

**Transcript**  
**GNSO Drafting Group on Cross SO/AC Working Groups**  
**21 July 2011 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the **GNSO Drafting Group on Cross SO/AC Working Groups** teleconference on 21 July 2011 at 15:00 UTC. . Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-cwg-20110721-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/>

**Attendees**

Jonathan Robinson  
Bill Drake  
John Berard

**ICANN Staff**

Liz Gasster  
Margie Milam  
Glen de Saint Gery  
Gisella Gruber-White

Apology:

Wendy Seltzer

Absent:

Rosemary Sinclair  
Jaime Wagner  
Jeff Neuman  
Tim Ruiz

Coordinator: Please go ahead. The call is now being recorded.

Gisella Gruber: Thank you (Tim). Good morning and good afternoon to everyone on today's Drafting Group and Cross SOAC Working Groups on Thursday the 21st of July. We have John Berard, Bill Drake, Jonathan Robinson. From staff we have Margie Milam, Liz Gasster, Glen DeSaintgery, and myself Gisella Gruber. Apologies today noted from Wendy Seltzer. And if I could just remind everyone please to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you very much. So I put out an agenda and Margie has worked on a drafting team charter. I guess the first question for input is on the agenda. If that agenda makes sense or if there is any changes or proposed changes to the agenda from either John, or Bill, or Margie, or Liz.

Bill Drake: I'm looking at the Drafting Team charter document where - oh the agenda is over here on the right.

John Berard: Jonathan this is John. I don't have any problem with the agenda and I think we can probably power through this Drafting Team charter pretty quickly. I have a couple of topline questions when we get to it.

Jonathan Robinson: Right well let's try and make it as efficient as possible. I mean I think what - you can see what I was hoping to do here is work through the Drafting Team charter and make sure we had something. And I think you in some ways it seems like it is perhaps overkill to have the charter, but on another it makes it clear what we are hoping to do and achieve. So I can see the motivation for having something as sort of formal as this in place.

The other thing is the rest of the agenda then tries to figure out how frequently we are going to meet and what we are going to try to produce by Dakar, and I guess this is a helpful indication. The fact that there's just a couple of us on this and I think everyone is busy. I think there's a lot of parallel work going on, so we've got to try to set a realistic goal for what might be achievable, but let's talk through.

Why don't we go through this section by section then, and really in the first instance, Section 1, I mean we've got me down as an interim chair and we need to think about whether we get some help. A co-chair or whether we - you know how we handle the ongoing way in which this group might work. I don't know if - just I think for the sake of ease, if you've got no comment or don't think you don't want to see anything change, let's just say that and we will move through it quickly.

Bill Drake: Jonathan this is Bill. I am inclined towards the minimum bureaucratization of this process because I wouldn't think that we have to get - well I am not inclined towards the heavy formalization of things in the first place. So rather we want to build a whole apparatus around this is a question to me, so I'm pretty content on keeping it minimalist. And you know you are perfectly fine as the chair as far as I'm concerned, so I don't know that we need more.

John Berard: And as long as there is just - I mean there's only a few of us who are involved Jonathan, so I don't think it will be that difficult to be the chair. There are a lot fewer cats to herd in this instance, so...

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. I mean I think that's right. And I suppose what I'm really looking for is you know I guess for people to really step up to the plate as much as possible and really also if anyone can help in assisting the staff as well, because there is going to be me working with Margie as to how we draft this and if anyone else is willing to work closely with her. But as you say, given that we are such a small group potentially, we are small anyway. And with active participation, it may be even smaller. So perhaps we can just be rather efficient about this.

John Berard: Well I would like to make one organizational recommendation, and that is anybody who signed up and who doesn't participate on a call gets first dibs on any assignment that we might come up with.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah. Fair enough.

John Berard: But just to - if I might, just to satisfy an urge that I have. I mean so the title of this is - and now all of a sudden the screen has gone weird on me. The title on this is the Cross Community Working Group Drafting Team, but really isn't it the Cross Community Working Group/Working Group Drafting Team?

