

**Consumer Metrics Project Discussion
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 04 October 2011 at 2000 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Consumer Metrics Project Discussion meeting on Tuesday 04 October 2011 at 2000 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/gns0/gns0-cci-20111004-en.mp3>

On page :

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#oct>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Rosemary Sinclair - NCSG
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC
Olivier Crepin Leblond – ALAC
Carlos Aguirre - NCA

ICANN Staff:

Maguy Serad
Margie Milam
Gisella Gruber

Apologies:

Alex Gakuru – NCSG
Wendy Seltzer - NCSG
Steve delBianco - CBUC
Michael Salazar – ICANN Staff

Coordinator: Excuse me. I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's CCI call on Tuesday the 4th of October. We have Cheryl Langdon-

Orr, Rosemary Sinclair, Carlos Aguirre, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond. From staff we have Margie Milam and myself Gisella Gruber.

We have apologies from Michael Salazar, Alex Gakuru and Steve DelBianco. If I could please just remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Rosemary.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks Gisella. I thought we might have a look at the motion that was passed at GNSO Council meeting a couple of weeks - oops. And then to have a talk about arrangements at Dakar to see I guess whether the schedule for the meeting has progressed to a point where we can see where our discussion group might be and how we take our interim report to Council.

And then I thought we might just get back to where we're up to in the definitions matrix measures process. Is everybody okay with that approach?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Rosemary Sinclair: Margie, are you able to pop the motion up for us?

Margie Milam: Just one moment. I should be able to pop it up in just a second. I'm sorry. I wasn't ready for that.

Rosemary Sinclair: No problem. (Unintelligible).

Margie Milam: I got it. Give me a second.

Rosemary Sinclair: (Unintelligible) Cheryl Rosemary trip.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: See they don't know how motivated we can be at this hour of the day do they?

Gisella Gruber-White: Excuse me just to say welcome to (Maggie) to the call.

Woman: Hi (Maggie).

((Crosstalk))

(Maggie): Good afternoon everyone.

Woman: Hi (Maggie).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's sure not afternoon here in the Antipodes my dear.

Margie Milam: Okay Rosemary, there it is.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okie-doke. So this was the motion was adopted by the Council. And if we go down to the results. So we've got a Council direct a working group be formed to product a report for consideration to assist them to respond to the Board.

So then the working group is not authorized to forward or otherwise communicated its findings directly with the Board. That's fine. I've been appointed as the GNSO Council liaison for this working group. But we need to just note that the next GNSO Council will be my last Council meeting. So one of the pieces of work we've got to do is think through the GNSO Council liaison position. Oh, that's the alarm. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Rosemary, can I as a question at that point?

Rosemary Sinclair: Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here for the record.

Rosemary Sinclair: Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is there a - is there a ruling in GNSO world because there is not such a ruling in the AC world that a liaison from an SO or AC needs to be a serving member of such a Council? So for example, the ALAC makes its appointments as liaisons but they do not have to be serving ALAC (impetus). They often are but they certainly don't need to be.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. I'm not sure of the answer to that. Does anybody from staff know?

Margie Milam: This is Margie. I'm not aware that we have a rule on that but I think past practice has always been that it's been a Council member that serves as liaison. So I don't know if anyone has any other input on that but that's my recollection.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: See sometimes it can be historical and sometimes it can be -- Cheryl for the record -- sometimes these things can be historical and sometimes they seem to - because of rules of procedure.

If it's not a rule of procedure, then it can be far more easily dealt with at the Council level by then making a specific appointment and given whatever requirements and (tethering) to reporting, et cetera, et cetera. If it is in rules of procedure, then it's a whole different ballgame.

Rosemary Sinclair: Well is the way to clarify this perhaps -- pardon me -- me to go to Stephane as Chair of the Council and ask this question.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think it needs clarification because it's a bigger or a lesser issue depending on the answer.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah. Okay. I'll do that. Yeah. Okay. Good.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Rosemary.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks Cheryl. That's good. So...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: They don't call me the princess of process for no reason the ALAC world, you know.

