

**Geographic Regions Review Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Friday 27 May 2011 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Geographic Regions Review Working Group on Friday 27 May 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-20110527-en.mp3>

on pages:

- <https://community.icann.org/x/voFb>

And

- <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>

Present:

David Archbold
Cheryl Langdon-Orr
Olga Cavalli

Staff:

Rob Hoggarth
Gisella Gruber-White
Bart Boswinkel

Absent Apologies:

Carlton Samuels
Fahd Batayneh

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning. Good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's Geographic Region's call on Friday the 27th of May.

We have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olga Cavalli, Dave Archbold. From staff we have Rob Hoggarth, Bart Boswinkel and myself Gisella Gruber-White.

Apologies noted from Fahd Batayneh and Carlton Samuels. And if I could please just remind you to state your names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Dave.

Thank you very much, Dave Archibald. Well the aim of this call is quite simply to review the draft that was circulated around by Rob. Both Rob and I had worked on it, but primarily Rob I must say.

He's put in a tremendous amount of which much thanks.

There are a couple of ways we could do this. I don't know how much time Olga and Cheryl you've had to look at it. But we can either review it sort of at a high level principle point of view or we can actually go through and start looking paragraph by paragraph. What do you feel?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Either way. I'm not particularly fussed - I must say if we do it in hard principles we're probably going to devolve into nit-picking anyway. So why don't we just cut our losses and go straight for nit-picking?

Dave Archbold: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: I had the same idea so that's a good idea, sure.

Dave Archbold: Okay well let's - let me bring it up to start off with.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Seeing who we are, I mean it's...

Dave Archbold: We're a bunch of nit-pickers, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, and in (unintelligible) incorporated.

Dave Archbold: All right, let's look at the executive summary. So we're looking at Paragraphs 1 through 7 to start off with.

You will notice that Paragraph 6 I had highlighted basically because I wasn't all that happy with the wording but I couldn't come up with something better.

Anybody else got comments on 1 through 7?

I take it from silence that everybody accepts 1 through 7.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well what is your problem with the wording on six?

Dave Archbold: Yes, I knew you were going to say that and I can't remember.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm reading it and I'm not having a visceral reaction to it.

Dave Archbold: Okay, recognize the...

Rob Hoggarth: Well Dave if I - this is Rob, if I can help, and one of the areas when you and I had discussed this that I had tried to adjust based on your input was that the struggle you were having with, you know, the term interest groups and more importantly that sort of concept across regional groupings.

And so I used that term but I think you may have highlighted this because just, you know, a week and a half ago or so you had been sort of struggling with that terminology. So I don't know if that helps jog your memory...

Dave Archbold: Yes I think that is the case. I highlighted this before you made some changes to it perhaps?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes.

Dave Archbold: Yes, okay, which case that's why I can't find anything too much wrong with it so I can take the highlighting off. That was easy.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Rob are you holding the pen on the edits?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes I am.

Dave Archbold: And so am I actually. Well I'm using a mouse but I've just managed to spill my coffee which hasn't helped.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh dear, well that's serious. Just a piece of knit-picking to go back to the cover sheet, I'm no longer the chair of the ALAC. I was only chair of the ALAC from 2007 to 2010. I'm now the vice-chair. So if you're going to be looking for (pageantry) I think we should be Working Group members properly titled if we're going to be titled at all.

So you need to give me two titles or none, I don't really care.

The second thing is on Page 1 I have a huge affront with orphaned words and introductions needs to go to Page 2. Now you can move on.

Rob Hoggarth: Can you help me? I'm in a - oh I see. I see at the bottom of the heading.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes I figured that ultimately that will shift once we propagate the table of contents so there's...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes it does.

Rob Hoggarth: The - just to clarify Cheryl, again this is Rob, you would prefer to - just have it say ALAC vice chair? Is that appropriate?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: To be honest, you know, when I - when we started obviously I liked chair. No I'm not. I mean if we keep going on I might be retired.

So, you know, just you can either put Carlton and just in as ALAC and leave it at that.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Or, you know, make it longer and go chair 2007 to 2010 vice chair 2011.

The choice is yours. It depends how much of the pie you want to take up.

Rob Hoggarth: Right. Okay great. And then I'll follow-up with (Paul) and (Pablo) about (Pablo)'s formal status for purposes of this report.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, yes.

Rob Hoggarth: The other substantial change that I made on the list of Working Group members is that I did take (Yaniff) off.

You know, he was on the previous reports. Obviously he's got nothing to do with this report. And at present we do not have a GAC representative who's actively participating in the drafting effort.

Dave Archbold: Right.

Bart Boswinkel: Rob this is Bart.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Why not just say along the lines of what Cheryl proposed is that you just do the SOAC that is good and for the members?

So (Adiel) and Paul Wilson for instance would be the NRO.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: And Cheryl and Carlton would be ALAC and Fahd and David would be ccNSO.

Rob Hoggarth: An excellent suggestion. I will do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Dave Archbold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Less ink Bart. I like less ink.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Done.

Dave Archbold: Okay let's move then to Page 4 which is the background.

