

**Policy & Implementation Drafting Team Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION**

Monday 17 June 2013 at 1900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Monday 17 June 2013 at 1900 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-policy-implementation-20130617-en.mp3>

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Holly Raiche – ALAC
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Mike O'Connor - ISPCP
Jill Titzer – RrSG
Chuck Gomes – RySG
Avri Doria – NCSG
Kristina Rosette - IPC
Jordyn Buchanan - RrSG
Wolf Knoblen - ISPCP
Alan Greenberg - ALAC
Eric Brunner-Williams – Individual
Eduardo Diaz – ALAC
Greg Shatan – IPC
Anne Aikman Scalese - IPC

Apologies:

Brian Winterfeldt - IPC
Tim Ruiz – RrSG
Jen Wolfe - NCSG

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Lars Hoffman
Berry Cobb
Julia Charvolen
Nathalie Peregrine

Operator: This call is now being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect now.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, Damien. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening. This is policy implementation Drafting team call on the 17th of June, 2013. On the call today, we have Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-

Orr, Mike O'Connor; Jill Titzer, Chuck Gomes; (INAUDIBLE); Kristina Rosette; Jordyn Buchanan; and Wolf Knoben.

We have apologies from Tim Reeves and Jennifer Wolf.

From staff, we have Berry Cobb, Lars Hoffman, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind all participants to, please, state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much. Over to you, Holly.

Holly Raiche: Good morning, everyone. First of all, I would like to-- I've got myself (INAUDIBLE). How did I do this? I got myself out of the room. I'd like to welcome everybody and, first of all, to say I have very much appreciated what's gone on in terms of the chat and the conversations. I think it's probably a really, really good background for discussing where we're up to.

I would like to repeat probably what I've said and what everybody else has said, which is we are not actually drafting what the working group will draft. What we are drafting is what is required by the working group charter template and what-- Let me just mute myself so that I'm-- What is up on the screen so that we can all work to this is we have to draft mission and scope. We have to have a set of objectives and goals. We have to have deliverables and timeframes and then just go through what we have to do. I think this morning, after we've probably gone through an overview of what we have to do, then we can start to discuss just the mission and scope because that will be the guiding light for what else we have to do, which is things like objectives and goals. We do have to put in some kind of outcomes. If you look at the deliverables and timeframes, we should try to work through a timeframe what we have to do and what is a reasonable timeframe in which we come up with a charter template so we can actually go out and ask for the membership of working group.

So, that said, I think we might start with-- Marika, do we want to do deliverables and timeframes before we get into the actual discussion on mission and scope, because I think that's where we should start in terms of our discussion.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Holly, Cheryl here. Just a point of order. We've got a proposed agenda up, which includes (INAUDIBLE) you as chair. It's probably a good idea to run through items one and two before you jump into three.

Holly Raiche: Fine. You're right. Okay. For everybody, we have a roll call. And could we do that first in terms of who's on the call? And, if anybody has anything to add to their statement of interest, could they identify it first?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck, Holly. I think that the roll call was essentially already done. Was it not?

Holly Raiche: Okay. I think so. Nobody else is there that I see.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan. I've joined on the phone but not on the Adobe chat because I am standing in a Dairy Queen. (INAUDIBLE).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: For the audio record, neither Alan Greenberg or Eduardo Diaz would have been recorded.

Holly Raiche: I don't see-- Oh, Alan's on the list. And Eduardo is also on the list. Okay.

Eduardo Diaz: Yep. I'm in here. Can you hear me?

Holly Raiche: I can. Okay. Well, could I just say, look, if you're not on Adobe, could you just speak up, and I will recognize you, because, otherwise, you know, I won't be able to see your hand.

Okay. Did anybody have anything to add to their statement of interest?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. If I can just note, as well, we do keep an eye on the meeting view as well the Adobe Connect. So even those that (INAUDIBLE) we keep note of that and don't necessarily need to be called out. So we do keep an eye on that as well.

Holly Raiche: Okay. I do that as well. Okay. Now, would anybody else like to put their hand up as chair? Or are you happy for me to proceed? I think the phrase is speak now or forever hold your peace.

Speaker: Very happy with you proceeding.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. The opportunity was given to those who weren't at the last meeting to discuss the matter on the list (INAUDIBLE) before. Guess what. You (INAUDIBLE).

Mike O'Connor: I was going to add - What, are you crazy? - to that list.

Holly Raiche: Thank you, Mike. I appreciate your statement of support. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Crazy attracts crazy I think.

Holly Raiche: Thanks. Listen, if you're not careful, I'll have to put up (INAUDIBLE). That will throw the meeting into chaos.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Some of us are used to those.

Holly Raiche: Okay. Now. Review of the draft charter, which is number three. This is really where we're up to. Just to remind everybody because at least some of you may not have been following what's on the list, we have a job to do, and it's not to come up with a charter. It's actually to come up with a document that will produce a charter that people can then use as a basis for coming up with text. So we're not doing that. We're actually doing something called putting in a piece of paper that outlines what it is somebody else is going to do, though somebody else may in fact include us but not necessarily.

So I think, with that in mind, I trust you have read the charter; at least, certainly, on the list of discussion. It looks as if people have understood that.

There are several headings under the--

Chuck Gomes: Holly, this is Chuck, if I can jump in. I don't know if I understood you correctly or not. But I thought you said it's not our task to develop a charter.

Holly Raiche: Sorry. It's not to develop the actual outcome.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay. That's better. Okay, yeah, because it is our task to develop a charter.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It is actually that, Chuck. I was just trying-- it is only 0510 here in AU. Holly's lack of coffee might be showing.

Holly Raiche: Well, there's no way I'm going to get up and make a cup of coffee.

Chuck Gomes: Cheryl, this is Chuck. I'll let Holly off the hook but not you. No excuses.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's because I'm on my second coffee.

Holly Raiche: Right. Look, we've got-- what we have to do is produce a piece of paper or many pieces of paper on which people are going to either join or not a working group to develop the charter. That's all we're going to do. But, if you actually look at what's--

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, Holly. I think you need to back up just a tiny bit. We are developing the charter that will instigate the workgroup that will look to the issues. What we do is framework. What they do is discussion, deliberation, and outcome.

Holly Raiche: That's exactly what I'm saying. I agree with you, or, rather, you agree with me. Okay.

Let's proceed. We have a number of tasks. If you just-- I'm going through on my screen, and I invite the rest of you to do the same. What we have got in terms of the actual charter template, which guides the work that we have to achieve, there are-- there will be a bunch of things we have to do.

There'll be a working group name, which is probably going to be easy. There's a working group identification.

The fun bits start in section two, which is probably what we're going to spend most of our time on, which is defining the mission, purpose, and deliverables of the charter document. Now, the mission and scope is probably going to be the guiding principle which is going to lead to the other things we have to do, which is the objectives and goals and then deliverables and timeframes.

It's probably going to be easier to look at section three in the template, which is the membership criteria, the group formation, and the workgroup roles.

Rules of engagement I think is something that--

Speaker: Holly, Marika's hand is up.

