlund from staff. And it's not an objection, it's just to confirm that staff is taking the action item to get the materials and do the comparison at least to the extent that we can determine that against the six points, getting the materials from the ccNSO one week before the next meeting in two weeks. So we would propose having those materials for this drafting team to see by the 6th of February to give this drafting team a week to review before our meeting on the 13th.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Julie, that's super helpful. Now forgive me because I'm going to shift my screen to calendar so I won't see hands up for the moment. I wonder – and Julie, I wasn't thinking, you've taken on more than I intended. I wasn't thinking that staff necessarily had to do all the hard work there in identifying the overlap. I think if staff takes a week to do that what I would suggest – it might be a big ask to get us back to the SGs and Cs and discuss that – those documents and take any input that we need from back in the SGs and Cs to then have a meeting one week after that.

So I almost wonder if we ought to have our next call on the 14th, we just – we have to have undertakings amongst ourselves that we'll use that – that time constructively. I'm just afraid that, Julie, if we don't, you know, if we only have a week to digest what it is that you guys have created we might not be able to take any action. So I suppose the other way around that would be to say if we have the call on the 14th – what do you guys think?

Should we have the call on the, you know, one week to get the materials, one week to digest? Or, yes, Valentine's gift, right, but that's you, you're in Australia it'll be the 15th. So, do you want one week to digest the materials, or do you want two with an opportunity to go back to SGs and Cs? Let's take a quick snap poll using Doodle. Who wants one week?

Julie Hedlund: And, Heather, while they're considering that, so the 13th would be two weeks from today. Is that what you meant?

Heather Forrest: Oh I'm sorry, Julie. You're right. I'm looking at Australia time. I'm just putting everybody – it's always tomorrow where I live, you know that.

Julie Hedlund: Oh I know...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: It's the 14th for you, Valentines for you, 13th for us just to confirm.

Heather Forrest: There we go. Oh so I get the Valentine's gift, isn't that charming?

Julie Hedlund: There you go.

Heather Forrest: Good stuff. Okay, so back to the point, one week – meeting two weeks from today or meeting three weeks from today? What do you think? Two weeks. Two weeks. Two weeks. Two weeks has it. Yes? That's good. Those who were keen enough to answer quickly.

Great, Julie, let's set the next meeting for two weeks, action item for you guys and don't worry, we're not putting the onus entirely on you to do that comparison of the ccNSO work with this work, although you guys taking the first stab at that is going to be extremely helpful as you're the ones that have put together the initial documentation that we've seen today which has been super helpful.

All right, Maxim is typing. Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Oh just saying that I think we have our marching orders here then and thank you very much, Heather. We'll get a calendar invite out right after this call so you'll be able to get that on your calendars and thank you so much for that guidance.

Heather Forrest: Awesome. Thanks very much to Julie and Julie for getting the ball rolling. Thanks to each one of you guys. Oh, Maxim, we'll send you chocolates, I promise. Thanks to everybody. We're bang on time. Any further points, comments? No, seeing none, thanks very much to staff for all your hard work in getting us to this point. Up to us now. Thanks very much, everyone. Talk to you in two weeks.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks everyone. Have a great morning, afternoon or evening. Bye-bye.

Julie Bisland: Thanks, all. We'll stop the recording now, (Jack). And everyone have a good rest of your day.

END