

**Policy & Implementation Working Group Meeting  
TRANSCRIPTION**

**Wednesday 18 September 2013 at 1900 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Wednesday 18 September 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-20130918-en.mp3>

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Holly Raiche – ALAC  
Greg Shatan – IPC  
Anne Aikman Scalese - IPC  
Wolf Knoblen - ISPCP  
Chuck Gomes – RySG  
Olga Cavalli - GAC  
Philip Marano – IPC  
Michael Graham – IPC  
Olevie Kouami – NPOC  
Nic Steinbach – RrSG  
Kiran Malancharuvil – IPC  
Amr Elsadr - NCUC  
Tim Ruiz – RrSG  
Tom Barrett – RrSG  
James Bladel – RrSG  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC  
Aparna Sridhar – BC  
Kristine Rosette – IPC  
Brian Beckham – IPC

Apology:

Alan Greenberg – ALAC  
Edward Morris – NCSG  
Maureen Cubberley – Individual  
Avri Doria – NCSG

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings  
Tim Cole  
Lars Hoffman  
Glen de St Gery  
Nathalie Peregrine

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

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, Camille. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everybody. This is the Policy and Implementation working group call on the 18<sup>th</sup> of September, 2013. On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Olga Cavalli, Michael Graham, Wolf Knoblen, Chuck Gomes, Tim Barrett, Kiran Malancharuvil, Greg Shatan, Amr Elsadr, James Bladel, Brian Beckham, Alex Rascolesi and Kristina Rosett. We have apologies from Alan Greenburg, Edward Morris, Maureen Cubberley and (INAUDIBLE).

From staff we have Marika Konings, (INAUDIBLE), Lars Hoffman, Mary Wong, Tim Cole 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 and over to you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Nathalie. And welcome--

Tim Ruiz: And this is Tim Ruiz just joining.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Tim. Okay. Again, as I started to say before we started the recording I- it was supposed to be Jay Scott chairing today, but he is traveling and unable to do so, so he will chair the next meeting. The agenda is on the Adobe Connect. Again, for those that can't be on Adobe Connect, please speak up when you want to enter the conversation so that we know and I'll keep a queue in that regard.

Those of you who are on Adobe Connect, please raise your hand when you would like to say something. Nathalie, I think you-- am I correct. You already did the roll call. So I think we're done with that. Is that correct?

Nathalie Peregrine: That is correct.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Then the next item on the agenda is the outreach letter to other SOs and ACs, as well as the Board invitation letter. Let me give a brief overview here and then let Marika or Mary step in to add any other information that may be useful.

A draft outreach letter to SOs and ACs in general was sent out to the working group list and I think there were just a few edits adjusted so we would like to finalize that one today. So if anybody hasn't had any input on that and you want to provide some today, please do so. Otherwise we can send that out.

Now let me be clear on one thing. That's to the other SOs and ACs except for the GAC; the GAC we are going to do a letter that's specifically tailored to the GAC and what is happening on that is we have a draft letter that has been prepared for that by the leadership team. Marika, correct me if I'm wrong, but has that letter been sent-- A, that letter has been to the full group and in fact that's why we got edits I think from Brian. Is that correct?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Both of those were sent to the group and the edits you see on the screen were only some minor edits that were suggested

by Brian that we didn't send to the list because they're really just corrections, like a capital letter, or spacing here and there. I just realized or Glen actually pointed it out in line two, we actually had a word missing that was as well a copy/paste from the charter. So we didn't think it was necessary to re-circulate and forward just that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Thank you. Now, so let me ask a question of those on the call right now. Are there any additional edits that anyone wants to submit on this or can I assume that it's ready to go once the edits are accepted to the SOs and ACs, again with the exception of the GAC?

Okay. Not seeing any hands or hearing anyone, I will assume that that letter is ready to go so an action item for the leadership team with staff support will be to go ahead and get that letter sent to those groups, excepting the GAC.

Now with regard to the GAC, we are in the process, I say we the leadership team for this working group-- of scheduling a call with Jonathan Robinson as Chair of the GAC-- excuse me-- chair of the GNSO Council and also he would like to involve the chairs of the different stakeholder group and constituencies if they're available. And so it looks like in the doodle poll so far, quite a few haven't responded but it looked like the best opportunities may be Monday or Tuesday of next week.

And in that call, we'll talk with them about the GAC- ways to incorporate the GAC into this working group. Suzanne Riddell sent to Jay Scott and I, some thoughts in terms of how we could use this working group to test some ideas that have been put forward in terms of interaction. And so the chairs of this group have talked about that with staff and also with Jonathan and thought that it would be helpful to have a call with Jonathan for his suggestion-- leaders of other stakeholder groups and constituencies in the GNSO. And so we will hopefully have that next week.

One of the things we need to make sure we do on that is that expectations are clear; both on the part of the GAC as well as on our part and Marika's identified some concerns there. So we're going to try and get those all ironed out up front. But both Jay Scott and I are--and I think the co-Chairs as well are very encouraged by the fact that the GAC has reached out. And as long as we set expectations carefully so that all of us are on the same page on that, we think we'll have an opportunity to hopefully learn some things in terms of how to better involve GAC and GAC input earlier in the working group process.

So we will keep you informed on that. Marika or Mary, do you have anything to add to that?

Marika Konings: This is Marika; maybe just to clarify because I think you mentioned that it would be all the Chairs and it's just with Jonathan and the Vice Chairs.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, I misunderstood. Thank you for clarifying that. That makes more sense. And so that's good to know. So it'll be-- okay, so there will be three from the GNSO council and then the leadership team for this

working group and staff. So that's good. That'll be easier to schedule, too.

Now Marika, was the Doodle poll sent to the Vice Chairs as well for the council?