Holly Raiche: Marika, away you go. Yes.

Marika Konings: Yes, Holly. I was waiting for you to come to-- I was just wondering whether it would be helpful for me to take you through those items I've filled in and just give you a little bit of the background of what is in there currently. And that may help then, as well, introduce some of the comments that were received on the mailing list. I don't know if that's helpful.

Holly Raiche: If you'd like to, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes. Basically, indeed, as Holly said, the section one-- I think some of the information there still will need to be filled in because some of it is historical data, like when the charter's approved, the chair of the working group, and some of the links that need to be included.

So, when it comes to section two, the mission, purpose, and deliverables-- the mission and scope, as we discussed on the last call, this would be just a starting draft. Basically, I've just listed the language from the call for volunteers in here because (INAUDIBLE) identifies at least the four questions that were reviewed by the GNSO council because the call for volunteers was also shared with them on the mailing list as the four items that, at a minimum, I think the GNSO council would like to see input on from this working group.

For the objectives and goals, I've looked there at some of the other charters that we've developed and probably looking, as well, at what we currently do under the existing PDP rules-- but, of course, there's another PDP working group-- following this same kind of model where you do have an initial report. And it could be-- I'll call it initial recommendations report, basically to specify that this doesn't necessarily need to be a full-blown report as we do for PDPs. It may be a set of 10 or 20 recommendations that are put up for comment and input. And then the final recommendations report that would be submitted to the GNSO council, again, following a little bit the model of the PDP orders at least. It's that, and then input is received. And then that input is reviewed by the working group before a final report is produced and, again, outlining that the process to be followed would be the GNSO working group guidelines.

And I've also emphasized here that these recommendations may include proposed changes to the GNSO operating procedures and/or relevant sections of the ICANN bylaws. I think, looking at, at least, the four questions that are currently there, many of these are currently either covered by some of those documents or, for example, looking at GNSO

policy guidance process. Should there be a process that's adopted that would need to be covered somewhere, I think, just to clarify what some of the expected outcomes may be of the working group.

For the deliverables and timeframes, again, I followed there what is currently in some of the other charters, also looking a little bit to the process (INAUDIBLE) in the form of PDP working groups; so, basically, requiring the working group to reach out at an early stage to different stakeholder groups and constituencies, as well as other ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees to get their input on the charter questions and make sure that factors into the working group deliberations at an early stage-- again, a requirement to produce this initial recommendation report for community input and produce a final report that would address the comments received. And that is then submitted to the GNSO council. So, again, this is a kind of a minimum, of course. As within different frameworks where we currently have working groups free to develop additional products or questions or forms that they think are necessary to get to those minimum deliverables.

Holly Raiche: Now, my question with that one. At the Beijing meeting, it was already going out to constituents saying - What do you think? Now, do you consider that that has already happened or that that should happen again?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think the input we received at that time was all on the staff discussion paper and for the forum or the workshop we had. And I think, here, we're probably looking at more specific questions. So, from my perspective, I think we would need to go out. Groups maybe just reiterate what they have submitted before if they feel that that covers our questions here as well. But I think it would be helpful to put those specific questions out as well for stakeholder group constituency as well as SOAC input to really make sure that all the necessary, relevant input is available to the working group at an early stage of the discussions and deliberations.

Holly Raiche: Thank you. I just wanted to confirm that. I thought that would be correct.
Now Alan's got his hand up. Alan, do you want to go ahead?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Just for clarity, we're talking about going out for comment on the substantive issues not on the charter.

Marika Konings: Yes. That's correct. This is talking about what we expect the working group to do as part of their deliberations.

Alan Greenberg: That's correct. Okay. I just wanted to make sure because I almost thought I heard that we were going to go out for comment on the draft charter.

Holly Raiche: No.

Alan Greenberg: I didn't think that's normal practice.

Holly Raiche: No. Sorry. What I was asking is-- At the Beijing meeting, there was an opportunity for comment on the topic itself before this group was formed. And I was wondering the extent to which the comments that have already been received and they're on the Website did or did not meet the requirements in the template, which is that we go out for comment to form the charter not as part of developing what the working group is going to be doing and what we're not going to be doing. I'm sorry the language wasn't clear.

Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Holly. It's Cheryl, for the record. To be honest, I couldn't give a shit. Was that clear enough? Let me think. Yes, I think it was.

If any member of the charter development team, drafting team, want to take into account those inputs, that's fine, but it doesn't drive this. Our job's really clear and really narrow. I would have thought that the Beijing input, if it's worth anything, is worthy of the working group yet to be formed to look at rather-- more than us.

That said, any one of us may wish to be influenced by it. But, as a command to the whole, I go back to the I couldn't give a shit line.

Holly Raiche: Thank you, Cheryl. Alan, your hand is still up. Do you still want to comment?

Alan Greenberg: It's an old hand. I'm sorry.

Holly Raiche: That's a very young hand, Alan. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: I guess I just needed to continue. What I've added here, as well, on the timeframe, basically, is, well, following some of the other charters (INAUDIBLE) adopted because that's part of the GNSO working group guidelines. Working groups are responsible for developing a work plan at an early stage in our process that outlines different steps and expected timing, which we then submit to the GNSO council. So it's basically putting part of the remit for that on the working group to really define and scope their work and determine how much time they think they need to achieve these different milestones.

I think, then, for section three, those are actually relatively standard items and just assuming that this working group will operate under the GNSO working group guidelines. So, for the membership criteria, typically, all GNSO working groups are open to anyone interested to participate. The only requirement is that people submit a statement of interest. (INAUDIBLE) information that I think also comes up in other charters that, if new members join after certain parts of the work have been completed, they do have a requirement or the expectation that they review previous documents and meeting transcripts, so there's not a situation of reopening issues that were previously closed unless, of course, new information is brought forward.

On the group formation, dependencies, and dissolution, again, this is standard language, as well, that comes in other working group charters. It's standard GNSO working group following the GNSO working group guidelines - how the call for volunteers should be circulated and to which groups.

Working group roles, functions, and duties. Again, I think this is standard language I've imported from other charters, again, referring to the outline of those roles and functions as per the GNSO working group guidelines. And then, again, a statement of interest, just clarifying that there's a requirement to submit those for those that want to participate in the working group.

And I think there's one other item there further down that's called (INAUDIBLE). And, again, I think I took their language from previous charters that notes that (INAUDIBLE) of the request of the GNSO council and, while the GNSO council liaison may play a role or have a function as well. So it (INAUDIBLE) there.

And then, basically, on the closure and working group self-assessment, the working group will close upon the delivery of the final report unless assigned additional tasks or follow-up by the GNSO council. And, again, that's language I've imported from other charters that have been recently adopted.

So I think that basically covers what I've inserted here.

I know there were some specific comments from Chuck and Jordyn or suggestions. So I don't know if it's helpful to pull those up or have the two documents side by side. So I think Chuck and Jordyn can maybe cover their comments based on, I think, this initial draft. I don't know what's the most helpful way to look at that.

