

**Policy & Implementation Definition Subteam Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION**

Monday 06 January 2014 at 2100 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Monday 06 January 2014 at 2100 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

Attendees:

Michael Graham – IPC
Wolk Knobens- ISPCP
Amr Elsadr –NCUC
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC

Apology: none

ICANN staff:

Mary Wong
Marika Konings
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Everyone this is the operator, I just need to inform you that today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect your line at this time and you may begin.

(Nancy Kobin): Thank you very much (Lori), good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the Policy Implementation Definition Sub-Team Meeting on January 6, 2014.

On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, (Omar Sadar), Michael Graham and Wolf-Ulrich Knobens. From staff we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong and myself (Nancy Kobin) and we received no apologies for today's

call. I'd like to remind everyone to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Michael Graham: Great, this is Michael Graham for the recording and um just to pick up where we left off when we spoke back on December 22, 23, we had gone through definitions and made a few final comments and changes to the draft document that we had prepared with the hope that today we would be able to go back over any further comments either proposed changes, corrections, criticisms and such and finalize this.

And I think if we could - Marika you could help out, if we could go through any changes that were made and just to summarize them. The only ones that I'm aware of other than language that's included in the draft document - well one bit that was included in that was a response to the requests for possible definitions that were brought up during the Buenos Aires meeting and except for one of those terms that we were given I believe all of them are responded to as being beyond the scope of this group.

And then we received yesterday today further comments on the definition of GNSO policy guidance from (Omar) which I think we need to go over. But I think rather through this in order which we've already done if we could maybe turn to its under numbered square three where we have policy advice and then the second definition there is GNSO policy guidance. And perhaps ask (Omar) if you would just go ahead and summarize the comments that you had included in considering whether or not to amend the definition that we had come up with there.

(Omar Sadar): Sure thanks Michael, this is (Omar) - would you like me to read out the text that I suggested and then maybe comment on the amendments that you proposed?

Michael Graham: Yes if you could include that that would probably be a great way to combine both of those, thank you.

(Omar Sadar): All right sure, well what I suggested was as a definition for policy guidance a process for developing gTLD policy other than "consensus policy" instead of a GNSO policy development process.

The process by which policy develops in GNSO policy guidance as well as the criteria in determining when it would be appropriate to do so will be deliberated by the policy implementation working group and included as part of the working group's recommendations in its final reports to the GNSO Council, that was the text that I had suggested. And the - oh it's in the text here - it's in the chat here, the text that Michael suggested as an alternative definition to that was um as positive in policy implementation working group charter.

GNSO policy guidance would consist of input or advice provided by the GNSO on policy-related issues in response to a specific GNSO-generated proposal. Or a request from the Board or other non-GNSO ICANN entity or working group where no policy development process PDP has been requested, defined, required or deemed necessary and where consensus policy is not required. The nature, scope, and effect of such guidance is undefined and to be considered by the policy implementation working group and proposed as part of its recommendation in its final report to the GNSO Council.

Um well to be honest I'm a bit more comfortable with the text that I suggested for a couple of reasons. Um first there is one part I did not completely understand, um - oh I'm sorry is the text in the - I'm just trying to check here, is that the same as the text that was provided by email Michael or is it different?

Michael Graham: I - it should be the same, Marika had put it in there - I don't know if you amended it Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika; I just copied and paste it.

(Omar Sadar): Oh okay, all right well the thing is there's one part that I'm not very comfortable with which is um specifying where the - under what circumstances policy guidance should be - would be needed, which is when specifying whether it come from the Board or other - whether - yes or a request from - in response to a specific GNSO-generated proposal or request from the Board or other non-GNSO ICANN entity or working group.

That's one part, because while it seems to me that this is a discussion that's going to take place amongst the working group and to include it in the definition at this point is kind of jumping the gun and making a sort of preempted decision on who will - where - how policy guidance will be initiated. The working group might very well decide that it is from the board and from any other part of the community or it might decide that this is something to be used under certain criteria as one requested, for example only by the board or only by other parts of the community.

