

**Policy & Implementation Working Group Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION**

Wednesday 30 October 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 30 October 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-20131030-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Wolf Knoben - ISPCP
Chuck Gomes – RySG
Philip Marano – IPC (for Brian Winterfeldt)
Michael Graham – IPC
James Bladel – RrSG
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Alan Greenberg – ALAC
Klaus Stoll – NPOC
Marie-Laure Lemineur – NPOC
Nic Steinbach – RrSG
Gideon Rop - Individual
J.Scott Evans – BC
Kiran Malancharuvil – IPC
Anne Aikman Scalese - IPC
Tim Ruiz – RrSG
Brian Beckham - IPC
Olevie Kouami - NPOC
Greg Shatan – IPC

Apology:

Holly Raiche – ALAC
Olga Cavalli – GAC
Tom Barrett – RrSG
Kristine Rosette – IPC
Amr Elsadr - NCUC
Maureen Cubberley – Individual
Krista Papac
Marika Konings
Tim Cole

ICANN staff:

Mary Wong
Glen de Saint Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. This is the Policy Implementation working group call on 30 October 2013. On the call today we have Michael Graham, Gideon Ropp, Nick Steinberg, Olevie Kouami, Cheryl Langon-Orr, Carl Rove, Alan Greenberg, Kiran

Malancharuvil, J. Scott Evans, Charles Gomes, Wolf Knoblen. Greg Shatan, and Ann Aiman-Scolice have also emailed saying they will try to make the call but they might be very late. And we have apologies Holly Race, Burt Cavali, Tom Barret, Tim Cole, Maria Corning, and Krista Outback. From staff we have Mary Wong -- and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I would like to remind you all to state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you so much. Over to you.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you very much. Welcome, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to our call. I think Marine had sent out an email later today. Did she not, Mary? That she's going to be late coming to this meeting?

Mary Wong: Yes. She said she'd probably be on but quite late. You might want to proceed with the update on her behalf?

J. Scott Evans: I am happy to -- let's just -- we have an update from her that she submitted but I'd like to just move on to the second item of the agenda and we can come back to it when she joins us. That would be the update from the work plan sub team. I know you all have developed a grid that has been submitted to the chairs and both Mary and Chuck have worked on assisting them with some provisions to that. So, at this point I'd like to turn it over to Michael who's the chair of that sub group and, Mary, I would ask if possible can you post up that work grid on the Adobe Connect?

Mary Wong: I'm loading it right now.

J. Scott Evans: Great. Michael?

Michael Graham: I am on. Hopefully you can hear me clearly. Basically what we have done as a sub team is to take the information that we had and our last conversation in terms of getting one of the sub teams that we identified rolling and that's Maureen's definitional sub team and took both the grid that we had started as a draft and the mind map and have worked it into the grid that is now on the screen which is intended to be an outline and some proposed dates showing both the various sub teams, the full working group work, and then setting up a schedule at least initially for getting this work done and I must say this is probably more pudding than Jell-O in that the dates are entirely movable. Many of them based on the completion or the status of work that is done by the first two sub teams.

The one which is developing definitions so that we all have a working understanding and when we say use a particular term, and there have been seven of those identified and just to go over quickly, they're policy, policy development, implementation, implement, principles, consensus, and consensus policy. I'll wait and hopefully Maureen later will be able to summarize what that work team is doing.

However, it's essential we talk in putting together this grid to have these definitions for discussion, for finalization, hopefully by Buenos Aires, at which point the next sub team -- we're going to split this into sub teams so

it would be workable. The next sub team is working on a working -- and I put this in quotes -- working principles to underpin GNSO policy. That's just to get a definition of our understanding as a working group by what those principles may be so that we can drive the other sub teams and there are actually -- one, two, three -- I've got three on my screen. I think there are actually four. One is for deliverable one which is developing GTLD and over ICANN policy, proposing the process for developing those.

Deliverable two and three, which is developing the criteria to determine when something should be addressed by policy development or guidance process and then also developing a framework for discussion of implementation options. Then deliverable four, which is drafting guidance on the formation and function of GNSO implementation review teams -- something along those lines. And then finally, five which is returning to the general principles underlining all of these efforts and policy and implementation working through ICANN.

What we've done then is to propose that these various tasks be broken out into sub teams, how those would operate, leaving it up in the air because we understand when sub teams are formed, including our own, that they will develop their own specific process but at the same time -- team are now working on some general tasks, the questions to be asked and some of the other information to be address by these various sub teams so we can populate either this grid or an introduction to the sub teams that can be distributed prior to Buenos Aires and discussed at that time.

You'll note that if you look at the chart that it's divided out so that the definition sub team is working now, that the deliverable -- we call it zero B sub team, the working principles starts out but doesn't really begin its work until we have those definitions and that sub teams one, two, three, and four will all wait to begin their work until after zero B has come up with some working principles.

Those three sub teams are working in parallel at the same time although we recognize that sub team four which is coming out with some larger draft guidance on the formation and function of the implementation review teams really has to wait until the other two deliverable sub teams complete their work before it can get finalization of its own. These are a little bit -- they're working in parallel but then also allowing that there will be time differences and then finally the last group, deliverable five, would wait until those other sub teams are pretty much completed.

So, this is sort of the proposed idea of a schedule. It's looking out probably towards having something close to completion with several of these major working sub teams by London. And that's with some presentation time in Singapore and then also looking at beyond that to the Los Angeles meeting to projecting that we would be able to complete a lot of the work or at least to the point of being able to make this public in review. You'll note that the schedule does not include all of those details in terms of publishing, initial documents, getting the public comments,

responding to those. All of that will be a little bit more in flux I think as the work teams actually get going in these sub teams.