Rob Hoggarth: Excuse me, this is Rob. I would just like - I'd just like to note that that was a - that you all just accomplished something very substantial in just going through the executive summary because that was the area that I had shared with you Dave that I, you know, thought was the place where we would have the most changes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Could I ask a question? Are we now in - after introductions still paragraph numbering from 9, 10? I would have thought that numbering would have (stayed) after we finished the executive summary.

Rob Hoggarth: Cheryl the reason why I did that was based on our previous challenges with different word programs and the rest and different pagination that folks experienced that at least for...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure. No I understand.

Rob Hoggarth: ...purposes of drafting. But I can certainly remove it once we produce the final report.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: As long as that goes through for final (torlet) and that - those numbers aren't there that's fine. I mean I can either have every line numbered or, you know, the exec summary certainly makes - could use the numbering but the rest obviously (unintelligible).

Rob Hoggarth: Yes that's totally your guy's call. It's primarily for purposes of the drafting review. But also and I didn't know cause you guys have the best experience in working with your communities whether it helps those community discussions to focus hey let's look at paragraph whatever...

Dave Archbold: Yes, I am used to all being numbered. That's Dave sorry, interruption.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You mean...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...paragraphs or all lines?

Dave Archbold: Paragraph.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Legal things I read have every number lined - every line numbered. Paragraph numbering tends to indicate an order or bullet point prioritizing within a subset...

Dave Archbold: Not to me. So that - it's obviously different areas have different things.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Right. In the next word group I'm about to dive into. The GNSO and ALAC community involved in the JAS Work Group will debate over the ordering as in which goes first versus third of even bullet points in case that indicates a hierarchy.

Like you're going to stick numbers on things to make sure it's clear what the (hell) they mean.

Dave Archbold: Right.

Rob Hoggarth: I'm more than happy to provide a footnote at the beginning of that would be sort of a compromise.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If you say every paragraph in this document is numbered for the purposes of keeping Dave happy that's fine.

Dave Archbold: I'm quite happy with that.

Rob Hoggarth: I'll make that note and wordsmith a little bit.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh (really)?

Dave Archbold: Okay. No, you know, Paragraph 1 means it's the first paragraph. Paragraph 2 means it's the second paragraph. Like Page 1 is the first page and Page 2 is the second Page.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes (unintelligible), next.

Dave Archbold: So there is an order, you know, this one comes first, this one comes next.

Rob Hoggarth: Are you generally comfortable with the organization of the document in that, you know, we do have, we - you know, there's the executive summary where we do an introduction, we go to the background and the rest?

Because the one thing that unfortunately this draft does not show is, is the table of contents because I figure we were still somewhat in a state of flux so...

Dave Archbold: Yes. I was - Rob, this is Dave. I also paid not too much attention I must admit, to the executive summary because I think I would like to see various bits of

the body enhanced and that will then be reflected back into the executive summary.

Rob Hoggarth: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

So I do the executive summary last normally when I write a document.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But you don't publish with a - last. It's first in your (conversation). It's just you prepare it last. Yes okay.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, that's what I understood him to say, yes.

Dave Archbold: Okay can we - that's all. Are we now back out looking at Page 4?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir.

Dave Archbold: And I have no comments on Page 4. Can I move to Page 5?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Yes?

Rob Hoggarth: Mr. Chair, point of order, you're giving folks time to read the pair - the page or I'm just asking for a quick yes or no?

Dave Archbold: I'm looking for people to say I can move to the next page. If they have to read it they have to read it. We're hoping that they wouldn't need to read it again.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay, thank you.

Dave Archbold: But I'm not hearing anything back from people.

Rob Hoggarth: Well I didn't know - I know Olga's on mute but I didn't know if she was on mute by her own design or whether Gisella put her on mute.

So I just want to be careful that what you define silence as assent or you're waiting for...

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, I'm on mute because there's a lot of noise around me, not in this...

Rob Hoggarth: All right.

Olga Cavalli: ...moment but I'm moving from one office to the other one so there was a lot of noise. That's - you can move off from my side Dave. That's okay with the page.

Dave Archbold: Okay. And Cheryl can I move on?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I already said yes.

Dave Archbold: Yes. So Page 5 I have no comment. In fact I don't have any comments on any of this background stuff. So I don't have anything until we get down to Section B Working Group recommendations which is on Page 9.

So has anybody got any comments on anything prior to Working Group recommendations on Page 9?

Are people still reading? Speak to me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm fine if you want to move to nine.

Dave Archbold: Fine. Olga are you happy to go to nine, Page 9?

Olga Cavalli: Sure, yes.

Dave Archbold: All right. Paragraph 32 onwards contains proposed recommendations. Obviously I am reasonably happy with most of this because I've been with Rob. So it's your comments that I'm looking for.

Bart Boswinkel: Dave this is Bart. It's Paragraph 33 on the UN Nation's Statistical Division's classification.

As I recall this was based on a GAC advice. So if the Working Group's advice is to abandon this probably there needs to be something going back to the GAC as well.