I don't mean to bring up a subsequent discussion on this at this point but I'm just - I just feel that this is something that needs to be discussed amongst the working group before we include it and it should not be included in the definition at this point. And as similarly when you go on with the rest of the sentence where it says where no policy development process PDP has been requested, defined, required or deemed necessary.

Again these are circumstances I feel the working group - the full working group should actually come to this conclusion and decide that okay these are the - this is - these are the circumstances under which policy guidance would be a better route to take or an alternative to a formal PDP. And in these circumstances policy guidance should be sought after and not of course excluding consensus policy which is part of the charter language.

So I just feel that it's a bit too specific and the text that I provided was more in line - in-synch with the charter question. And just to sort of leave it open at this point because this is something that needs to be deliberated for (their benefit) working group, thanks.

Michael Graham: This is Michael, (Omar) I think you've got a good point there and I think, you know, if you could revise it.

The one thing in going back to your proposal, the one thing that I was trying to address and I think I agree with you that it's over-defined whereas the importance of this is to give enough of a definition that it can be discussed and as you say the guidelines for it and the procedures can be established or discussed by the working group. Um the one thing that I would say when I was going through um your good proposal was that it was phrased, the process through developing gTLD policy other than consensus policy instead of a GNSO policy development process.

And I guess - my understanding is the consensus policy is what drives a - the determination that there must be a PDP - a Policy Development Process put into place so I guess it's just rephrasing that a little bit so that it's clear. This is a non-PDP process which in situations other than those in which a consensus policy um or PDP is necessary might be put into place. I'm not sure how we rephrase that and I'm not sure if I got my concern across clearly.

Marika Konings: This is Marika - yes this is Marika because I think where the difference comes from is and what I thought was missing in (Omar)'s definition.

Which I think did come back in the one that Michael provided is that I think in practice most of the instances where we've seen the GNSO in need of different process and the PDP is for example on request for input from the ICANN Board. And I think if I understand (Omar) correctly, I think where you feel the definition that Michael has provided doesn't cover it - or doesn't

provide enough specificity or seems to suggest that it would actually be the Board asking for the GNSO to use the policy advice.

Where I think what we're actually - or I think - and Michael you can correct me if I'm wrong, I think what the working group will be tasked with is actually to define the process that the GNSO Council or the GNSO may decide to use if they deem appropriate. So (way) if that is indeed the concern and I think that the mismatch between the two current definitions we're looking at, a way of address that may be by adding for example in Michael's version.

And as (positive) in the policy implementation working group charter, the GNSO policy guidance would consist of input or advice provided by the GNSO and policy related issues that the GNSO may decide to use in response to specific GNSO generic - generated proposals or related to a request received from the Board or other GNSO ICANN entity or working group where no policy development process has been requested, defined, required or deemed necessary.

I don't know if that may be clarified the fact that it's really up to the GNSO to decide whether or not to use that process or whether they deem that the PDP is the most appropriate way to provide input. I don't know if that - I don't know if I understood you correctly (Omar) in stating your concern because I think I heard that you were concerned about that fact that it seems like the Board or working group could basically ask the GNSO, saying you need to give us policy advice and not do a PDP.

While I think what we're trying to say is that this is basically merely an option that will be provided to the GNSO. And it's up, you know, it's within their (agreement) to decide which process they deem more appropriate to respond to any request that is received either related to specific gTLD policy. But I think there may be instances as well where the Board actually asks the broader community for input on certain issues or currently the GNSO doesn't have a mechanism at its - available to provide a response.

And I'm thinking of more broader issues such as, you know, strategic plan or um, you know, the budget for example. Currently the GNSO could write a letter for example but there's no formal process by which a GNSO position could be developed. So I think that's - and I'm wondering if that could maybe be a bridge between the concerns expressed and take into account what's currently on the table.

Michael Graham: Oh yes (Omar) you had your hand up then?

(Omar Sadar): Yes thanks Michael and thanks Marika, this is (Omar). Um yes my concern is not really with whether a - this would be a response to something coming from the Board or from somewhere else.