So, this is what we've come up with as a proposal for the work plan. It is certainly not perfect. Hopefully this will lead to some clarification and understanding both of what our task is as a work group and what the particular sub teams are meant to do. And I believe after our call on Monday one of the thoughts is on not only gaining general agreement going forward that this looks like a plan which obviously can be changed as we go along but that at that point also to begin the process of calling for volunteers for the various sub teams so that there is participation across the working group.

At the same time no one is over burdened with work and also providing some safe guards to ensure that the work teams do not end up going on detours and coming back together speaking different languages and different definitions. I think part of that was the presumption that when these sub teams are formed that each of them would have at least one member of the leadership group participating who would have sort of theoretically at least would have a good overview of the working group and be able to know also what is happening in the other sub teams and be able to help keep the sub teams on the correct path.

So, this is where we are at this point. Again, my hope is that the sub team members which have been given assignments now within the next week, 1.5 weeks will be able to flesh out the tasks of the particular sub teams we've listed here and we'll be able to have that for discussion in Buenos Aires.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Michael. I appreciate that very much. Now we'll take a queue for anyone who has any questions of Michael. If you would use the raise your hand feature in the Adobe I would greatly appreciate that. Let me scroll down here. I don't see any hands. So, I suppose we don't have any questions. I see here we have a compliment from Chuck in the chat section. I'd like to say that as well. The sub team that has developed this workflow chart has done quite a Herculean task in a short amount of time. I'd like to express our thanks to each of you. James Blodel has raised his hand. I'm going to recognize you, James.

James Blodel: Thank you, J. Scott. Can you hear me?

J. Scott Evans: I can.

James Blodel: Yes. Great. Thank you, Michael and those folks who put together this work plan. I think it's excellent. I think it's definitely a good starting point. We can definitely check in with it as we go along. I think that's really it. What I was just going to make as a possible suggestion and perhaps you didn't hear it -- I'm just not picking up on it.

So much of a context and so many things are happening in parallel as we go into later this year and early next year, wondering if there could be some basis in check points, one or two to ensure that each of the sub teams would check in as an over arching PDP working group that we

would have them all present their status and then we can adjust the schedule based on where they're at at any given moment and determine whether there's any dependencies popping up between the sub teams. Just a thought that may or may not be applicable but wanted to get that in, put that on the table for discussion.

Michael Graham: I think that's a great idea. It's difficult from this chart to say what those points would be but I think ultimately when the tasks are laid out a little bit more clearly for each of these we should be able to see some points where that will happen. One thing that we discussed too in setting up these sub teams is the fact that this would enable us to have fewer perhaps full working group sessions but at those sessions I think those too will be -- provide us with the opportunity of reviewing, getting reports from the sub teams, and keeping an eye on it that way as well.

But I think setting up as you suggest some points of checking in and confirming what the progress is and what direction the various teams are headed, that would be really good to build into this. As you pointed out, it's a place to start. And utilizing this as a tool then we can fill in the blanks with reality as we go and see how things are changing and especially with these first two sub teams, the definition and the working principles, that may inform how we deal with the other ones as well.

J. Scott Evans: Great. And I would suggest that a good check in point will always be when we have the full working group meeting, that each of the sub teams would then deliver a status to the whole group. So, we know. And then I would also suggest that whomever is chairing the working groups that they are all cross pollinating at the end of their calls the information to the chairs of those particular groups so that they all are simultaneously following the progress of the other groups and then can make sure that that information is disseminated to the largest group when they have their particular meetings. I think that's a really good idea. I see Mary Wong has raised her hand and unmuted herself which means she probably wants to speak. I'm going to recognize Ms. Wong.

Mary Wong: Thanks, J. Scott. How did you know? So, just a follow up on what you and Michael have been saying, I think as everyone takes in this whole grid that the timeline in some parts especially is fairly aggressive which says to me -- in our minds, again, the need for sub teams and also the need for the sub teams to coordinate with each other and I think that was the basis upon which this particular work plan sub team developed the grid. I suppose one of the questions for feedback from the larger group of what the sub teams would be looking for is not just for these timelines but because of what Michael says -- they're pretty flexible and I think the expectation is that many of those will change as things go on.

But in terms of the sequencing of the sub teams for example, the main sequencing here is that we already have a definition sub team that started work and you'll see in the column there that there's -- them providing status updates and so forth at particular points in time. The next sub team is, as Michael said the deliverable zero B in the next column over, there's a question as to when they ought to start that now because their work will inform the work of the other sub teams which can and will start much

later. So, some feedback from working group members on this particular form of sequencing or other suggestions I think would be very welcome.

J. Scott Evans: Are there any comments?

Ann Aiman-Scolice: I'm not in Adobe Connect. I'm calling in remotely. So, my question and maybe it's -- I called in a few minutes late, but with respect to deliverable B and the sub team Mary just mentioned needing to commence their work soon, I'm trying to understand the relationship between deliverable B sub team and deliverable five sub team a little better. Perhaps this was discussed because I see the note that says may be delayed. But deliverable A talks about the working groups that already exists and then deliverable five sub teams talks about the principle underpinning any policy discussions. Those seem so closely related. I don't know if it's indicated by the end of this process we will have refined the work of sub team B and that will be refined in deliverable five sub team?

Michael Graham: Ann, you have summarized our goal very well. It was in looking at this and looking at the charter, the questions, and what tasks we were set out with, is one of these issues that we have a starting place, a general understanding, and that's what zero B is working on. What is that understanding? And basically defining that for us in a way that we can understand going forward. Having that general understanding, we think was necessary and for the sub teams one through four to operate.

Recognizing that as they are developing their various deliverables, what those deliverables are, what they conclude is going to probably either change or further clarify what those principles are going forward for ICANN so that once those deliverables are completed, the thought was now we understand what the true principles are going forward. And in part I guess zero B might be that is where we raise the questions -- is this what we understand the principles of policy and implementation process within ICANN to be? And hopefully by the time we reach sub team five we will be able to say -- this is what we believe it is or should be.