Rosemary Sinclair: I'm princess (parties) in the university world.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry. I just kind of have some background noise. Can - Gisella, can you mute me for just a moment or not?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Rosemary, it's Olivier here.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Has the question of your succession been raised in - at the GNSO Council already or not?

Rosemary Sinclair: Well this I think was the point of the question. The question came from Mary Wong who's the Deputy Chair - or the comment that GNSO Council would have to consider what happens after I step off the Council as a Council member.

So that's why I'm thinking if I go back to Stephane and clarify the rule and ask the Council assuming that I cannot be the liaison officer for rules of process or practice - ask the Council to consider who the successor might be. And I - the other thing is there's quite a changeover of GNSO Councilors in the non-commercial stakeholders group. Three Councilors are stepping down or at least up for election.

And but of course we have very strong support on this issue from the commercial stakeholders group in the non-contracted parties house. So did you want to make a further comment Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: No thanks. That's fine. Thanks very much Rosemary. I'll put my hand down.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. I just noticed it was up, so. Now back to the motion. So the next is our cause - clause is the - was indicating that we had already made informally and commenced our activities then says until such time as the working group can select a Chair and that Chair can be (concerned) by GNSO Council, the GNSO Council liaison shall act as interim Chair.

So that's the second process we all need to think about the Chair of this group now that we are established as a working group. Let me come back to that issue in a tick.

Results further that the charter is approved. As specified in the charter a working group update report is to be produced for consideration at the ICANN Dakar meeting in October 2011. So we certainly need to talk about that today. And results was that in the event that no other SO/AC approves of the terms of this charter that the working group shall continue to proceed as the GNSO Council charter working group.

So that's the motion that was adopted. Are there any comments or questions? We've got one from Carlos who is using the chat. I read the operating procedures of GNSO and I'm almost sure there are not any rule against someone being a liaison of course if she is in a - who's in a constituency. Okay. Thanks Carlos for getting that piece of information.

So I (unintelligible) at this I'm asking the question but in such a way saying that we've done this research and we don't see a reason - or we don't see that it has to be a Council member. And I'm just asking this as a question. So are people happy for me to do that? And then we've got to - so we've got two positions to consider.

The GNSO Council liaison and the Chair of the working group. So perhaps if we just take some discussion on those issues. Margie, did you want to jump in and then I've got Cheryl?

Margie Milam: Sure. This is Margie. I was just glancing through the operating procedures of the GNSO Council. And with regard to liaison it says that a member of the chartering organization may be appointed to serve as liaison to the working group.

So it doesn't say that a member - a Councilor has to be, you know, or, you know, you have to be a Councilor to be a liaison. It's just saying that you can be one if you are a Councilor. So I agree with Carlos that it doesn't look like there's a prohibition on that.

Rosemary Sinclair: What section was that Margie?

Margie Milam: Section 2.2.4.

Rosemary Sinclair: Two point two point four. Right. Okay. And now Cheryl. Still on mute perhaps. Cheryl is typing. Pardon me. Un-mute me. So Gisella, could we un-mute Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. How's that?

Rosemary Sinclair: That's great.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. I mean the concept of me being muted is a challenge in itself. One of the few people I allow to mute me is Gisella so (unintelligible). And then only on request. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record.

Thanks for that Margie and that clarification is very important. Thanks Carlos for doing the initial research in the workgroup as well. If that's the case, that's a great assistance as far as I'm concerned and I'm totally biased here

because going to the second or actually third part of the resolution read the role of the GNSO Council liaison to this workgroup now chartered acting as the interim Chair.

I think as where we are in the workgroup it is appropriate for us to now consider the role of ongoing Chair being decided by the workgroup. Now there is no specific selection or electoral process in the rules of procedure as I remember them. Margie can you concern that for me while I continue to (rattle) on this.

In the absence of any particular requirement for nominations to be called and processes to be followed, I certainly would be putting forward as I believe I have mentioned in a previous meeting that Rosemary continue as Chair formalized of the chartered workgroup.

I think she brings a particular depth of experience from industry and from beyond the realms of ICANN, which is extremely valuable and she also is a very good Chair. Those two things are not always the same thing being an efficient Chair as well as a knowledgeable input doesn't always reside in the one person and in this case it does in Rosemary. So I would be putting her forward formally in whatever process is appropriate.