Marika Konings: Yes. Yes, I sent them a separate email as well with some of the context of our discussion and I actually just sent a private note to Wolf who I see is on the call, asking him to (INAUDIBLE) and I'll send a reminder to Mason.

Chuck Gomes: Good, good, okay; so very good. So hopefully that'll happen early next week. Any questions or comments on that letter- the GAC letter? And then once we get together with the Chairs of the GNSO Council, it'll be easier for us to start drafting the letter. It may also involve a call with Suzanne Ridell and anyone else she wants to involve from the GAC to make sure that we're all on the same page with regard to expectations. But we'll know that better after the call with the council chairs.

Okay, now with regard to the Board invitation letter; was-- Marika, I think you said that that was also sent to the full working group. Is that correct?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes, that's correct. We didn't receive any comments or feedback on that letter.

Chuck Gomes: So, unless someone tells us right now that there's additional feedback on that, I think that can be sent to Jonathan to assist the council. They can accept it, change it, write their own or whatever; but they had asked us to provide a possible letter and staff provided some good edits to what we started with. And so I think that's ready to go to Jonathan and then he can work it with the council in that regard. And now, I think it's possible; correct me if I'm wrong on this Marika or Mary; but it's possible they could come back and say that we should send it to the GAC. I think our expectation is that Jonathan would, on behalf of the council, would send it to the GAC. Is my understanding correct there?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It's the letter to the Board. I think the GNSO council indeed agree that it would be better if this letter would come from Jonathan but noting that the idea, the suggestion to invite the members of the Board to either observe or follow the discussions, came from the working group itself.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Any questions or comments on the Board invitation letter? Okay, so an action item then and follow up to this is to make sure that we get that letter sent to Jonathan so we'll do that after this meeting. Marika, can you take care of that?

Marika Konings: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: If you make sure I have the latest version; I think I do, but just to play it safe, I am happy to send that. Just send me an email, making sure I have the latest version, okay?

Marika Konings: I'm happy to do so as well and pop feed the chairs list in, so you know (INAUDIBLE).

Chuck Gomes: That's great. Okay, thank you very much; any questions on the outreach letters? Okay, moving on I think then to agenda item three; in our meeting two weeks ago, we had started going over the mind map and Marika was leading us through that. Now as we prepare to pick up where we left out on that in terms of discussing it last week and the version that's going to be posted here and that was distributed is a version that had some revisions from the earlier version.

So, as we go through this though in this meeting, I want to-- each of you to think about whether or not you might like to be part of a small working group; probably of no more than six people, that would in the next few weeks-- two or three weeks-- start looking at how we can develop a work plan. We'll talk more about that later, but I'd just like you to think about that possibility so that when we come to that point in the meeting, that possibly we can get some volunteers for a little sub group that would develop some recommendations on how to convert the mind map into work plan; not a final one necessarily, but to help us move forward rather than trying to do that as a full working group, since we have over 30 people in the group.

And of course the full working group would be responsible for ultimately finalizing any work plan and approving it. So, as we're going through this and as Marika takes us through the mind map, picking up where we left off last time, think about that to see if that's something you would like to be able to be a part of. Again, we want to keep it small, and we'll deal with that later on. Marika, I'll turn it over to you if you're ready to take us through, and I think it needs-- if we can expand the mind map on the screen so that it's readable that would be great. Maybe it is for everybody else except me. I do have it up in another window so I can switch to that. But when I'm doing that I won't be able to see the hands raised. So if it can be blown up a little bit so we can look at segments of the mind map that we're talking about, that would be very helpful.

Marika, I'll turn it over to you.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Let me just see if I can zoom it in a little bit more. You also have the option to use the full screen version or the full screen button at the top of the pod that shows you basically the full screen. If I enlarge it of course, it makes it more difficult for you to see the overall picture. But as I also send this out as a separate document, hopefully people can pull that up as well if they want to see the broader picture of the mind map.

So basically, I think we to a large extent went over the different elements and we added a little bit of information based on our discussion today, but not very much. I didn't receive any further suggestions on the mailing list, so the idea would be if people have ideas they want to throw out, thoughts they think should be added because as I explained before, the overall idea would be that based on this mind map, which basically tries to capture our brainstorm ideas on how we want to tackle these

questions; the work that would needed to be undertaken, what kind of questions do we need to investigate in order to get to the answers for the charter questions we've been given? From that we can then extrapolate basically our work plan and identify what would be the next steps we need to take in order to get to the eventual outcome.

The mind map is built up, at the top just some basic project information. And then it has a section on basic requirements. And again, some of this information is literally a copy and paste from the charter. So it talks basically about-- our requirements basically I'm trying to understand what do we need to know or do before we actually get started and start looking at some of the charter questions. The treaty like- and I think that was one of the points that was raised on the call last week is that we as a first point should understand what the overall territory looks like and what are the major division points in policy and implementation. Understand the typology; and I think it's actually a point that Allen raised at the time that we should, as part of that understand what every step in the current policy and implementation process is and so ensure that everyone is as well using the same definition- so we use the same terminology.

Someone also suggested that maybe we should make some efforts to get a better understanding of policy and implementation principles that are used outside of the ICANN contact. As an example, I've quoted here an article that I came across in doing some of the research from when we prepared the briefing paper and there's some other literature out there that may have some applicability to what we're looking at. And it was also suggested that based on that or based on other ideas or suggestions that people may have, we may even consider whether inviting a third party would be helpful that would basically present on a policy and implementation principle that are existing outside of an ICANN framework but that may have value for us to look at the broader picture and see if some of that may be applicable as well to what we've been tasked to look at.