I can definitely see where policy guidance and situ- a number of situations could be something that will be - well effective in an efficient way for the GNSO to answer questions. But my concern here is just that as a definition sub-team, we are making some assumptions that should - that we shouldn't be making. And that these decisions and this specific language is something that the full working group will have to determine itself.

And we should not include that in the initial working definition that we are trying to provide the rest of the working group. So in the text that Michael suggested he pretty much left it open to whether it would be the Board or any other part of the ICANN community because he doesn't really exclude anyone in the language he's suggesting. But my concern is that the working group itself might decide to exclude a certain part of the community from requesting policy guidance from the GNSO.

So it's not really a matter of whether I agree or disagree that this - that policy guidance could be requested from a working group or from the ICANN Board, it's just that this is not - we're not supposed to be making that decision in the definition that we're providing right now. But - and Michael also asked the

question on consensus policy earlier and please Marika or Mary please - or anyone just correct me if I'm wrong.

But my understanding of consensus policy which is between quotation marks - and by the way I took this language from the working group charter so I didn't really um come up with it myself. But my understanding of the term consensus policy is a policy that requires a certain level of consensus in the GNSO Council to make amendments to contracts with the registries and registrars for example.

So that's why - and that's why I assume it's been excluded from the need to - it's been excluded from sort of a scenario where GNSO guidance would be necessary, because in order to have consensus policy we do need a formal PDP. Michael does that answer your question at all?

Michael Graham: Yes I mean (nice) and I think it's just a matter of wording. You know, I'm looking back at your definition and making a few marks here that maybe I can come back to and propose. But meanwhile Cheryl you put your hand back down?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I did but thank you for coming back to me I will say what I wanted to say, thanks it's Cheryl for the record.

I hear and understand certainly and it's very clear what you are both saying and the slightly different directions you are taking. But I do think Marika raised some really important points and I'd like to suggest that some of the inserted language she made to Michael's draft takes is actually very important to capture.

That said however, whilst I mean I hear and understand and indeed agree that we can't be too presumptuous here, I think what we're doing with this text however is allowing not just for a working definition which we do need and it's our mandate to create or at least capture to get more to the point. But also we

have an opportunity to propose some draft picks - sorry that (might be) - that can be the instrument discussion from the whole working group started.

So what I was looking forward to doing was perhaps somehow doing both things, having the (as she is) written part text that you propose as our working definition but for the workgroup. But also presents the workgroup with I think the broader context stuff which will give them something to chew on. Otherwise I think we'll use valuable time in discussion with the committee as a whole by not having some worthy text to start editing, thanks.

Michael Graham: Yes this is Michael, you know, I take it from what you are saying Cheryl is that leaving in perhaps some of those possibilities that might be applied to, you know, further clarify what exactly this - I want to say consensus policy things (like that are) out of my mind, these GNSO policy guidance when that would be appropriate and where are actually factors that need to be determined by the workgroup.

And by raising that as part of the definition we are pointing out that the definition that we're giving is, one, limited, and two, that in order to use this term going forward the workgroup is going to have to make those - define those limits when it's...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, Cheryl here - I'd be annotating your text modified by Marika's language with a (two) recommendation or to be further defined by the working group as a whole.

Michael Graham: Yes and going back to your comment (Omar) if that were made clear would you be more comfortable with some of those, you know, specifics that I had included which I do agree with your (idea that) I don't want to be - I don't want that to be the definition but to at least point out that those are portions of the definition that will need to be arrived at in the context of the larger work group. I mean is that more comfortable?

(Omar Sadar): This is (Omar), yes I think so - yes I think that would be great. I would just hate it if at some point the topic did come up and then someone says, well the definition sub-team already did the work on this and they determined, you know, whatever it is we're determining right now and so we don't need to redefine that in any way.

So I think as long as our language is clear that this is something that the working group still needs to deliberate on as it's one of the charter questions than yes sure that would be great.

Michael Graham: Right and this is Michael again for the record I think something, you know, in going with, you know, a sort of combination of yours and mine and it's difficult to do on the screen right now at least for me.