And I think in the absence of a process we could deal with that perhaps as a call to a list and a confirmation between now and the next meeting. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks Cheryl. Are there any other comments or views from anybody?

Thank you Carlos in the chat room. I'm certainly very interested in the work. And even though I'm stepping off the Council, I'm very keen to continue in this role. And Olivier, thank you as well.

The - perhaps - I'm happy to do that. Perhaps when we get a wider group of people we might just confirm that again. Margie.

Margie Milam: Yes. To address Rosemary's question about - I'm sorry, not Rosemary, Cheryl's question about working group guidelines; there's no requirement for the - how you conduct the Chair election. There's a suggested procedure which is - it's purely suggestion.

Nominations or self-nominations followed by a statement of qualification from the candidate as set forth the qualifications, qualities and experience that they possess. Just that will serve the particular working group. A vote by simple majority and then a notification to the chartering organization of the results of those actions. So that's kind of what they outline in the working group guidelines. But again, that's just a suggested procedure.

Rosemary Sinclair: And whereabouts is that Margie?

Margie Milam: That is in Section 2.2.

Rosemary Sinclair: Point two. Okay. So should I include in my letter to Stephane the fact that I have been nominated as Chair or would the group like to wait until we had more members before I take that next step? Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you Rosemary. What I would suggest is that the wider group gets informed of this suggestion by - through the list. And then if there is only positive support, and I'm sure there will be, that finding (for Stephane).

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. That's a great idea. Okay. I took the note to do that. Okay. So that gets us through that. Now Dakar. Sorry Margie, is your hand still up on that issue?

Margie Milam: No. I'm sorry.

Rosemary Sinclair: Oh thanks Cheryl. You're going to go through the list. Thank you. Now the Dakar meeting. Is Margie or Gisella able to update us in terms of the

timetable for that meeting and whether we've managed to get our discussion time on this work? And the second thing is then we need to find some time in the GNSO Council to update the Council on where we're at.

Margie Milam: I'm looking at the schedule now. It's Margie.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks Margie.

Margie Milam: I believe we got it but let me just see if I can find it. Two, three - okay yes. Okay, so we have it listed tentatively on Wednesday from 1:45 to 90 minutes. So whatever that would be, 1:45 to 3:15.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. Great. And then have we got an item in the GNSO Council? We've got the pending projects list and this is one of the pending projects. So perhaps we can use that as a mechanism for getting our report to the Council.

Margie Milam: I believe I've informed the leadership that we wanted time to provide an oral update. And I think they were trying to do something on either Saturday or Sunday. I don't know. Gisella, do you have that - the latest at your fingertips or was it Glen that's really keeping that one?

Gisella Gruber-White: If you just give me a second, I'll check it. I'll check it for you.

Rosemary Sinclair: So that's in the informal meeting Margie. I'm thinking about the actual formal Council meeting because I want to make sure that this work remains part of the formal process of GNSO Council.

Margie Milam: So you're suggesting that this should also be a update on the Wednesday meeting.

Rosemary Sinclair: That's right. GNSO Council's on Wednesday. Is it?

Margie Milam: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: What time does it start?

Margie Milam: Let's see. Sorry.

Gisella Gruber-White: Give me a second.

Margie Milam: The public meeting starts from 2:00 to 6:30. Is that right Gisella?

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay. Let me just check. I've got it here. Tuesday we have the - sorry, that was Wednesday to 6:30. GNSO public meeting yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: So that's problematic. Not that I'm going to actually be in Dakar. But even by phone if I'm part of the public meeting then I won't be able to Chair the working group discussions from 1:45 to 3:15, so.

Margie Milam: So I suggest that if you're unable to make that time, you can designate someone to, you know, deliver the (report) to the GNSO Council meeting.

Rosemary Sinclair: I don't know. What I'm saying is I'm actually in the Council from 2:00 until 6:30 on Wednesday. And we've scheduled the working group discussion from 1:45 to 3:15. So what I'm thinking is I'd have to designate someone to Chair the working group discussion from 1:45 to 3:15 so that I could be part of the GNSO Council public meeting. The Sunday update is no problem.

