

**Policy & Implementation Working Group Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 09 July at 1900 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Wednesday 09 July 2014 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-20140709-en.mp3>

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

Coordinator: Recordings have now been started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, (Cybil). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Policy and Implementation Working Group call on the 9th of July, 2014. On the call today we have Alan Greenberg, Jonathan Frost, Tom Barrett, Phil Karnofsky, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, J. Scott Evans, Greg Shatan, Klaus Stoll, Nic Steinbach and Stephanie Perrin.

We have apologies from Michael Graham, Chuck Gomes- oh I apologize, he has joined, Olevie Kouami, and Olga Cavalli.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong, Amy Bivins, Steve Chan and myself, Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you. This is J. Scott Evans for the record. I'll be chairing today's call. I guess the first thing we do - as we always should do is check to see if anyone has any changes to their Statement of Interest.

Hearing none we can move on to the second point in our agenda - agenda item. And for everyone the agenda is posted at the top right hand corner of

the Adobe Connect room. As you all know we had an ICANN meeting just a week or so ago in London. And one of the first thing that our group did was we met with the GNSO Council on the Saturday morning of their working sessions. They have two full work days, Saturday and Sunday.

And during that session we gave an update on our status of where we were in our work and provided them with our plan for what we're doing and what we hope to continue.

We didn't get many questions from the Council at all. So I think that our report was accepted. And we just, you know, gave a brief summary of where we are and did tell them that, you know, we were hoping to make some slight changes to the way we were working in hopes of moving things along a little faster.

So then on Wednesday - the Wednesday of the week we met late in the afternoon as I think has been done at the last two previous ICANN meetings, Buenos Aires and Singapore. We had a face to face meeting, was well attended.

And at that meeting we continued our work that we had been doing with regards to going through the examples that had been put together by staff with regards to various initiatives that have occurred over the last few years, I think it's two to three years.

And we have been going through this document and identifying strong points and weak points that could be included and help us discern some lessons learned that we could then further our work with, with regards to that.

We also went over our work plan and discussed it a bit and we discussed a mapping document that Chuck had put together with regards to our deliverables. And I think the mapping document and the work plan document were both circulated to the entire committee or the working group along with

the agenda for today's call. So I hope you've all had a chance to look that over.

One of the, I think big changes that we were going to make is rather than meeting every other week for an hour and a half it was decided and encouraged that we begin to meet for an hour every week which means we would then again meet next Wednesday which will be the 16th to continue our work.

And we felt like it was just best to keep the momentum going especially since the original plan was to have sub groups that would work in the off weeks when the main group wasn't meeting but due to participation levels and the work that was getting done we made the decision probably about six to eight weeks ago that we would not divide into subgroups unless we came up with specific topics that we felt required us to do so that we would, as a group, continue to work on the documents in total. And so that's what we've been doing.

And since there are no sub teams meeting as off shoots of the main group it seemed to make more sense that if we met weekly. Does anyone have any questions or concerns with regard to any of the things that went on in London and our new work schedule? Conference call schedule? Okay. Great. That makes it easy.

Marika, can you put up the - the work - the deliverables mapping document that Chuck put together? Oh that's the work plan document. Let's do Chuck's first, it's a little easier to deal with. Something flashed but I don't see anything yet.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It's up on my screen. I don't know if others can see it?

J. Scott Evans: Here it comes.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: As you can see this is the document that Chuck put together and it has all of our deliverables sort of mapped out here and it's got color codes for things that have been completed, things that are currently being worked on and things that need to be worked on in the future.

And we've completed a few things and I'm hoping today that we can close out some of these things and then it informs just what we're supposed to do. If you move down he goes through and he tells you well what we're going to do is we're going to answer specific questions with specific work that we've done. And the questions of course are those that were laid out in the charter document.

And so right now we've been concentrating on our Deliverable 1. And I think we've worked through that mostly, we still have some work to do on C I think of the questions we need to consider. But for the other part of Deliverable 1 we're on our way. We've been working on 1a which is to review that chart which we did; that was an Excel chart that we all considered and we worked on the pros and cons of things. And that's been turned into a document that we'll show you later.