Chuck Gomes: Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Marika let me stop- let me stop you there just temporarily so that we can talk a little bit about the idea of inviting an expert in this area and suggest to those in the working group, if you're aware of an expert that might be able to contribute a point of view that would be constructive to this working group, that we would like you to be able to put somebody forward so we can investigate that further. So let me throw that out as an opportunity for any of you who know that.

Now some of the literature-- I reviewed myself some of the literature that staff has distributed and so far it's very government policy related and certainly there's some points that seem to be helpful for us, but it's my own opinion, but I'm throwing this out for discussion, that an awful lot of it is more specific to the public sector than it would be for the ICANN environment and I personally don't want to spend a lot of time listening to experts that are mainly focused on the public sector, except to the extent

that it relates specifically to our task which is quite a bit different in some respects, although there are similarities.

So let me pause there and before I turn it back to Marika to continue; and see if there are any comments, questions, suggestions in that regard.

Okay, not seeing or hearing from anyone; Marika, I'll let you continue.

Marika Konings:

Yes, so this is Marika again. So basically I've tried to capture the points that were made now again, as a way of trying to capture our discussion as well as identify action items that we then take to the next meeting or as part of a potential work plan later on.

So the section in this category is looking at all the efforts that the working group should take into account or follow as it may relate to working group discussions or to topics that are under consideration. So those include the GNSO PDP improvements staff paper that you may have seen; it's something that we've developed for the council basis on discussion that took place in Durban and that the council is now considering which are basically within the current framework, to see if there are some enhancements or streamlining that can be done.

As you may be aware, the ATRT2 has hired an independent expert to look at the PDP process and its effectiveness against some of those recommendations may also relate to some of the questions this group is looking at. The metrics and reporting working group will look at how can we get better data and help inform PDP deliberations as well as part of the PDP process, but as well as part of any implementation or review of that, again, that may relate.

The multi-stakeholder innovation strategy panel will look at the overall-like how was policy development done and again may relate as well to some of the issues we are looking at. And then as well, the BGRI work on the early involvement of the GAC in the PDP may also come up with some recommendations or some practical ways in which the GAC may be involved earlier-- at an earlier stage in the PDP or potentially implementation-related discussions.

So again, it's not something I think that at this stage we all know how much that will impact our discussions or how much it will relate. Bt it's good to keep an eye on those and I think at least there are several members that are part of this working group are also either involved or following some of these other efforts. And of course from a staff perspective, we'll do our best as well to make sure that information flows back and forth.

Another part that was also identified in the charter as well as here is that one of the basic requirements of course for everyone to have a basic understanding of the GNSO policy development process and the current approaches towards implementation and there are some required materials that hopefully all of you have-- will have already reviewed and looked over which are the GNSO and PDP manual, the Annex A of the ICANN bylaws, which pertains to rules for the PDP process, the staff

discussion paper on policy and implementation- a page on that was to a certain extent to the basis of the work we're looking at now and identify some of the questions that, at least from a staff perspective, we thought were important to ask in continuing this debate.

Another point I think that was raised on the last call as well that will be important as some of the basic requirements to determine the dependency between the different charter questions and the tasks which will facilitate or help establish a timeline for the overall project.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. Let me interrupt again. This is Chuck-- and see if there are any comments or questions on the basic requirements section of the mind map as well as suggestions for anything that might be missing there.

Okay. Again, if you think of something later-- please--

Tim Ruiz: Say Chuck, this is Tim.

Chuck Gomes: Hi Tim, go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Say I just-- I'm not able to see the mind map so forgive me if this is already there, but I guess I'm just-- or maybe you have a different place for this to go, but I'm just concerned that-- just spend a little bit of time on certain definitions, maybe not that we necessarily come up with definitions for different terms, but many of these things are already defined in various places. And maybe just spending some time, bringing some of the common terms that we're going need to use together with some basic definitions might be helpful. We've ran into that a time or two before in other working groups where we kind of went down the road and we got started on different understandings about what different things meant.

And I know part of this working group is to decide-- what's policy and what's implementation perhaps? But I think there are some basic definitions of those kinds of things and associated terms that already exist that we might want to bring into this.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Tim. That's excellent. And in fact, I know you can't see this, but Marika is actually adding into the mind map as you were talking. So those of you that are in Adobe can see that, but that's the kind of thing we're looking for so that this mind map gets more and more complete. So thank you very much. Anne, I see your hand.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thank you, Chuck. That's along the same lines when Marika was talking about the materials that we should have all already reviewed and I'm afraid and that goes to the question of it kind of being on the same ground, on the same page; everybody working under the same definitions. I'm thinking that I have to confess that I've probably not recently reviewed all of these materials that are referred to in the mind map and on the possibility that I am not the only one who has not done that, I kind of wanted to point it out that under our basic requirements blocks at the top of the mind map and I think Marika referred to the GNSO

PDP improvement staff paper; and then we have the required materials GNSO PDP manual Annex A of the bylaws, staff discussion paper on policy versus implementation. And then when you look down under our WG tasks in the mind map, in the very block you also see a task that says- review the ICANN bylaws with particular focus on GNSO PDP associated GNSO PDP manual. And then above that you also see a reference to a paper called- Proposed principles contained in the Policy versus Implementation Draft Framework prepared by ICANN staff.

And again, I confess that whether I've been having to ignore some emails or what; I'm not familiar with this document that's cited here-- this proposed principles contained in the Policy versus Implementation Draft Framework prepared by ICANN staff. So where does all of that lead me in terms of my comments other than to say maybe we need a slightly more concrete direction to each of us-- here's your assignment. Please review this set of materials at these lengths so that everybody is on the same page. And maybe those have come out before and I just haven't focused on them, and if so, I apologize. But that's my comment.