Dave Archbold: I don't think it was GAC advice, certainly not written GAC advice Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: No, that's what I recall but let - I'll check and then I'll inform the Working Group.

Dave Archbold: Yes please. It's not my recollection of the written history. But, you know, whether there was something unwritten I can't tell.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes okay, but I'll check. But say that's the only caveat I have with abandoning the United States. Now I'll go on mute.

Dave Archbold: Right, right. From a wordsmithing point of view I'm not sure that I'm comfortable with the assertion that ICANN uses. I can't remember whether that was my word or your word Rob to be honest. But it's - I'm not that comfortable with the wording there.

Rob Hoggarth: You don't - so there would be some change to assertion. Yes you're right, I mean not abandon the assertion that ICANN uses but abandon the strategy, abandon the construct of...

Dave Archbold: Yes it's difficult. I mean it - basically the - ICANN says that it is based on that when in actual fact it isn't because it's twisted so much.

Rob Hoggarth: Right. Expectation. I agree that assertion is not the right word...

Dave Archbold: Right.

Rob Hoggarth: ...so I'll...

Dave Archbold: If we could just mark it up and try and think of a better one.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, I'll...

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: ...yes. One's process issue and it's Bart's comment I think was very helpful in terms of raising that concept.

You will all recall that, you know, just based upon the group's consensus that the process in terms of drafting the final report is as I understand is follows.

You're complete this draft and get it to a point where the Working Group is comfortable with it.

Ideally we'll do that in the next week or two so that we can have a version of the draft posted for communities to potentially discuss in Singapore.

It's okay that we're passed the - that we'll be passed the community deadline for posting documents because there's not going to be an action, you know, a board decision or something like that in Singapore but that we'll have a document out for the community to have an opportunity to discuss in person.

We'll also put it on based on your advice in San Francisco the draft will also go out potentially once you get that - we get that community feedback it'll go out for public notice.

We could do that at the same time. That all depends upon where you all are going to be as a Working Group and your comfort with the document.

And the idea there Dave I think that you came up with in San Francisco when we had the workshop was it'll be a draft final report. The community will have another opportunity to react to it and submit comments.

You'll all then as a Working Group assess those comments and produce a final report.

Now that then takes us back to the charter of the Working Group. And this gets to Bart's point.

You know, number one the GAC will have an - or GAC members will have an opportunity to comment during the comment period.

There will also be according to the charter of this Working Group when the final report is done it then gets circulated to the various SOs and ACs. And each SO and AC then has the opportunity to report back to the Working Group formally, you know, as a written document to say thank you Working Group, we are fine with it or Working Group we're not fine with it for the following reasons.

That then you guys would consider whether you'd make some additional changes or whether you would go ahead and submit the report with, you know, all the approvals or with approvals and objections. And those would be the recommendations that then go to the board at which time the board can accept or reject your recommendations as well.

So I mean there are going to be a number of opportunities formally for the GAC to come back and say wait a second, we don't like the idea that you're,

you know, changing this classification. We don't like the RIRs or any number of other potential concerns they would have.

Dave Archbold: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: And...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I would (Foshetta) is it. Our community intents is at-large is likely to want some hybridization model rather than one that's sort of secondly off the shelf from the recommendations.

Rob Hoggarth: And that may be so. I think, you know, Dave's concept and perhaps that's something that you could anticipate in working through this draft document because I can't remember the exact paragraph at the moment.

You know, we talk in this draft about how the RIR system is the overall framework. But each SO and AC then has the opportunity to be flexible in how it's applied or how it's adjusted or how it's shifted or whatever.

Dave Archbold: Can I - there's a subtle difference in how I would put that Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Well and yes, please clarify any comments that I've...

Dave Archbold: My view -- and it is only my view -- is that the makeup of the regions whatever that is there is only I say let's take Asia-Pacific region. The countries in the Asia-Pacific region must be the same for every SO and AC.

So the modifications that we're talking about are like GNSO merely says now within the bylaws that all these constituency elements are to aim for geographical diversity. It doesn't actually refer to the regions at all from memory.

That's fine. That's a different solution if you like, to the geographic diversity problem. I don't think we can say all right, the ccNSO can take the ICANN regions and move five countries from here and five countries to there.

And so that the regions that we use are slightly different from the regions that the board uses or that ALAC uses.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, there has to be consistency.

Dave Archbold: Right, so this - the actual makeup of the regions has got to be consistent. How you use those regions within your ISOC is up to you subject to the approval of the board.

Stony silence.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well it's - without foreshadowing too much what I suspect some of the community feedback will be because whilst I'd like to be able to think I would be successful looking at a crystal ball, I haven't got the feedback yet so I am guessing here.

Dave Archbold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I've got for example, looking at what in our last discussions we're relatively comfortable indications that something along an RIR type model would make sense to our community.

And then looking at what changes, let's just use the Asia-Pacific model again because it's one you've already introduced to today's conversation, it immediately says to me looking at that recent listing that we have a likelihood of that - but then why can't we do an RIR model and have a group of island state interests and a group of Arabic interest groups clearly delineated at the beginning, in other words, going to some RIR model with a dash of hybridization that's clearly outlined at the beginning that Dave just what I'm

suspecting will be the feedback. But just looking at the list, you know, it sort of sifts out that way.