But this is basically the sort of mapping document that Chuck felt would be sort of a good way to help guide us and keep us on track with what we are expected to deliver and for the work we're doing how we should use the things we're putting together. Does anybody have any questions or concerns or additions to this document? Okay.

All right, Marika, you want to put up the work plan document? And since you were the one that's gone through and updated this I'll let you describe to the group what's going on.

Marika Konings: Yeah, and this is Marika. First of all apologies for the small font. It's probably easier to read on your - the version that was circulated with the email. But basically the only updates that were made is to reflect the work that basically went on since the last work plan and London and also reflecting that we're moving to weekly meetings from London onwards.

One thing to note as well is that we still have the, let me just - looking at the screen, I don't know if it has actually cut off some part. That we still have in the work plan the target date of the LA meeting for delivery of our initial reports but not really sure as we're still under Deliverable 1 if that's still a realistic target noting that the publication deadline for that meeting is already the 19th of September or somewhere around there.

So that is something we may want or need to adjust as we get closer to the LA meeting. And of course that's also depending on how much work we're able to get done between now and then. But I just wanted to flag that.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. And this - these documents - these dates that are early on of course are 2013 dates if - correct? And then we get - I see have some like from December?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. This is correct. I think what has happened I think part of it has been cut off in the conversation to PDF so apologies for that. As said, it's probably better to look at the Excel version that circulated with the agenda which is - should show all the dates.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right. So, you know, I think that it just shows that, you know, we have a considerable amount of work to do and hopefully we can get some things accomplished prior to the LA meeting so that we will have at least, you know, something to present there more than just the simple status of where we are.

And Marika's just posted that we have a publication deadline of the 22nd of September so that would be our hard date to move things forward. All right, Marika, do you want to post the lessons learned chart that we have - that you and Mary have worked on and created for us?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. You want the (unintelligible) version or the summary?

J. Scott Evans: The summary version. So this is the - you see here that what this is is at the top you see that there are 12 enumerated - what we're terming as lessons learned. And this is basically having gone through the Excel chart that we had and we went through it for I think two or three weeks where we looked at various processes that had taken place.

And I think that you will also find down in the summary on the attached pages like 2 on the specific events that we looked at. And this top tries to take and summarize those lessons learned that may have been, in some instances, I think, some of the positives, the negatives were similar for each in more than one of the - one of the efforts.

And so this is an attempt to summarize those into a list that extrapolates from all of these. I did notice myself, Marika, that it looks like Point 8 and there was another - Point 5, okay, all right I see it's different now. When I looked at it earlier I thought it was the same. But I want everyone to look over these and feel like they think that this is a pretty inclusive list of lessons learned.

Marika, you have your hand up?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And as J. Scott explained indeed this is an (extrapolation) from the lessons learned trying to translate those into some basic principles that the GNSO policy guidance process would need at a minimum. I think it really tries to, you know, take those lessons learned and see how we can build those into kind of principles that, you know, could be the building blocks of any potential process or processes.

And again, you know, these are circulated for the working group to review, you know, this is what came out based on the review of some of the processes that the GNSO has used over time in either responding to Board requests or other requests for input.

But there may be other elements that, you know, the working group may want to think about. And I think also as we dive into the further review of the other items under this deliverable there may be other basic principles that we can derive from those conversations so I think the idea would be to keep this as a living document for now and add any additional items that people believe should underpin a policy guidance process so that from there we can actually start, you know, building something that would meet all those criteria.

J. Scott Evans: Thanks, Marika. I look at this and I wonder how 3 and 8 are different. Three is to be inclusive, representative and 8 is to ensure broad input at an early stage.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I can try to answer that one. I think on the third it relates more to membership of any kind of group that is formed while I think 8 is more making sure that whatever that group is also reaches out even beyond that group to...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: But those, you know, there may be a combination of those two of course in any case. And may also respond to Anne's question that allow for iteration I think refer to, and maybe we can word that better here, is the fact that the process would allow for a way that if a certain result is produced it is not only an up or down vote but there's also a way for, you know, sending it back to the group to look at it again and come back. I think that was what was

intended or at least, you know, one of the lessons learned from one of the processes where I think the end outcome was basically voted down because there was no other way of dealing with it.