Ann Aiman-Scolice: Great. Thanks. It seems in this case there should be some consistency or constancy in sub team members between sub team B and sub team five. Just a comment. It might be easier in terms of the work that's to be completed if at least some of the members on sub team B move on to sub team five. That's my only comment.

J. Scott Evans: Thanks, Ann. So, are there any more comments or thoughts with regards to this particular plan? Alright. Moving on, I'll check once again -- we will now move to the next point in the agenda which is to talk about how we plan to populate the sub teams. We have a very large working group. And we need to make sure as chairs that the sub teams are populated so that the work is evenly distributed among the group and doesn't fall too heavily on a concentrated group.

Also to make sure that the community is well represented within the sub teams. And so our idea is we are going to be making a call for volunteers and we would like everyone to put a first choice and a second choice for the sub teams that they would like to serve upon. And then we're going to

then look at those preferences and assign people into the teams in order to make it at least initially a stab at getting this sub team adequately staffed and staffed throughout the working group, the full working group.

That is our initial thoughts with regards to that and we would bring it up for discussion with the full working group today but that was our idea of the way to try and assist with making sure these things are populated and the work is evenly distributed. Are there any comments or thoughts with regards to that plan? I see we have several. First hand up was Alan Greenberg and we've got James Blodel and Michael Graham and then Olevie. We'll start with you, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Jay. That methodology doesn't seem to factor in the time frames of these sub groups are different.

J. Scott Evans: There are only a couple of them that will be different but you're correct that there are some -- but we can -- you know, we don't want to burn anybody out either. But we will certainly take that under advisement. James?

James Blodel: I guess my only question or observational concern with the assignment idea is that it raises the scenario, the potential scenario where someone would believe they have something to contribute to a sub team and-or have an interest in it and then would be told the sub team was full and they were not -- they would be turned away. Is that perhaps not part of this? You're really just making sure that you have enough people in these sub teams? Or do you envision there would be an upper limit at which point the leadership group would start telling people no?

J. Scott Evans: Under the working group guidelines, you're not allowed to do that. You're allowed to try to balance the team but it's open to anyone in this group or anyone else who would like to participate. I wouldn't -- I do not see anyone being turned away. I can see that we might as leadership if we believe that one group is too heavily populated with one particular constituency, trying to use powers of persuasion to get that constituency more broadly represented in the other groups rather than concentrated in one group. But I don't think it's necessarily our task to turn anyone away.

James Blodel: Okay. Thank you for clarifying. That's very -- that's excellent. Thank you.

Michael Graham: My only comment is I think too when we ask people to volunteer for -- or express interest I guess, also asking them to express interest in chairing or leading any of these particular teams or maybe as James was saying there may be people with a particular interest or a particular affinity for one or another of these that would be good to have them go ahead and self-identify as someone who would like a leadership role in those sub teams.

J. Scott Evans: I think that's an excellent suggestion. We will certainly take that on board. Next we have Gideon Ropp.

Gideon Ropp: Good evening. I want to appreciate the use that selecting the members for the sub committee it's a good thing to have two choices for people, if

there is too much, too many people who have decided to do one thing, they can have a second choice so we can have balance and I think the issue of having sub teams is a great idea and you have the information so you don't have overlapping responsibilities. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: I would also say if you volunteer for nothing there's a chance you will be randomly assigned by the chairs because we want to make sure everyone has the opportunity to participate and we understand that of course if that's problematic, we can always have a discussion. I see now Cheryl Langon-Orr has raised her hand.

Cheryl Langon-Orr: Thanks. I'm just wondering about accommodating the crazy people who may wish to serve on more than one of these sub teams?

J. Scott Evans: Again we're not using it as a upper limit and the only reason that I can see for trying to offer any sort of persuasion would be if any sub team looked like it's densely populated with one particular constituency which the working group requires the guidelines as you know, Cheryl, require that we try to balance that group.

Cheryl Langon-Orr: I understand all of that. But an allocation from a choice of three indicates that everyone will be allocated too unevenly, et cetera, et cetera. But there may be one crazy person amongst us that wants to be in all three of their choices. Will you be accommodating that?

J. Scott Evans: I can't see any reason why we would not. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I was going to ask what Cheryl asked. But I've got one further one. I'm a little troubled about the concept that if someone doesn't volunteer they will be assigned. Bodies in a group do not necessarily correlate with workers in a group. There's no forced labor here. If people don't want to serve on a particular group, then just putting them there isn't going to serve any purpose.

J. Scott Evans: I think we have to be pragmatic. Just because someone is assigned to a group, they can participate at the level they seek to participate. We're not -- we have no way of mandating that somebody participate. Just like we have no mandate here. But if you're on the working group list I see nothing wrong with allocating you to a group if you didn't self-identify. You can then chose to participate at whatever level you're comfortable with.

Alan Greenberg: It sounds like a make work effort which is a chancy outcome. I guess it's not --

Charles Gomes: I can think of one reason that can be a little bit problematic if people are in multiple groups that are working at the same time and that's scheduling. Like J. Scott said, we're not going to prevent anybody or forbid but it does make scheduling more complicated because you obviously have more conflicts if you're in multiple groups.

I would suggest that if people do end up wanting to participate in more than one group that they be as flexible as possible for scheduling because scheduling is difficult enough as it is. So, that is one reason why

it makes it a little more complicated if people are in multiple groups because some of these groups could be meeting at the same time. It certainly narrows down the options for available meeting times. So, I just throw that out. I think that's one reason where it's helpful if people are distributed more evenly. Thanks.

