

**ICANN
Transcription
Geographic Regions Review Working Group
Tuesday 11 June 2013 at 12:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Geographic Regions Review Working Group call on the Tuesday 11 June 2013 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, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-geo-regions-20130611-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jun>

Attendees:

David Archbold
Cheryl Langdon-Orr
Carlton Samuels

Apologies:

Fahd Batayneh

Staff:

Rob Hoggarth
Gisella Gruber

Coordinator: The recording has started. You may begin.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much (Gail). I'd like to welcome everyone on today's Geographic Working Group call on Tuesday, the 11th of June at 12:00 UTC.

On today's call we have Dave Archibold, Carlton Samuels. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, apologies from Fahd Batayneh and Bart Boswinkel. From staff we have Rob Hoggarth and myself Gisella Gruber.

If I could please remind everyone to state their names on speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Dave and Rob.

Dave Archibold: Thank you Gisella. This is Dave Archibold. Welcome everybody. You have up on your screen very organized a copy of the agenda.

We've now in fact done the roll call. And so the next aim is to look at and review and confirm the final recommendations which are also appearing on the screen. I'm just trying to find the start here.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes Dave we had - yes, we had right there summary of conclusions and recommendations. This is Rob.

Dave Archibold: Sure.

Rob Hoggarth: This is the summary section of the document that lists the six primary recommendations. Of course this is just a summary. There's text to support this. And they're also listed in the executive summary at the beginning of the document. Thanks.

Dave Archibold: Yes indeed. I was just looking for the first paragraph number. And I've got it now. So we're starting at Paragraph 80 if people are following this on the screen.

And could I ask in fact Cheryl and Carlton whether they have in fact read the document and if they have any major concerns that we could address straight off?

Carlton?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Two-part question. So the first part yes and to the second part no.

Dave Archibold: Sorry. Cheryl started so...

Carlton Samuels: This is Carlton. I have read the document. I - oh okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's Cheryl, Carlton.

Dave Archibold: Cheryl go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What I said was you had asked a two-part question, have we read the document. We both answered yes. And the second part I said I had no particular major concerns.

Dave Archibold: Okay that's fine. Thank you. I couldn't hear you because Carlton over shouted you as far as I was concerned.

Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Yes. This is Carlton. Thank you Dave. Yes I have read the (document) a couple of times. I don't have any concerns on it.

Dave Archibold: Okay. I therefore wonder is there any particular point in going through each of the individual paragraphs here and recommendations? If you are both reasonably happy with the document it seems a little bit of a waste of time at this stage. Comments?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. I think it is worthwhile for a brief review mainly because at the moment you're only talking to Carlton and I. And what we will be preparing in this call is a record that others can refer to.

I am of course assuming that we will be doing something in Durban and it will be very useful. So I think it'll be a useful part of their transfer whirlwind tour so that when we call the rest of the committee to order to prepare for something in Durban they can be referred to these discussions and any deliberations.

Dave Archibold: Good point Cheryl.

Any other comments or shall we start at Paragraph 30 then and quickly go through?

Carlton Samuels: It's very important that we go through it for the record. Yes I agree with Cheryl.

Dave Archibold: Okay. Paragraph 80, the principle of geographic diversity remains important concept to ICANN community.

This diversity is not only one of geographic presence, cultural language, economic and other situational factors that from time to time forge commonalities within the Internet community must also have the opportunity to be addressed.

And I think we've had this finding in our recommendations right from the outset. This is not something that has changed. It has been a constant factor throughout. Again throw it open for comments.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's fine.

Carlton Samuels: That's (unintelligible), that's fine.

Dave Archibold: Okay Paragraph 81, Working Group concludes that the wholesale modifications to the original geographic regions framework is not merited and recommends that ICANN should adopt its own geographic regions framework based upon the current assignment of countries to regions.

This new framework system should govern the makeup of the ICANN board and should serve as the default for other parts of the ICANN community.

And my comments on that of course are that this is a change from where we were at one stage. It is the decision we've reached following feedback from the community at large.

The need for ICANN to maintain its own list is based on a fair number of factors that are covered in the report including the fact that the - there is no independent list that maps clear - that maps well on to the ICANN's existing five regions.

Again throw it open for comment.

Carlton Samuels: This is Carlton. This is so this is that extension and conversation and comment in the (at large) for example and the balance of the evidence supports the view.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is Cheryl. The only point which doesn't change the statement in the paragraph at all is that there is in fact the point made that no - there is no reason that ICANN has to follow another. It is allowed and able and physically reasonable to have an independent carving up. But that's it. This is a perfectly reasonable statement where we got to.

Dave Archibold: Okay fine. Moving on 82, whilst continuing to mandate geographic diversity on the ICANN board the Working Group recommends that the board give all individual ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees the opportunity to develop or affirm their existing geographic diversity rules or mechanisms or to present the board with their own particular diversity methodology that is more appropriate to their unique operational and community characteristics.

My comment here I think would be that feedbacks that we've had from the - all the SOS and ACs has been the need for flexibility. And I think this gives that to them.