Whereby what we're doing is we're pointing out that GNSO policy guidance is a process for developing some types of gTLD policy other than those which require a PDP - a Policy Development Process. And that seems to me to be sort of the short definition and then going further from that pointing out these other variables that need to be determined to understand exactly what this GNSO policy guidance would consist of.

And I really appreciate it (Omar) is the fact that you are bringing that back from the charter so that that would be something that needs to be looked at. And although we've been asked to look at it, it was done so in a way that we didn't have the definition going forward. So Marika is that still hand or new hand?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, it's a new hand. But this is Marika, first of all I think responding to (Omar)'s question on consensus policy.

So basically consensus policy relating to any - if those issues that are defined in the contracts in which terms of policies can be developed and provided they follow the process then it would become enforceable and part of the

contract. But it doesn't mean that if, you know, some of those issues if the Council deems that it may not be appropriate or timely or effective or efficient to do consensus policy, it doesn't mean that there couldn't be another way to make certain recommendations through for example a policy guidance process.

But data would take a different kind of form such as, you know, best practices or suggestions or other ways in which, you know, they could still be implementable but not necessarily enforceable as, you know, contractual language. Um in addition maybe one of the initial suggestion to the language as suggested by Michael but to address (Omar)'s concern could maybe be changing the - in the first sentence the words to "could" - and say could consist of input or advice.

Basically making it more clear as I also posted in the chat that this is really, you know, these are working definitions. And I think for all of these the idea is that at the end of the process the working group will come back to all of these and say, okay so now we've come up with our recommendations for the different charter questions, those that still align with the working definitions we started out with. Or do we need to make changes and modify these to make sure that our definitions align with the recommendations we're making?

So, you know, maybe the - changing the "would" to "could" could already be a further (hence) to that. I think in addition to - probably need to be back at the intro but maybe it's something we need to further emphasize in the introduction as well. Or as we submit this to the working group to really make clear that these are really working definitions and people shouldn't feel confined by these if, you know, they believe that, you know, there are broader issues that need to be considered or indeed that they are just too narrow for what we're trying to do, but (unintelligible).

Michael Graham: Okay I note that (Omar) and Cheryl both have noted their agreement with what you were proposing.

And I - let me just put this out there, what I would suggest is that we have a general, very broad definition of GNSO policy guidance um so that that's clear. And that be brought in from the charter and maybe as simple as what I was suggesting before, GNSO policy guidance refers to um, you know, what was the language here? Refers to a process for developing gTLD policy other than the GNSO policy development process required for consensus policy - I guess that's quote and end quote, determination period.

And then pointing out GNSO policy guidance could - and going on with the language that Marika was just proposing that this is sort of an example of some broad areas in which the real work group will need to make the determination going forward. And then the last part of what I had proposed I guess could be out - could be left out which is redundant to of where consensus policies not required unless you wanted to include that for clarification. And then...

(Omar Sadar): Michael this is (Omar)...

Michael Graham: Yes go ahead.

(Omar Sadar): ...yes I think that part where consensus policy is not required is - yes it is important to be included.

Michael Graham: Yes.

(Omar Sadar): It should be - yes it should be clear in this definition that consensus policy does not fall within the scope of the definition of GNSO policy guidance.

Michael Graham: Okay, yes I think we should include that - Marika do you think you have enough to sort of cobble that together?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, I think I took down what you said and the suggestions as well in addition to the (added they are showing). I can incorporate that and send it out for the sub-team's review.

Michael Graham: Okay, yes that would be great and I don't know if you all who are attending now intend to be on the workgroup call on Wednesday, but in discussing what we would be doing if during that call we could just confirm - or ahead of that call confirm our agreement to those revisions that Marika sends us.

You know, take a look at it, respond by email and if we could have that final draft to submit Wednesday morning. What's going to happen then is we're not planning on discussing the definitions in the workgroup as a whole because we want to make sure that everyone both attending the phone call and also those who are not attending the phone call but are in the committee will have a good chance to review all the definitions that we've proposed going forward before we discuss that.