Cheryl Langon-Orr: Back to your point, Chuck, I'm not following on this one because, yes I see the challenges but the usual limiter is staff resourcing for working group. We do try and avoid having too many calls running at exactly the same time because of the staff resources not being able to be cloned very successfully. If you're crazy enough to be in more than one sub team I can certainly see a scenario where you might end up on three straight calls in two days running but in an ideal world with this number of work teams you should be able to have calls spread across the month even if it's at an identical time each week.

That's certainly a scenario that Michael and the rest of the work plan team have been exploring. Each time we put these concepts together we've put it together with the idea of also not having created too much risk of conflict and more importantly having to spread the tasks too thinly in any given week. I see your point but we're also trying very hard to avoid that.

J. Scott Evans: Right. Just so everyone understands, this is not done for any other reason other than we have a very brisk timeline, we have a huge group of people, and we have a lot of issues. This is merely being suggested as a way to facilitate orderly functioning of a large group. Please understand that everything that is done by any sub team will come back to the full working group for input. So, there is no need to feel compelled to serve on each and every sub team and overload yourself when in fact you will have an opportunity to fully participate in whatever finalized work product is put out to the public by this working group as a whole.

Sub teams work is only being divided up to make the work load more manageable. It is not in any way some sort of fiat complete or abdicating decision making or discussion to a sub group. It will always be brought back to the entire group for discussion much like we've had today with regards to the work done by our first sub team. So, you should feel -- you should know that we're going to do the best we can to make sure everybody in the working group is comfortable and has an opportunity under the working group guidelines to express whether they have consensus or they don't have consensus with any of the things that are being prepared by these sub teams. And I see we have Michael's hand?

Michael Graham: I'd just like to second that. I think you expressed it very well, J. Scott, that although it's not included in this version of the chart very clearly, the idea is that the sub teams are preparing materials to bring to the working group as a whole so that the only way I can refer to it is the laboring ore is being handled by the sub group and then it's brought back and we're all going to be considering it. But to have everybody trying to work on every issue, as you pointed out, there are so many possible issues, so many possible directions that it seemed to the sub team working on the work plan that the most efficient way would be to set out so that these sub teams are working out here to develop materials for the working group as

a whole then to take a look at, to deal with, to discuss, to prepare whatever deliverables, revised deliverable if they're brought in by the sub team, but always, always with the view that the entire working group is going to be reviewing all the material at some point along the process.

J. Scott Evans: Now I think that we sort of have an understanding of how we're going to go about this process and I appreciate and again this is not being done as any sort of call for interest. If we send out a call for volunteers and ask you to identify your first and second choice and you want to do more than that, you simply need to indicate in your response what your desire is. I think that that will be taken into consideration. I see Chuck has raised his hand.

Charles Gomes: Just a few questions. First one is are we going to handle volunteers for group sub team zero B before we handle the other three? That's just a practical logistics point. Secondly, with regard to zero B, because the other three sub teams are dependent on it finishing its work I wonder whether we should consider starting some of the preliminary work for zero B earlier rather than waiting until the definitions are done. I think that might buy us some time which would help us later on. But I'll just throw that out there and I'll stop there.

J. Scott Evans: My thought would be that the three sub committees, sub teams that are working now are the two that are working now and zero B. Zero B should be populated as soon as possible and then the process that I'm speaking to will happen with sub teams one through four. Not with the preliminary work. So, we can go ahead and staff, do a call for volunteers for zero B and get that kicked off. And then everyone who has participated in the work plan sub team, the definitions sub team, and the zero B sub team will be asked to put a one and two choice for sub teams one through four. And then of course we'll look at five once the work is all done because it could be that five doesn't ever take place if we end up that we're very close to where we are at the beginning. But in the event it does we'd ask for volunteers at that time and it would be treated differently because there would be no first and second choice. Mary, I see your hand is up.

Mary Wong: One of the things that came out in the call on Monday is where and when sub team zero B would start to fit in. The only point I want to make now is it seems logical that that particular sub team should kick off probably imminently but looking at the time line the Buenos Aires meeting is the week of the 18th and people might be traveling the week prior. So, without going into scheduling, I think that's just one thing for this group to decide on today that if you want to issue a call for volunteers amongst the working group for sub team zero B it should probably be today if not imminently so that perhaps they could at least have an initial meeting or two prior to Buenos Aires or in Buenos Aires.

Michael Graham: I agree with Mary whole heartedly. I don't know if I populated that data. I think Marika or Mary must have. Having that first sub team meeting during the Buenos Aires meeting, I think that's perfect because I think the starting place for zero B is not only the definitions we have during that time but also the questions that we had drafted for discussion in Buenos Aires. I think that will be richly rewarding and having that sub team sort of

identified before then will mean the members of that sub team will be especially alert to those answers and the discussion that should get them off on a really good footing I would think.

J. Scott Evans: As Chair I'm going to ask everyone, anyone who disagrees that we should send out a call of volunteers at the end of this call for sub team zero B to begin work, the call for volunteers so we can get that constituted, if you disagree, if you could put -- I think there's a disagree mark on the choices you have up by the raised hand. I don't see any. Mary, if we could give out a call for volunteers at the end of this call to the list?

Mary Wong: Will do, J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. That group can begin. Cheryl has said that she agrees that group should begin its work. I think we just need to get them started so we can get the preliminary work done as quickly as possible. It's always nice for a working group to be able to meet in a face to face meeting if it can be arranged. And given that we have on coming up in a couple weeks we should take full advantage of that. I think also Michael's points with regards to Buenos Aires are well taken.

So, next I'd like to move down our agenda and talk about planning for the Buenos Aires meeting. Given that I am not going to be there because I just started my new job at Adobe I'm going to ask Chuck if he will run this particular part of the meeting because that is going to be your job down in Buenos Aires.