Chuck Gomes:

Thanks, Anne. And this is Chuck. No need to apologize because I think it would be unrealistic for us to expect that everybody has reviewed all of these documents. But I think it's fair to say that one of the things that we're hoping will come out of this meeting is a-- that the sub working group that would help begin the convert this mind map into the first sketches of a work plan. And I think in that, and I'll let others and Marika in particular correct me if I'm thinking about this incorrectly, but how we would do that. If we expect everybody to have already reviewed all those documents, we're going to be sadly disappointed I think, because there's a lot of material there. At the same time, part of our work plan will need to be-- okay, how do we tackle those things and how do we make that happen in a timely fashion?

So your point is very well taken and I think part of translating this mind map into a work plan we'll deal with exactly what you're talking about. Now Marika am I on the right track or am I using this incorrectly?

Marika Konings:

Yes, this is Marika. Yes, exactly; I think you're right and Cheryl is right making the suggestion as well that maybe we can include the links to these documents as well in the mind map so it's easier for people to find them. I noted as well that all the documents referred here are also posted on the working group Wiki. But I've also made the suggestion, if it would be helpful, I would be happy to either during the next call or set up a separate call for those of you that would like me to work through some of these documents and maybe I might be able as well to answer some questions you may have, if that would be deemed helpful, I'm happy we can maybe set up a separate call or spend some time on the next meeting going through some of those or if people have specific questions they would like to pose; or anyway I think we can get people familiar with it. Because even though it's a basic requirement at this part, as Anne pointed out, it will come back in several of the questions that we've been tasked to answer that indeed a good understanding of how things currently work and what is within the framework of the PDP and what isn't

will be crucial in being able to develop answers or responses to the charter questions.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. And thanks Anne for raising that; and the good chat that's going on with Cheryl and Anne there.

A question; Marika made a suggestion there that we could have a special session for those that would like an overview with staff on some of these documents. Do you think that's better earlier on or is it better to have the sub group begin to develop initial steps of a working plan and then maybe provide that later? Or should they occur concurrently? I'm just curious as to what the interest of the working group members would be in that regard.

And Cheryl, you're first.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Chuck. This is Cheryl for the transcript record. I'm all for earlier and I meant to shout it in capitals in the chat that was delivered. I think it's essential that sort of thing goes on earlier and I would go further and suggest that even some of us will feel like we're being taught how to suck eggs, it should be the committee as a whole. We're talking about establishing common ground and shared understanding. I would suggest at this point common ground and understanding should be built on us all having a known and recently refreshed knowledge of the references. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Cheryl. And I want to ask a clarifying question if I can. Did I understand you to be suggesting that you think the whole working group should be involved in that; is that correct?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct. Yes, obviously not compulsory. We still have freedom of choice.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Cheryl. This is Chuck again. So is there anybody that-- well I guess to me that's fine to go that direction. Now the next question is- to make that happen, should we using a working group meeting to do that or should we schedule a separate meeting? And I'm throwing that out for discussion.

Michael Graham: Chuck, it's Michael.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Michael. I saw your hand there. I was going to call on you. I didn't know if you wanted to answer this question or not, but please go ahead.

Michael Graham: Yeah, on both of those points; I entirely agree that I think that we all could do well regardless of whether or not we've participated in a full PDP which I have not. I think if we could refocus a bit; we've talked about finding an expert outside to discuss different ways that other organizations have approached development of policy and then implementation and how those relate. I think it would be essential for all of us and I would say the committee on a whole- I'll go with Cheryl on that; to have a presentation going over how it does work. I mean an A-B-Cs of how it is established to work within ICANN and then I suppose a second person, so it would be a

two-person panel, to say how it actually does work or has worked in the past in a particular instance; and take us through that, incorporating as they apply these various documents.

I don't know if there's a single PDP expert on staff that we might call on to do that, but I think that that would be very, very useful for us. And in terms of-- and in answer to your question of whether we should do this as separate or as part or concurrent; I would think that it would be an extremely useful thing if it could be done-- I don't know if it can be done within an hour and a half; to have one of our sessions early on now devoted to that so that we're all on the same page. And that would also assist in developing the working plan because at that point, that group can presume certain understanding because we've been through it as a committee as a whole.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michael. So my question then; this is Chuck again; is which of the documents are most important to have that done with or is it all of them and that's an honest question, so let see if people have a response. Which document-- let me break it down a little bit more refinely; which document do you think and staff you're welcome to respond to this as well; do you think it would be best to start with, in terms of an overview?

Speaker: Marika's got her hand up.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. I need to look up there too, don't I? Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I actually really like Michael's idea where maybe instead of purely looking at a document, maybe indeed have a kind of panel session where maybe me and as I said my colleagues on the call as well who deals more with implementation-related elements, where we basically walk through maybe a recent PDP and say like- this is how things went and this is how things are currently done. And through that I think we will already be referring as well on what is required under the PDP manual, what's required under Annex A, where are currently there no guidelines and where we're just basically doing it based on experience or we believes works or doesn't work? And I think linked to that, we can then go into the discussion paper because I think that's basically what tried to identify which are some of the questions that are currently not answered or where we are struggling and don't have an existing framework to deal with some of the questions that have come up, mainly through some of the new GTLD-related discussions where we found out- okay, we're in a situation where there's maybe no clear path or where everyone expects the same thing and how can we address that?

So that may be an approach of maybe not going word by word through each of the documents, but actually in a more-case-study, take you through how the PDP works, how currently implementation is done and based on that, how actually staff came to the discussion paper identifying some of those questions that we believe need to be answered and I think help inspires or informs some of the questions that are currently before this working group.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. Now I see that Amr mentioned a PDP improvements document in the chat. I'm not clear on what-- is there a PDP improvements document?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. As you may recall, we did a presentation in German that I prepared together with Jonathan that we basically tried to like-- is the PDP broken and basically trying to debunk some of the myths that are around say that the (INAUDIBLE) is too slow. There's never consensus. You never seem to agree. No one can participate.