Dave Archbold: Yes. Okay let...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, do you really want to have these changes to only emulate and RIR model exactly or an RIR-like model with the flexibility for the already identified needs of the special interest groups?

Dave Archbold: Yes. To answer some of those I think it's got to be something that is based upon but may not be identical to the RIR model.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes I think that's - yes.

Dave Archbold: For example, the RIR model puts Antarctica in North America I seem to remember.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And there are a whole bunch of things we won't be happy about.

Dave Archbold: That's right, okay. So that may be an instant modification that most people would agree with.

We are - the RIR model moves many of the Eastern European states into Europe out of Asia.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, but they're predominately the Arabic's.

Dave Archbold: Right. We have got to recognize the national sovereignty of lots of the - of all the countries. Many of those countries have been wanting to move into Europe. Some may not have been.

I think they're at a - not a transitional, at a one-off. Countries that are being required to move should have the option of saying no, we don't actually want to move. We want to stay where we are thank you very much.

And to me that would be acceptable. So you get your list changed in that way. So there will be an initial refining of the list by the individual countries on a one-off basis at the time of implementation.

So you're going to get differences there. But once those differences have been made that structure will be consistent throughout ICANN. And it's up to the SOs and ACs whether they actually use that structure or likely GNSO do it in a slightly different way.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes the second part I don't think there's any disagreement with at all. It's how we get to that initial list without too much drama that...

Dave Archbold: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...think the interesting part. And (unintelligible) I didn't feel that the current report in its draft form was making that option clear enough. I...

Dave Archbold: I 100% agree.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You were saying here is a bowl of oranges, here is a bowl of apples and here's a bowl of bananas and no you're not allowed to have any fruit salad.

And I think we all recognize that there's going to be a need for fruit salad.

Dave Archbold: Yes, yes. If we had started looking at the points of general principles to start with that's one that I was going to make.

And the other one is I don't think we have got enough in - about whether you call them special interest groups or some region or whatever.

I don't like only using sub regional because many of them will be cross regional...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, we need...

Dave Archbold: ...I think.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...(nomenclature) but I think we all agree with the principle of what we're talking about.

Dave Archbold: Yes, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think - we're going to be heading to sort of (Clusto), you know. There was some sort of associated terminology that we came up with in San Francisco that I thought we were comfortable (which we're)...

Dave Archbold: Rob can you recall?

Rob Hoggarth: I'll go back to that transcript. I had listened to the recordings and didn't pick that up. But I'll do that second check through...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: ...to try to find some...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If there isn't then we need to try and create a...

Rob Hoggarth: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...(unintelligible) that works. Because things like special interest groups for anyone who comes out of the ISOC world is going to have an entirely different meaning so...

Dave Archbold: What is the entirely different meaning?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh they're effective Working Groups. They're a stage up from those who (serve us). They're project-based. They're not ad hoc. They're formalized topic-based interest groups...

((Crosstalk))

Dave Archbold: (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So you would have special interest group on IPV6 or you would have a special interest group on education or you would have a special interest group on (Z health), certainly nothing to do (unintelligible) or by definition cross check and therefore I guess extrapolatable to be cross-regional.

So to some extent that would meet some of their needs. But to the other extent it would indicate that some - there would be a far more less I fear attitude to have the (use) of those interpreted.

So it - the role that we see is very important for consistency across the ISES and the FOs and use within ICANN might be lost on this (unintelligible) particularly careful.

Dave Archbold: Okay. I mean I think it's unlikely that we'll come up with a name that isn't used by somebody somewhere.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Yes).

Bart Boswinkel: David this is Bart.

Dave Archbold: Yes?

Bart Boswinkel: Listening to your conversation I think Section 34 says I think that is critical - so that's still on Page 9.

Dave Archbold: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: That is critical in explaining how the proposed geographic regions will work doesn't really capture say what you just discussed and what you just proposed.

It's a bit - it's attitude very or say for people by the board - their own diversity methodology...

Dave Archbold: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: ...it is more appropriate to their unique operational community characteristics. You can bend it say both sides, both ways. Either you adjust the geographic regions up to what you want or it's more how you use it functionally.

Dave Archbold: Right, yes. I think...

Bart Boswinkel: And that's...

Dave Archbold: ...it needs more clarity, yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, and especially that if you use the words (San Douglas), their own (Douglas) to methodology.

Dave Archbold: Yes, yes.

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob. What it sounds like we need is to wordsmith Paragraphs 33 and 34 and actually have a new paragraph between the two that talks about the fruit salad concepts.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes I would like that parted out...

Rob Hoggarth: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But particularly before we build into recommendations. And to be honest I'm kind of uncomfortable using the word recommendations. I think they're discussion points or options at this stage but...

Dave Archbold: But this is a draft of a final report that has to contain recommendations. So all we're using is the format of the final report and asking comments.

I understand what you're saying but that caveat's got to go on the whole report.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We'll get to that paragraph.