An example might be some of the diversity rules that the GNSO has adopted would fit well within this framework. Open for comment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But that's fine Dave, Cheryl here. I do think that the - that the mandate - the one thing I would add here if I - or if I was going to add anything -- and it's - this is purely personal. This is not from what I've heard from any of our meetings with the community. This is a personal point of view.

And that as well where it says while continuing to mandate. But I would be tempted to say while currently continuing to mandate because I do believe in the not-too-distant future the requirement to actually mandate geographic diversity on the ICANN Board may in fact be less important than certainly it was in the very beginning and then - and this is an agreed (view) of this Working Group now.

As we change what I can as in terms of its outreach and its flexibility and the way it's going to operate in its hubs and its interactive spaces may become less of an issue.

But to add the word currently is maybe here nor there. That's just for my own personal point of view.

Dave Archibold: Again a personal - sorry, this is Dave. A personal point of view I 100% agree with you Cheryl. I would have no problem with adding a currently - except currently and continuing perhaps doesn't ring weld together.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Something that - that's something that indicates that Rob you'd be in a better position to wordsmith something that picks up the - just sort of at this time concept here?

Dave Archibold: Or for the time being continuing to mandate or whatever.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Yes.

Dave Archibold: Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: That change in the last - yes that change in language I would go along with it. I don't see anything there. It just makes it much more - much clearer what the intent is.

Dave Archibold: Rob have you got any comments on this one?

Rob Hoggarth: No sir. I - as I typed into the chat there I will wordsmith this either by using the word continuing currently or for the time being. And then I'll double check the text in the main body to make sure that we reflect that as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Rob.

Dave Archibold: Okay 83, Working Group recommends that the board directs staff to prepare and maintain ICANN's own unique organizational table that clearly shows the allocation of countries and territories as defined by ISO-3166 to its existing five geographic regions.

The initial allocation should reflect the status quo of the current assignment.

However staff should also develop and implement a process to permit stakeholder communities in countries or territories to pursue if they wish re-assignment to a geographic region that they consider to be more appropriate for their jurisdiction.

I have no comments. I think this is self-evident. Any comments from you?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's self-evident. I agree.

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob...

Carlton Samuels: I agree. No comment.

Dave Archibold: Yes Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: Quick comment on this just so that you are all aware of it, (Matt Ashtiani) and I have been working on the first part of this recommendation. And that is updating the current organizational table.

Your - you Cheryl and you Dave are probably aware of this that the issue came up within the ccNSO that the existing table needs updating. And so (Matt) and I have been working to do that.

With respect to the second part of this recommendation of course we're prepared to move forward should the board adapt the recommendation to assist in the development of the processes that are described here. Thank you.

Dave Archibold: Okay thanks Rob. Moving to Paragraph 30 - 84 the Working Group recommends that ICANN seek ways to recognize and accommodate special interest groups to promote the interest in an unique attributes of stakeholder communities that may not clearly fit into the formal top-down regional structures. These bottom-up groupings should be complementary to the formal regional framework and should not replace it.

They should not form any part of ICANN's decision meeting structure but would be free to lobby for the support of elected representatives.

Open for comment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm - Cheryl here. I'm comfortable with all that. Just for the record on a number of times that the text reads would you said should not that that makes a big difference but just for the record if someone is a reading that Paragraph

84 versus listening to what we're saying on a transcript so that's neither here nor there.

I have a minor discomfort on the free to lobby for support of elected representatives. It just - if it's possible to make that sentence either disappear or be really clear if it - I'm not at all sure that that currently read by some to indicate that the - and I think the concept of the special interest group as you realize is extremely important for many, many current needs.

And that includes the small island specs, et cetera, et cetera, but that these may not be permanent issues, that these things are going to be somewhat ad hoc and as required.

Dave Archibold: Well we - yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I wouldn't want to see the need for each special interest group to have a clear line into some form of representation or status with either the councils or the board.

And I also fear that there would need to be a recognition in leadership of the special interest groups and to have validity. Do you know what I mean there? That if I didn't - if I was a special interest group and I didn't have a champion on a council or the board then that would somehow lessen the impact of the work we do.

I want to make, you know, I'd almost want that that sentence to disappear if not to be rewritten in some way, shape or form.

Dave Archibold: Interesting. Now I take your point Cheryl. This is Dave. I'm wondering whether we could turn it around a little bit so that we are not talking about support of elected representatives but rather somehow talk about free to promote their ideas with the appropriate elected organization or something of that sort rather than seeking...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well that's actually needing to be said. I mean what other - if the special-interest group is (unintelligible) how are we going to measure its effectiveness if effectiveness will be if it's voice is heard recognized and indeed acted upon?

But to tie that to elected representatives gets me uncomfortable. We of various forms of public competent, of public fora. None of this needs specific elected representatives to...

Dave Archibold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...support what we are - what we're doing is creating a culture that influences or indeed influences those who select the elected representatives.

It also worried me to turn elected representatives because I suppose wearing my noncom hat for a minute...

Dave Archibold: Yes, absolutely.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Normal elected representative from before. You know those - what do they do?

