

**Geographic Regions Review Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 02 February 2011 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Geographic Regions Review Working Group on Wednesday 02 February 2011 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, <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-geo-regions-20110202-en.mp3> on pages:

- https://st.icann.org/geo-review-wg/index.cgi?geographic_regions_review_working_group_wggr_wiki
- And
- <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#feb>

Present:

David Archbold
Cheryl Langdon-Orr
Carlton Samuels
Olga Cavalli

Staff:

Rob Hoggarth
Gisella Gruber-White
Bart Boswinkel

Absent Apologies:

Bart Boswinkel

Fahd Batayneh

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's Geo Regions call on Wednesday, the 2nd of February. We have David Archbold, Carlton Samuels, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olga Cavalli.

From Staff we have Rob Hoggarth and Gisella Gruber-White. Apologies noted today from Fahd Batayneh, and if I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes.

Just to let you know we are still trying to get hold of Carlton Samuels and he will be joining within the next few minutes. Thank you. Over to you David.

David Archbold: Thank you very much and good morning again to everyone or good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. We circulated an agenda - Rob did on my behalf last Monday, and I think we should go straight in to Rob who will give us an update on the public comment forum.

Robert Hoggarth: Good day all. Yes, thank you very much Dave. Relatively brief update in terms of the public comment period. As you know, the period was scheduled to conclude on the 30th of January.

I've kept the public forum open a couple of more days because I was alerted by the GNSO that they were completing their internal process to get their comments submitted.

Chris Disspain sent me a note the other day and so I'm holding off preparing the summary of public comments until I've received that. For everyone's information, once that is received we'll have had a total of four submissions from I believe a total of eight parties.

Anthony Van Couvering submitted comments very early in the process. We have a submission on behalf of small island developing states in the Pacific for Maureen Hillard, who's from the Cook Islands.

The At Large Advisory Committee submitted comments that include statements from all the various RALOs, so that's what boosts the number of total comments.

And then with the ccNSO we have a good sort of cross section of comments from various communities. I would expect that within a day or two after receiving the ccNSO's comments, I'll be able to produce for the Working Group a summary and analysis of those comments.

Based on our previous discussions in Cartagena, unofficial, not official of the group, I've also included in the forum the transcript of the workshop session that Dave, Carlton and Olga were able to participate in.

During that session a number of members of the community commented, and we advised that group that we would be including that transcript in the public comment forum.

So I'll also be summarizing those comments and I would imagine if I recall correctly that we had about four or five other substantive sort of comments from that group.

So we'll have probably about 10 to 12 parties commenting in all, and I'll summarize all those. It's a small enough number that members of the Working Group may choose to also look at or read all the comments individually as well, but as part of our operating procedures and Staff we will be producing a summary of those. And that's it Dave.

David Archbold: Thanks Rob. Can you give any, I mean, I know you haven't done the summary but any comments on the comments that we've received so far?

Robert Hoggarth: Well I think it was interesting and you'll find them to represent a fairly broad array of points of view, all basically acknowledging that it's a worthwhile effort.

But, you know, as you would expect I think bringing various points of view, for example we know the small island developing states noting the uniqueness of how - where they sit particularly not only geographically but how - and you're probably much more aware of this Dave than I or others just in terms of the unique aspect of small islands and the interest they have in participating in ICANN, and given the opportunity to do so in a more official way.

In terms of the At Large Advisory Committee I might let Carlton or Cheryl talk in a little bit more detail there. There what was interesting, and I really just like the approach and the format that ALAC took in terms of reaching out to the various regional At Large organizations and basically collecting their comments and letting the individual groups talk, what was particularly interesting to me and just from my personal perspective was an interest in preserving the existing framework in many respects.

And I think in an overall sense not just At Large but between Anthony and Maureen's and the ALAC comments, a general reflection that it seems as if the current framework seems to work well and there just need to be more tweaks or adjustments in smaller ways.

So that's what, you know, that's what I've gotten out of my just general reading so far.