So we basically put some bullet points together pointing out some of the facts around PDPs and we suggested as well some potential options for streamlining or improvements to the existing PDP within the current framework. The council had some discussions around that and then basically asked- can you maybe work that out and provide some more detail around it and some suggestions on how some of those improvements may be implemented so we can further (INAUDIBLE).

We submitted that paper to the council I think at the end of August and the council actually discussed it at their last meeting. So I think now the next step is for us actually to tabulate those concrete suggestions and incorporate some of the comments or feedback that was received during the call and I think for the council to evaluate with which of any of those improvements will move forward to implementation. And I'm happy to share that document as well.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marika. And thank you, Amr; and I do recall that, since I did listen to the MP3 of the council meeting. Just wanted to make sure I knew what document. Now notice that he suggested that that be added on the Wiki, working group Wiki. Should it also be added on the mind map?

Speaker: I would think so.

Speaker: Yep.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I just wanted to throw that out. Okay, Amr you put your hand down. Marika, is your hand still up?

Amr Elsadr: Chuck, hi this is Amr. I just wanted to say the document is already in our mind map.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay. Thanks. It's already on the mind map. Okay, I've got the small version up there so I'm having trouble reading it because I'm trying to watch the queue as well. So okay, thank you. Okay, so that's taken care of already. Let me ask this question. This is Chuck speaking again. Do we want to schedule this for our next meeting two weeks from now? Is there any reason why we shouldn't schedule it for then? What I'm hearing people say- this is better done earlier than later.

Michael Graham: Hi, Chuck it's Michael. Just to-- I guess correct before we go too much further. We had had discussion on leadership on rescheduling the next meeting, so it actually wouldn't be two weeks hence.

Chuck Gomes: That's true. It would be one week if we make that change. Thank you, Michael.

So Marika, why don't you communicate what the issue with the regularly scheduled meeting two weeks from now?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So basically the policy team once a year comes together, as we're all placed in different parts of the world and usually at ICANN meetings we don't actually have time to actually go through some of our more strategic plans and discuss how we can improve our support to the different groups we support and so we come together one week a year in Los Angeles and that happens to be that week of the second of October and it will be difficult therefore for us to support a call, especially because it falls in the middle of the day. So we would like to ask for your indulgence and consider moving this call a week up so we can provide you with the staff support and then you'll have three weeks after that before the next call takes place.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marika. This is Chuck. So the next meeting then; and let's just go ahead and kind of jump ahead on that. Are there any real big issues if we schedule our next meeting a week from today on the 25<sup>th</sup> instead of-- we can't have it, it won't work very well to have it two weeks from today and it's my opinion that I don't think we want to skip a meeting, because there's too much to do and we really need to get moving. It'd be nice if we made some reasonable progress by the time we get into the Buenos Aires meeting. So are there any big problems with scheduling a meeting a week from today at same time?

Speaker: Nope. All good.

Chuck Gomes: Not seeing any; okay thank you, so we will go ahead and do that, so notice for that agenda item five has now been taken care of, so thanks Michael for bringing that up. I'm also not hearing any objections to going ahead and planning. Now Marika, does that give you and your team enough time to prepare for that, if we schedule that for next week?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I think so, as long as you don't expect 100 slides, I think I'll be able to pull that all together. I just did check with Tim and he is actually not available next week; but having been involved in some the (INAUDIBLE) work I think I can convey probably what the current process is and if there are then more detailed questions, then we can always take those back if that's okay for the group.

Chuck Gomes: Very good. Thank you. I think that's going to make Jay Scott's job easy next week, huh? So I wish I'd a got that easy one. Anyway okay, let's go on. Anything else on the basic requirements area of the mind map before I ask Marika to continue?

Okay; Marika, back to you.

Marika Konings:

Yes, this is Marika again. So I think we basically covered the basic requirements and as I said we'll try to highlight; now the next time will be to provide the introductory section to all these documents.

So then the next part of the mind map basically looks at working group tasks and again, most of those come straight from the charter. So there were a number of tasks which were already identified there which I think were viewed by the drafting team as required tasks that would need to be completed by the working group in order to actually come to your conclusions or recommendations on the questions that are actually laid out there. So again, these are just more copy and pastes; I can briefly walk through it so-

One of the first requirements and that's what we're talking about today as well and they will be actively working on this; develop a work schedule, frequency of meetings, estimate some targets on what we expect to deliver our different work products. It also suggests that the working groups should review a sampling of previous implementation efforts and create a list of lessons learned, to that we linked the question of reaching out at the start of the process to the different GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies and ask them the same kinds of questions-- can you provide us input on the charter questions, lessons learned, how ICANN core values relate to policy implementation related efforts, the strengths and weaknesses of previous approaches and if they have any recommended principles about policy implementation?

The charter specifies that the working group should identify applicable ICANN core values and describe how they directly or indirectly apply to policy development and our implementation of policy. If possible, make a determination as to whether the identified core values apply differently to policy developments were then to implementation of policy. It's also suggested as a task that the working group should review previous policy development efforts and follow-on implementation work to determine whether particular approaches have resulted in better or worse outcomes historically.

Something that Anne already pointed out; it's also suggested that the working group review and analyze the proposed principles that are contained in the policy first implementation draft framework prepared by ICANN staff to basically outline the number of principles that, from our perspective, thought would be helpful in underpinning any policy implementation related discussions and may form a starting point for the working group to look at those and review what your perspective is on those.