Dave Archibold: Okay. So could we change that to but of course would be free to promote their ideas as they consider appropriate?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well...

Carlton Samuels: But that's what our...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible)?

Carlton Samuels: Sorry...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh go ahead.

Carlton Samuels: Go ahead Cheryl. Go ahead Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh no I was just pleading for someone else to come up with something smarter than I can. I can see the problem. I can't give you the solution.

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob...

Carlton Samuels: (Unintelligible) line that says you - I get what Cheryl is saying and I think that's the proper way. We should make clear that it's an organized group but it would not be - there would not be afforded elected representation to any of the ICANN councils but they should be recognized as an organized group and be free to help to promote their interest. It's just the leadership...

But so I add a line that says we could probably change the last sentence that says they would not form any part of ICANN's decision-making structure but the leadership would be recognized and free to promote their interests in ICANN counsel or something like that.

Dave Archibold: I...

Carlton Samuels: Take out the elected representative part of it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's the...

Carlton Samuels: I know what it means. I know what this was intended to mean. I take Cheryl's position that it - having that support of - some people may misread it to think that it means that we're saying that they should have elected representatives and ICANN parties.

Dave Archibold: Or even that they - yes, or even that they have to latch onto one. I mean I...

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Dave Archibold: I'm happy to take your point Cheryl. I'm just trying to find the wording. And

I think the reason the sentences there is because of some of the discussions that we have had particularly during the meetings at ICANN with the great (unintelligible) as it were where since the comment has been okay explain to me a bit better where the special interest groups fit in and what they can do and what they can do. And this was to try to make that clear.

And I think the first half is fine. But I think we've got to say something like but would be free to promote their ideas or I don't like the word ideas.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't...

Carlton Samuels: How about interest?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. What - I don't - some sort of sentence. It just says you're talking there. I was wondering whether the first part of the sentence would not form any part of ICANN's decision-making structures, whether that could be somehow associated with an earlier sentence perhaps towards the beginning somehow before the bottom up groupings would be complementary or somewhere in that sentence. I'll leave that to Rob to think of.

And then yes just to take away any of this lobbying and support of elected representatives reference what we could have somewhere is that their contributions would be valuable in ICANN community discussions or in the mechanisms of the ICANN multi-stakeholder model or something.

Because I really think the special -interest groups, the key to their power is their ability to influence at all of those decision modes (unintelligible) stakeholder process...

Dave Archibold: Yes absolutely agree.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...just the council or board level.

I also get very nervous that if we see that we don't have a situation where a - an ad hoc group informs itself together and then they try to claim a degree of legitimacy that would be either counter or competing with formal structures for support.

For example I could see where a subsection or a section of the stakeholder group in GNSO might want to suggest that if the noncommercial or commercial interests that don't seem to be exactly representing their voice at this point in time perhaps because they have a minority that the normal facilitation support of that leadership attending a meeting or going to a regional meeting or whatever, you know, we don't want to get - we want to make it clear that this is not replacing the structures that are ICANN but that they have a clear and favorable set of points that they can influence.

But I'm beginning to ramble which is because there's other voices in my head coming into my earphone. But you see what I'm getting at? If we...

Dave Archibold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...make sure that that - you know, I'm not forming part of the decision-making structure but they are key to contributing community input and view or their community input and view, their special interest community input and

view at all points in the community decision-making process, something like that would be really helpful.

I just get (most) nervous about that particular part of that sentence. That's all.

And now I'm going to try and get my head back into the (unintelligible) meeting again. Sorry.

Dave Archibold: Okay they're not important. Anyway Rob looking at editing because we don't have many more days to do this, how about going something like the sentence it starts these bottom-up groupings.

So these bottom-up groupings would be complementary to the formal regional framework comma, would not replace it comma, and would not form part of ICANN's decision-making structure full stop. And then follow that with Cheryl's contribution that she just made that hopefully is all on tape...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Which has sadly got (unintelligible) I'm afraid. All my ramblings will be transcribed and...

((Crosstalk))

Dave Archibold: Now before you ramble too much I liked what you are saying about - well I can't even remember now what you said. But I like what you said. We can go back in the tape.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The opportunities for contribution into the...

Dave Archibold: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...is a multi-stake for the ICANN multi-stakeholder model.

Dave Archibold: You said it again. Well done.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Dave Archibold: I'd do that as a separate sentence.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes this is Rob. I can break it into two sentences. I had been playing around as you all - as all three of you were contributing some ideas here.

What I had come up on the slide was revising the sentence. And I had one long run-on sentence so I'll probably break it as you recommend Dave.

But what I jotted down here is these bottom-up groupings would be complementary to the formal regional and decision-making framework. It would not replace it.

But these groups would be free to promote their interests and points of view as they consider appropriate within the ICANN community and its multi-stakeholder participation and indeed the mechanism.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sounds like a plan to me.

Dave Archibold: Yes that - yes just watch where you put your full stops. But basically the concept is fine.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. That's great. And I will double check I've looked back at the main body of the documents. And we might want to play a little bit with the wording there. So I'll make a note to (unintelligible).

Dave Archibold: Okay. And also the executive summary obviously's got to mirror what we're doing here.