Holly Raiche: May I just have a request? The way that you've gone through this, which is very helpful-- thank you. We keep talking about a working group. Now, are we talking about us as a working group that will produce another working group, because our job is not to produce the charter. Sorry. It's to produce the document. It's just the language. You've got a working group and a working group.

Chuck Gomes: Can I jump in, Holly? This is Chuck. It is our job to produce a charter.

Holly Raiche: Yeah. But it's sort of-- we're not going to go any further than that.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. We are not a working group as defined in the PDP. Okay? We are a drafting team and, more specifically, a charter drafting team.

Holly Raiche: You know, it would be really useful if we can use that language because, if you read through this, you talk about working group. And I'm going-- we're sort of--

Chuck Gomes: But you need to understand our charter is going to talk about the working group.

Holly Raiche: I know. I know. I know it.

Marika Konings: Holly, this is Marika. Maybe to clarify the process-- because, basically, really, what this drafting team is tasked to do is to complete this charter template, which is then submitted to the GNSO council for approval. Once that happens, this drafting team basically dissolves, and a new call for volunteers is sent to create the working group. And, of course, anyone in this group is free to join that effort as well. And I really hope that most of you will, as you've been closely involved in scoping the work and identifying the issues.

So I think those are (INAUDIBLE). And what is on the screen is really the working group charter that this drafting team is developing and that will be put forward to the GNSO council for approval.

Holly Raiche: Thank you, Marika. You know what I'm going to do? I'm going to call us a drafting team because I really like Chuck's term. And, that way, what we were talking about, us as a drafting team doing a charter for a working group-- and then there's no confusion in the language.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Welcome, Holly. We've always been a drafting team. We've never been a working group.

Holly Raiche: Thank you. I'm just clarifying for my own mind that's what we're doing.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Fine. Well, call me some time, not during these calls, and I'll help you with that.

Holly Raiche: I think I'm in the right space. Thank you.

Now, Marika, do we have to come up with our own set of timelines and deliverables?

Marika Konings: That's really up to the drafting team. But I think that's something that probably the GNSO council will review very closely. I mean, from my personal perspective and having seen working groups work, I think it's also more effective if the GNSO can set a deadline or a preferred delivery time of the work. But, often, it really depends on the number of volunteers that join, the chair, the outside set of milestones, how much time you want to spend on scoping or researching some of the issues, if you want to do public comment. So I think, at least from experience, it seems that, often, at the start of the working group, they first have an assessment of what they think it takes to answer the charter questions. And, on that basis, they develop their own work plan. And, of course, nothing prevents either the drafting team or the council to suggest expected timelines by which work is delivered. But it just doesn't necessarily mean that the work gets delivered by that time.

Holly Raiche: So it seems to me the first task of this drafting team is to come up with our own work plan as to when we expect we will be able to produce a charter. Right? And what we've got, if we're looking at deliverables and timeframes, which I'm assuming, in the test that you've put in, Marika, the working group-- let's call this a drafting team instead-- is expected to follow the steps for its deliverables, which is we should be reaching out to the GNSO council, stakeholder groups, as well as other ACs and SOs. So that has to be factored into the timeline. We also have to come up with some text.

Speaker: Holly, I'm sorry to interrupt. But I think you're confusing the drafting team and the charter because this drafting team doesn't need to go out to stakeholder groups and constituencies for input.

Holly Raiche: Okay.

Marika Konings: And I think, on the last call, we did discuss our timeline. Or, at least, our hope would be that we could actually deliver this by the 7th of July, in time for the council (INAUDIBLE). So what is on the screen in the charter is really called the working group. That's the next effort. The drafting team-- you can develop a work plan if you want to, but it definitely doesn't need to meet those requirements that are up here in this document. As said, I think our task is really to complete this template and submit it to the GNSO council. I think those are basically the deliverables for this group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Preferably, before Durban.

Holly Raiche: That's fine. That's exactly what I was asking. And, when I said I think guiding us rather than guiding the charter working group, which is different, we can be guided by what's in this template. We can be guided, if we want to be, by the framework document that's been circulated by the summary of comments, by the comments themselves, and by what everybody else has been saying on the line. And we don't need to go further for our work. Would that be correct?

Speaker: Yep.

Holly Raiche: Thank you. Good. Now, basically--

Chuck Gomes: Holly, this is Chuck. One of the things that's a challenge for the chair is to keep their eye on the raised hands and the chat. Chat's a little bit more challenging. But Alan's had his hand up for quite a while.

Holly Raiche: Alan, now that I'm sorted, go ahead. Or is that the old hand?

Alan Greenberg: Okay. It was a new hand. It may be old at this point. I think I understand what your concern was. And you have been looking for a charter for this group.

Holly Raiche: Yes. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: This group does not have an explicit, written charter and will not. Our implicit charter is to write the charter for-- is to draft the charter for the workgroup for GNSO council approval. We operate under the same sort of rules, but they're not written. We don't have a formal, written charter; nor are we going to write one for ourselves. Our implicit structure is-- our implicit charter is to write-- draft the charter for the working group.

Holly Raiche: Thank you, Alan. That's why I'm going to call us a drafting team. I'm just going to not use the--

Speaker: (INAUDIBLE).

Holly Raiche: -- so that we don't get confused with language.

Alan Greenberg: And we don't have a written charter. Everyone knows what we're here for. We're here to do the-- to create the charter for the working group.

Holly Raiche: Right. Okay. Now let's get down to what has to be-- and our implicit timeframe as, I understand it, is Durban, which is not that far away.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It needs to be in the paperwork for GNSO council consideration at Durban. So it's pre-Durban, unless I'm wrong. Marika?

Holly Raiche: Chuck, you've got your hand up.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Holly. Jordyn and I actually suggested a timeline for the group that would allow for council consideration of the charter and possible approval in Durban, because, remember, we talked last week about the fact that there's not going to be a council meeting in August. So, if that doesn't happen in the meeting in Durban, it's not going to happen until September, which would really be unfortunate. Now, I just refer people to that particular timeline. It's aggressive, but I think it's doable.

What I originally raised my hand for, though, was to point out that, in what Marika went through in terms of the template, much of that work, with the exception of section two is all done. Now, we may want to modify some things, like, for example, some background in the section one and so forth.

But the formation, staffing, and organization are really all basic procedures for the GNSO, section three.

The rules of engagement are procedures for the GNSO, so section four is pretty well covered.

So our focus is really on section two, which is the mission, purpose, and deliverables. And what I said in chat, not realizing that I was just chatting with Avery at the time-- I think I've since corrected that-- is that we might want to talk a little bit about the outline of section two before we start getting into specific things like mission. And the reason-- And Jordyn and I in our comments talked a little-- we had some little, parenthetical notes along this line. We might be able to break it out a little more finely than

what is broken out in section two right now. And that will help us fit things into the outline as we move forward and get into specifics. Thanks.

Holly Raiche: Thank you, Chuck. And thank you for lowering your hand, so I'm-- oh, wait a minute.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, Holly. Would you like me to pull up the language that was submitted by Chuck and Jordyn, so people can have a look at that and discuss?