So Olivier, did you want to comment on this or anything else?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you Rosemary. I was going - it's Olivier here for the transcript. I was going to comment on the actual material to be presented. I know that other working groups that have to present material have created a small set of slides, a handful of them.

Some have asked for as much as 15 minutes to update the Council. I'm not sure whether we would require as much time as that but of course one always has to take care of any questions that might be asked by Councilors. So I would say that 15 minutes would probably be what you'd be looking for to ask from the Council itself.

With regards to you not being able to Chair the working group whilst the Council takes place since you're part of the Council, I shouldn't think that it's a hard job to find someone who can take your place in the meantime. I'm not going to push for anyone in particular but I think that can be worked out. That's no - nothing where you can just ask the meeting list as a wider question. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. (That's) good. Thank you. Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I'm disagreeing with Olivier on his last point. I don't think we need to ask them on the list at all. Whoever is to Chair a meeting can be established at the beginning of the meeting in the absence of the Chair by those people who are in attendance.

And it would be appropriate if it was someone who was physically in Dakar. But of course it shouldn't exclude remote participation. So I'm disagreeing with it needing to be (unintelligible) asked around at the list stage pre-Dakar.

But I would suggest that in the selection of someone to Chair at the Dakar meeting the workgroup discussion that we remember that at this stage it is still a GNSO workgroup and I would encourage that Chair to be someone from one of the GNSO constituencies. So I for one would be trying to forward someone who is clearly tethered to a GNSO constituency to Chair us in that (being) very public view workgroup discussion. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Could - sorry. Margie.

Margie Milam: Yes Rosemary, it's Margie. I actually did not intend to have that conflict with the GNSO Council meeting because I obviously want to be at both of them. So unless you guys like that time, I'm assuming can perhaps do a - see if there's an alternative time that might be more appropriate.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hell yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: That's a good idea. I think we should certainly explore that. And then if we can't - if we can't do it, then we've got two problems Margie. You've got to find someone to take your role and I think - okay.

So if we get Margie to just check the timing and see if there's any flex there. If there is not, then my suggestion would be that we let the list know that I won't be able to Chair the meeting and that the meeting itself will decide the Chair at the time of the meeting just to let people know what's happening.

I wouldn't like people to get to the meeting expecting to see me or hear me and that I'm not there. So we'll do it that way if everybody's okay. Cheryl's giving that a (unintelligible).

Okay. So on that particular matter we'll just wait until we hear back from Margie about whether there's any flex in the timing. In terms of the Sunday presentation, then I think if staff could - and is this the way it happens staff to prepare some slides.

I think if we focus on about, you know, a seven-minute presentation and then leave time for discussion because again, I really want to try to engage the Council. And in those Sunday meetings of course other people can be there and participating in the discussions.

So we should make sure if we can that there are others interested in this work on Saturday -- thanks Margie, sorry -- in our presentation on Saturday

that there are others interested in this work in the room at the time of that presentation.

So if it's possible Margie to get that presentation prepared so that this working group could have a look at it in the next couple of weeks or is that really stretching a friendship?

Margie Milam: That's fine. I was bogged down with doing the UDRP issue report that just got published. So I'm quite (unintelligible) to get that out. And so this is one of my priorities now to get this presentation drafted so you all can take a look at it.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah. Okay. So that takes us through all the admin. I'm - my suggestion is going to be that if there are any comments or suggestions people want to make about where we're at that we take those comments. That we actually have a short call today and that at the next meeting if we can Margie our focus should be to look through the presentation.

Perhaps if you could even send it to us earlier, that would be better if there are any initial comments. But to just make sure that everybody's happy with the presentation that will go to Council on that Saturday, 11:00 to 11:30.
Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Rosemary. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I apologize but only thinly. I did want to take you back to your administrivia just for a little bit longer...

Rosemary Sinclair: Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...and simply report to the workgroup from the ccNSO Council meeting last night that the resolution and chartering of this workgroup was an agenda item and was reported to the Council by (Han) from his GNSO liaison to - sorry, the ccNSO liaison into the GNSO. And that a follow up action item to

the ccNSO Council mailing list was requested and that I also brought in some of the ALAC perspectives on the - in that discussion.