Rob Hoggarth: Correct.

Carlton Samuels: Absolutely. (Unintelligible) you've got a good ear.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you.

Dave Archibold: Okay Paragraph 85 finally the Working Group recommends that the board maintain oversight over the existing framework at all levels within the ICANN organization and they review the effectiveness of its application at regular five year intervals.

That seems to me to be noncontroversial but I'm happy to have any comments.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Guess what, why do we have to tell it to do it at five year intervals? Why not just say regularly?

Rob Hoggarth: Well consistent with the - this is Rob. We're consistent with the ICANN bylaws which state five years.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes which means why do we have to (state this)?

Dave Archibold: It says three here at the moment. Does it not?

Rob Hoggarth: Well that's correct. So we - that's a good point.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just like regularly.

Dave Archibold: Well are you then saying at regular intervals decided by the board or...

Carlton Samuels: Just says regular intervals period.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because it is...

Dave Archibold: Well that probably means it will never get done as you well know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well it should be...

Rob Hoggarth: That's a good point. This is Rob. Just right now it's a three year interval.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: And clearly it's taken this group three years just to work up the recommendations.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: So if I recall you original discussions correctly there was a recognition that the time frame should be longer but the message still be regular.

Dave Archibold: I personally think that if you don't put a time in there it will go off the forward-looking screen, it won't be in anybody's program and it will never get done. So I would rather at least put it in here as a marker. The board of course can adopt whatever they want.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Yes just leave it there. Thanks Rob.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So if I was of board and I had a set of bylaws and in that set of bylaws it gave an interval for a review it would stay on my forward planning agenda.

Having it too short a period usually means it doesn't get done or you do what we had done which is to take longer than the period recommended to do it anyway. And setting five years certainly gave a longer period of time.

Have these continued saying five years because it's a longer period of time it might actually be achievable. But these are one of those things where if I'm sitting on the board I'd be definitely wanting to have it regular but open. In I tend to go for, you know, as required which is even less frequent than regular.

In fact I think bringing it to regular is important. If it has to be tied to it time then longer interval is better than shorter interval.

Rob Hoggarth: Dave, this is Rob. Would it be helpful if I just read out on Paragraph 79 because I think that does a good job of sort of reflecting the rational?.

Dave Archibold: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: It reads the heading is the board must preserve its oversight and future review opportunities, Paragraph 79.

The ICANN community cannot predict potential communities or participants who are not yet known or may not yet exist.

The new geographic framework must remain flexible enough to accommodate new players and potential new regions as they evolve.

The board needs to maintain ultimate oversight over the framework but the Working Group believes that the present requirement in the bylaws for a review to be carried out every few years is excessive and impractical.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: The Working Group therefore recommends a review should be carried out every five years and that the bylaws be amended accordingly.

Adherence to the five year review cycle should be part of the board's ongoing regular agenda that is tracked and monitored by the ICANN staff.

End of paragraph.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, no. It said there, that's fine. That's...

Rob Hoggarth: I mean one of the potential amendments to that Cheryl might be, you know, where it says the Working Group therefore recommends a review should be carried over five years the bylaws be amended accordingly, it could be then said adherence to this longer period or this longer review cycle, this longer but regular review cycle should be part of the board's ongoing regular agenda -- something that reflects your point of view that, you know, that emphasizes the need for regular review but sort of captures to Dave's point that if it's not a specific timeframe it won't get done. It's up to you...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well that's what feeds the sentence adherence to the five year review cycle being part of the regular agenda.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, that's true.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's what it says.

Dave Archibold: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Yes. So why - I think at this point if you're making a recommendation that the review cycle is going to be extended why not just put it down here instead of (right here), harmonize.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh I (unintelligible) harmonize. This is (unintelligible) And that's fine. It's repetitious. That's equally fine but, you know.

Dave Archibold: So we're leaving as is?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, leave it alone but, you know...

Carlton Samuels: Yes. Yes it's not all (bad).

Dave Archibold: Okay. Then should we then moved to timetable for comment responses from the SOs and ACs? And I'm going to although it's says chair there am going to say to Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you sir. Yes, this is purely a discussion for you all to determine what you think an appropriate review period should be for the SOs and the ACs.

You'll recall that the charter basically calls upon completion of the final report that it be shared with the leadership of the various SOs and ACs for their review and comment but there's no specific.

What I threw into the agenda here was a stalking horse if you will of 90 days from the June 24 public - the targeted June 24 publication date which would make the deadline September 23.

The question is whether the Working Group would like that time period, whether it should be a longer time period or a shorter one based on your knowledge of what time it takes for your groups to discuss, review and write, you know, a comment back to the Working Group.

Dave Archibold: Well it's not a comment back to the Working Group is it? I mean this is the final report. It is the ability of the SOs and the ACs to send their comments to the board, not to us.

Rob Hoggarth: But I'm going to fight with whoever is currently moving the documents on the screen to the footnote that outlines the process. And yes, then you guys can have that inform you that I can drive the presentation screen here because I think I can move it. Right, yes there we go.