Bart Boswinkel: So why not use that (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well you think - I think the whole - let's go back up to our rolling (unintelligible). We are recommending a modification to the existing framework. That's fine.

The (minutia) and details of that are not Option A versus Option B, options, Option C.

And the way it's written, you know, we, you know, by the time we get to Option D, you know, adopt the RIR model I think we're going to spend a reasonable amount of time then explaining that oh well we mean an RIR model that's not actually a strict RIR model. I mean, you know what I mean?

Dave Archbold: Yes. I mean it's going to involve if we go down this road somebody somewhere within ICANN being responsible for maintaining the list of countries to regions.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, yes, yes. So perhaps what would make me feel - let's get established we do need that additional panning out and another paragraphing in the 30 to 36 series.

Then we - if we could have a section then before we go into sort of the one and the two, the modification to the framework and then the flexibility type subheadings even if it's a title or a something or just a couple of bullet points that just establish for the reader that we are recommending modification to the existing framework.

And we are also making a very clear caveat that such modifications need to be flexible and then the following general principles blah, blah, blah for existing framework modifications should be considered and apply.

And the following points on flexibility should - do you see how changing that design of the language and taking the reader through that process slightly differently will hopefully take them away from us do I have a choice between this and that or am I looking for some sort of more consensus best fit model to be developed?

Dave Archbold: Yes, yes. And I agree and I think somehow we've got to - I'm concerned about the special interest groups. I've got the call them splat at the moment because I haven't got another term.

And I think they're important to bring in at an early stage as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely yes.

Dave Archbold: Because otherwise it appears that we're going with the RIR framework and we're totally ignoring all the other issues.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly right. That makes me very uncomfortable which is why having, you know, a slightly different design on what we're calling recommendations would be useful.

Dave Archbold: Yes. Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: Dave can I sort of read back my interpretation of your consensus recommendation here?

Dave Archbold: Yes please do.

Rob Hoggarth: Like us to go back and rework Section B, Paragraphs 32 through 36 to, you know, incorporate some more discussion particularly to highlight this concept of a - it's a framework based on the RIR model but modified or modifiable depending on a certain transition period or set of processes by which individual sovereign governments or representative groups within ICANN can opt into different categories within that framework.

Then what you're suggesting Cheryl and I'm not sure we can - we'll - we can play around on the drafting side with the execution of this recommendation.

What you want to have is then a section or some text or language between existing Paragraph 36 and 37, you know, it would be prior to the actual recommendations that flushes out more of this concept of modifying, you know, basically underlying the fact that we are recommending modifying the existing framework.

But it's got to be flexible and it's got to be flexible on the following general principles. And here are a number of options of the Working Group has considered.

Now that's where I understand we are at this moment and then perhaps we can do a draft of the document is for you all as a Working Group is then to say and here are some of the options.

And then, you know, essentially going we've consider these options. We think that options A, C, and D are the best but, you know, these are a number of ways that we could go.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely.

Rob Hoggarth: Is that right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But I wouldn't actually be wedded to the necessity to have the recommendations as such, listed as recommendations just in their briefest form down past Paragraph 36, 37. I think they can be, you know, right off the top.

You know, we are recommending change. We are recommending that is flexible. And that we are recommending that in particular it takes into account and our common model that meets particular cultural special interest in various other words yet to be inserted their needs.

In other words those macros from what we're currently calling our recommendation, you know, to modify, to be flexible, and to, you know, do those, adopt the RIR model. Well I wouldn't necessarily make that recommendation but to have that last section, the communities to be flexible to meet their needs.

And then what - the paragraphs that are currently existing under each of those recommendation headings are supportive and explanatory in the text of the document.

Dave Archbold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes so it's almost just taking the word recommendation - for example four recommendations for oversight for future review.

If you - if - I'm more comfortable if we've made a bunch of one, two, three, four, five for recommendations right at the beginning and then have Section 4 simply talking about oversight and future review.

It just allows people to see the high principles that we're trying to establish and engender and then the text as supportive of them but not concrete choices between one or the other. But that's just me.

Yes. I mean the structure that I'm used to which is probably not an ICANN structure is that a lot of what you have got in the subsequent paragraphs are almost the Working Group's considerations.

And I would probably put them up first and go through if you like, the thought processes that there was a need for a general principle of geographic diversity, et cetera, et cetera.

And falling out of that is the basic fundamental recommendation. So I'd almost turn those on their head so that you go through the thought processes of the Working Group before arriving at and as a result of all that here's what we're talking about.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well certainly if you're going to write it to a conclusion and have the recommendations concluded, yes. And I don't mind that direction only

because I want to see them, you know, several irrelevant jointly approached in the text.

Dave Archbold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But we would still be listing them in the synopsis and executive summaries LOB upfront anyway.

Dave Archbold: Absolutely, absolutely yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Understood. That's very helpful from my part.

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart again. Is it - if I understand it correctly in fact what you want Cheryl is to make it one recommendation which contains several elements?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well actually yes. I think I'd be relatively comfortable with that because the primary recommendation is yes we should change. We should change...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We should change the framework.