What we are aiming to do is to put some brackets around what it means to have a cross community working group and yet we are a creature of the GNSO. So we are a GNSO working group that's focused on - and I'm not trying to you know reconjure some old Monty Python skit here, but you know we're not - we are a GNSO - we are a creature of the GNSO. Aware that in the future the complexity of the issues confronting, ICANN will likely cause there to be more cross community working groups and so we are looking at what - how those things should work.

Jonathan Robinson: Right.

John Berard: And so as you say in the mission and scope, the Drafting Team will be responsible for developing a proposed framework under which working groups jointly chartered by other ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees. I mean I think that's part of what we should be talking about is what does it mean for there to be a joint charter. Because we had a joint charter with the Joint Applicant Support Work Group, but that didn't really seem to do the job. So it's not just about being jointly chartered, but it's about having you know charters that are aligned, or exact, or the same.

Jonathan Robinson: Well I think that's absolutely right. And it's funny you should mention it because the one thing in mission and scope that I underscored or highlighted was the word jointly because it's quite clear that - well it seems that one of the big issues in the past has been the possibility of two different charters. And one of the points that I started to hear emerging in Singapore was the

issue that - you know one of the key inflection points anyway is whether or not more than one charter can exist.

Now I have to try and keep my personal view out of this and try and hear what others have to say, but you know that's clearly an issue. It's the issue of joint charters, a single charter, or multiple charters, but yeah so the charter is a key point.

John Berard: Right and so that ought to be part of you know one of our - it probably belongs somewhere else in this document than in the mission and scope. But you know I - you know then the question is do we as this GNSO Working Group focus on this Cross Community Working Group issue? Do we want to officially solicit participation from the other SO and ACs?

Jonathan Robinson: Well that's a really good point. And that as you know doubt will be aware comes up in Section 3, and there are really two ways of dealing with this as I see it. We either literally form a Cross Community Working Group in the first instance and bring in other peers and get others to sort of jointly come into this or simply encourage as much participation as possible.

Now we know already that the ccNSO is pursuing something - is looking into this themselves as far as I remember and recall. So really we would want someone from that group within the ccNSO at least participating in our effort as well.

Bill Drake: This is Bill. If I could perhaps say a word. First of all on the approach from the get go, I do think it would make sense to try to do this on a cross basis. I think if we go off and develop within the council something that's kind of insular and not mapping with what the other groups are thinking about this kind of thing, then we're going to have a kind of process where we have to go through (postdoc) efforts to reconcile very different text, et cetera, and I just think that that's going to be adding cycles. I mean I think we should be

working with the other groups from the beginning to try to work out a common solution that everybody has - buys into.

My second point is on the notion of the jointness of the charter. I expressed the view and others from MT expressed the view in Singapore, and I will reiterate, that I don't necessarily think this is a space in which one must have a singular completely synchronized kind of charter under which every organization works. I look at the JAS experience and I say well the fact of the matter is if we had not had two different charters working there, we wouldn't have gotten anywhere.

So there could be cases where one defines a common set of problems that concern different parts of the community, and there is a desire to have some ordination and communication going on as different parts of the community work on it. And you have parts where there's shared objectives, and shared work (bits), et cetera, but there's no reason in the world why those different SOACs can't also in my view perhaps have different charters where they pursue different elements that are more specific to their constituencies, their interests, and so on. I think that's okay.

So I am against personally trying to rigorously impose a singular approach on this. And frankly I think that if the GNSO tries to do that, it would make it very hard for buy-in to happen for the other parties. So why even go that route?

John Berard: Well it's curious though. I mean if Jonathan is right that the ccNSO is looking at this, how come we didn't get invited to that?

Bill Drake: Because we have a dynamic. This fragmentation and silo stuff is already setting in, and this is why you know it's problematic. We need to act more affirmatively to break down the silos and get people talking across spaces. That doesn't mean that everybody within each space has to have completely the same substantive agenda, but there needs to be communication and it's not happening.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, but don't we cover that effectively? If we sort of bring this back to the charter that we are discussing here, I mean does Section 3 cover that adequately for the moment?