So yes Dave that's a very good point. That's up to you guys. But let me double check here these - I'll pull up the right footnote. And I'm sorry -- don't let my moving the document make anybody sick. Here we go. Following on the screen, page 9, footnote 15, subsection E, support. "Following its submission the and SOs who have contributed a representative to the working group shall discuss the Geo Working Group final report and decide whether they support the recommendations. The chairs of the SOs and ACs shall notify the chair of the Geo Working Group in writing of the results of their deliberations."

So what I would do there Dave is that, you know, the final report is done. It gets published. People have, you know, whatever the time frame you all think is appropriate to review and comment. And sort of the final action of this group would be subsection G, which says that the Geo Regions Working Group shall within five days submit to the ICANN board its recommendation.

So essentially this is a final opportunity. This is your final report but the SOs and ACs will submit their final review and comments to this working group. Well, you to you Dave as the chair and presumably you'll discuss it with the group. You will then have one final opportunity to potentially modify your recommendations based upon that formal feedback.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry. Go ahead Dave. I'll jump in later. Go on.

Dave Archibold: OK, what my comment would be is I'm not sure that that actually is the right interpretation of it. I thought that's what we did when we released the - if you

liked the draft final report. And this time it was all right, we've taken your views into account, SOs and ACs. Here's what we've come up with. This is our final report. Of course you can make your own comments to the Board on it, but that's it. How many times can we go back and potentially view the final report?

Rob Hoggarth: Well, remember - this is Rob again. Remember, when you decided to circulate the draft final report that was for community feedback. This provides that final oversight, if you will, of the SOs and ACs and their leadership -- not the overall community. And I've scrolled forward to the end of the footnote that carries over to the bottom of page 10. You'll see the last paragraph there.

"In the event that the final report is not supported by all the participating SOs and ACs, the Geo Regions Working Group may submit the final report supplemented, of course, by their statement with the statements of support and disagreement to the Board." So, I mean...

Dave Archibold: That backs up what I'm saying, that this final report goes to the Board, goes to the SOs and ACs. They either provide a statement of support or disagreement, which is forwarded to the Board together with any supplemental comments that we want to make.

Rob Hoggarth: You can do that. As I said, I mean, I'm just, again, reading from the charter. There is the opportunity for them to comment and you all can choose what you do with that comment but there is this next and final step that gives them the formal opportunity as a leadership group within the SO, AC...

((Crosstalk))

Dave Archibold: Absolutely, and I'm not trying to take that away from them.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Dave Archibold: I'm saying, I suppose, that, you know, our report is what it is and their comments should be allowed to the Board as they stand -- not that we should go back and yet again tweak the report if there's something that they don't like. It goes to the Board.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (I say) - my mindset's always been along the lines of how it is written and I believe the leadership of the ACs and SOs that I've spoken to probably are of a similar mind, that there is in fact this next step whereby not just the individual and subunit views. For example in the case of the ALAC -- not just the views of their particular regions will be being bought forward but a harmonized or standardized or official view of the leadership group in the case of the At-Large. The At-Large Advisory Committee, the ALAC view will be bought forward.

For example, to date, what ALAC has bought into the conversation on the reviews and reports that we've done to date have reflected the various needs and desires of our regions. And as you know, some of our regions have very, very strong views (on this). But I don't believe -- (Robin) correct me if I'm wrong -- we've (sent) some things that (says) the ALAC agrees or disagrees with. We've asked for considerations, for tweaks, for this, that and the others.

If this goes just as (unintelligible), if we skip this step, then I don't see that the Board would do other than put it out for public comment. So we're not actually gaining anything by cutting...

((Crosstalk))

Dave Archibold: Don't get me wrong...

((Crosstalk))

Dave Archibold: Sorry to interrupt. I am not suggesting that we skip this step.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Right.

Dave Archibold: All I'm saying is that the comments of the SOs and ACs should, I believe, be forwarded to the Board, whether through me or not -- I don't care. I would have (thought) directly to the Board so the Board gets the final report and the comments from each of the SOs and ACs saying whether they support it or not.

Man: That's what I understand.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes Dave, this is Rob. That's a fair interpretation. It's just that there is - and I skipped it -- my apologies. There is subsection F, which says in the event and it only provides in this rare instance as SO or AC could come back and say that it objects to the recommendations. You all then have the option to, one last time, it says here the Geo Working Group may at its discretion reconsider its report and submit a redrafted final report to seek support.

There is that final, if you will, option. You all don't have to take it but that exists as part of the process. And it may require, you know, one more call between all of you once all the SO and AC comments come in. Or Dave you might just see them and everyone says, "Yes, it looks fine," then you in your discussion as Chair can just proceed with final submission to the Board. That's, you know, that's ultimately a determination to be made when the SOs and ACs, if they choose, give you guys any written feedback.

Dave Archibold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Dave, Cheryl here. In a number of work groups that I've been involved with frequently between (unintelligible) GNSO work groups on this case, where dissenting or variation of view are held by component parts in the GNSO World stakeholder groups, for example.

Dave Archibold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The work groups have frequently (unintelligible) our consensus view in the report and we have attached these non-consensus views verbatim.