Holly Raiche: For those who haven't read it, that's fine. Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. That would be great. Thanks, Marika. That was Cheryl saying thank you, by the way, because, even though she's read it, she'd like to see it again.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Maybe we could have Chuck and Jordyn maybe to take us through it. So (INAUDIBLE) ask questions or clarifications.

Holly Raiche: Thank you. Yeah. That would be good. Do you mind doing that, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: That will be fine. Let's go down to-- Keep in mind that's not-- Our input was not intended to be a complete charter. It was just input for the various sections.

Let me take you down, since I think you wanted to talk about timeframes. Okay? So, if you scroll down to the end of our document, where it says timeframes, no less, you'll see that what we suggested was submission of a draft charter and motion to the council by Wednesday, the 3rd of July. And that complies, and correct me if I'm wrong, Marika. I think that complies with the council requirements for consideration of a motion. If not--

Holly Raiche: I thought (INAUDIBLE) for the 7th.

Chuck Gomes: What's that?

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. That's correct. I think the 7th of July is according to the recently approved rules and new guideline. But I think we did discuss last weekend that the 4th of July is a holiday in the U.S., and it would be difficult for people to look at it. So I'm assuming that's where the 3rd of July comes from. But I think, from a council perspective as well, the sooner the better, as people are traveling. It would give them more time to review before actually coming online.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. And, Marika's exactly right. We added some-- I think it's ten calendar days in advance of where the motion is acted on. But we added some on because of the U.S. holiday that's in there and to give us a little fudge factor as well.

And then we suggested, as you can see if you're looking at that, the first consideration of the charter approval by the council, then, would be at the

Durban council meeting on the 17th. That would allow, and this is all adjustable, but the formation of a working group possibly by mid-August, understanding that August is a tough month. A first working group meeting then could possibly happen in September sometime. We don't need to be any more specific than that.

Obviously, ultimately, more timeframes will need to be added. But I think it works out best for the working group itself to develop their schedule and milestones and so forth rather than the charter drafting team trying to do that for them.

So let me stop there and open it up for discussion or questions.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is Cheryl here. I'm happy with that timeframe. I think, if we can manage 3 July, that's great. We've got to get this done by Durban. I can't see any other way other than being very nonproductive.

Holly Raiche: Nobody has their hand up that I can see. So I'm assuming that people are comfortable with that timeframe. So, Chuck, thank you for that.

Should we go back and look at the rest of your input, then, because, if we all pretty well accept that timeframe, then let's go through what we have to do between now and 3 July, how many meetings we've got, and have a little-- our mental work plan that will get us to 3 July with something-- with a document that can go to the GNSO. Do you want to walk us through the rest of that document, starting at the top this time?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. And I think, before-- I don't think we're quite ready to look at the content that we suggested. I think, first, one of the things, and, again, I suggested this in the chat-- my personal chat with Avery-- that, if you look at the section on mission and scope, I think mission and purpose or scope is fine as a category.

But, when you start getting into-- and I'm just using goals, I think, as a good section-- then it starts combining some things. Like, for example, what we did is we had a category called Recommended Working Group Tasks. Nothing magical about that. We broke down the work of the group into recommended working group tasks and even included some questions that need to be answered in that section and then broke out deliverables separately. And that will eventually tie into timeframes. But I don't think we're going to be able to set timeframes for the deliverables. The working group will need to do that once they get started and move through it.

So, when I was talking about outlining the section to there, breaking it down a little bit further, and people may have other ideas-- we were suggesting that we break out working group tasks-- that can include questions that should be asked and attempted to answer-- produce answers and so forth-- and then break out deliverables separately. Don't have to do it that way. As I was-- as we were working on this, we found that it was maybe-- it might be helpful for us to break them out a little bit more finely than it is in the template.

And I'll stop there.

Holly Raiche: Thank you, Chuck. Look, I think Mike's template and his PowerPoints would support the fact that there's probably a lot of work that can be put into objectives and goals of what we want the working group-- what we as a drafting team want the working group to do.

I think, when I commented on the mission and scope, the only reason I said or made the comment maybe we go a little bit further is that, if you look at the objectives and goals and the way people have been talking possibly, we need to have a mission statement that does cover the sort of objectives and goals that you've got and that Mike's got.

But I think working through the timeframe, which is a very short timeframe-- I think, what, that gives us three, two meetings? If you look at it, we're at June 17. So that's one, two-- we only have a couple of meetings.

Chuck Gomes: Yep.

Holly Raiche: So, moving right along, are people happy to proceed along? And, Mike, have you seen how-- what the stuff that you have developed fits into what Chuck has to say? I haven't had a chance to actually mentally do that myself.

Mike O'Connor: This is Mike. Can people hear me okay? I'm having a bad internet day.

Speaker: Yes. We hear you fine.

Mike O'Connor: Okay. Marika-- I guess Marika didn't. Others lived through a bad call this morning.

Anyway, my hand was up because I was going to chime in right behind Chuck and say that I really like the idea of having a separate section for deliverables.

What I've been doing in the last day is sort of building one of those outlines that I built for other things. And I thought what I would do is pay sort of close attention today to what people say and sort of chop together the very first, rough outline of the work and throw it out to the list pretty fast, like either late today or tomorrow morning, so that we've got at least a first hack at the outline that we need.

And then I think that, with that, we'll probably be in pretty good shape to sort of edit it and get down to a final spot. So I'm pretty comfortable with where things are going. And, rather than go through all of it now, I think it's probably easier to just publish it to the list.

Holly Raiche: Okay. And Marika in the chat is volunteering to produce an updated draft based on comments provided by Chuck and Jordyn and additional comments made today. How is that going to fit in with--? I was going to

say, Marika, could you wait until Mike comes up with his comments and fits them in as well?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. This is actually just a suggestion that I'd like us just to try to get a quick turnaround to integrate the comments that Jordyn and Chuck provided, and that may-- because I think it's easy-- like a lot of people have made suggestions in the discussion, but the most productive or effective, at least from past perspective, is if people would provide concrete suggestions on how to add or edit or make changes to the draft charter because that may make it easier as well for the working group to really focus their discussions and the language that's in the charter and sort of not verging into some of the broader debates that are very interesting but may be more relevant for the next effort that comes after that.

My suggestion was more that, as a next step, I'm happy to take what Chuck Jordyn produced and any further concrete suggestions that are maybe made on today's call on what needs to be added to the charter and put that out as a kind of next draft, so the working group can take that apart ahead of the next meeting-- drafting team. Sorry. I don't want to confuse things.

Holly Raiche: Please. We're not a working group. We're a drafting team. Okay. Mike, if you're going to produce, which would be great-- putting all this stuff together-- how is that going to work with Marika's document? I'm just thinking what Chuck has produced is a really useful outline of how to go, which is we've got some text on mission and scope, and we've had some discussion in the list on that. We've got then the objectives and goals. Breaking it down into the task, which is that that can give rise to the actual charter working group finalizing their own tasks and timelines (INAUDIBLE) deliverables.

Mike O'Connor: This is Mike. What I was going-- I basically listed everything that Chuck and Jordyn came up with and stuffed it into the outline.

Holly Raiche: Yeah. It looks good.