Bill Drake: Section 3 - objectives and goals.

John Berard: Section 3 is formation, staffing, and organization.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

John Berard: So we are open to all interested parties, publication of, distribution of, so staff as a group. We had this conversation a bit ago about the resources. Where does working in support of this fall and there is a list of things to do.

Jonathan Robinson: You mean in terms of prioritization.

John Berard: Right.

Jonathan Robinson: Well let's just assume for the moment - I mean I'm just thinking well it's a fair point, but is it - just in terms of trying to keep it focused on this issue of how we make this. Because there is a point that's being raised now and it was raised in Singapore. There's a risk that if we simply keep this to a GNSO activity, we will just have to go back to square one again when we bring it out in the open.

So while we could have it as a primarily GNSO activity, the only way to really make sure that this is effective is if we invite, and include, and encourage as much broad participation as possible. And in so doing, try and keep whatever we are doing as a GNSO aligned with any other thinking that's going on throughout the ICANN community.

So just trying to deal with that for a moment, does the membership criteria to the proposed outreach et cetera - is that adequate to ensure that or should we be doing something else?

Bill Drake: As long as it is not marked too much as being GNSO run. I mean that's always the issue.

Jonathan Robinson: As we discussed a moment ago, I think that...

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead.

Bill Drake: No I'm just saying it's - like one of the things. I talked to some GAC people about why the hell didn't you guys get involved in the community working groups that we set up to deal with MAPO and JAS. These are issues that are supposed to be important to you guys, et cetera.

And aside from the usual (hook) about how you know we are government and we can't do that, I was also getting the perception of well it's really your group. You are asking us to join your group and we are in your group - sort of the odd little side people you know that are - I mean there's the perception about how things can be constituted. If they are constituted by one particular entity, one particular silo, participants from the other silos look at it and think they are coming out of their playground. And so we have to find a way I think to avoid those kinds of dynamics.

Jonathan Robinson: Well the irony of that is that of course it goes back to this point where the only alternative is to call this drafting team the Cross Community Working Group. But really what we are - I'm going to go back to where this started. And the GNSO asked us to come together to form a drafting team that would

look at and try and expose the issues in and around cross community working groups and propose some ways forward.

Now I think we've got it open within us to make that as wide - to get as wide as possible participation. I don't think anyone has said, "We should only involve contributions from," - and so I accept the point. But if one just says - I think we are in danger of just getting stuck. We will continue to be saying well this is the danger of a silo, but how the hell do we break out of that silo?

The only way to do that is to reach out and say look we want, we welcome, we are very keen to have as much participation, influence, and activity from anyone within the broader ICANN community.

Bill Drake:

Jonathan I am not trying to complicate your life. I recognize we all have enough on our plates to do. I'm only saying we're not far down the track that we can't already course correct if we want to. I mean we could proceed as is and say well the council has to - one of the silos asked us to do it and figure out for that silo what we want and then we will engage people and encourage them to come and hope that that happens.

Or we can start - back up two steps and go hey folks. This is an issue that cuts across the community. Clearly these are going to come up again. Why don't we try creating a group now to take it on and then just a lot of what's already presented in this charter here can be put to work there. So I mean for me, I don't know. I'm not opposed to the idea of launching across through - to talk about the cross groups.

Jonathan Robinson: So practically how would we achieve that though? We've just missed the council meeting. I'm just wondering what practically we can do to achieve - if we were to go down that route. The existing route is we as you say - we continue in the current silo. I'm not so keen on that wording, but we continue as we are and we simply reach out across the community. What's the alternative that we go back up to the council and say look hang on? Having looked at this, we worry that we will go down a silo-based route.

Perhaps we should reach out and see before we make that decision and see - and actively reach out across the ICANN community and see what level of additional volunteers we can get. And if it falls on sort of (hollow) ground where we get no one, then we take that back to the council and say look. We are supposed to be doing this piece of work. We've got no engagement with others across the community in spite of A, B, and C efforts. We think this is potentially a problem.