So it actually won't be discussed until the following workgroup meeting which is what on the 29th I believe? No 22nd, but if you could send that out Marika so that we could all take a look at that revision. Now the other thing um that I wanted to touch on because it is something that you had included for us and that's at the bottom - what is that, Page 5 - at the bottom of Page 5 which is a reference to the terms that were brought up in the workgroup discussion in Buenos Aires.

Those were public policy, public interest, staff, ticket sense and implementation review team. And one change I would make in that would be to remove implementation review team because we do define that um in nine. I don't know if you want to note the first four and to have the statements and then after that to list implementation review team um that we did review that as part of the definition of GNSO implementation review team that have been included that definition in the document.

Marika Konings: This is Marika.

Michael Graham: Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes it is Marika, I think the main reason why that it is listed there as the first (sense) it basically said these were the terms that were suggested in Buenos Aires and I think then it goes on to specify that, you know, apart from the last term the other ones were considered out of scope.

It's more - I think it was more as a kind of recordkeeping because, you know, initially that term wasn't on the list as it was given by the working group. It was hence more kind of to add it here in the list to make clear where that term came from. But I'm perfectly fine either way in leaving it in or taking it out.

Michael Graham: Okay yes, I'm finally being able to read red ink here um apart from the last term, implementation review team - maybe it should say um - (it wasn't) the last term, implementation review team which is the (plane) above, none of these are considered germane.

And I see (Omar)'s comment and yes I think we ought to specify rather than just implementation review team it should say GNSO implementation review team. Unless you want to say implementation review team defined as GNSO implementation review team above. Yes I see Cheryl and (Omar) agreeing, so with that little change I think we're fine. Now before - the only other two terms that I was able to make out in going through the discussions that the Principles Workgroup had had, although there were other terms that they were trying to pass our way through definition.

The two that seemed to be one's that were being passed to us to consider for possible definition was multi-stakeholder model and policy neutral implementation. Neither of which seems to me to be especially easy to define, although I did trace back multi-stakeholder back to very early WSIS

discussion of Internet governance in general where it was put forward that that would be inappropriate new form of governance coming out of the way the Internet had early been governed when it was total anarchy and RFP driven.

I was not able to find a specific definition of multi-stakeholder model though which I think would be really useful if we could come up with one just in terms of the discussion they were having in the principles. Then as to policy neutral implementation the discussion within the principles group that led to that request as I recall and we read it, it was trying to come up with a term that would mean implementation that would have no policy ramifications versus the suggested idea that was out there.

That there was some sort of implementation that would have policy implementations that was - that would be improper - it would be improper implementation as they were understanding it since implementation would be outside of the policy development process. I am somewhat of a mind that policy neutral implementation needn't be defined where we've defined implementation the way that we have.

I don't know if anyone else has any thoughts on that particular term, if it's something that we should define for them or if you consider that to be a concept that's better addressed by the principles who. And (Omar) was there an example provided for policy neutral implementation you wrote in the chat? I don't recall that there was. And the objection to using that term which initially I thought was fine was that it suggests that there is type of implementation that would be appropriate that would impact policy. Marika you have your hand up?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, I think basically I agree with what you're suggesting that I think it was basically came up as a kind of concept for them to consider.

And if we look I think at the list of definitions we worked at those are really existing concepts that are either defined either in the bylaws or the PDP manual where we've been able to derive those concepts from them. I think by starting to define possible concepts we may actually start getting into the actual working group tasks. So it may be more appropriate in this case I think that the other sub-team is quite keen for this group to provide a definition to maybe have them elaborate on that or provide it as a possible avenue to explore.

And then have that more as a broader working group to explore if that should be indeed a concept or a recommendation that needs to be included.

Michael Graham: Yes this is Michael for the record, I would agree with that. I don't think we're (punching) on that, I think we can point them to the definition of implementation.

And if they needed more with establishing their basic principles that's something that probably is better for them to do. And (Omar) and Cheryl I think (March) that they agree with that and if we could include that in the last statement again in response to their request that we consider possible definition of this in that footnote. And I will go back though to multi-stakeholder, I looked and I was unable to find in ICANN materials a past definition of what that would be.