Following that hopefully, the working group will be in the position to prepare working group recommendations regarding such principles and incorporate revised principles as applicable into the working recommendations regarding policy and implementation. And also suggests that the working group should review the ICANN bylaws with a particular focus on the GNSO PDP and the associated PDP manual to determine what elements of the process provide guidance regarding

implementation of policies and whether there are any gaps in the bylaws or process that leave ambiguity regarding implementation. I think this partly goes back to our earlier discussion on the basic requirements. I think the idea is once the working group indeed understands how the current process works and is able to review where it doesn't work, it will help you as well to make an assessment on how that can be improved.

And basically it just maps the charter questions, and again, ideally at some point we'll be able to link this specific path to specific charter questions or maybe groups of charter questions so we can basically try to track what needs to happen for each of these charter questions for us to be able to answer those. So I think one of the questions to the group is-- in addition to the tasks outlined here, are there any other things you believe the working group should be undertaking in order to be able to come to recommendations or suggestions for each of these questions?

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marika. This is Chuck. So, are there any questions or comments on the working group tasks or charter questions in the mind map? Or suggestions for things that we should add to the mind map there?

Michael Graham: Chuck, Michael.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Michael.

Michael Graham: Yeah, Marika, I'm looking for-- I thought we had here an item relating to what we had previously discussed about outreaching to other types of organizations to explore how they may deal with the relationship between development of policy and implementation. Is that under one of these other categories? Because I think that would be one of the tasks that goes into the analysis somewhere.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Is this a third-party you're referring to or SOs, ACs; because the third-party invitation is under the basic requirements and it's what we started discussing a bit (INAUDIBLE) indeed external papers or experts that could be involved. Is that what you're referring to? Because that's captured in what's up on the screen now.

Michael Graham: Yeah, that is what I was asking about. I guess it's up there.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michael. This is Chuck. Any other questions or comments on the tasks or the questions?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Chuck, Cheryl here. Sorry, I haven't put my hand up.

Chuck Gomes: That's okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: My Adobe keeps dropping in and out, which is extremely annoying; so I'm just phone lines working problems this morning (INAUDIBLE) and connect room as well. The advantages of course of using the mind map here is that they are living documents and we can make changes throughout. I just wanted to check that we not necessarily going to go

through the minutia of the mind map regularly, but that we will have a standing item in our agendas perhaps where we review our action items and in that review of action items, ensure that any modifications of the mind map are done and alerted to the work group for the record. And the same would go for updating and adjunct documents or actual references linked from the mind map and obviously from our Wiki. It's very easy for example; Marika mentioned earlier, there's going to be a staff review of comments coming in from that presentation set that was done in Durban.

Well, when that becomes available, we need sort of a point that says-- oh by the way, work group, this is now up. Here is the link. I'm not suggesting we go through the mind map in as much detail each time, but I'd like to have a-- by the way, these are the changes we've made to the mind map and the Wiki point interchanges. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Cheryl. This is Chuck. I know in the chat that there's some discussion about moving the meeting next week one hour later. Now, I guess generally I'm a little bit cautious about changing a standard meeting time, just because some consistency seems to help with people's schedules and planning longer term and so forth.

But the--

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is it really a change?

Chuck Gomes: What-- excuse me, Cheryl. What was that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But in this case, it's already a change.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, we already made a change and that's a very valid point. Now if we make it an hour later, obviously that makes it even later in the evening for those in Europe and the time zones over there. But we're already asking those in Asia and Australia and so forth to get up pretty early and this would be two weeks in a row. So are there any big concerns about making that one hour change just for next week, since we're having back-to-back weekly meetings? Please speak up now. I'm trying to watch the - I guess I'd better look at my own calendar, although Jay Scott's chairing next week, so we're probably be covered.

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim, Chuck. Tim Ruiz.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry. I was looking at my calendar.

Tim Ruiz: I guess I didn't quite catch why we wanted to make it later.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because some people had clashes Tim and a few people were saying they couldn't make the call next week.

Tim Ruiz: So are we talking about it just next week or permanently?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just next week.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, just next week, Tim. This is Chuck.

Tim Ruiz: Oh, okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here.

Chuck Gomes: I'm just looking at my calendar. I think I'm okay with that. I'm not as critical next week if Jay Scott's chairing. But I think I am okay with that. But I thought I should since I'm a co-Chair, I should at least check.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's only that it is essential that we realize that it is only because the meeting is being proposed to be changed, that it's worthwhile fiddling with time if people can't make it. It doesn't matter if-- it can stay the same as well, but if people like Anne who are regular contributors can make it that hour later, then I think it's certainly worthy of exploring, but just for the one week.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck. That certainly makes sense to me. I'm not seeing any objections to that, so let's go ahead and change that and staff help us out in terms of making sure we get the message out that just for that one week, we're going to make the time change one hour later and we need to be real clear that it's just a one-time change because we had already made a change and there were some conflicts because of the change we made.

Okay? Thank you for suggesting that and sorry for the digression, but it was an important one. Back to the mind map; any other questions or comments on the tasks and the questions?

Don't worry about the plan timeline yet; it's kind of tough to do that until we get a working plan. But okay, I'm not seeing any hands or hearing anybody. So the next item on the agenda then is to discuss our approach and next steps to developing a work plan.

And as I indicated early in the call, just so that people would be thinking about it as we work through this today, the leadership thought that it would be helpful to form a small sub group and this would be a short-term sub group. We're talking about the next few weeks. To take the mind map and start coming up with some ideas for how we can develop it into a work plan that we can ultimately develop into a final work plan and move this process forward in a hopeful timely manner.