Bill Drake: That's one way to do it. You could - you start with what you've got, you fail, and then you try to recalibrate. The other way is to start by saying, hey Stephane, talk to the chairs of ALAC, and ccNSO, and so on and say we'd like to form a thing and we've got a group that's interested in working with you. Please tell us who you want to nominate to join this thing and we restart it.

I will go either way. I just - I anticipate if we are doing one thing, and the ccNSO is doing another, and GAC isn't even in the conversation, and ALAC has got their own world going on about these things, we can end up coming out with something, which is then received poorly. And it is definitely the case that some other parts of the community - the experience with the JAS led to very strong perceptions.

And I know this particularly about ALAC because I'm the NCUC liaison to ALAC, so I'm on the ALAC list. And there were very strong perceptions among ALAC that you know the GNSO basically just attempted to try to dictate how everything should be done, and part of the result of that was that they got their back up about that and kind of said, "Well screw it. We're not going to wait around for you guys."

So you know what I mean? People read things and read into things, and so you know I'm for trying to get the signaling right at the front end. That's all I'm saying.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Can I turn it back then and say to either yourself or John what practically might we do to do that? What actually? Do I just go and have a conversation with Stephane and indicate the - that this is a concern that we need to - or do I put it out on the list and make sure that the council is aware that there is a risk of going down this particular route?

Bill Drake: Well I'm just telling you what I think. If you and John disagree with me and if you send a note to the drafting list and others are going to say Bill is full of it, then don't feel too obligated to follow my advice.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah.

Bill Drake: But if you agree with me, that would be...

John Berard: Bill as tempting as it sounds to say that you are full of it, I don't think you are in this instance.

Bill Drake: Oh shit. Sorry. Are we transcribing this?

John Berard: I'm sorry. Yes we are.

Bill Drake: But anyway, so I would think you know look. My view is you reach out to them, you say we'd like to do it this way. If you don't get takers, then you are able to say well at least we tried, right. We approached you guys, we said we wanted to work on a cross community basis; we invited you to come together on equal footing. If nobody responds to that, then you say fine. The council goes off, and we will try and develop our own stuff, and we will come back to you later with it.

John Berard: Okay.

Bill Drake: So in other words, rather than doing - the first model Jonathan that you suggested was we do it as is, and we invite them to our process, and if it fails, then we say gee now what do we do. Stephane help with the outreach. I'm saying (for teams that are around), let's see if building something cross community from the start fails. And if that does, then we can go siloed.

Margie Milam: Jonathan may I comment? It's Margie. I had my hand up.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes of course Margie. I would love to hear your input.

Margie Milam: Okay yeah. I just want to give you guys some perspective of some of the challenges we've had in other groups because this issue has come up for example with the group that Rosemary is trying to put together for the consumer trust metrics work.

And when we drafted that charter and circulated it for a motion that didn't actually get presented today, we got a lot of pushback because of the fact that it was set up as a joint working group. And the clear message from leadership is there is no support for joint working groups right now. Don't go there until this group we're on right now comes up with a process.

And so I'm just afraid you're going to get the same kind of obstacle if you attempt to approach it from a joint perspective. And I completely understand why you'd want to. I think in the case of my personal viewpoint and in the case of the other group that Rosemary has headed, it makes sense to do it as a joint group because it was a joint request from the board to each of the SOs and ACs. Yet, you know, we got pretty firm resistance that that's not the way to go.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Yes Margie, that's very interesting input and I suppose the challenge for me is I mean I basically guess I need to think about whether I or we or others

challenge that notion because perhaps I need to talk to Stephan about this on a one to one and just give him a call and understand why.

Because I think the argument why is we can't do joint working groups because we haven't figured out how we're doing joint working groups. But that's incredibly circular in this case because what Bill is in a sense proposing is that this is a joint working group. Yes, we don't know how we do joint working groups.

And so what we're hearing is don't do anything joint working group until we've figured out how we do do joint working groups. Is that a correct way of phrasing it?