And most of the materials I've seen in fact apply it as a concept in that very general sort of definition of - I think I try to get that through their act - where acting in civil society business and government institutions come together in order to form a common solution to problems all of the, that was the closest I could find to a definition. (Omar) did you want to say something on that note or on the policy neutral note?

(Omar Sadar): Yes thank Michael this is (Omar), yes I was on the multi-stakeholder definition from - I was - I'm just curious why - I guess I should go back and check the transcripts of the other sub-team.

I was wondering what prompted the request for a definition for multi-stakeholder that somehow um - I don't know it just somehow seems unnecessary some of it to the work that we're doing here. Because and well I guess we are working on recommendations on policy implementation under the assumption that the multi-stakeholder model already exists the way it does, you know, within ICANN.

And I guess we could work up a definition for multi-stakeholder and we could take a few of the things from the text provided here. You might want to add users I guess and make a differentiation or clarify consensus as opposed to other decision-making mechanisms. But I'm still a bit unclear on why we need to define multi-stakeholder at this point, thanks.

Michael Graham: Right, Marika I don't know if you wanted to answer that question. My quick answer would be one of the early principles that's under discussion is that policy and implementation at all points should conform with the multi-stakeholder model.

And the question that arose well how do we ensure that they are conforming to that model, what is the model? And that was when the definition was punted toward us - Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, that's correct I think as Michael said I think there was a discussion on the proposal that one of the principles should be that, you know, policymaking as well as implementation (rated work) are based in ICANN multi-stake - in ICANN multi-stakeholder model and the question was what does it actually mean.

But again I think it's - and this is a principle I think it's probably for the principle working group to define what they mean with multi-stakeholder model in this context instead of punting it probably to this team which is really looking and working definitions for some of the concepts of the working groups they will be dealing with. So I think the actual - the other sub-team already made an attempt at trying to define what from their perspective multi-stakeholder means.

But I think they were trying to say well maybe this is something this sub-team can look at as well. But I think following from the discussions there seems to be an agreement that it may not be appropriate because I think as well to, you know, to (Omar)'s concerns before if we're trying to define these kinds of definitions as multi-stakeholder as well as the policy neutral we actually may be doing the work for the working group and are putting too much in there.

Because those are actually (councils) that don't exist within the current documents or references that we've used for some of the other docu- the other definitions where I think these are some of the concepts that are probably for the working group to define. If you're talking about, you know, implementation needs to be multi-stakeholder, you know, one of the main tasks of the working group will be just to define what that means.

What does it entail, what kind of processes that are associated with that? So I think that's a little bit of a conundrum that will of course be very easy if this group could provide those definitions. But I think at the same time you're under (rates) are actually doing the work of the working group in that case.

Michael Graham: All right Michael for the record - I think you're right on there. And I think my impression and sort of the aid that we can give to that other sub-team is that they were becoming caught in the same sort of debate over meanings in their discussions that led to the creation of the definition sub-team.

So if we could, you know, without as (Omar) points out there's no reason to reinvent the wheel, but I think maybe we need to have a snapshot of the wheel to give back because in the discussions then they can rely on that snapshot and determine from that if they need to clarify it further and how they can use that in their discussions as they go on. So (Omar) I would be very happy if you could take that language that I jotted out there which is I'm trying to locate the exact source - it's actually from a summary of a journal article.

And I just grabbed that language because it seemed to be the closest to a very simple straightforward definition. And if you could perhaps mold that to include the terms we need in the ICANN context as you were pointing out users and such. And I don't think it would be again incorrect if we also referred to, you know, through the use of (AS as OC)'s, other constituencies as well as At-Large in the ICANN context to make sure that we've covered that.

To be able to put it in a quick definition that we could then give back to them and say this is what we understand it to be. If you want to discuss more that would be some - part of your determination of the principles I think.

(Omar Sadar): And this is (Omar), sure I don't mind. I'll also rely on some of the more experienced members of this sub-team to help me when I have an initial draft, thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl, sorry I didn't put my hand up. I think if we can make that contribution that you were suggesting um Michael.