David Archbold: Fine. Thanks Rob. Okay, now we reach the stage where the rubber hits the road as it were, and it's make our mind up time. And the question is how do we proceed from here in the most effective way, because I think we're hitting an area where there will probably be diverse views amongst even the members of the Working Group, so it's how to start that off.

Normally I would say perhaps it is up to - well me, the Chair, to put some thoughts up as something to start from. My particular problem at the moment is we're supposed to have within my organization four people at a professional level and we're down to two.

So I'm one of two people doing four people's jobs, and I'm also going to be away for ten days on a trip with one of our ministers over - well from next week.

So I'm really pushed for time but I still think that might be the best way ahead. I mean, I could start throwing some comments and ideas up during this meeting, but I'm not sure how productive that will be.

I'd be interested in comments back from you. I mean, the other approach is that we could ask each of you to prepare very just brief notes to circulate on your thoughts on that next steps, but I'm open to any other suggestions. Any comments at this stage or are we going to get a stony silence?

Olga Cavalli: David, this is Olga.

David Archbold: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Why don't we go through the document and each of us make comments that we think are needed, identifying our selves perhaps using - I cannot find the word in English this morning - changes - start changes.

And maybe we can - you didn't have to do that on your own, especially now that you have a lot of work to do. And we can all do the job at the same time and using one document may be Gisella or Robert could prepare that document in a certain form that we can add our doc- or our comments there.

And once we have all done that we can perhaps check all the comments and see how to move forward.

David Archbold: That would certainly be helpful and I like that approach, Olga.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here if I may.

David Archbold: I'm sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm saying Cheryl here if I may.

David Archbold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, just building on what Olga was saying, it's - sorry, talk and cough, it's inevitable. Is it possible - Rob, looking at the ways some of the reason GNSO Work Groups have sort of used sort of I guess a chart or template form, it might be possible in the review document that the key points that you'll be taking out, these - and putting in a main column, leaving us another column or two where as Olga said each of us can start making some annotations.

The adVantages there of course is that it means it's not just those of us on the call, but all of us who've subscribed to the Work Group.

Carlton Samuels: Hello?

David Archbold: Yes, I'm here. I think that would be a way to do it. We'll simply kind of extract the key points and - or the key ideas from each area and we just kind of make comments on it.

Robert Hoggarth: I think - this is Rob. Sorry, go ahead.

David Archbold: Go on Rob, please.

Robert Hoggarth: Well I think that Cheryl's right that a number of other groups have found that as you sort of move to the decision making phase to be a useful way to tease out and spur some comments and insights and it may be, particularly given folks' works - work schedules a good way to have a dialogue without necessarily having a schedule, you know, and meeting every week or something like that.

So that's certainly something that I'd be delighted to take on and have you all take a look at it. It would probably be - I would imagine that I would be able to

pull that together within the next week to ten days, you know, doing the summary and analysis first and then moving to that template.

And then that would give you all a structure to start some sort of dialogue or discussion. Cheryl's right. I think a number of the other Working Groups have found that to be useful, slightly different issues and things like that, but I think it's a model that could provide a useful path forward.

David Archbold: Well that's fine and I think in that time scale I could try and get some thoughts to you Rob as well that you might be able to include in that template.

And I think we should keep it open that certainly on the first round as it goes round, if people feel that the template doesn't include some of the key points that you would like to comment on, you can add them at the bottom so it is - we're not - comments.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yes. It often shakes out additional opportunities, but what it'll also do is before the San Francisco meeting give us something that we could engage the community with to get input on some of their reactions to options that we might be coming up with.

David Archbold: Well that I suppose turns us on to another item on the agenda, which is sort of the schedule and timing for all this. Rob, as ever you are the schedule king and I'm sure you'll have thought about this. Can you make any comment?

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks. Yes, my only observation would be that it would be impractical and unrealistic for you to have any substantive document for the San Francisco meeting, and that you'd probably generally want to be looking to target some benchmark for the June, you know, meeting that's scheduled for Amman, Jordan.