Dave Archibold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: They are giving the Board a full picture and avoiding the squeaky wheel happening at the very end, as being able to say, "But I wasn't listened to." It's quite clear that a minority report has been listened to. It may not have made its way into a consensus outcome but it is recognized and forwarded to, in the case of the GNSO Work Group the GNSO Council, but in our case the ICANN Board (reads) the consideration.

Dave Archibold: Yes, fine. I have no objections at all. I'm not trying to prevent comments in any size, shape or form -- I'm merely saying that I don't think it necessarily has to come back to us for yet another reconsideration of our final report unless it is absolutely (lambasted) by the SOs and ACs.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And just on that -- and I'd really like to get to all my point 4 in the agenda before we tie off point 3 -- my (unintelligible) depend very much on how or not we're going to be doing something (unintelligible).

Dave Archibold: Right. Can you expand on that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, certainly. Because this has been going on, as we all know, so long that it's very possible and certainly in the case of the regional leadership and the regional representation within the At-Large Advisory Committee that we have people serving on the Council but that quite literally do not have any background or basic foundation of what we've done in all of these years working through the (Geo Review) Work Group.

So unless we've got a piece of interaction with community and community leaders -- probably community leaders (unintelligible) -- in Durbin then this

step we're discussing is even more essential. If we're not going to gather in Durbin then I can't see that you're going to get, for example, from the sectors - some of the sectors within the At-Large Community anything but what looks like rejection, because they won't realize their voices have already been heard. (Unintelligible)

Dave Archibold: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think the confirmation of holding a Community workshop and saying, you know, 90 days happens now (unintelligible) is critical.

Dave Archibold: I'm happy that we hold a community workshop, provided it is not yours truly on his own who's doing it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Say the second part again please.

Man: (He) should be on record of saying that we provided (unintelligible) to the workshop. But Chairman's quite right -- there have been changes and maybe we want to - we want to at least take this one last (unintelligible).

Dave Archibold: As I said, fine and I'm happy to do that but I am looking then for support from the working group to do it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Rob, what's the planned format if we were to hold a community workshop during the ICANN Public Meeting in Durbin? What's the thinking? Because I don't know what you and Dave have planned, if anything.

Rob Hoggarth: At this point we haven't planned anything Cheryl. This is Rob. The thought was and this was, you know, my general thinking, at least initially, similar to yours, that it has been a considerable period of time. We've got new people -- even on the Board for that matter -- who weren't around (at the)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (They have no idea).

Rob Hoggarth: Right. They just went around at the beginning of this process. And so it's a useful (reset) to give people a perspective. I mean, this one would be one piece of a two or three part process, right. The other piece would be, you know, that the final report gets accompanied by a note from Dave to the leader of each SO and AC saying, "Hey dear SO or AC, here's our report. This is where it came from. This is what we intend to do. And you have 90 days or 100 days to give us your feedback. We're going to be having a workshop in Durbin where we're going to be, you know, basically summarizing why we came together and what our recommendations are. I'm also, you know, happy to meet with you guys separately to explain to you, you know, what we've done and what our recommendations are."

So essentially three-fold. One, there's the written communication. Two, there's a workshop (to give everyone) in the community who may be participating in discussions within their SO or AC some background and perspective on this. And then, three, there's the opportunity either during Durbin or quite frankly, you know, maybe after it for a teleconference or something to support the discussions of the SOs and ACs on, you know, what the report says and what the recommendations are.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: OK. Rob, Cheryl here. I think the last point you made is absolutely critical. If I was king of the world and creating a relatively short workshop, I would suggest we don't need to be 90 minutes here. The block of time doesn't have to be a minimum block of time or the maximum block of time. I would have the whole of the committee sitting up so they can be clearly identified. I would have probably the executive summary and those paragraphs -- the (unintelligible) that we've (been through) today -- gone through and justified and discussed. I'd have a bit of an open floor Q&A and I'd make it really clear that there's going to be this 90 or 100 day exercise from the close off of the Durbin meeting and that the committee, the working group -- sorry -- will

make itself available (unintelligible) component part. So it's, you know, (unintelligible) everybody else -- not just (Dave) -- for any teleconference or webinars...

Dave Archibold: Questions.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...community desire between now and (unintelligible), which I'd run, say, you know, between now and (50) days on. So we give them 60 days where if they want to have any of (it) presented jointly or separately in their meeting then other than, you know - and close it off. But I do think it's essential that we do do that because we have to resuscitate this patient. You know, our work has pretty much gone (into the), "Oh, isn't that finished? What happened with that? I thought we'd done that. Oh, haven't we? (Unintelligible)." And we have to resuscitate and refresh.

Man: Sounds like a plan to me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Dave, you comfortable with that or not? I know it means, you know, it's more work and a sense of déjà vu.

Dave Archibold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible) came from (in) presentation and not so much the helicopter view. But, you know, here's the executive summary, here's paragraph (unintelligible), here's the process going forward -- be warned. (At least know what it's like) if you want to talk to us now.

Dave Archibold: Yes. Yes, fine. So when do you see this then going to the Board?