Charles Gomes: Thanks. I'd be happy to do that. One more comment. This is kind of jumping ahead to our next meeting but are you available on the 13th for our regular working group meeting on I think it's 13 November? Because I will be on a plane, a couple of different planes during the day that day.

J. Scott Evans: That day I'm on the East Coast. That's a 3 o'clock call?

Charles Gomes: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Let me check.

Charles Gomes: I should've brought this up at our leadership meeting but I didn't think of it.

J. Scott Evans: I have a Board of Directors meeting that I'm in but I can step out. I'll chair that call on 13 November.

Charles Gomes: Thanks. Another comment before we do agenda item five. It sounds like the work plan working group has already considered this once we have three working groups working simultaneously it may not be necessary to have the full working group meeting every two weeks. I got the impression by a comment that somebody made -- I forget who it was -- that we might be only meeting once a month. Did I hear that correctly?

Cheryl Langon-Orr: That's certainly a plan we had woven into our proposal because of not wanting to have volunteer burn out and also wanting to allow very regular touch points of working group involved.

Charles Gomes: That makes a lot of sense. Thanks, Cheryl. I appreciate that. Okay. Jumping to agenda item five, planning for Buenos Aires, the time and day -- Mary, would you please give the details of the meeting times both I think on the weekend which is an update for the council and other GNSO members that are there, keeping in mind for those who are new to this, the weekend meetings are open to everyone. They're not just council participants. Counselors will probably be seated at the table but the meetings are open to anyone in the GNSO and in fact anyone else.. They don't have to be part of the GNSO. Mary, can you give us the details as far as the schedule on that right now?

Mary Wong: As you say, the weekend sessions are actually GNSO working sessions. They're not just for the GNSO council. There will be remote facilities available as well for those who aren't going to be in Buenos Aires. The GNSO as usual has a full schedule for both Saturday and Sunday. This particular working group has a slot on Saturday at the moment between I believe 11:30 AM and 12 noon Buenos Aires time.

Chuck, I believe you'll be there in person. J. Scott, I don't know if you'll be calling in? But that will be the half hour time slot for the chairs to update the GNSO council and the rest of the community as to the status of the working group's progress. Then during the week itself of the ICANN meeting there is on the schedule a face to face meeting for this working group on Wednesday from 4:45 PM to 6PM local time which will follow from the GNSO council meeting but hopefully end in time for those who wish to go to the gala or who wish to call off if you're participating remotely. So, one face to face, we think from the chair to the GNSO on Saturday, late morning, and one face to face working group meeting on Wednesday evening.

Charles Gomes: I have a question. I think it was Michael and Mary may have suggested it too, mentioned it might be good to have the first meeting of working group zero B in Buenos Aires. If that's the intent, we would have to find a slot for that which is hard to do without creating conflict. Another alternative would be to use this time slot for that. I'm not advocating one way or the other but I would appreciate some discussion on that right now. It would be good if we think through that carefully and look at the pros and cons of different alts.

J. Scott Evans: What time slot are you talking about?

Charles Gomes: The slot during the week.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Charles Gomes: The one that's scheduled for our face to face meeting for the working group.

Mary Wong: The thing that occurred to me, obviously with tight schedules and potential conflicts and even the possibility of finding a room which isn't always easy, as you know, the easiest way to schedule that zero B meeting is to have it during or with the whole working group during the allotted time on Wednesday evening. I think that might also depend upon whether -- it sounds like this group will do a meeting the week before so there's a couple of dependencies. If this group is not doing a meeting the week before then it could create some time pressures on the Buenos Aires Wednesday time but that will be less so if there's a working group meeting the week before. I guess the other dependency would be the definition sub team. But I think that's the easiest way to go.

Charles Gomes: Thank you, Mary. Cheryl, I'll hand it over to you in just a second. A couple more thoughts. I think probably we're going to need to also have some time in our face to face for the definitions team. One approach might be to combine the definitions sub team and the zero B sub team, the principles team. Now, another point of information for those that may be new to this, typically, historically may be a better team, working group session that occur during ICANN in person meetings are open to anybody who wants to attend. So, now it is possible to close a meeting. That doesn't happen very often and it's probably discouraged a little bit. I throw that, in other words anyone who wants to participate in that meeting if we make it a meeting of the sub teams would be welcome to do so unless we decide differently and request it to be closed. Sorry to take so long on that. Cheryl, I see your hand is down?

Cheryl Langon-Orr: It is. But Michael's jumped in the chat as well and I just want to grab it while I can. I respectfully disagree with you, Michael. I think the opportunity with the time slot on Wednesday to have a meeting with the working group as a whole for a period of time and it should probably be able to be no more than -- in an ideal world -- 30 to 45 minutes if that. And then split into an OB and definitions activity. The room should be large enough to go in two different directions. That would be really good. But if we had to give up on one, I guess I would have been on the OB in the week prior and it would have to suffer for the lack of not getting face to face then in Buenos Aires. And focus on definitions which is what you were saying with the committee as a whole because experience has shown many of us with battle scars to prove it that definitions is an exciting subject that could very well benefit from some face to face frank, fearless, and robust discussion. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: I've chaired very large committees before and I think the best thing to do is this working group will have a little bit to discuss as a whole, perhaps to inform those who were not there on Saturday morning about the GNSO update and what if any questions they received from the GNSO. But it should be more of an introductory face to face, introductions and that's that. It should be very short. I want to support slotting out the time where you do ten or 20 minutes, do an update, have everybody introduce themselves, and then the rest of the time split to the two groups that are actually already populated and have work to do. I strongly feel that's how the agenda should be set up. It doesn't require us getting any additional time. We can use the facility. It's already been allotted. And we can get those teams working quickly.