Margie Milam: Yes. And if I may, maybe Liz wants to comment. She put some notations in the chat about one suggested way forward where you might start off with a GNSO only to get the GNSO perspective kind of in line and then expand it after you know, the document is published. I don't know Liz, if you want to comment?

Liz Gasster: Well, yes and it's not to - I mean I think I understand Bill, your point about you know, if you start in a really inclusive way then you've kind of got everyone at the table and it just seems in a sense more efficient.

And I wasn't trying to I don't know, be less efficient. I think what I was trying to do, partly it was get the GNSO's view together on joint working groups but it was also to allow you I thought to consider some options that might be a little bit out of the box, not just rules for joint working groups but you know, this issue of what the role of supporting organizations versus advisory committees are.

Because you know, here we're talking about I think by definition we're talking about joint working groups are not PDPs. We don't have joint PDP processes. So by definition when we talk about joint working groups they're

filling some other function. They're providing advice to the community or to the board or to the staff or to each other.

And in this case it almost seems premature because one of the things that I thought you know, not a staff position, just a personal opinion that I thought this group should consider is something more a fundamental question. Like I think it was Kristina Rosette who in the after action meeting said something like you know, and this is a paraphrase.

But it was something along the lines of maybe what we should be doing is not thinking so much about rules for cross working groups but think about what the role is and if they are advisory, look to advisory committees to provide their advice, really peel back the reasons for cross working groups. And it seemed to me that it was almost premature to bring the other groups into that discussion until you guys had a chance to really talk about it.

Because I think we've been talking about it like in the context of the JAS but we're not really talking about it in a holistic sense. We have lots of other or several other joint groups that seem to be operating effectively, the SSAC, GNSO working group on internationalized registration data. And I think there are some other examples.

So it was more to just not presuppose some outcome that required everyone because that may not be all you want to think about or discuss.

Bill Drake: Right. I guess I'd say two things. One is the kinds of points that you just mentioned Liz, about relative roles of SOs and ACs for example, or even the larger meta questions that Kristina may ask, I would be inclined to think it's more effective to discuss those directly with the other parties.

Trying to have that conversation amongst ourselves leaves some sort of shared world view about that, that may be out of sync with the other parties then try and take it to them. I think to me that enters into again the possibility

of feeding perceptions that the council wants to sort of set the rules for everybody else.

But the other point is on what Margie said, I wouldn't necessarily just like I wouldn't necessarily want to over generalize all aspects about community working groups from the experience of the JAS. I also wouldn't want to over generalize from the other particular instance including a failed one. Now in the case of what's been going on with the consumer thing, there are a lot of factors going on there.

That is not specific to whether or not community working groups can work as a model or something like that. There are a lot of people who just don't get what the rationale for that activity is and have trouble understanding you know, the precise, clear bounded conceptualization and how it differs from other things that already exist and so on.

And so there are a lot of things that are going on here that you know, both whether you're talking about the individual cases or the larger structural principles, you know, you've got to try to keep them clear. I'm not going - to sum the point, you know, if I'm the only one who thinks that it makes sense to start this way then fine.

But I just have this feeling that the tops are going to go off and come up with something and then we're going to go back to these other folks who didn't want to play in our sandbox because it was our sandbox and they're going to say well, that's not the way we were seeing it. And then we're going to - it becomes a negotiation to reconcile different models rather than something that you had buy in and dialogue about from the start.

And I just think in my time at ICANN we spent so much time on almost mind bogglingly needless process stuff that gets constructed to keep everybody busy that keeps us from actually doing stuff that I'd like to try to avoid things

that add layers of potential friction, misunderstanding, turf behavior, all that crap. That is my orientation. But I'm - I cede to the majority on this.

Man: Well, the challenge for me Bill, is that that is - what you describe is very closely aligned with my own sentiments on all of this. The challenge for me is what we actually do to effectively achieve that.

Now if I go back to what this document is, it's supposed to be a discussion document, not a position paper, not a set of recommendations. And in many ways it's meant to in my understanding is draw out the issues perhaps with examples. And if we make that very, very explicit that this isn't about solving the problem.