Mike O'Connor: And so I think that Chuck is right that the key discussion for today is probably going to be mission and scope. If we can sort of hammer the roughages out of that or at least get some pretty solid discussion to sort of tie up this discussion that we've been having on the list today, I think the rest of this stuff pretty much flows right out of that. And I don't think it will be tough after that.

Holly Raiche: Okay. And are you happy with the way that--? Are we all happy with the way that Chuck and Jordyn's first go breaks things down into the categories that they have?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You'll need a lineup of hands.

Holly Raiche: Alan. Okay, first, Chuck-- it's your document. You start.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. What I was going to suggest to help Marika in her task of putting a first draft version of a more complete charter-- and, by the way, I agree with Mike that, if at all possible, to talk a little bit more about mission today would be very good, and that would help Marika in her task. But, if we could-- if we have time on this call to make sure there's agreement from most of us if not all of us on what Jordyn and I submitted-- Now, the quickest way to do that just to see if anybody objects to any of them-- if people want me to go through them one by one, I can. I'm flexible on that.

With regard to mission, I want to point out again, as I did on the list, we didn't provide a mission. We provided two assumptions that we think underlie the mission. So, please, don't look at that as the mission. It's two assumptions that we think form-- are important to agree on before we define a mission. So, please, understand that.

I will follow whatever direction you provide, Holly, and the group want with regard to whether we need to go through these one by one. Or, if people have reviewed them and just want to ask questions or say-- point out ones where they would modify or change, that would be even quicker. So I'll let you take it from there.

Holly Raiche: Thank you, Chuck. And I think probably we'll do the latter, which is-- let's assume everybody's read what you've done, and we'll comment. But, in the meantime, we've got Eduardo and then Alan. Eduardo, go ahead. Thanks.

Eduardo Diaz: I agree that we could (technical difficulties).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Eduardo, Cheryl here. Could you speak closer to the microphone, please? Hard to hear you.

Eduardo Diaz: Let me see where the microphone is. Can you hear me, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. That's better. Thank you.

Eduardo Diaz: Anyhow, I was going to say that I think during this call we should talk about the key assumptions and the mission and scope, like Chuck said.

And, also, there was some discussion in the-- offline about if we're going to ask the working group to define what policy is and (INAUDIBLE). I don't know if that would be something that (INAUDIBLE).

Holly Raiche: Eduardo, I think that will be one of the things that we will ask the working group to look at. And they may or may not do something. But I think let's get through the mission and scope, and that discussion should flesh out your question.

Alan, you've got a cross against that, but you've also got your hand up. So you've got the floor.

Alan Greenberg: Just for the record, the cross was-- you said the working group should decide for themselves whether they define policy and implementation and

what the dividing line is between them. I would think that's one of the core things that we decide for them. I would fight on that one.

The reason I raised my hand is, before we get to mission and scope, I'd like to talk about the title line. The title line is saying policy and implementation PDP working group. At what point did I miss where this became a PDP?

Holly Raiche: That's a very good question. Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. As far as I know, it will not intended to be a PDP working group. I'm sure Chuck or Jordyn can clarify.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Wishful thinking, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: That was probably my mistake, although it could-- any working group could result in policy recommendations. And we're going to follow the PDP working group procedures. Even a PDP working group doesn't have to produce consensus policy recommendations. So I don't have any problem with the leaving the PDP in that. Bottom line, guys, the only working group guidelines we have are the PDP working group guidelines.

Alan Greenberg: Chuck, what I was asking was-- I have no problem with using the PDG working group guidelines, which I believe are actually just working group guidelines which are used by the PDP. I would not want to see us tied to all the rest of the process that a PDP is required to do, including super majority voting and things like that, if it comes down to that, since we weren't chartered as a PDP. We would not-- an issue report was not created. We haven't gone through all the previous steps that a PDP required. So I don't think we can arbitrarily start calling this a PDP, nor would we want to from my personal opinion.

Chuck Gomes: Good point, Alan. Thanks. This is Chuck.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika, maybe to clarify because what we have is GNSO working group guidelines that can apply to any working group not only PDP working groups. We do have a PDP manual, which is specifically for PDP working groups. I think, again, Alan already made the point that this is not a PDP as there was no request for an issue report or a preliminary issue report or final issue report. So I think the whole idea is that this working group may choose to follow some of the steps which I think are well recognized practices within the ICANN community of how we do things-- you know, reaching out at an early stage, having an initial report for public comment. And they don't need to be necessarily tied to some of the other requirements that are within the PDP manual that need to be followed by PDP working groups in their specific process.

Holly Raiche: Okay. Avery, you've had your hand up for a bit of a time. Sorry. Go ahead.

Avery: Okay. Thank you. This is Avery speaking. I wanted to check though. Are we actually talking about the mission and scope content, because that's when I put my hand up. But, if we're not there yet, I'll back off.

Holly Raiche: We were almost there. We got sidelined. I think we're back there.

Avery: Okay. I'll back off.

Holly Raiche: Okay. I think the rest-- we've got probably about a half an hour left. And it's probably time to say, well, we need to look at the mission and scope, which is our first task. And, if we can actually knock that off today or get well into discussion, then I think we can-- we've made a really good head start on getting a document.

So I think the place to start-- Chuck, just repeat what you said briefly, which is about the key assumptions. And then, Mike, you've had stuff to say on the mission and scope. And then we'll open it up for discussion. So, first, if we could start with Chuck and Mike. And then we'll have a discussion and hopefully be able to come to some kind of agreement by the end of the half hour that we've got. So go ahead, Chuck. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Holly. This is Chuck again. And, Jordyn, please, feel free to jump in if I misstate anything.

So two assumptions that Jordyn and I thought were accurate assumptions underlying the mission is, first of all, the processes for policy development are pretty well defined. And implementation processes are much less well defined. And, hence, that's where we believe most of the work of the working group will focus.

So my question, I guess, to everybody on the call is: Is there any disagreement with those two assumptions? And disagreement is welcome, so, please, feel free.

Holly Raiche: Okay. Mike, you also had a lot to say.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hang on. Holly, Cheryl here. I think Avery popped her hand in response to Mike's question on the key assumptions. So I'd like to hear what she wants to (INAUDIBLE) now.

Holly Raiche: Avery, go ahead.

Avery: Okay. Thank you. Yeah. It was a place marker. I think there's an assumption missing. Or, rather, there's an assumption being made that's not being brought out. I think we're assuming-- and you especially see it when you get to three below and the objectives and goals-- that there is (technical difficulties)--

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think we've lost her.

Avery: -- and implementation process. And we're not looking at what is the relationship between those two processes. And I think we have to deal

with the fact that we don't understand the relationship between those yet. And so I have a problem in three later when we talk about transition. I don't see this as an issue of transition. I think we have to understand how the two play together. Thank you.

Holly Raiche: Thank you. Alan has his hand up. Then Jordyn.