Michael Graham: I succumb. I agree with both J. Scott and Cheryl on this. The brief meeting as a whole I think then splitting into the two sub teams, those who want to discuss -- although I think the definitions might be something that should be discussed and that should be the basis for that face to face meeting. I had been thinking that we would not be as far along I think with the work plan as we appear to be with as little contradictory discussion on it. I guess to the extent that that was what we were going to do, that may already have been done. At the same time, the questions for discussion in order to expedite that working group as a whole and also to provide information to both of those sub teams, perhaps those could be made questions to ask the working group as a whole to provide email responses in advance of the meeting on the 13th or to discuss on the 13th.

Mary Wong: I'm not voicing a preference one way or the other. I guess just wanted to point out that given that the meeting in Buenos Aires, however it's structured, is going to be open to the whole community and hopefully there will be an attendance, one thing this group might want to think about is if you split into two sub teams, even halfway through the Wednesday meeting, whether there might be a missed opportunity for feedback. Although I suppose if you wanted feedback on both definitions and working principles that's the only way to do it. I was thinking that the definitions would have gotten further with their work. That may be someone pointed out earlier kind of a touchstone for people.

Charles Gomes: In fact we have talked about having four questions that we did want feedback on generally for the working group. So, we have to keep that in mind as well. I would also think that there might be some value in the definitions work team interacting a little bit with the principles work team if there's a need there. One of the things as we see how things progress over the next couple weeks, that will give us some insight on how to best outline the activities of that working group meeting. So, let's keep that in mind, that we're going to know more in a couple weeks and we will work together to make the best use of that in person time and including those who are participating remotely. I don't see any other hands up right now or hear anyone asking to speak. So, we have some work to do in refining the details of that meeting. So, let's take a look at the questions for discussion that I just made reference to are on the screen now in Adobe. So, we would like -- we being the chairs and vice chairs of the working group -- would appreciate some feedback from you in terms of these four questions. Some are kind of multiple questions. But I think all of you can read. I guess for those who are not in Adobe it might be helpful if I read the questions.

The first one is a sub team has been formed to look into the following definitions. Do you have any suggestions as to possible wording, language or sources that could help in their work? Are there any other terms related to policy implementation that you think should be defined as well as any suggestions for wording? And the terms have already been gone over so I won't repeat those, that the definition team is working on. It's possible that the definitions teams will have some first cuts of some of

these definitions in which case we could decide to share those. We'll have to judge that one as we get further along and see where we're at.

Now, let me stop there. Before I read questions two, three, and four, is there any discussion? Anybody think this is not a -- these are not good questions to put out to everybody who's there for their feedback? Or any comments you have? Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I guess I'll make a comment I've made a number of times before. The whole reason we're here is it's clear that what we have been calling implementation is a lot of different things. And I can answer specific questions of what other words we need to define. But I think one of the important issues that the definitions team has to resolve is to come up with definitions which have clarity and we're not going to be debating after the fact that -- Oh, I thought you meant something else by that word. So, almost certainly because we know implementation is a messy phase -- if it wasn't we wouldn't be here -- they're going to have to come up with some clarity so that we're not stuck in continually using multi definition words throughout the rest of this process. That doesn't quite come through in what's there. There's a door open for it, saying what else do we need to define? But I think the primary charge is that they need to come up with definitions which we can use with clarity throughout the rest of the process.

Charles Gomes: I think that's a good preface to the questions. I would hope that we would if Maureen, for example, gives the introduction to what that sub team has been working on, that would be a good preface to that so people understand why we're doing that if I hear you correctly.

Ann Aiman-Scolice: My question, I guess it addresses the second part of that question. Are there any other terms related to policy and implementation that should be defined? I notice for example in our deliverable two, three sub team that we do use the term policy guidance with a capital G. I think that the term policy guidance is in our charter even and even though we may not have an existing mechanism within ICANN to talk about policy guidance, I think it needs some kind of definition, particularly if we're going to refer to it in this way in the working group. We have to know what we mean when we talk about policy guidance, even if it's not an existing procedure. Even if it's something that we're seeking or something that somehow comes out in later processes, we have to define whether it's currently undefined because we're using it already as a term.

Charles Gomes: Thank you very much, Ann. Let me ask -- does anyone object to the term policy guidance being added to the list?

Cheryl Langon-Orr: I think it's a great idea.

Charles Gomes: Has Maureen been able to join us yet? I guess not. She's traveling. Mary? Would you please make sure that Maureen is aware that we added that term? Any other comments or discussion on question one? Going to question two, do you know any experts in the area of policy and-or implementation from other organizations? In addition to what is in the working group charter, do you know of any other resources that would be

useful to this working group? I don't think this question will take a lot of time. People can obviously give us their list of experts or resources even after the call as long as they do it in a timely manner.

Any discussion on question number two? Okay. Going to question number three, can you identify any particular successful or unsuccessful examples of ICANN or GNSO policy development or policy implementation? What reasons may have accounted for their success or lack there of? Any comments or questions on that question? Again, on all of these, we don't need to take -- we want to give people opportunity to share in the in person meeting but we can also ask them if they have a lot of detail to submit it in writing to us subsequent to the meeting.

Cheryl Langon-Orr: I would like to take what you just said a step further or more importantly, you again, took the words right out of my mouth, so I'm going to embellish on them. This is one of the questions I see as important for perhaps not full blown public comment at this early stage but certainly outreach. Some form of less formal and full on public comment ability to open up the survey or some description to get wide cross community input on because that's going to -- the answer to that depends very much on the lens you're looking through and grappling with the issues that come out of the feedback on that earlier will save us problems at the end.

Charles Gomes: Thank you very much. I suspect question two would be another one that would be good to do a specific outreach on to the community.