Bart Boswinkel: Because say if you frame it that way say so as the outcome this is the recommendation not one, two, three, four it's very clear it's a pattern.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. We're recommending a change and here are sort of the enablers and the...

Bart Boswinkel: Principles.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...options that...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Dave Archbold: Yes I think that would work.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because everything else is a very well-reasoned, well based rationalization for those outcomes.

Dave Archbold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That was actually a complement Rob. I hope you picked that up.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you Cheryl. I'm - they're so rare that I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I just didn't want you to miss it.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. Thank you he says graciously.

Dave Archbold: Okay I am comfortable with that. But I think we then need to do something about that before we can grow that much, much further.

Can you and I Rob work on doing just that and produce another version that we can send out?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir. I think that, you know, this draft has and this conversation have, you know, done what I think you intended to have them do which is essentially to spur the discussion the - this is very fungible in terms of a document and how it's ordered and everything else.

The real key of getting it down in writing was to force this sort of conversation to say okay is everybody comfortable with this and are we going in the right direction.

We can reorder and restructure this definitely to comply with the consensus that you guys are reaching here.

And I think that's an excellent recommendation Dave. I mean basically what we need to do now is go back and restructure things consistent with this conversation.

And then I think that will, you know, drive, you know, more detailed edits. I think that the one other thing that this conversation has been helpful on is getting you all to think about, you know, maybe this is more of a two-step process.

If you've got this general recommendation you have this whole other transition piece that's not necessarily reflected in this document and coming to some terms about whether you detail that transition in this recommendation document or you go more the direction of saying board here's the overall general direction that we're recommending.

If you agree then we'll take the next step of, you know, providing you with the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Implementation.

Rob Hoggarth: ...Ts and I - yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes implementation.

Rob Hoggarth: But that's for you all to discuss. But I mean that's, you know, sort of your decision point I think from here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well we're going to give feedback on implementation when this goes through its next iterations with the community anyway.

But perhaps we should be very particular to ask them for implementation options and...

Dave Archbold: Yes but I think we should give some ideas on that. If you don't give people something to criticize you tend not to get any feedback at all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes absolutely.

Dave Archbold: So I think we should put something out there and yes ask for a comment on it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Dave Archbold: I wouldn't defer at all to yet another Working Group at some time in the future. If the board want that they can do that without us telling them.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I thought it would what Rob was referring to was a little early in the conversation was to have, you know, here's a couple of options and of course is there something else your community can come up with?

I think that's a reasonable approach to get them to react.

Dave Archbold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's happened in a number of other work groups and that's not a bad way of getting - we usually get reasonable feedback from communities.

Dave Archbold: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There is this direction, there is that direction and then there is this alternative or hybrid between the two.

And there may be more. If there are let us know. But yes, we need to give them something concrete to react to and at least having things like the RIR model in there is going to give them something to react to.

Dave can I ask I know we were sort of out there in the 30s and hadn't gone much further but I did wonder why you had Paragraph 58 highlighted?

Dave Archbold: It may have been that...

Rob Hoggarth: If it can help jog your memory Dave that was, you know, you were concerned about how that was characterized.

Dave Archbold: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: And I - so I left it there because I thought it was important to note that that concern was still there. In the timing that we are trying to generate the draft I was not - my muse abandoned me and I couldn't find a way to sort of to deal with that.

The concept was, you know, how to - whether it was important - because I recall from our discussion whether it was important to, you know, talk about this sort of ad hoc evolution that took place on an SO by AC basis because the idea was really to try to find justification or some support for why you wanted to be flexible going forward.

This could be - this paragraph could be jettisoned. But I think perhaps...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: ...we sort of set it aside for now just because when we do do the reordering this may, you know, naturally...

Dave Archbold: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: ...just fall out.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Dave Archbold: My basic concern was that I don't think it was true. I think how it was adopted by communities on sort of a one-off basis when they wrote their particular bylaws varied from place to place.

The only one that I think has changed it over time probably is the GNSO. So I was concerned about this ad hoc continuing process thing.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'd...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Dave - sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...be...

Bart Boswinkel: Dave but even the interim solution of the (unintelligible) is the showing the roles that you need for flexibility.

Dave Archbold: Yes, yes I suppose. I didn't take that as it depends what we're looking for. I have no problem about needing the flexibility. We all know that I think.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Dave Archbold: I just didn't like that wording that gave me an impression of something happening that I didn't see particularly there.

I think it could come out and be reworded and brought in and dealt with without these particular words here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I actually think that the argument for flexibility is well dealt with and this doesn't aid in any way. With the diversity and the need for flexibility we probably need to be thinking about a very likely future clustering of need.

And that is coming out of the identification of developing and developed countries where we have at least developed and emerging economies about to section themselves off into interest groups in terms of new GTLD processes applicant support.

And of course now I hear developing countries so much being proposed as a regular thing within ICANN.

Dave Archbold: Right yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So if we...

Rob Hoggarth: Okay well I...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...want to talk about a couple of examples, you know, we could certainly not just stick to, you know, island states, language groups and various other things. We have the very real examples right now coming to a head in Singapore.