So let me ask right now whether or not there are any objections to that particular approach? I hear some talking in the background so somebody probably needs to mute unless you're trying to talk on this call, and then you need to speak louder.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It was an echo of you, so it is a mute issue.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks, Cheryl. All right so, we now come to a time-- now let me tell you that in our leadership call that we held on Monday, Michael Graham, as one of our co-chairs volunteered to take the leadership of this small group. So we have a leader, one of our co-chairs, and now what we need are some volunteers that would be willing to work on this small

group. And again, I suspect it's quite likely we'll divide into lots of different working groups going forward that will be probably a little longer term than this one. But this one is anticipated being in the next few weeks to come up with some suggestions for how we get from the mind map to a working plan that the whole working group can consider.

So what I'm asking for now is some volunteers; and again, our thinking is that we'd like to keep this down to about six people, just so that it's easier to schedule things and for that particular group we can set up a mailing list for them and even arrange calls and so I am now asking for volunteers but also questions before you volunteer you may have some questions or comments. And those are welcome now as well.

Michael Graham: Chuck, Michael. Without holding up my hand; just to clarify for everyone, what one of our primary goals is to have this small group develop a draft or draft ideas for a working plan that is sufficiently well formed that during the meeting in Buenos Aires, face to face it can be hashed out towards a more formal and final work plan. Our idea being that within the next three or four weeks and let's say the goal would be to have the draft of this completed by no later than November 4<sup>th</sup> so it could be mulled over before that meeting, for us to meet separately once a week or so and try and come up with this plan.

So that's what, in terms of the work that would be involved, that's what we were discussing and the goal that we had set.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michael. This is Chuck and that's very helpful. Anne?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thank you, Chuck. I just have a question. I don't think I can personally be involved because of travel schedule and also I'm not able unfortunately to travel to Buenos Aires, but plan to participate remotely. But the question would be- what do you anticipate as the time commitment for this smaller work group in terms of trying to schedule calls and whatnot in between now to produce the results that Michael described by the Buenos Aires meeting?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Michael, would you like to respond to that first?

Michael Graham: Well, I mean with six people an awful lot can be done I think in correspondence that could not be done with this larger group. And that's one reason why we were looking at the smaller group. I would anticipate that this group, the commitment would be to have a conference call. I wouldn't think it would need to be more than an hour each of the weeks in between our regular group meetings, if necessary. If we're able to work more quickly, fine; but I do anticipate that it would take that amount of time.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michael. This is Chuck again. Does that answer your question, Anne?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thank you very much. That's a very concise answer. I appreciate it. So you're talking about a one-hour call every other week?

Chuck Gomes: Correct. And by the way, I want to-- this is Chuck again. I want to respond to one point you made, Anne. And that is I don't want anybody to think that you have to be in Buenos Aires to be a part of this group. That certainly isn't a prerequisite nor should it be, so don't think that. And there will be remote participation for those who can't be in Buenos Aires. The thinking of the leadership teams is that we should try to have an in-person meeting in Buenos Aires, understanding not everyone will be in person, but we will not have very many opportunities for those, so we thought it was useful to take advantage of this opportunity coming up.

So do we have any volunteers? Obviously this work needs to get going fairly quickly, so we don't have a lot of time to get volunteers. Cheryl, your hands up. Please go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that's me volunteering.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Cheryl. I appreciate that. Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Also volunteering.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. Holly?

Holly Raiche: I'll volunteer and this will likely mean that the time zone in which we have calls will obviously take advantage of Cheryl's and my's presence.

Chuck Gomes: I think Michael would be accommodating there. Is that correct, Michael?

Michael Graham: Oh yes, it will be 4:00AM central time, while I'm still awake. Not when I'm waking up.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Is there anyone else who wants to volunteer? Now if we could get a call out to the list for anybody that's not on the call if they'd like to volunteer, right after this call that would be very helpful. But I would only-- I would ask for any responses for that by the end of the week so that we know exactly who the group is.

Now I don't think it hurts for the group to be smaller than six. I think we have enough people right now. What do we have? I think a total of four that they could put their heads together and probably come back with some pretty good ideas. So it's okay if we just have four, but I don't want to exclude people who are not on this call or somebody on this call who maybe couldn't make a decision right now. We really probably don't want more than a couple more, so it's not as if we're trying to search for a lot.

Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I'm just wondering as well if it would be helpful to have a representation in that small group that represents a little bit as well the diversity in the working group itself. So I think we have Cheryl and Holly from the ALAC, Amr from NCSC, Michael are you individual or associated with a group?

Michael: ITC once I get back organized.

Marika Konings: Okay, so maybe it would nice to also have someone maybe from the contracted party side, so we have a little bit as well the diversity of the working group reflected possibly in this smaller team. I don't know if that would be considered helpful.

Chuck Gomes: So is there anyone on the call on the contracted parties' house that would like to volunteer to be a part of this? And again, we can suggest that in the email that goes out for participants, saying we particularly would like someone from the contracted parties' house if possible.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. That would be good. That would be good, yes. It's Cheryl.

Chuck Gomes: So this is Chuck again and let me suggest that I'm all for representation, but if we don't get-- I don't want to hold this up because there's a group not represented. I think I happen to be in the contracted parties' house, but I'm really not worried about this small group doing something that's going to be contrary to our interests and we would get a chance to chime in on that down the road anyway. Ideally let's try to get someone from the contracted party house. If we don't, I would suggest let's not let that slow us down and let's go ahead and proceed. Anne?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Yes, thanks Chuck. Just on this theme of diversity and I probably should have approached Olevie in a private chat, but I'm wondering about some possible geographic diversity as well and whether it's possible for both vice chairs to participate in the group, just from the standpoint of geographic diversity.