It's not about - perhaps that's a way of making it more inclusive and feel like it's the GNSO just going off and doing its own thing. That actually this is about the GNSO taking an initiative but a very inclusive initiative.

Bill Drake: Right. Let me give you a concrete example. The issue we started with before, chartering. Should charters be synched? Should everybody play by exactly the same charter, okay?

The council based on the conversations that we've had over the past half year on this, if I had to identify a probably majority view would be the view that yes indeed there should be a single sort of charter that nobody gets on in front of each other and goes off and does different things.

But if you were to - if the council were to present a document saying this to the ALAC, I would think the ALAC would have every reason to say screw that, that's not at all what we want because we just had the experience with the JAS where precisely that's what we rejected being locked into. And we want to do our own thing.

So this is us going off and trying to put forward something that we think makes sense, it makes sense in our life world, in our internal political configuration. But then you bring it into the other guys and they go that's not it.

Man: Does someone else want to speak?

Man: I guess that means me.

Man: And/or one of the staff (present).

Bill Drake: I'll shut up now.

Man: So let me see if I can make a suggestion that would allow us all to move forward arm in arm. The GNSO council has asked you Jonathan to at least at the start take the lead in figuring out what we think about how a cross community working groups and how they ought to be structured.

That I think gives you the imprimatur of the council to reach out to every supporting organization and advisory committee. Maybe it means you prodding Stephan to do it. But I think we really ought to begin this process by letting every supporting organization and advisory committee know that we intend to get into this and that we would like them to be involved at the front end so that we have the possibility of agreement at the back end.

Man: I really like that because in a way it's as you can see, I've been fishing for a practical solution because the danger is that we sit spinning our wheels at the front end.

And although I accept that we still carry some of the risks of what Bill has highlighted, at least no one can accuse us of being non-inclusive or not reaching out to gain as much initial input at the front end as possible.

Man: Right. And you know, maybe none of us has a lock on the next great idea so who knows where the next great idea is going to come from especially as it relates to the cross community working groups.

So that's where I would begin. I think maybe that what we've done right now can be repurposed after we take that step. But maybe we're just a little bit ahead of ourselves and we need to just do a little grassroots lobbying here before we begin to take votes.

Bill Drake: I'd certainly agree with that. And the only modification I would suggest is in doing that initial outreach you could present it to people that we're trying to think about how to do this.

We have a process that we have kind of started in the council, which they're welcome to join. Or if they prefer to formulate it another way from the get go we could do it that way too. I would give them the option. You know, if people don't take offers then you kind of say fine, we asked you. And you move on and do what you want to do. But you have to at least ask them first.

Man: Yes. So I think that's probably a decent way forward. Now when I look ahead if overall regardless of the extent to which we gain cross community participation or it remains as arguably it currently is, a GNSO confined effort, in order to - I mean I did a rough count and I think it's around 13 weeks to Dakar.

The question is really what might we hope to achieve between now and then and what would be an ideal outcome at Dakar given what we've just been talking about here? I mean realistically I can see perhaps three telephone meetings or something between now and then and even that is a little ambitious given the chance of people being away over that period and so on.

I think ideally we've got I suppose just maybe walking ahead, in my view what we might ideally have is a paper and/or a presentation and the paper may be

written up in the form of a presentation for some form of workshop in Dakar where even if - regardless of whether we've got broader participation or not, we can put it up for broader participation then. I accept the outcomes won't be exactly the same but how does that sound?

Man: I'm a fan of using deadlines to drive decision making. So I guess I'm okay with that.

Man: So in essence what I would be proposing guys is three meetings, three to four meetings between now and Dakar. And the presentation of a discussion document in Dakar.

What format that presentation would take and I think we'd need to think about a little more whether that's a workshop or in part that depends on the various first points that we've been discussing up until now, which is how much we manage to get others on board. So I think between now and the first meeting it's in outreach phase.