Dave Archbold: Yes good point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I'd be happy to use boxed out examples to, you know, help the reader understand what we're concerned about in terms of...

Dave Archbold: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Dave Archbold: My biggest flaw on the interest groups side is the question that I think we posed back in San Francisco as well is fine, we have the interest groups. What recognition do they get? What does that mean? So you have an interest group what does it do for you, et cetera, et cetera? And that really hasn't been flushed out.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And what it doesn't do for you is give you direct entry into any structural or functional outcome that is linked to graphically based models i.e., where you have a diversity rule or requirement in the case of for example the at-large.

I can only see it as, you know, getting very uncontrollable if one is to have representation on councils and executives that reflect every emerging associate even in later on business associate instead of interest groups.

Dave Archbold: I absolutely agree. And I think that's got - we've got...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And it doesn't give you these needs to be clearly articulated.

Dave Archbold: Yes, yes, agreed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You know, it might give you the opportunity to gather together in a supported facilitated situation at an ICANN public meeting as those needs arise.

But it doesn't give you, you know, seat on the ALAC or a position in a constituency to representation model in one of our other councils.

Dave Archbold: Yes. Fine, I agree that's what it doesn't give you. What does it give you? And that's the way I like to think about it.

Rob Hoggarth: Well Dave as you have written this, what it would give you is or at least as this draft suggests is that structure would apply to the Board of Directors.

So that would be a - at least as it is written now. You know, you said that this existing framework would apply to the Board of Directors...

Dave Archbold: No, no we're talking about interest groups now, special interest groups.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay understood but so you're I was - and my fault there. I was thinking or concerned about to the extent that you create this broader framework that might have island nations or others that that might be an issue. I'm sorry I'll...

Dave Archbold: Now I'm saying the special interest groups just like Cheryl said, I'm with Cheryl on this. Being in a special interest group such as island states or whatever does not give you in my view a right to then participate in the management model just by virtue of being in that special interest group.

Rob Hoggarth: I understand that. I - what I was harkening back to was the previous suggestion that in recommending the hybridized RIR framework in which you might have additional groups how those would be applied.

So I mean I guess that gets you back to that what is the definition of special interest groups?

Dave Archbold: Yes, yes.

Rob Hoggarth: That would be separate from the framework itself. But if you do have a hybridized RIR framework that includes certain additional groups -- Arab states, small island nations, then you'd also have to do the parsing at that level.

And if you had that framework then you might not have those special interest groups within an SO or an AC. But that would be dependent upon the SO or AC.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed Rob. And I think this is going back to what we said in San Francisco where admittedly the terminology wasn't something we could agree on.

But from my mind when I was talking about trans-regional cross regional intra and sub-regional clusters it's still the GI regions that get you the management and representational roles.

But the gathering and association and disassociation across, between and throughout those regions is where the flexibility comes in.

Dave Archbold: Yes, again my own view is that so that people can understand I would separate the two things out.

I would not try and incorporate things if you like within the IRIR structure. I would see them as something separate running parallel to but not part of.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It certainly needs to be - that needs to be clarified because otherwise you've got expectations that might be misdirected unless it's very, very clear.

If you've got a district and a sub-district for example and you've got a model which allows for support, financial or otherwise, material support of a district what often happens is those sub-districts particularly if for whatever reason the sub-district is in some cases more active, more important in inverted (unintelligible) and more largely populated in some situations than another bona fide district you can get into some very thorny areas and arguments where, you know, but hang, on we do this and, you know, therefore we should be given that.

Now that needs to be avoided in the ICANN model by making everything incredibly clear at the very beginning of...

Dave Archbold: Really?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...do you get from what particular partitioning.

Dave Archbold: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If it's between a linear approach which is designed on hierarchy and a more interactive and to some extent I think a more akin to social modeling approach where you look at how things actually happen versus what the flowchart says I should do.

Dave Archbold: Indeed, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But I'm sure you've got a tool that'll draw this up. If anyone's got a tool that can graphically represent this it's you. Come on Bart, you must have one.

Bart Boswinkel: No I don't. Dave has one.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Could you...

((Crosstalk))

Dave Archbold: Okay. Now that we've got onto Bart's tools I think the usefulness of this conference is...

Bart Boswinkel: You don't want to go there.

Rob Hoggarth: Dave can I...

Dave Archbold: I think the most constructive approach now is for us to go away and try and incorporate some of this and come back with it I think.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir. And this is Rob. Based on looking at the calendar and timing and seeing that there are some substantial, you know, organizational issues here with the present document Dave I would propose to have something to you from me by next Thursday close of business that would then give you several days to sort of react to and then share with the Working Group maybe by the Tuesday the 7th or Wednesday the 8th.

Dave Archbold: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Now and I'm just getting the ideal case scenario. If that were to happen and Working Group members could produce some sort of feedback by just before Singapore then you might have a document that's worth circulating.

I think what the latter part of this discussion has underscored is there are still some potentially fundamental issues that you all still should talk through or work out prior to circulating something to the community.