And I would assume that during Dakar there will be continued discussions furthering us towards the other SO and undoubtedly some of the AC approval in terms of the charter. So I just wanted that to be reported back to the workgroup that it fell on particularly open ears but there will be more discussions undoubtedly...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...when we're all face-to-face. And I would expect it perhaps to be even on the ccNSO and GNSO Council agenda. Thank you. That's it for me.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks Cheryl. I wonder Olivier if I could just put you on the spot to let us know what ALAC is thinking about this charter. And then...

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you Rosemary. Olivier here. I - well, ALAC itself - I can't speak for ALAC because we haven't had any discussion on the charter itself. We've waited for it to be voted and now I will pass it on to the ALAC and we'll find out.

From what we've had so far there doesn't seem to have been anything against it (at a glance) but I can't give you a right answer if you want an authoritative answer from the ALAC on this. Not at this moment. Perhaps Cheryl has a slightly different view on this. I'm not sure. Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Olivier, Cheryl here for the record. No, I don't have a different view. In fact I would think that there's a great synchronicity in the discussions going on in Dakar agendas both in the At Large Advisory Committee and in the fellow support organization in the ccNSO.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: What I can add - it's Olivier again. What I can add is that on Tuesday the ALAC has reserved a merely - well, 45 minutes on consumer metrics to discuss the (unintelligible) perspectives in the afternoon from 1445 to 1530. And Cheryl will be moderating that session.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Following on from that if I may Rosemary. Cheryl for the record. Margie, you might expect (Bart) from the ccNSO staff to specifically follow up on this with you as well. I did a hard sell on the advantages of the ccNSO community being involved with their particular experience in the development of these metrics. And I believe that fell on very fertile ground. So there's an action item on (Bart) to follow up staff to staff.

Margie Milam: Excellent. I will go ahead and do that. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. So and Carlos is just making the point in the chat that it will be good Olivier to hear back from ALAC about the charter when you've had a chance to have those discussions. Then that leads me I think reminding Stephane that he should go to the GAC with this charter to - for their consideration, whatever that might be. Is everybody happy for me to do that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Rosemary Sinclair: Silence fills the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yes, yes, yes, yes and yes again.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes, yes, yes.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes too.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks for brining me back Cheryl to that last bit of administrivia. It's possibly one of the most important bits of administrivia that support from all the other elements in ICANN (then). Now - okay. So I think now we're at a

point just opening up for any comments or ideas that anyone might have had that we haven't covered in terms of the actual work itself.

Margie, could you just remind us where we got to? It all seems so long ago.

Margie Milam: I know. It sure does. Hold on. I will bring up the document and I have it highlighted where we last were. So that's - give me a moment.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thank you.

Margie Milam: Okay. So I just pulled it up. And if you scroll down to the yellow highlights. We were working predominantly in identifying the metrics for the definitions that have had consensus.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah. This will be done definitions. And can we say we have a consensus definitions for each of our terms? Or we've got rough consensus perhaps. Margie, can you just take me in the document. If I'm looking for the definition of competition, I'm looking at 1.4. That right?

Margie Milam: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. And then if I look for the definition for consumer trust, I'm going to 3.5. Is that right?

Margie Milam: Yes, that is correct.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. And then I'm going to consumer choice and I'm looking at 4.3.

Margie Milam: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: So then - so I've got the definitions and then we were working on metrics. Now where will I find the metrics in the - okay. So the last column. If I go back

up to competition and we've got a consensus on metrics competition and we were starting to work on consumer trust. Is that right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. Great. Now (unintelligible) there's any - everybody I have done a single little bit of thinking about this since then. Has anyone else been able to do any thinking about this? We had - uh-oh, hang on. That we've - so it was in 3.5 we've actually made a bit of progress on suggested definitions. And at that time we had a couple of questions I think for staff to follow up in terms of compliance and other things that we do now.

So perhaps if we can come back to that work at the next meeting Margie. Would that be suitable?