Alan Greenberg: I support strongly what Avery just said. I think the demarcation-- and if indeed there is a demarcation and how important that demarcation is is very much a responsibility. Remember, the board asked for community input and, in this case, GNSO input on policy and implementation. So that raises a whole bunch of issues that I think cannot be sidestepped. And I won't go into the political things that are going on in the background in response to the recent board governance committee decision on the reconsideration (INAUDIBLE). But it raises a whole bunch of issues that I think fall flat in the-- under the remit of this working group-- the working group which will come after us.

Holly Raiche: Thank you. Don't say this working group, please. Jordyn, you're next. Thank you.

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks. Avery, I think it certainly isn't an intent. I think the line between policy and implementation is inherently fuzzy. I do think there are ways that we can define it that are workable, at least in terms of creating a framework in order to allow us to sort of know what procedure we should be applying at any given time. But I think that creates definitions of types of policy and types of implementation, whereas I think where it would tend to get sort of bound up trying to find some dividing line between-- you know, that is policy with a little "p." That's implementation with a little "I" as opposed to some specific instantiation of it.

I think what we can do-- what we can hope for is a set of procedures that allows us to work through the sort of-- from a notion existing in someone's head through the GNSO process of adopting a policy and through, ultimately, that policy also being instantiated in contracts or whatever other form it needs to take in order to be implemented. I think we can have a set of procedures along the way that largely obviate the need to get the exact distinction right between where one thing and the other begins.

I think, when you look down the assumptions, yeah, we used the word transition, and that's intended to be the transition between sort of like phases of work as opposed to necessarily agreeing that there is a distinct-- that we stop-- suddenly we stop talking about things that could be construed as policy, and it's clearly construed as implementation.

And I think, most importantly, there is another assumption here maybe that we should make more explicit, which is that, just because something is implementation, it doesn't mean that the multi-stakeholder process stops. And I think, in some cases, people are sort of saying - Oh, it's implementation; therefore, it's purely a staff issue at that point. And I think, if we could start with the assumption that that's not correct, then I

think the debate becomes a lot less fraught. And then we're just trying to define a procedure to make sure we get the proper multi-stakeholder input during the implementation phase as well.

Holly Raiche: Jordyn, thank you. I think that's really useful. Alan, is that a new or an old hand? I mean, it's a beautiful hand anyway.

Alan Greenberg: It's a new, old hand. All my hands are old these days.

Holly Raiche: Yeah, well, (INAUDIBLE) new hands.

Alan Greenberg: I think Jordyn is right on. Many of us have spent the last five years or a good part of the last five years developing what has become the applicant guidebook for the new gTLD process. That was all implementation. And I don't think anyone can say there was no community involvement in it. Whether we have a formal bylaws rule saying the community is involved in implementation, we are-- we have been.

And I think part of what this group needs to do is demonstrate that and make sure that we don't forget it in the future because it almost doesn't matter where the line is. The line between policy and implementation isn't where the policy group stopped. If the new gTLD PDP had decided to define things in far more detail than it did, a lot of things that became implementation would have been policy. They just chose to stop there. So I don't believe that we're going to find there is a hard line that you can, after the fact, look at something and say - Is it a God-given policy or a God-given implementation? If it wasn't done in policy, it's done in implementation. And it's a moveable line, depending on where the various groups decide to start and stop. Thank you.

Holly Raiche: Cheryl's got a nice, green tick. I think that's fine. Could I summarize by saying-- somebody's trying to talk. Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz: Yes. But finish for you. I think somebody else was talking.

Holly Raiche: Go ahead, Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz: Oh, I was going to go back to what Alan said-- that there is a very fine line between policy and implementation and that it would be hard to define at some point in time. So I think one of the things of this group that we're trying to put a charter for what it should do is-- let's say there is a policy out there and there's implementation and there's deploying the implementation that the community thinks is policy. It really is groups look at ways of capturing that and have a process in place to go back to the other, in this case, the GNSO. And I think that's part of what the charter for this working group should-- this working group should (INAUDIBLE) a solid charter. That's my opinion. Thank you.

Holly Raiche: Thank you, Eduardo. Is the issue not so much what is policy but what kind of process is followed, what kind of input is followed rather than labels, because it seems to me what we're talking about, and I'm quite happy to get comments back on this. What we're talking about is we now

have just one policy process called the PDP. There may be other processes that can be developed or have been developed informally that don't have that formal status.

And what Jordyn was saying is that perhaps what is more important is at what point do we stop talking to each other. At what point do we have to start talking to each other?

So is this a definitional problem, or is it really fleshing out some of the process problems or some of the processes that aren't in place? And is the mission therefore based on a multi-stakeholder assumption of process that is not just PDP? Is that kind of what sits on top of what Chuck and Jordyn and Mike were talking about?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Holly, Cheryl here. My computer's frozen. Put me in the queue, please.

Holly Raiche: You're in the queue now. Thank you. Nobody else has their hand up.

Speaker: And Marika's hand is up.

Holly Raiche: Okay.

Greg Shatan: Hi. This is Greg. Can I get in the queue too?

Holly Raiche: My space for seeing hands up is really small. I don't know. I'm going to have to reconfigure this.

Marika Konings: I think Greg is not on Adobe Connect. That's probably why you don't see his hand. But he's on the call.

To make the point I wanted to make-- we're talking a lot about where implementation fits in. And something I pointed out already in the mailing list, as well, is, as part of the revised PDP, a number of improvements were made to the PDP to partly address those kind of discussions of how much detail should be included. At what point does something become (INAUDIBLE) staff? At what point do we need to (INAUDIBLE)?

And, as such, I think there is specific guidance within the PDP that talks about implementation guidance that would be helpful if provided by the working group if they would like to do so.

And, also, this concept of allowing or encouraging the creation of implementation review teams that are basically intended as a kind of sound board for staff to come back and check if they have any questions or clarifications with regard to the policy recommendations. (INAUDIBLE) basically saying, look, this is what we think should be the implementation plan based on the guidance you have given us in your final report and recommendations. Is this what you think--? Did we understand you correctly? And then this is ready to go forward.

I think what is missing and I think that what came out as well in the questions that were in the call for volunteers and what we've discussed in

some of the previous discussions in Beijing and other discussions is that there's very little guidance at the moment around how those implementation review teams should function. So at what time they, for example, need to go back to the council if indeed they identify that an issue is really policy and not just implementation. Or what kind of points-- further checks need to be had, for example, with the broader community, because, again, these implementation review teams-- the idea behind there is that it's consisting of members that were involved in initial development of the policy recommendations so that staff can actually verify, like, if this indeed is the intention of the policy recommendation. It's a kind of sound body. But there's no current mechanism around it. Like at what point do you need to go back to the broader community or put implementation plans out for public input?

So I think that's what we're really looking at, at further guidance. But I just want you to know that some of that basis already exists there, and it's really building that up and having, indeed, more transparent and predictable processes in place when policy recommendations move from adoption to the implementation phase.

And just one question I had as well. (INAUDIBLE) telling me that I need to speak more slowly. I'll try that.

Is the question whether some of the key assumptions, starting off with those that were suggested by Chuck and Jordyn-- if they should serve as the introduction to the section on the mission and scope, basically, setting the scene. What I've done on the right-hand side is I've posted there what is currently in the draft that staff developed that was circulated last week-- whether, indeed, as the introduction to that, we should start by introducing those key assumptions and just put in that language there. I think Avery had some additional suggestions. And start building up that section from there.