Rob Hoggarth: Just before (Argentina), I would imagine.

Dave Archibold: Just before when, I'm sorry?

Rob Hoggarth: Argentina.

Dave Archibold: Well (unintelligible)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What's the Board's meeting cycle Rob? Are they meeting October or September?

Rob Hoggarth: Let me take a quick look. (I've got my) (unintelligible)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It needs to fit in with their cycle (unintelligible).

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, they have the - I have the cycle through Buenos Aires right now. And so they're meeting end of - in a couple of weeks, then in Durbin, then in August, then in September, then in October and then, of course, in Buenos Aires. And if you look at the 90 to 100 day cycle I think (Carlton) is correct in terms of the timing.

Now, again, this - you don't have to time your submission of the report to a specific Board meeting. When it's ready they can just, you know, send the letter to Steve Crocker. There's not a, you know, a requirement that that be tied to a particular Board meeting. But I think the timing that (Carlton)'s suggesting is right, that that's, you know. If you had 100 days then that's going to be somewhere in the October timeframe.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Or even 90 days from the Durbin meeting. I mean, that's just the calendar.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I like 90 days from the Durbin meeting because most of the committees and councils have a meeting every 30 days.

Man: Correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And so it gives them....

Man: It gives them two meeting cycles.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...two (readings) of things, you know.

Man: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: And this is Rob. One other point. If this was the original set of recommendations, you might want to have it be a longer period because it would reflect a more substantial (change) for the community. But given the recommendations that you're providing, they represent an evolution of the framework -- not a (C) change and therefore it should be doable for the community in that timeframe.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Dave Archibold: OK, that sounds like a plan we've got there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And Dave to me - this is Cheryl. To me that makes the running through of the comments, reports and responses from the SOs and the ACs easier to just go along with because we've got this particular punctuation where we've got everything sort of refreshed, restarted and reviewed in Durbin. And then it's over to them and they've got some clear milestones.

And should there be something earth-shattering that we haven't thought about that, you know, suddenly comes back we've got that last (minute) that Rob was saying that we can either make a change or, as would probably be the case, simply (append) any minority report or recognize any minority views or even a majority view, which is or is not, you know - we can only put forward consensus (unintelligible). So here is our consensus report view and please note blah blah blah and then...

Dave Archibold: Yes, absolutely, yes. I mean, that's what I anticipated happening, indeed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Dave Archibold: OK, any other business?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I need to ask Rob has he got a slot put away for Durbin. (Unintelligible)

Rob Hoggarth: I submitted - in anticipation of this discussion I did, you know, submit a placeholder request. As many of you know, the schedule is a major challenge at every meeting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yes.

Rob Hoggarth: We are likely to be, as we have been at past meetings, in the third, you know, late Wednesday, earlier Thursday timeframe. The meeting arrangement are evolving as we speak. You know, with some significant desires for exclusive time for various sessions, which only makes the conflicts for the non-exclusive sessions even more challenging.

So, I mean, I'm throwing myself on the mercy of the schedulers until they give us, you know, an initial cut and then, you know, Gisella and myself, other members of the Secretariat teams will then circle around and try to pick the best time we can for the maximum participation of working group members. Is that sufficiently (parched).

Man: I have every confidence you both will get it done.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, they will, but I want to make a plea. Nominating committee requirements at this meeting are going to be extremely high and we will be interviewing (Diane) Friday. There is less likelihood that we will be interviewing late Wednesday but I would be - particularly have my (nose out of joint) if after what I would consider consistent and ongoing contribution to

this process, I wasn't able to be part of a publicly facing (forum) because I'm locked away in a room listening to people tell me why they're wonderful.

Rob Hoggarth: Understood Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Dave did you think that was...

Dave Archibold: (Unintelligible) as usual.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So Gisella I don't know whether you want to have a quiet word to (unintelligible) when the (unintelligible) of these slots (unintelligible). But my, my, my, I will be annoyed if a number of people who basically have been (acting blank) and not regular contributors to this process get to sit up and present on the final public facing (forum) and I'm locked away somewhere.

Gisella Gruber-White: Cheryl, Gisella here. Just to say, as soon as Rob starts putting his feet - well, as soon as he knows when he'd like to schedule this meeting I'll make sure that I coordinate with (unintelligible) to keep this as a placeholder in your schedule.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Terrific but you know, basically Thursday and Friday wipe out totally for me because I will simply be in interviews Thursday and Friday. And indeed Saturday we'll be working as well. But we'll probably going to use part of Wednesday and so it's really important that (unintelligible) knows which part of Wednesday is going to be less annoying for me. And that will probably be good for any of the interviewees as well, if I'm less annoyed.

Gisella Gruber-White: So basically Wednesday.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes but part of Wednesday (unintelligible) will be wanting part of Wednesday. We just need to make sure...

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...the right part of Wednesday and not a part that everyone else has got a bit of.

Rob Hoggarth: Well we'll make that happen Cheryl. Dave, if I can just circle around because you're at the top of hour here, just in terms of next steps. Just to confirm, especially for those listening on the recording, we gave members of the working group two and a half weeks to respond or react in terms of written or other comments on the document. The only comments I have received in writing or verbally or the ones I had during this call. So I will make the change that were resolved here.