Cheryl Langon-Orr: Or a call for expression of interest. Some people may want to pass it on to experts they know rather than put them in.

Charles Gomes: Right. By the way, just a side note, at the IGF in Bali last week in one of the multi stakeholder sessions I met a couple experts that could be very useful for us. So, I will take advantage of that information. I got their business cards.

Okay. Anything else on number three? Okay. Number four, what do you believe the relationship should be between the GNSO and its working groups and the ICANN Board, GAC, community stakeholders, ACs, other SOs, and ICANN staff in regard to first implementation planning, policy implementation, policy implementation review, accountability for policy implementation, revision of policy, or implementation plans? This one's a pretty broad question. So, how much time we'll have for it in the live session I don't know but any comments or questions on that?

Cheryl Langon-Orr: I do feel the treatment of this one to the treatment of the last it's one that it's the wide outreach, dealing with it obviously, but also allow for wider outreach.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure the wording makes sense. It says what should the relationship be between the GNSO and a whole laundry list of organization in relation to implementation planning and so forth.

Charles Gomes: Do you have a suggestion?

Alan Greenberg: No. I'm reading it here for the first time to be honest. I don't.

Charles Gomes: We can -- wording via the list if you like.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I just don't think it's good English to say what's the relationship between one organization and others in regards to something.

Charles Gomes: Let me throw it out to the group. I think your point is well taken. I found it awkward myself and made a couple changes but I would appreciate anybody who could word this more effectively because I think you're right that it's a little bit awkward.

Alan Greenberg: I mean, for instance, on things like implementation planning, it's not -- if the issue was who should be involved in it, not necessarily a GNSO and versus other groups. The GNSO has some level of involvement in everything that has to do with GTLDs but for that matter so does the GAC and the At Large advisory committee and various other groups who have an interest in it. They may not have the mandate to do it but they certainly have an involvement or should have an opportunity to work in it. I guess I'm not sure what the question is trying to get at.

Charles Gomes: Okay. Let's give some others a chance you may be thinking of some things. You phrased one idea in my head but I'll defer to others. Olevie? Olevie, it's your turn. Make sure you're not on mute. Olevie? We cannot hear you if you're talking. Let me come back to Olevie and go back to Cheryl. His line dropped.

Cheryl Langon-Orr: Hopefully by the time I'm done rambling on, hopefully I'll be done. I wondered about then perhaps framing the question with more of a request for comment and observation. Do you have any comments or observations on the relationship between the GNSO and other parts of the ICANN community, you can list them if you want, with regard to and then you bullet list.

Charles Gomes: Thank you. Olevie? Are you back in?

Olevie Kouami: I'm back now.

Charles Gomes: Go ahead. It's your turn.

Olevie Kouami: Just a comment. I know there is already some agreement in the community regarding the relationship between the groups regarding policy development. So, I don't know what we can add to this.

Charles Gomes: Taking off on something that Alan said there when he said who -- would it be better here to just ask who should be involved in these five different activities? Should the -- I mean, we can be more specific. Should the GNSO be involved in all these different activities? What other groups in the community should be involved including the ones that are listed there? Another way to approach it. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure what we were trying to ask but I think what we should ask is what should be the involvement of each of these groups in these subject

areas, in these activities. Perhaps with some examples given up, this is the leader, they should be a participant, they have the ultimate say over -- what role should each of these be playing in the different parts of the policy process?

Charles Gomes: I saw that word mentioned by Mary in the chat. I think that's a good suggestion. What role should each of these organizations be playing with regards to those? I think that's an improvement.

Alan Greenberg: If you look for instance at the PDP process, clearly that is led by the GNSO. The GNSO makes a specific recommendation to the council, it makes a specific recommendation to the board as an outcome. Or it can do that and other parts of the community may participate in the leg work but not in the decision making. Is that proper? And I think we can then carry it through in the other aspects.

Charles Gomes: Right. I think everybody probably knows the basis for question number four because the board made some decisions based on the fact that there are certain things they consider to be implementations so they thought it was a staff issue and not a GNSO issue. That's where it comes from. Olevie, I see that -- I was going to ask you that question and you answered it before I asked it. You also like the term role there. Ann? Is that your hand up?

Ann Aiman-Scolice: I think it's Marie.

Charles Gomes: Marie? Oh, that's right, you can't put your hand up, Ann. Marie?

Marie: Can you hear me?

Charles Gomes: Yes.

Marie: I just want to suggest that as well as looking at the who, we might look at which stage, the when they should be involved. That's the full dynamic.

Charles Gomes: That's a good question. Thank you. Mary's hand is up.

Mary Wong: Thanks, Chuck. I feel compelled to ask this. Even though this is a GNSO working group and as you say, Chuck, a number of these questions arose in the community's mind, or at least the GNSO community because of certain actions, decisions, and so forth but should the questions as rephrase and suggested by other with bullet points and so forth, should it focus on the GNSO? Or should it be more neutral if I can use the word? Clearly these are questions of perhaps more concern to the GNSO than the ccNSO but the GNSO is very active in policy development, its role is limited to policy and is different from the ASO or SSC and the ccNSO. I'm just wondering if this group would like to rephrase it accordingly or if this is fine?

Charles Gomes: Before I turn it over to Alan again, I want to point out that I think we're discovering that just with these four questions, we can use up 90 minutes really easy. And if we want to allow some time for the two sub teams to work as well, we're going to have a problem. So, I'm going to throw out a

question and I'll let you think about it while Alan talks and then we'll come back to it. My question is which of these four questions would we get the most value out of in an in person meeting? And which ones could we do through a written outreach to community members and it might be okay to do it that way? So, think about that while I turn it over to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I thought we already in turning and asking what should the roles be took the focus away from the GNSO and the GNSO is just one of the bodies we're asking it about. Clearly the GNSO is in a privileged position in that the bylaws give them certain responsibilities. So, yes, the GNSO is in a different position with regards to GTLDs policy than the other groups. I think we should be asking in a more general sense what should the roles be of all these groups in relation to that laundry list. I think very much it should not be focused on the GNSO although clearly they're in a dominate role.