Holly Raiche:

There are a few interesting things on the chat. I think, first of all, two of Chuck's comments-- the primary mission of the drafting team is to develop a charter. Yes. The primary mission of the working group is to respond to the board's requests. Yes. So that's a nice clarification. Thank you.

Avery, I'm looking at what was suggested on the right-hand side of people's screens, which is what's in the current language, which I think maybe, if Chuck-- well, maybe we can start on-- is this what we're going to do, a set of principles that underpin any GSO policy and implementation-related discussions? So that avoids the fact that we're trying to distinguish between the two and pick up Jordyn's point that we're talking about principles that underpin any discussion, some recommendations for policy guidance. And that would pick up the difficulty of defining what policy is. And it probably would pick up at least when we would use a PDP or not. And, if we don't use a PDP, what further things do we do?

The third is a framework for implementation-related discussions. Now, the framework would allow for Jordyn's comment, which is just because it says implementation doesn't mean you don't continue to discuss.

And that would be picked up by the fourth point.

So, Avery, you were suggesting that there's missing things in there.

Here we go. Okay. In the chat. My two assumptions

Marika Konings: This is Marika, Holly. Just to clarify. What is on the right-hand side is actually what was in the draft that I produced and that basically takes (INAUDIBLE) language from the call for volunteers. What Chuck and Jordyn produced is not up on the screen. So the question was whether we need-- whether we should introduce those key assumptions together with that part of whether we completely rewrite it, which is another option of course.

Holly Raiche: Okay. Avery, I agree that we do not understand the relationship between the practice and implementation but need to establish a framework that takes the relationship between the two. The language really comes from the call for volunteers. Right.

To me, what we've got to do in the next 20 minutes is start off with mission and scope. Since what Chuck has said, which really is the key assumptions are what underpin it, what language--? I'm looking at the language that was used in the draft. Is that inappropriate or not? Does that cover what we've been saying on the list or not? And, if not, what's missing?

Alan Greenberg: There are many hands up.

Holly Raiche: I know. And I'm just going to go-- It starts with Chuck, Jordyn, and Mike for a start. So, Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks. And I'll try and be brief. I think we're getting a good outline and even contents of the mission. I do believe that the basic mission is to respond to the board and, obviously, the council in responding to the board. And that needs to be cited and referenced. Okay?

Holly Raiche: Yep.

Chuck Gomes: Then we have some assumptions, and we're up to four now. I'm fine with Avery's being added to what Jordyn and I put if everybody else is.

And then I think that what Marika outlined under mission and scope follows right on from that and gets a little more detail.

I'll stop there.

Holly Raiche: Thank you. Jordyn, go ahead.

Jordyn Buchanan: Thanks. I actually have one brief thing to say. But, actually, I think Greg wanted to talk at some point a little while ago. And he's not in the chat room. So maybe we should give him a chance to do that.

Holly Raiche: Absolutely.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. I appreciate that. I guess I wanted to say, first-- sorry if this is a little out of sync with the conversation at the moment but not too much.

I think it is-- it should be within the remit of the group to look at how policy and implementation should be defined. I don't think it should define the success or failure of the group. But it should be open for discussion within the working group and not something that we try to solve as a drafting team.

I do think that the reason that they're interesting to discuss really only relates to the consequences that something is defined as one or the other and that, really, one could discuss primarily the consequences of those definitions without necessarily deciding what those definitions-- those are bright lines or blurry lines-- how they would interact. But, nonetheless, I think it needs to be considered. What does it mean for something to be policy? What does it mean for something to be implementation? -- and to try to have at least the opportunity to see if definitions can be arrived at or structured in framework.

Of course, the more we charge the working group with finding processes-- that may be where it doesn't matter so much whether something's policy or implementation-- the less the definitions matter. But I think, at least, up to the point of the discussions of this drafting team and maybe (INAUDIBLE) recent discussions in other forum. A lot has been made out of the difference between policy and implementation, and I don't think it should be-- the working group should be shut off from discussing the definitional issues of policy and implementation. Thanks.

Holly Raiche: Thank you for that. That's very useful. Mike, your hand is up, and, Jordyn, your hand is still up if you would like to talk after Mike.

Jordyn Buchanan: This is Jordyn. I'll wait for Mike. But I do want to make a quick comment. Go ahead, Mike.

Mike O'Connor: No. Go ahead, Jordyn. You were first.

Jordyn Buchanan: All right. I'll briefly say-- just briefly, in response to what Greg just said, I do think there's a high probability that, if a working group gates other work on first defining policy and implementation, that it's-- there's a high probability that they will fail.

If, on the other hand, as Greg was just putting it, it's something that we would like the working group to cope with but it doesn't gate the work on other deliverables, then I think that's a fine way to express it.

But I just think we need to be careful to not say, first of all, define what policy and implementation is, and then, once you've done that, do all this other stuff, because there's a good chance you'd never get past step one in that scenario, which would be a disastrous outcome for the working group.

My other general point is I do think what Marika said earlier is great in that we already have-- it sounds like we already have some places to latch onto in existing procedures. For example, how is the implementation team supposed to work? There's a bunch of places where-- another example of this is the exercise that we're engaging in right now, which is-- we think we're doing something related to policy, but it's not a PDP. What exactly is that process supposed to look like? What's the start and end state supposed to be? Once we're done and have issued something that the GNSO adopts, is that documented somewhere? Can some future implementer come back and look at this, the work that we've done, generally speaking, other than consensus policy that's difficult to find-- work like this.

So there's a bunch-- there's a whole universe of things that we can do, which is, essentially, creating more predictable, timely, efficient, repeatable processes around some of these characters other than the PDP, which I think will be really useful.

Holly Raiche: I think that's spot on. Thank you very much. And I'm just noting Alan is very happy, as am I, with Greg's point.

I'm not sure I can answer Ann's question in the chat immediately.

Mike, you're next.

Mike O'Connor: Thanks, Holly. This is Mike. My hand went up so long ago. I'm not sure that this is relevant. But I'm going to pound it into the chat. It's really ugly.

The one thing that I wanted to throw into the hopper was a series of questions. And these could be in questions the workgroup can answer, or they could be in the mission. But it seems to me that, at the end of the day, what we need to do is come up with a series of pretty good recommendations about how this flow from policy to implementation and back works. And so this is a very ugly summary of that slide deck that I posted.

I have absolutely no editorial pride, and so, if people would prefer to see this come out in the working group or something, that's fine. Or it could go into a series of questions. But I think that the mission is to describe something. And what I tried to do was list a bunch of things that the working group, not us, could describe. So I'll just put it in the chat and leave it there for now. Thanks.

Holly Raiche: Thank you, Mike. And, look, I think that, probably, your slides do raise the sorts of things that the working group, as opposed to the drafting team, will be looking at.