And we see who else we can get signed up and we literally do what you described as I think (genuine) grassroots lobbying and that includes talking to Stephan between now and the next meeting and see where we get to by then in terms of sign up. And that'll determine the direction from there. So I guess in essence what I'm saying what I hope we're saying or I think we're saying is that we reach out as much as possible to seek broader participation and then we take a stop check at the first meeting depending on how effective that has been.

And at that point we're either sort of shrinking back into a GNSO only initiative or accepting if we've been successful in our outreach and have got broader participation, am I being too ambitious or how does that sound?

John Berard: I vote aye on that. This is John.

Bill Drake: This is Bill. It sounds like the right way to go. The only thing I would bear in mind is that it's summer and in Europe of course that's a special thing. And so we have to be somewhat realistic about things.

I suspect at the end of the day like most stuff, we'll end up back loaded with a lot of this stuff getting started on in September.

Man: Either that or we can just put the burden on our southern hemisphere colleagues.

Bill Drake: There we go.

Man: To the extent that we have some. All right. Well, then I think really it's incumbent on me to put maybe a short note out to our group that is the CCWG discussion group.

And in fact more broadly to the council to say look, our first meeting has come away with the following points really. We have a draft charter but we felt uncomfortable going ahead full speed without making sure we first did further outreach to try to ensure as broad as possible community participation. And it is that, which we're going to do in the first phase of our work.

And we're going to take a stop check at the first meeting so I would expect we'll be somewhere like three or four weeks from now and at that point either move on as we were going or move on with broader input from there.

Man: Before you do that you should probably just have a quick chat with Stephan though, right, and let him know what the deal is.

Man: I think that's a very good point and that should be the first port of call.

Bill Drake: It sounds reasonable.

Man: Okay. Rock on Jonathan.

Man: Right. Well, I think that wraps it up then. Any comment finally from you, Margie or Liz? Is there anything else you would like to say on that? Otherwise we'll move ahead in that broad direction.

Margie Milam: This is Margie. No, I think we're fine. We'll send out a Doodle for a call in three or four weeks from now.

Man: Yes. So my approximate date for that Margie, is 11th of August.

Liz Gasster: Okay. So the only thing I want to echo is Bill's comment about vacations and staff. And Margie is going to have some knee surgery as well coming up in August. So we just may have I think the 11th works, right Margie?

Margie Milam: Yes.

Liz Gasster: But we caught her right in between vacation and surgery. So I think you picked the only window of opportunity. We're going to be in the same boat for August.

Man: That's the week commencing the 8th then, if you could put the Doodle poll out for the week commencing the 8th and let's see what we get. We may get no takers of course, which is...

Margie Milam: Okay. We'll do that. Thank you so much.

Man: Thank you everyone. I'll talk to Stephan and then based on...

Gisella Gruber-White: (Unintelligible) - can I just a quick question?

Man: Yes.

Gisella Gruber-White: Is this timing, approximate timing suitable to everyone who is on the call today?

John Berard: Yes. It works great for me. This is John.

Bill Drake: You mean the time of day that we're talking?

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes.

Bill Drake: Yes.

Gisella Gruber-White: Approximate - just because you're on a call. I'll put the Doodle out but there's no point in me giving ten time slots during the day if this is a suitable time slot for everyone, I'll work around this timing.

Bill Drake: Generally speaking.

Man: (Unintelligible) - those people who aren't on the call.

Bill Drake: Yes. It's hard to know.

Gisella Gruber-White: That's fine. I'll give other options as well. I just wanted to know for those who were on the call.

Bill Drake: For me it's convenient (if not on) the same day as the council.

Glen de Saint Gery: Gisella, this is Glen.

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thursday is a council call day. So I would say please look at the meetings that are on the GNSO calendar so that we don't crash into the same time.

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes. Absolutely. Okay.

Glen de Saint Gery: Because I know this is an urgent time for the council.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you.

Man: Okay. Great. So it sounds like we're all set then. All right. See you soon.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Thank you (Tim). I'm sure we'll be speaking before next week.

END