Margie Milam: Yes. I apologize. We've been very busy but we will try to get to that by the next meeting.

Rosemary Sinclair: That's okay. Now there's quite a bit going on in the chat, which I had not been looking at. Is there anything that I need to bring forward to the meeting or is everyone in the chat room okay with - that looks like some ALAC focus, is it?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I - sorry, Cheryl here. And I've got so many windows open I now can't make my computer get back to the - there I am. I'm back in the IC room. Yes, there was something on trust that I particularly wanted to raise with this workgroup and it's perhaps something -- sorry, Cheryl for transcript record -- something that Margie might need to follow up on. I was an observer in the Whois Review Team meeting online deliberations and IC rooms when they met in Marina Del Rey recently.

I noted, and it was at a particularly unfriendly hour from the Antipodes point of view that they were having a briefing from a - I gather either a briefing or a

discussion that there was an agenda item in that Whois Review Team agenda where they were looking at one or more consultants who were I suspect going to be doing a survey specifically on measurements of consumer trust and confidence.

And I just wanted to make sure that if there was two parts of ICANN focusing on a very similar topic that we were working smarter and not repeating work. So I was just keen to make sure that there - if there was a nexus, that nexus was properly explored.

And that probably needs to be done at a staff level at the moment because when I logged into the AC room, those discussions were in fact in camera. So it may be that there is going to be a consultants report or a piece of work made out for this.

If there is such a piece of work being let out to this then it would be important that we weren't unnecessarily duplicating and that we were benefiting from it. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Thanks Cheryl. That's a very useful link. And I also had the same thoughts when Whois Review Team was briefing the GAC I think at - in the Singapore meeting. And I made a connection with Peter Nettlefold at that time saying - at that time of course we were just starting to do our work. But I expressed some interest in seeing whether there was synergy.

I think it's really important for the whole community that we coordinate and build onward and not have a whole - well a series of separate streams that really are addressing the same sort of things.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here, here.

Rosemary Sinclair: I think that it gets very confusing and makes people disgruntled. And then at the operational end of things when you've got, you know, all of this - all of

this work winds up with some policy, which then makes requests on registrars and registries. And if they have a number of requests that they think are covering the same sort of territory coming at them from (unintelligible) then that dilutes the interest and their efforts.

So Margie, I think we're probably asking you to explore the (unintelligible) that Whois Review Team consultancy work and our own efforts.

Margie Milam: Right.

Rosemary Sinclair: Perhaps the small amount of thinking we've done on this could assist that consultant and their work - their (unintelligible) could assist us, so. All right. Thanks Cheryl for bringing that forward. That's great.

So having now checked through the chat, I think we've sort of got a rough statement on the sorts of things that could be metrics for each of competition consumer trust and consumer choice. But I think there's more work to be done to really nail those down to the ones that we think are the most important.

Again, just coming from an operational point of view and I see your hand Olivier - coming from an operational point of view the trouble with asking people to measure 20 things, they don't. If you can ask people to measure two or maybe three really important things, they're more likely to do that. And for this work to be important at some point it's got to be operationally possible. Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you Rosemary. Olivier for the transcript. I think I might have missed the call where consensus was reached on 3.5. And I just wanted to ask whether it also covers the corporate confidence that one has in the company.

To give you an idea, a corporation or an organization that gets sold and merged and acquired at short notice and changes hands quite fast is one which sometimes doesn't inspire much trust for the consumer. But I'm not sure if that covers it or does it not because it looks very technical here.

Rosemary Sinclair: My own response to your point is that I think you've raised an important issue and I don't think we captured it here. It's possibly in 3.4. We were getting nearer that version of the definition being nearer to your point. So we'll need to revisit 3.5 when we've got the larger group. And just make sure that that nuance is picked up.

Perhaps the reference in 3.5 to the registry operator fulfilling its proposed purpose and complying with ICANN policies and applicable national laws has - that takes us in the direction of your concern. But let's put that for discussion at the next meeting of this group.

Now Carlos is suggesting - I think we need to add the idea of end users interest into each one of definitions particularly after (unintelligible) absence or at least not well and completely mentioned. I'm absolutely sure that the concept of competition consumer trust and consumer trust has to do specially related non-commercial interest of end users. And the last idea is to keep those interests before others.