That would be, you know, a target I think and you'd probably have a better sense, you know, a month to six weeks from now in terms of everyone's work

schedules whether that would end up being a draft similar to what we circulated prior to the Brussels meeting, or whether it be more of a final document like we circulated prior to Cartagena.

David Archbold: Yes. Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I agree Rob. Cheryl here again. But what it would do, for example if you look at the - at what you got from the At Large Advisory Committee, which as you rightfully pointed out was very much an outreach activity with Carlton and I presenting I think in most of the regional meetings and really getting the information on the questions we were raising out there, but we - they all actually now have an ability to react to even a draft set of opportunities or options.

So we as part of the ICANN community could certainly engage with our communities on that, and perhaps other parts of ICANN might want to do that as well.

But it makes it I guess a little more - if they've got some opportunity to go, "Whoa, that was a totally left of field idea. We really like that," or, "Oh, you haven't thought about doing this. How about this goes into the mix?"

And we as reps on this Work Group can bring those in, not just our own voices but those of our communities.

Carlton Samuels: Yes it does.

Robert Hoggarth: Yes. Sorry Carlton, go ahead.

Carlton Samuels: No, I was saying yes. I'm endorsing Cheryl's point that we've seen good results from this approach, and maybe it would help if we just continued in this way.

David Archbold: Okay, so let's wind back a bit and agreeing that we're not going to get anything as a final report in one form or another until the June meeting, what should we try and get in the public domain prior to the San Francisco meeting?

I would like to have I think that options for change document if you like out and in the public domain so that the various communities have a chance to actually discuss it and provide some feedback at San Francisco. Is that what we're agreeing on?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

David Archbold: Okay, so working back - how many weeks do we have till San Francisco?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not many.

Robert Hoggarth: Now actually that's an excellent answer Cheryl. Not many. Particularly the other potential challenge we run into is the new Board tradition and guidelines to have any documents that would be subject to public discussions produced three - well essentially 15 business days prior to the start of a meeting.

The ICANN meeting in San Francisco officially starts I believe the 13th, 14th but that number keeps jumping back and forth, since most of the meetings now seem to start on the Friday or Saturday before.

But in general in terms of guidance and the opening ceremonies on the 14th, and if you back that up in terms of working weeks, you're literally looking at around February 21, 22 for formal documents.

I think we could look at having that date slide a bit if - only because these will be some general thoughts or ideas that the community would be looking at, and there would not be a specific action, you know, that any official group would be taking in San Francisco.

So - and please, any other Working Group members can comment in terms of whether you think that's a flexible date or not. I would think it - of it as one because again you wouldn't be expecting some sort of final action.

It would be a major problem if you produced your final report and expected the Board to act on it and submitted the document but that's not...

Carlton Samuels: No.

Robert Hoggarth: Right, so I think that date could slide a bit, particularly since a number of you might be adding it to some agendas. But again it's mainly for planning purposes and if you all have a very sort of sense of a firm sense that you would have the document in a, you know, in a place that you were comfortable with by, you know, by the 4th of March then I think you could, you know, look at that as a reasonable time period rather than forcing yourself to rush and put something together that you might not be completely happy with.

And again what we would be very careful about doing is alerting them to the communities, this is just, you know, a beginning work product similar to I think what you guys do in ccNSO and a little bit in the At Large as well where, you know, this is for discussion purposes only.

It's to spur some additional thinking. But I think you wouldn't want to go later than March 4 because you would want people to have an opportunity to read it on the plane or something like that.

Carlton Samuels: Right.

David Archbold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And Rob if I may, it'll also give us the opportunity for example with the ALAC scheduling and perhaps other ccNSOs might want to do the same. I'm sure Carlton and I would be suggesting to Olivier that he approach you and a few of us from the Work Group to have one of our 45 minute slots of community and direction type meeting, you know, my old hop fix so that we get, you know, a roundtable discussion on some of the thinking at that stage, which again is part of the contributory and discussion process.