It's going to be very useful because you do need to allow for the fact that once ICANN is - has a multi-cycle to model that is often held up as a prime example of multi-cycle, there isn't - it is in fact different to other models of what is also called multi-stakeholder. And so it is important to have that clarity available for use within this working group. And the other thing of course is

the multi-stakeholder model, one could argue in a GNSO context not need to go beyond GNSO and dial all their own varieties of stakeholders.

And yet one could equally argue that is in many cases not the case and that it does in fact need to go wider to the ICANN community. And so that's where having that defined is going to be pretty important, thanks.

Michael Graham: Yes Michael here, I - Cheryl I think you really hit the nail on the head there with it, I think it will be important for them.

And as you were saying that I'm realizing as well one of our challenges of course in working on the entire working group is to get input and participation from the various stakeholders. And stakeholder groups I think as we all know tend to get involved when you touch on one of their sensitive spots. And as you point out there's a definition of multi-stakeholder process that is different I'm certain between the GAC as it is within certain NGO groups as it is within ICANN.

So in bringing this up for the principles group to discuss and then to distribute widely to those stakeholders we want to get involved, I think there's a high likelihood that we will get them to begin participating in the conversation now rather than when the final report is in and people want to review that. So hopefully I'm looking comment - hopefully it won't be an essay at this point. I think if we can give a definition and then pass that on for the essay.

I'm mindful of one of my favorite definitions of anything which is oats which is a grain - I don't know, I'm paraphrasing this badly. But it's a grain that's suitable for eating by horses and Scotsmen and that was about it. (Being a Scotsman I will say that and not take (it back).

Marika Konings: Sorry.

Michael Graham: (Could be founded Samuel Johnson) so I think that was good, (Omar), you know, if you would be able to send out something, you know, tomorrow at some point.

And also Marika the draft if you could send that out of the revisions to GNSO policy guidance and if we could all take a look at that and get back to Marika before Wednesday's meeting that would be great. Um yes before we close it up we have a couple minutes and I just wanted to raise if anyone had - in retrospect had any comments on any of the other definitions that you wanted to bring up? And hearing silence I will take that to be approval of what we've drafted.

I think the expectation will be that once this is presented to the workgroup as a whole there will be some discussion of that. And I certainly hope that all of you, you know, will participate in those discussions both in a clarification of what we were trying to get across and in trying to help the workgroup reach the resolution of their understanding. And I think putting all of these together it is much more difficult to have a simple straightforward definition then it is to discuss these concepts.

But now that we've come up with some definitions I think is very useful and very good we'll be able to have that larger conversation. And I really thank you all for participating and helping with this - (Omar) your hand was up?

(Omar Sadar): Yes thanks Michael this is (Omar), I was just going through note that it might be a good idea to just maybe on the email list just ask, you know, the rest of the sub-team if everyone's okay with this so far.

Because we did go through quite a few of them during our last call which had low attendance. So I think it would be a good idea if folks who weren't on the last call could just again put their okay with what's been - what we've come up with so far. Or if there are any comments - whether they agree or disagree it would be it, thanks.

Michael Graham: Yes I think that would be excellent (Omar). And perhaps let me suggest this so we can get it all in one place, when you have drafted um your draft on multi-stakeholder if you could send that to Marika.

And Marika if we could perhaps send out together the two new proposed definitions and then the revised sheet of all the definitions and the references to the Buenos Aires and Zero B definitions are terms that they ask us to define and send that out as a single document with a request for members of the sub-team to provide any input before the Wednesday workgroup meeting. I think that would (gas), that way everyone will get in a single document instead of piecemeal.

Marika Konings: Sure, that would be good.

Michael Graham: Okay terrific, well you all may not know but I am living through a day of minus 15 degree temperature, (I'd like to) go and light the fireplace. Yes it's very delightful here.

Anyway I hope you all are having a tremendous New Year and I thank you all for the work that you've put in and comments that you've made. And look forward to talking with you all again on Wednesday in the workgroup and in emails going over this list. Thank you very much and I think this ends our meeting for today.

(Nancy Kobin): Thanks Michael, bye everybody.

(Omar Sadar): Thanks, Happy New Year.

Marika Konings: Bye.

Michael Graham: Bye now.

END