We've got Chuck and then Cheryl. Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Holly. I'll be real brief. Mike, a question for you on what you just talked about. I agree with you that asking some key questions are important. Now, is what you're talking about--? Does that fit into item four under working group tasks, where we said prepare working group responses to key questions?

Mike O'Connor: Yeah. This is Mike. Chuck, it certainly could. I was reading your draft and agreeing with you that we still needed a mission. And, actually, I think I hadn't seen Marika's draft. And so I'm pretty much fine with Marika's draft plus responding to whoever chartered us, which I think is the (INAUDIBLE) by its emerging-- that the GNSO chartered us, not the board. And so these could easily drop down either into the key questions section of the charter or just drop out of the charter altogether. I was doing this mostly as a way to frame the mission, but I think we're getting pretty close with what we've already got.

Holly Raiche: Look, I would agree with you, Mike. Cheryl, you're next.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. In fact, I was 15 minutes ago when I (INAUDIBLE) to Marika.

What Marika said in terms of the need for a loop back and some checkpoints on what happens when a PDP makes an implementation recommendations and then staff is tasked with making those implementations. And the importance, indeed, and I'd like to underline that-- the importance of the implementation review team, which is not just window dressing-- it's very important and, I think, something that the workgroup should be encouraged to focus on as a key area and a key opportunity. To check back with the implementation review team is where I would like to see some more of the mission and scope patted out and developed.

I was going to propose so long ago I can barely remember where it is in the point of time. I think it was about the 65 to 68 minute mark in the call where Marika's text or words were, I thought, just perfect for a little bit of a preamble that we could put to the potential workgroup for what they should be looking at. And then we could derive some specific mission and scope out of that.

On the need for not just tossing these things out to staff and this thing called implementation review team happens, and it's all well and wonderful. Clearly, that is not necessarily going to be the case. We need some pro forma and expectation and accountability and transparency and all of those good things involved around that, as well as some specific feedback or gate-keeping points, whereby, if a process goes down the line in a staff implementation review team dialogue to a point they can say it's time we went back and looped to bringing it back to the council, bringing back to the GNSO, bringing it back to the community at the wider ICANN interest. I think that needs to somehow fit into the mission and the scope of what we want the working group to look at, along with those basic bits and pieces of definitions, et cetera. Thank you.

Holly Raiche: Thank you. Marika's got her hand up, as does Alan. Now, Marika first, and then Alan.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think Alan had his hand up longer, so I'm happy for Alan to go first.

Alan Greenberg: I'm always happy for staff to go first though.

Marika Konings: I'm happy to go first then, in that case, Alan.

Just one thing that came to my mind in hearing the different comments is something that we may want to ask somewhere maybe as a note or maybe something to just take back in the discussions when the working group is formed. I think it's important, as well, to make sure that the working group considers agility of the process because not every PDP or set of policy recommendations is the same. So I think we really need to be careful, as well, that we don't get stuck with a very rigid system in which we need to jump through different hoops and circles and review rounds where, in certain cases, we may have a very stray-- you know, where a working group comes up and say this provision needs to be added to this specific policy. There's no need for an implementation review team or public comment period or anything like that. So I think we really need to make sure, as well, that somewhere we record here that the working group needs to take into account that there needs to be agility and flexibility to make sure that, in those cases where we don't need any rigidity, things can move fast and go quickly and don't necessarily need to be (INAUDIBLE) in circles that we don't necessarily need to go through.

Holly Raiche: Thank you, Marika. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'm so glad I let Marika go first because I don't have to say what I was going to say.

I'll just give the examples. PDPs and policies come in different shapes, sizes, and magnitudes. I was part of an implementation group. There were about five people on it, an implementation review group. We had a hard time getting two people to actually read the e-mails and respond. The review groups for some of the IRTP policies-- PDPs we're working on right now are probably going to be similar in size. The implementation review group for the new gTLD policy was all of ICANN, pretty much every attendee who came to a meeting and a lot of people who didn't come to meetings and large parts of the community who don't go to ICANN meetings at all.

So, yes, we don't want to be rigid about this. We've got to adjust the process based on what kind of policy we're talking about, and they do range widely. Thank you.

Holly Raiche: Okay. Well, we're coming to the end of our hour and a half. I think some of the things we can take away-- I think we're all working off of the outline that Chuck and Jordyn prepared in terms of tasks we have to do, which is

mission and scope, then the objectives. And then we have to talk about the deliverables.

Now, we haven't come up with a set of words for mission and scope. But we've come up with a lot of thoughts, and they're very useful in terms of some themes, such as what-- as important as definition is, the sort of process that's around it-- that the need for flexibility of that process but the need for that process to support, as necessary, the multi-stakeholder model.

And I would go back to Mike's original (INAUDIBLE) that has some nice, little loops in it. That actually described that pretty well. We can reduce some of that to paper. But Mike's going to do that for us over the next day or so.

And the next task we've got-- I think what I would hope over the next week is that we can come up with a form of words that we're all pretty happy with or at least come closer to statements about mission and scope. We've got the objectives and goals. I think we really need to make some really good headway on that next week because we really only have a couple of weeks.

I think the deliverables-- if people will just have a look at the deliverables and see if they match up, that would be our final session.

So do we have--? Marika, I think you're going to be doing some work.

But, Mike, are you going to be doing your--? Oh, you're going to wait for Marika's draft. Okay.

In the next couple of days, Marika and Mike, if you can, come up with your summaries of where we got up to, and I'll have a look as well. Then the task for the next meeting, which is probably also going to have to be an hour and a half, if we're going to meet this July 3 deadline-- the next task is going to be to get onto and make really good headway on the objectives. I think deliverables will just fall through.

But are there any final comments before we call it a day?

Alan Greenberg: Marika's hand is up.

Marika Konings: Holly, this is Marika. If I can make a suggestion, and I think Mike agreed with (INAUDIBLE) proposed. On the right-hand side, you really see I took some notes based on the discussion today with regards to an introduction to the mission and scope. I think there are no strong objections to some of the language that Chuck and Jordyn have suggested. So my proposal would be that I integrate that into the draft charter as an issue developed by staff, put that out to the mailing list so that people can actually start looking and that and suggesting additional language, changes, added. And that may make it easier. Hopefully, people can use maybe the red-line function, so we can actually see where changes have been

suggested. So that may help us prepare for the next meeting. And then Mike can take that on and tear it apart if he likes.

Holly Raiche: That would be really useful. And, Mike, you've got to wait until-- you do your work, and then he's going to do his work. I think that's where we're up to for the next meeting.

Is there any other comments? Whoops. Chuck. Alright. There's a note from Ann to Chuck.

Okay. Thank you, everybody, for your time. I think, Marika, your first (INAUDIBLE) in terms of putting what's on the right-hand side, the notes you've taken, into Chuck's outline. And then Mike's going to come up with something. Whoops. Mike is going to add assumptions. Okay.

I would hope that the list will be as active as it has been so that at the next meeting we can make some real progress in terms of signing off on a mission and we can start to work on some of the objectives. But in the meantime, (INAUDIBLE) everybody on the list. Thank you for—thank you for your time.

Speakers: (INAUDIBLE)

Holly Raiche: Thanks all.

END