So I think that was what, you know, someone suggested as a lesson learned there that it would be good for any kind of process to allow for that kind of iterative approach to have that flexibility in not only just up or down at the end of a phase.

J. Scott Evans: So what do people think? Do they think this is a good list? A bad list? Is this a list you're willing to live with? Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I'll make my standard kind of statement: I think it's a good list. It may well change as we go ahead but we got to start somewhere and this is - looks to be moderately complete at this point and as we iterate on the list just as we'll iterate on policy processes we will end up with something that we're proud of. But yes, this is a good start.

J. Scott Evans: All right.

Alan Greenberg: And maybe close to a good end.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I see that Cheryl is saying the same thing via text in the chat box. I was going to reach out to her as someone who hasn't been with us but has been involved in a lot of, you know, of these processes over the years to see if looking at it cold without having gone through the discussions if she felt like it sort of covered the bases.

And it seems to - it seems to indicate by her "Yup" it's a good start that we're on the right track. Am I correct there, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep, I'm on mute because it's 5:30 am and my husband is snoring very loudly but...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I know you all hate listening to my husband snore.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right, so we see that we have this list completed. Yes, Greg.

Greg Shatan: As one other point maybe that it needs at a minimum to have a clear decision making process I assume, you know, most of the time that will be consensus. But, you know, SCI is full consensus, GNSO Council is a voting process and if it's a GNSO Council is going to run a policy guidance process should that be a voting process or a consensus process, you know, if they don't delegate it to a working group.

So I think there needs to be, you know, something here, you know, about the, you know, the consensus or voting methodology of consensus or voting needs to be, you know, clearly defined at the outset.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, and you don't think that's handled by Point 2 as Marika points out?

Greg Shatan: Well that's how the results are to be adopted and communicated to the Council. This is kind of the step before that. How will the group it self or the guidance itself be essentially, you know, ratified or voted on or, you know, approved by consensus before it's, you know, adopted by the Council or is it - or are we talking only about a GNSO council policy guidance process while we're talking about this?

Because if it's only the Council then maybe - but even then I think we need to be more clear that - about, you know, that when we're talking about how it will be adopted that, you know, we're talking about perhaps the Council shouldn't be, you know, voting on it in its usual way if it's on policy. But I don't think that comes out in Number 2.

And if this is not a GNSO Council process but a process that might be delegated to a group, whatever it might be called, a policy guidance group, that that group, you know, is not necessarily a consensus group; it almost certainly wouldn't be a voting group, I don't know. So I just think it needs to be in there.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I will go to Marika who had her hand up next.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think the assumption is, but I think it may be a good point to clarify here that, you know, the Council should specify if, you know, what indeed (unintelligible) how decisions are made. But I think the way the Council currently operates is that, you know, any effort works on the GNSO Working Group Guidelines which outline the standard process for decision making unless otherwise indicated.

And that is also, I think, how any, you know, charter for any effort these days is billed that it's basically that standard process unless the Council specifically, you know, provides a different decision making process.

But I'm happy to add a point there that indeed the Council needs to, you know, make sure at the outset what - whether the, you know, standard decision making process is followed or whether other rules apply.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. Marika said basically what I was going to say. If you look at history essentially the Council never delegates anything except occasionally it will delegate something to its chair. So it's not very likely it's going to delegate a policy process to some working group and then say pass it on to the Board or whoever, don't bother coming back to us.

But should the Council decide to do that it would have to do it exclusively. So I'm not sure we need something here. It certainly doesn't hurt if we want to,

you know, say that, you know, decisions - formal decisions have to be made by Council unless it decides otherwise and any group it delegates a responsibility to must have formal processes for making their decisions.

I think that's pretty well given, however, within the makeup of both working groups and other things we form but it doesn't hurt to say it.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right, so what I'm hearing is that's the only addition that we might - we want to add at this stage knowing that these things may change as we move on - forward. Correct? I see Avri's typing something. Okay. I see not needed change. Not sure what that means, Avri. Ah, she's raised her hand.

Yes, Avri. You may be on mute. There you go, I think I hear you now. No. Okay I see your microphone is going on and off a couple of times but I'm not hearing anything. Is anyone else hearing something, it's just me? Okay.