Robert Hoggarth: Yes, I really liked the approach that the Working Group took for Cartagena where we, you know, did sort of make the effort in - at attendance at a workshop where we now have a transcript.

And so there's, you know, an additional resource for public comments because for whatever reason at least up till now, know again this is an issue that hasn't prompted a lot of written comments but I think the format of the workshop really helped to draw out some folks.

And you could even consider, you know, we would want to, you know, make a decision in very short order to at least tentatively put another workshop on the schedule for San Francisco.

I know that scheduling is always problematic, but as I indicated in my report we had, you know, in total about 50 people participating in Cartagena and that was a speed change from Brussels.

David Archbold: It was actually - yes, standing room only. Now part of that was because it was a small room but...

Carlton Samuels: But that's one way to get them in it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think that's an excellent plan. It doesn't have to be, you know, incredibly formal. It can be a, you know, here's the current state of play and I think that's very important. If we can do that then I think we're on track nicely.

David Archbold: Yes, well can we ask you to put in that scheduling request presumably for the Thursday again I would assume.

Robert Hoggarth: Yes. I'll - I've already given folks the heads up that the group would be discussing it so yes, I'll get that much more specific to the meeting planners to have that on hold for us.

David Archbold: Okay, nonetheless we are still very short on time. I think we should try and get the - let's call it the framework document but whatever you want to call it, out as early as possible.

I'm actually leaving on this ministerial trip on the 11th, which is next Friday. If I can put some thought to this over the weekend and send you something Rob to help, do you think you'd be in a position to try and get something out before that Friday?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes, I would shoot for close of business on the 10th.

David Archbold: Yes.

Robert Hoggarth: Would that be acceptable?

David Archbold: Well I don't think we can ask for more at the moment because we're on Wednesday today. I can't do anything before the weekend. I really can't, so it's how you place it after that.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay, just one little bit of information that I do not have, and I don't know if you have insight on this as well, is that I anticipate momentarily getting the ccNSO submission.

Is that a realistic assumption based on your knowledge of the internal processes?

David Archbold: I have no idea where it stands at all...

Robert Hoggarth: Okay.

David Archbold: ...is the short answer. I think this is being done at the ccNSO Council level. It is not something that I have seen on circulation lower down at all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I am the liaison now from ALAC to the Council and I've certainly seen the draft circulated and a couple of days ago. So I would think it shouldn't be terribly far.

I'm just searching my mail. Robert, I'm quite sure it wouldn't be, yes, unreasonable for me to give you the date that that came out. Let me have a look. Anyway, talk amongst yourselves and I'll find it.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay. Well - and the only reason I raised that is simply because, you know, I want to make sure that whatever comes in that that's reflected in the document so...

David Archbold: Yes, so whatever comes in isn't going to alter I don't think the key points that we're seeking Working Group input on.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay.

David Archbold: Because I think that's going to come from all the things that we have talked about.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Chris distributed on the 31st of January -- that was three days ago -- a draft, the ccNSO Council comment on the Regions - Geo Regions review and it's supportive of the work of our Work Group today.

It - basically the deadline for submission was 30th of January. I'm reading from the text here. Asked if it could be accepted late unless anyone objects, and I gather that is the conversation you had.

So I've seen no traffic indicating any edits or changes to this draft, so I would suggest a quick call out to (Gabby) and you might find it's in your possession relatively quickly Rob.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay, great. Thanks.

David Archbold: Okay, so turning round now back to Working Group members. If we get something out by end of play on the 10th, how long do you need to be able to turn that document round with your thoughts?

Carlton Samuels: Well I am going to be extremely busy starting on the 14th. All that week I'm traveling all over the Caribbean from Surinam in the south all the way to the Dominican Republic. I'll be on the road for two weeks so between time...

David Archbold: So you could have a couple of days to sort it all before you go.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, this is why I'm saying I have a couple of days, so I could make something of it on the weekend.

David Archbold: That would be good.