What I would suggest for us to meet our publication deadline is I will get out a revised document to the group in the next 24 hours, give folks, you know, up to the weekend (for a final check). It'll be a red line and based on this discussion today very few changes. And that will essentially close the comments on the document. I'll send it to translation.

We are likely - one last piece for (Carlton) and Cheryl to appreciate. It doesn't require public comment but Dave and I discussed the value of getting the document published before the 24 June document deadline for the community for Durbin. So we still want to meet that.

We will follow through with translated copies because we do want to have this posted on the Wiki site and elsewhere for community members to understand what's going on in all six UN languages. So we're going to proceed with that timetable in terms of publishing the report. And I'll indicate that in an email to the working group members when I circulate it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: OK. Now, just so I'm really clear, we're not (unintelligible) the six UN languages done by 24 June.

Rob Hoggarth: No, there won't be time to do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: OK, that's all right because that would be (unintelligible) impossible. We just need to get the master copy out in public circulation and have the Wiki page reflect that the other languages will follow. My guess is the other languages will probably come into play shortly after Durbin but that's just because I'm fairly aware of how much work Language Services has to do in preparation for a public meeting.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But, you know, we may get one or two languages out before that, officially, if we do have that document. Dave, I wonder if it's a better (unintelligible) with the only very minor (unintelligible) that are going on now. I don't think there'd be much of a downside of this going, you know, if Rob's got these changes done within the next 12 to 24 hours, of sending it straight to Language Services then. If by chance there's any other minor changes it's only going to be a word here or there and I doubt that that's going to be (unintelligible) if you're going another week in Language Services (unintelligible).

Dave Archibold: I would agree Cheryl. I think we should get it off to them as soon as we possibly can.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, absolutely. I mean, they could almost start now. It'll be a while before they get to page 9 in some languages and it's easier to go back and change three words than (it is) the whole bloody thing started.

Rob Hoggarth: That'll be great, thank you. I'll proceed with that instruction.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Great, terrific. We might have one or two languages done then before the public forum.

Dave Archibold: OK, good. I think the next issue is going to be once you have got the likely slot and making sure that Cheryl is going to be there. That's going to be the next battle.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed.

Rob Hoggarth: Gisella and I will work on that.

Dave Archibold: OK. Any idea of when you are going to get an indication of slot?

Rob Hoggarth: It's probably going to be I think another week or ten days before we see a schedule but I'll alert you when I see something.

Dave Archibold: OK, fine. OK, once we've got that then I will work on the agenda for that day and circulate that to the group for comment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Dave are you comfortable with my, you know, line up the working group so that, you know, people can (throw lemons) or (accolades) at them and just do a sort of (unintelligible) executive summary and (unintelligible) less time on the stuff that we've really done to date, sort of make it more of a - you've had all your contributions in here is where we are with it, rather than the justifying of why we're...

Dave Archibold: Yes, I think that's fair. The only bit I would be concerned about, you rightly said lots of them don't know the background and where it's all come from. So trying to (weigh) that up, if we're not going to give them any of the background they're no better off than they would be without the (beating), if you see what I mean.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I do, but I think if we - I mean, I'm not suggesting that we don't do, you know, one or maybe two (slides) and three to maybe five minutes on the whys and (unintelligible). But if we're going to then offer ourselves in the next 30 to 60 days, we can say, "If your communities want more information on

why we are where we are and what the background is, here's the Wiki page, here's the links and here we are available. Contact Rob and two or more of us will be available for you outreach..."

Man: (Edification).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Whatever.

Man: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because, you know, you've got to balance the - it's like (unintelligible) -- you have to balance the new and old audience knowledge, so...

Dave Archibold: I think that's fair. It is getting the balance right, which is why I suggested I circulate something to you well in advance and we take it from there. But as for having everybody out there in the (unintelligible) undoubtedly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: OK.

Dave Archibold: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Rob do you need anything else from us?

Rob Hoggarth: No, thank you. I'm good.

Dave Archibold: OK, in that case let us adjourn with thanks, as ever, to Rob and Gisella.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks for that. Rob, can you make sure Bart is brought up to speed on this? Because I do know that at the next - unfortunately, there was (unintelligible) call that was running in parallel with this one so we could have (unintelligible) input. But it probably would be useful to bring the (unintelligible) up to speed on the plans in the agenda (plotting) and the time

course, et cetera, because we do have a bit of a (unintelligible) what's happening box with the Geo reviews in that work plan.

So Bart can probably give a reasonable update to the (unintelligible) this time next month based on a bit of a quick report from you.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Certainly I will do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you kind sir. I'll switch back now...

Dave Archibold: (Unintelligible)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'll now get to my next meeting. Thanks guys.

Dave Archibold: Thanks Cheryl. Thanks for all your help. (Carlton)'s already gone, so bye everybody.

Rob Hoggarth: Bye-bye David. Thank you.

Woman: Bye-bye, thank you everyone.

Man: Bye.

END