That's a very important point and it reminds us that our policy work is really all about the best outcomes for end users and other (technical) focus although the focus of our discussions is a lot on the technicalities; the outcome has to be in that broader policy space.

So can we also list Carlos idea for discussion at the next meeting? And I'm wondering whether it would be helpful if we get Margie to just - and I hesitate because I find this worksheet extremely useful but I'm wondering if there's a lot of detail in this now and whether we might be best to just pull out the three

definitions and metrics statements we think are our working consensus versions at the moment and just have us read through the whole origin.

I often get to this point in discussions where you looked in such detail at (everything) that you then (unintelligible) that you've lost an important overarching principle in getting into the detail. So perhaps we need to take stock that our - that these principles have not been lost in this forensic analysis that we have been doing.

Margie Milam: Yes Rosemary. It's Margie. I'll do that. It'll be actually a very simpler document if it just has our latest thinking on this. So I'll do that and circulate...

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Margie Milam: ...it after this call.

Rosemary Sinclair: So those were a couple of really important ideas. Is there anything else that anyone would like to contribute to the discussion this morning?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Rosemary, if I may.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes Cheryl. Sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Cheryl for the transcript record. Just at this point as we move from sort of interim non-chartered but the work has to happen so we've been getting on with it mode and our current more formalized structure, I wondered Margie is it the intention to set up a Wiki space now for not just the repository of meeting archives and obviously our working documents but also to have a more community interactive space.

The reason I'm raising this now is for example some of our working definitions are at a point where I think we could put them on a page as current thinking and welcome comments by a wider community using the Wiki

mechanisms to assist us getting the temperature or the feedback from not just the constituency parts of the GNSO but the wider ICANN community and beyond as well. Thank you.

Margie Milam: Cheryl, yeah. This is Margie. I put in the chat a link to the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Brilliant.

Margie Milam: ...main Wiki page. But that doesn't have what you're talking about which is a dedicated page...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Margie Milam: ...with these new definitions. And I can certainly do that. That's a very easy thing to add a page and to have it for that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Brilliant.

Margie Milam: ...comment (fitted) right there. So that's an excellent idea.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We just need to bump it up to the next level I think, yeah. Thanks.

Rosemary Sinclair: I think it's a good idea Cheryl because as we have found, you know, working through this definitions and measured - very conceptual work. So it takes a while. I certainly found it took me a while to get my brain into this space. So if we make our work available for people ahead of Dakar, then hopefully it will be - mean that there's more interest in the discussions and people are a little more prepared with their thinking to contribute in that discussion.

Okay. Any last comments or contributions? If not, I'm looking for hands and checks and so on. If not, then let's meet again in two weeks time. Is that timing okay Margie in terms of travel arrangements? Because I'm not going I

haven't got at the front of my mind when people will be having to leave.
Perhaps while Margie's thinking about that, Olivier, you wanted to comment.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you Rosemary. If it's a Tuesday, I believe that most people would not even start their travels yet. The - it's usually from Thursday onwards that people will start traveling depending on how far they live. So I would expect that it would still work. But of course for the antipathy that's already Wednesday, so it might be that - Cheryl will you have already started your travels?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, I'm leaving Thursday.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thursday.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Rosemary and I are very busy this month so we'll be traveling within country and then when I get back from (Melbourne) on the Wednesday night, I travel out Thursday to Dakar.

Margie Milam: Okie-doke. So we'll just have to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We'll do our meeting from (Melbourne) I guess.

Rosemary Sinclair: That can organize ourselves from (Melbourne). Good point Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Rosemary Sinclair: All right everyone. I think - is your hand still up Olivier? No, it is not.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: It's down now.

Rosemary Sinclair: All right. Look, I think that's been as always with these meetings a very productive meeting. And I will look forward to getting back to the substance of our discussions or more so in two weeks time. Thanks everybody.

Margie Milam: Thanks Rosemary. Thanks all.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks Rosemary. Thanks. Bye bye.

Rosemary Sinclair: Bye bye.

END