Robert Hoggarth: Well Dave, this is Rob. In fairness to everybody, if you're looking at a 4 March sort of drop dead date for publication or circulation, we could probably give Working Group members until as late as the 25th with a Working Group meeting on March 2 or 3, particularly given everyone's pressure and time, you know, you could have as long as the 25th I think for feedback.

David Archbold: I'm not sure that we won't need two rounds. That's what concerns me Rob.
So I was trying to get some feedback that could be then collated, go back out again and then have the meeting.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay.

David Archbold: Now I was trying to push for something like seven to ten days. Is that feasible, people? Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think so.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, I think it's feasible.

David Archbold: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, that's okay for me.

David Archbold: Okay, so we try for seven to ten days. I don't have a calendar in front of me. We then try collating all that and going out with a second version, and once that's distributed we set up a call.

Robert Hoggarth: I can put - I'll put together a timetable as part of the meeting report, particularly, you know, to give opportunity to the Working Group members who aren't in attendance on the call.

And so I will target those general parameters that you suggested, that there would be an initial draft out by February 10, expected feedback and review - let's say we give everybody the full weekend of the 19th and 20th, so get feedback on the 21st, Draft 2 out on the 25th, Working Group meeting March 2 or 3, publication on March 4.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That works.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

David Archbold: Okay. Yes, that's good Rob. All right, we are virtually through the agenda. Has anybody got anything else to raise whilst we are on the call?

Carlton Samuels: No.

Olga Cavalli: Rob, you will send an email summarizing all these dates and all that?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes Olga, I will do that. Dave, I did have one issue that we've talked about and I'd certainly like to get your latest feedback and feedback from the Working Group members, and that is as we move to this, you know, sort of final phase, how you saw the potential involvement of the GAC in this.

I know that we've had some, you know, some transitions in terms of GAC leadership, that the GAC doesn't in terms of its participation in this Working Group, you know, their - the GAC list gets our list so that we are alerting them to what's going on.

Do you think that there's any need for any more specific outreach than that to help that community be engaged in this process? I - my only concern is that whatever steps you make, that there aren't any surprises and that we run into extra challenges from any communities, you know, when you guys produce your final report.

David Archbold: Well we have - when the ccNSO meets with GAC it is one of the subjects we should touched on as we go through, though I must admit at the last meeting there was very little said and - apart from an invitation to come to the Working Group meeting.

I mean, I'm happy to write or perhaps more realistically to try and meet up with a GAC Chair at the March meeting.

Robert Hoggarth: We can certainly work to try and schedule that or you guys can do that, you know, without Staff involvement.

David Archbold: Yes, I don't know. I mean, we were going to write at one stage, and then I seem to remember Bart got involved in that discussion and I'm not sure where it ended up.

Robert Hoggarth: I'll follow up with him.

David Archbold: But yes, I take your point. I'm sure they are aware of what is going on. The depths of their knowledge I'm not sure, but I can also perhaps get some time during the ccNSO GAC meeting to do a quick update. I will see if I can set that up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That would be very useful, especially because you'll have the status document at that stage which will give them something to sort of tangibly get their little teeth into.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

David Archbold: Yes, fine. I will take that on and do that, and that might lead to more discussions with their Chair anyway. I will arrange that. Okay, any other points? All quiet.

Well thank you very much ladies and gentlemen. Very much look forward to your comments once we get this framework document.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Dave.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Dave.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Dave. Goodbye.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you all.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you all.

Carlton Samuels: Bye-bye.

David Archbold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye. Rob, are you still on the line?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You've checked your email?

Robert Hoggarth: I did. I received it and sent you an ack back. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, thanks Rob. Well we've got Category 5 cyclone coming, now coming across into Queensland, so I'll spend the rest of my evening watching devastation and destruction live.

Olga Cavalli: Bye.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay, thank you. Be safe. Bye-bye.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh I'm not in that area. It's just...

Robert Hoggarth: Oh that's good.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's like watching train wrecks. Bye.

Robert Hoggarth: Bye-bye.

END