And I think, you know, we're on the right path. I think it's just, you know, it needs some percolation or fermentation time.

And this is right - I think you're all in the sweet spot where you need to be which is oh, I understand now which means Cheryl no I disagree you Dave. That's an excellent point but let's take it in this direction.

So I mean I think you're in that sweet spot but I don't know if the calendar cooperates in terms of I don't know that you want to force that that's all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm also concerned if I may Dave just before you jump in that yes, Rob thank you the few of us that are here or in the sweet spot. But where are the usual suspects have always been here? We are not the whole work group.

Dave Archbold: Indeed.

Rob Hoggarth: Well I'm hopeful that your fellow Working Group members will be listening to this recording sort of catching up and coming up to speed on that and being able to share on the list sort of comments or discussion points.

Because I think this has been a real good discussion. And certainly someone listening will be able to come up to speed and may be able to share some perspectives as well.

Dave Archbold: Okay just can we go back to dates for the moment because that's my biggest concern...

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir.

Dave Archbold: ...Rob? And I will try and do as you say. I have a huge case in court on the 7th, 8th, and 9th...

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Dave Archbold: ...of June. So...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We won't be (unintelligible) in your last day.

Dave Archbold: I spend my life in court.

Rob Hoggarth: Well and sir having understood that, you know, every hour of court time requires about 20 hours of preparation...

Dave Archbold: Yes absolutely.

Rob Hoggarth: ...that affects your time period before that time.

Dave Archbold: It does. However I will do my best. I will burn the candle at both ends as usual and come to ICANN for a rest.

Rob Hoggarth: If I can ask a general point -- and I recognize you guys are well past your hour block of the call -- is that I had as a placeholder simply as a precaution like we've needed to do in past ICANN public meetings reserve the time for a workshop for this group.

I think you could have that workshop regardless of whether you have a draft. We could even suggest that a draft document will be shared at the workshop...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: ...with members of the community. That would buy you guys another extra week or two so that the deadline for a document would be the workshop.

And that would sort of kick off sort of the next round of community discussions. There would be the workshop, people would have it, it would then go out on public notice as a proposed draft final report. And get you on sort of a good cycle for potentially some more maybe even a final report by Senegal.

Dave Archbold: Yes now that would be on the Thursday?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir. Right now tentatively it's Thursday around 11 o'clock I believe.

Dave Archbold: Okay well the only problem with that is I wouldn't want to just launch it there if you like because that then means we don't have the ability to give it to our SOs and ACs earlier in the week.

Rob Hoggarth: If you would like to do that ahead of time you guys obviously can circulate any drafts that's being produced. You could even circulate the present, you know...

Dave Archbold: Yes that's true.

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: ...your own discussions.

Dave Archbold: Yes. I'd like to get it out there to our main groups who may not attend the meeting on the Thursday is what I'm getting at.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes Rob just to let you know I'll be missing in action. But you know how many of the ccNSO workgroups are running that day?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes I understand.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It would have to be - it'll be very, very difficult (unintelligible) the Thursday.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes and that's - and unfortunately that was the only public time. Again you could all decide not even to have the workshop in view of the fact that you're still working on the draft. You know, it's entirely your all's call.

Dave Archbold: Okay well let's see how the next week and a bit go Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay all right.

Bart Boswinkel: Dave this is Bart. So what I could do is see if I can find you a slot during the TCNSO meeting of 50 minutes to explain where you're heading or where the Working Group is heading. Because I think by now it's getting very concrete so people are more interested than in the past.

Dave Archbold: Yes okay fine, yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Because that will give you a sounding board and maybe you can do this, I don't know Cheryl if that's possible with ALAC as well.

It will provide you with sounding boards of where the thinking of the Working Group is heading...

Dave Archbold: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: ...in terms of recommendations.

Dave Archbold: Yes that works.

Rob Hoggarth: That's also something Olga that you could consider as well for GNSO. I mean Dave was very generous with his time in this during the San Francisco meeting he, Carlton, and Cheryl for, you know, discussions within the at-large community. So, you know, I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think those little, you know, cameo visits worked well too. I think you got a lot out of them.

Dave Archbold: The one thing that I could never understand was why Africa weren't happy when Africa weren't being touched by this?

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe that's the reason.

Dave Archbold: Well that's what they wanted. They said...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Africa were not happy with the option of Arabic states being cut off from. That's what Africa weren't happy about.

Dave Archbold: They weren't being cut off from them. Anyway that's another story.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well...

((Crosstalk))

Dave Archbold: I'm going to have to go...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Have they read the proposal? Okay I'm 12 minutes into another call so are we wrapping up?

Dave Archbold: We are wrapping up. Thank you one and all, been most helpful. Rob as ever we're relying on you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Dave Archbold: I look forward to hearing from you.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir. And I'll send out a meeting report for you and for your absent members.

Dave Archbold: Okay. Thank you all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, bye.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye-bye.

Dave Archbold: Bye.

Olga Cavalli: Bye Dave.

Dave Archbold: Bye.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you Gisella. Thank you (unintelligible).

END