Chuck Gomes: Olevie, do you want to respond?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: (INAUDIBLE) me in please, Michael. I'm sitting in the chat.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: He beat you to it Anne; he was already hands up in the chat.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Olevie, I appreciate that. So really we're only looking for one more person and if we could get someone from the contracted party house, that would be good and I think unless anybody objects, our message that goes out should be--

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Be specific.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, be that specific, okay?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here here.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Okay, well that worked out quite well. I'm very appreciative of the people who volunteered on that. I think that takes us then to our Buenos Aires meeting planning which I don't think we need to spend a lot of time on. But I do want to at least open it up for anybody to talk about an in-person meeting. It's a little bit early to plan the details, although I think it probably is going to be around our work plans. That's hopefully part of the design here in terms of what we just did.

But any concerns or comments anyone has in terms of an in-person meeting in Buenos Aires? Okay, I'm not seeing any hands or hearing anyone.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's Cheryl here, Chuck. As long someone like Nathalie who has access to all of the other meetings that are going on, I think we need to plan the time early. That's the only thing. We all know how difficult it gets and clashes happen so quickly. But of course Nathalie and others in staff have total access to a number of calendars. So as long as they try and minimize clashes and we get our times locked in as early as humanly possible, it should work out.

Chuck Gomes: Has the meeting plan group already begun their planning? I'm guessing they have. Can anyone answer that? This is Chuck.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. We've actually been asked to submit our forms I think by the 30th of September and at that point we'll only get a view of most of the other meetings going on. However, I think what we typically do for most of the face-to-face working group meetings where the focus is really for the working group to get together and not necessarily external outreach or discussion is to schedule those at the 7:30 to 9:00 time slot; so basically before the meeting kicks off, which tends to work very well for most people because other meetings are not taking place yet and they're not conflicting with anything else. So if the working group is fine with that, we would look for one of those slots to have the working group meeting and noting that it's easier to get a slot in now and should the working group closer to the meeting decide that you don't need a meeting or it becomes too complex, we can of course always cancel it or even see if there is a possibility to move it around, but you know how difficult that may be. So it's kind of getting in there and hoping that it works for most people.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. Marika, I'm not seeing anything I'm putting in chat coming up on the screen so I may be repeating myself, I don't know. But obviously there are a couple of standing things like don't do it on a Monday, otherwise you won't get any women there; things like that.

Chuck Gomes: Well that might be a good idea.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hey Chuck, back off, boy.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry about that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Perhaps we should for the record, make sure that everyone realizes Chuck and I do have a bit of personal banter that goes on and that was a joke. When you read those things like in the transcript, they can sound rather aggressive or silly, so I just want to make it clear that was Cheryl and Chuck and Cheryl were joking with each other.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Cheryl. This is Chuck. So I appreciate that and you're right, in the transcript it can look quite different so they couldn't see I was laughing when I said that--

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Or indeed that I was.

Chuck Gomes: All right, so Marika is your hand-?

Marika Konings: Sorry, No, no that was actually responding to the question I already wanted to make my point of the suggested of doing it in the morning. So I'm taking my hand down.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. We've already covered agenda item five and so Marika and the staff team have their work cut out for them preparing for the next meeting. Now it's my thinking that probably we will not have-- there will be a few administrative things and follow-up things we'll need to cover next week as well, but those will be brief. But it may very well be that we need to have another meeting like this to get into some other documents or something and I think we can deal with that as needed after the meeting next week and it wouldn't necessarily have to be the immediate following meeting, but we can decide that later.

Anything else in terms of next steps or the next meeting?

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Chuck, it's Anne. I have my hand up.

Chuck Gomes: I see it now, thanks.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: I just had a question regarding the statement of interest as to whether staff can verify that all participants in the working group have posted their SOIs just-- do we know if all SOIs are complete?

Chuck Gomes: I believe-- this is Chuck and I'll let staff respond, but I had checked that a few weeks ago and everyone had except for one person and that person was told that they wouldn't be able to participate until they did it. So now let me turn it over to staff and they can set the record straight.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. That is correct. We did give that person last warning and as far as I know he didn't submit a statement of interest and should have been removed from the mailing list. I just didn't update the Wiki yet, but I'll double check as well, but normally he should have been removed from the mailing list and I'll remove him as well from our list on the Wiki, but apart from that, everyone else has completed their statements of interest and they are all posted on the Wiki.

Anne Aikman-Scalese: Thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: Marika, Chuck this is Glen.

Chuck Gomes: Hi Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: That person has come back and said that he would like to participate and that he will submit a statement of interest and I am again chasing him for that statement of interest.

Chuck Gomes: And when did he-- and Glen thanks for telling us that. When did he say that?

Glen DeSaintgery: This was about a week ago, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Let me ask you a favor- can you-- do you think it would be okay to send him a message and give him until maybe this coming Monday to do that so that we don't just keep hanging on there?

Glen DeSaintgery: (INAUDIBLE) Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, note that I think Michael had a message in the chat regarding the sub group. Did I see that there? Maybe I didn't see that there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes you did, Chuck. Cheryl here; it's just I was proposing that we start meeting next week and we were all agreeing that it should happen as soon as possible (INAUDIBLE). Leave it to us dear, trust us; we'll be fine. Michael will lead us.

Chuck Gomes: I'm not worried at all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well perhaps of course you should be-- that was Cheryl.

Michael Graham: As long as there's coffee involved, we're all fine.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here here.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, anything else before we adjourn this call? Okay. Thanks to everyone. We probably won't have too many calls when we end early, but today we are; not too much, but excellent meeting and let's keep moving ahead. Meeting adjourned.

Speaker: Thanks Chuck.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thanks, everyone.

Speaker: Thanks, Chuck.

Speaker: Bye.

**END**