Charles Gomes: We're running out of time. We're not going to resolve this today. My suggestion, if J. Scott's okay with this and the other leaders, is that we continue discussing this on the -- that question in particular, question four on the list, to get a sense and in the meeting two weeks from now that J. Scott will be chairing that we try and reach some resolution here. Now, I want to come back -- are you okay with the J. Scott?

J. Scott Evans: I certainly am.

Charles Gomes: Okay. Thanks. The last thing on item five, I want to come back to the question I asked and see what people think. This can be done on the list and the next meeting two but if we were to narrow down this list to just a couple questions, which two do you think are most suited for the in person, the live meeting in Buenos Aires? Anybody want to venture an opinion there? Or you can put it in the chat too.

Ann Aiman-Scolice: I have a comment on that. In a way I feel that question four is a bit telescoping what will ultimately be the outcome of the work of this committee. I feel the first three questions could be better discussed in the early stages of an in person meeting. The other thing you come up against in question four is it has to be carefully phrased to try to determine whether you're talking about what is the ideal role, what is the - - when is the ideal time for involvement? Because of course there are some existing bylaws that govern these relationships and so the committee is going to be in the process of looking at this type of relationship issue through the sub teams over the course of the work that we're doing and I almost feel as though question four is a bit premature and telescopes the results.

Charles Gomes: Let me interrupt you there and just suggest that why we're asking for some public in put now to get some input before we start doing our deliberations that will guide us and then of course we'll come back to it again later. I don't think it's premature in the sense that we won't have another in person meeting until the Singapore meeting. So, if people do have some thoughts there, it could help us. But your point is well taken. Now we're running out of time and I want to be able to turn it back to J. Scott and agenda item six and given him a little bit of time there. So, let

me ask Cheryl and Alan to be brief and keep in mind that we're going to have to continue this discussion on the list with regards to the questions as well as in the next meeting two weeks from now. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langon-Orr: As I said in the chat I think three and four would benefit from making the cut for the Buenos Aires meeting. I think a properly reframed question four would as you were just saying, Chuck, be quite useful and kind of a method of looking out the other end of the telescope rather than the other way around. But it would definitely need to be reframed. All of these would need the opportunity to also be advertised in the Buenos Aires meeting for additional and ongoing in put through some sort of online tool. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: I think four is what our working group is doing. I think that's the whole substance. If there wasn't disagreement on this we wouldn't be meeting. If it was clear what role everyone played and everyone sat in their little place and did it, there would be no controversy. I think four is the question.

Charles Gomes: I was going to pin you down. You think this is the most important one?

Alan Greenberg: I personally think so. Whether it's for Buenos Aires, one can debate. I think it is the question for the working group however which is interesting because we hadn't phrased it like this before. But I would suggest if we're going to do it in Buenos Aires, 1.5 hours is not a long time for people to start expounding. We might want to seed the discussion by having some suggested, not necessarily optimal, perhaps even radical, that roles somebody should be playing to elicit -- get the discussion going. That's something we can discuss next time.

Charles Gomes: One of the things we could do too is we could be fairly brief on one, two, and three, and say -- Hey, we really want your input on those but we need it in the next couple weeks or something, please provide it if anybody has any very brief remarks, we'll take them. And focus the attention on four and then allow some time for the working groups. Mary? If I can ask a favor and then I'll turn it back to J. Scott, could you put out to the list for those who are not on the call the questions that we've been talking about like how could number four be worded more effectively? Which of the questions do we think are most important to actually spend reasonable time on in Buenos Aires? Is that doable?

Mary Wong: Yes, of course.

Charles Gomes: I've taken up too much time, J. Scott. I'm turning it back to you.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I'm just going to quickly tell you that Maureen did not make it but she's delivered a report to show their sub group is off and running and just beginning their work. They have come up with a concrete plan of how to proceed and that plan is proceeding. I will ask, Mary, were you copied on Maureen's summary?

Mary Wong: Yes. I was. In the few minutes that remain we can upload it if you like.

J. Scott Evans: No. I don't want to do that. If we could send that with the questions to the group that Chuck asked you to send out so they can review it at their leisure? It's very well done and very succinct and shouldn't take anyone any great amount of time to go through. Lastly, I want to close the meeting, I want to thank everyone for their time today. I want to remind everyone that the next call will be 30 November at this time --

Charles Gomes: You mean 13 November?

J. Scott Evans: I'm sorry. Yes. I'm looking at -- and I think at that time we're all on -- the Daylight Savings issue has resolved itself. I think next week the United States changes.

Charles Gomes: Sunday.

J. Scott Evans: We will meet again on the 13th. I will be chairing that call. I want to thank everybody very much for their time today. Mary will be sending around the things Chuck has requested so we can take additional input and discussion on the list on these questions so we can make our final decisions on the call on 13 November. I realize some people will be traveling to Buenos Aires during that. That's unfortunate but we're going to hold the call to continue to move these things forward. In addition we will be sending out at the end of today or first thing tomorrow a call for volunteers for sub team zero B. So that group can get constituted hopefully prior to the Buenos Aires meeting. With that, I'm going to thank everyone very much for their time today and we're going to end on time because as the chair, that's our most important task. So, I thank everyone and we will speak to you again on the 13th and until then work hard, work steady, and let's all keep moving forward. Thanks, everyone.

Charles Gomes: When you send out the call, don't use code. Say what the team is.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Mary Wong: Thank you, everyone. Bye-bye.

END