All right, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Just, you know, maybe to wrap this up I think that, you know, I look at this being introduced by the statement, a GNSO policy guidance process so this is not, you know, limited to working group as we know it, it's, you know, includes whatever other processes we might recommend that might take place under other circumstances.

You know, especially as the GNSO or the GNSO Council is asked for policy guidance. So that's why I think that since this is not necessarily run under a guideline that already exists that when - if we are designing maybe a novel process for giving lightweight policy guidance that it needs to be clear how the decision making process of that group will occur, you know, and what the ultimate method will be whether it's a Council group or subgroup of the Council or a non-working group or whatever it might be. That's just my point, thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. I just want to clarify something because, you know, the charter is quite specific about it that this is really focused on the GNSO so the only entity that could basically invoke this guidance process would be the Council or at least that's, you know, I think how it's envisioned or intended. It's not that this would be a kind of process where anyone can just start it up and, you know, start moving down the track.

So I think indeed providing the clarity that, you know, if or when the Council invokes this process and if it decides indeed that it would form a small group, you know, to provide an initial recommendations that would come to the Council that's for that initial group there is a need to clarify how it would need to take decisions.

I think it's probably helpful to clarify. But I think it's always envisioned as being the GNSO Council as the initiator of this process so that it would always be this vetting mechanism whereby the Council decides whether or not this process or, you know, a variation of this process or whatever, you know, we at the end of the day come out with that they would decide, you know, whether that is used and if so how it would be used and what the rules of that process are.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I just wanted to point out that the Annex A of the bylaws say the GNSO - the GNSO may use processes other than the PDP - the formal PDP process if it sets rules for them. So the presumption is if we come up with some other process we must set rules which is why I don't think we need to explicitly say here part of any set of rules are going to be how decisions are made.

Now, you know, whether it's something as convoluted as the PDP or something a lot simpler the GNSO in chartering some other entity has to be

satisfied that it has - that there are reasonable processes for carrying out its dues. So that's already implied in the bylaws.

J. Scott Evans: And I see Avri is in agreement with that statement. Greg, is that an old or new hand?

Greg Shatan: Well it's an old hand but I still think that it's a point that's worth making in this list because we've seen the Council take on giving policy guidance itself. And when it's done so it's done so by vote. So I think it is, you know, it needs to be clear that whatever takes place, you know, maybe it shouldn't be by vote if the Council, you know, delegates to itself as a committee of the whole to be giving policy guidance.

I just - to my mind it kind of rises above as least as important as the 12 points that are enumerated here. And I don't think it's complicated; I think it's really, you know, rather simple. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. I guess it doesn't hurt here in terms of Council making decisions Council only makes decisions based on voting; there are no other mechanisms especially in these days of bicameral Council for it to take decisions. So there just is no other way. But if we want to add something that any work group must have, you know, processes by which it can take decisions I don't think it particularly hurts; I think it's somewhat redundant but.

J. Scott Evans: The point is it needs to be clear and that it may not be necessarily, you know, rough consensus.

Alan Greenberg: Doesn't hurt to put it in this document. I don't think it's necessary but - in an unusual situation Avri and I seem to be agreeing.

J. Scott Evans: I'm glad I could bring the two of you together. Well, I mean, we can put it here now. It's not a - and as we work through we may find that we don't need it.

But, I mean, Greg is bringing up a point that so I'll ask the group by indication of arrows is anyone that is strongly opposed, and I know Avri has - if you remain so I would appreciate that you continue to use your arrow - are there others that are in that believe we should not add it to this list? So if you think we should not add it to the list post an X. If you think - you don't mind or you think it's okay post a checkmark.

Have no idea what Cheryl's - oh a rabbit. Okay. So, I mean, as I look at this it looks like we can add that to it, Marika.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: I don't think there's, you know, I think there's perhaps one very strong opinion and I think just so we know just in case the chat doesn't get captured Avri thinks it complicates matters and that's the reason she - she thinks it's already clear and it doesn't need to - we don't need to add that to it. Okay.

All right so if we go back to our mapping document.

Marika Konings: J. Scott, which one do you need?

J. Scott Evans: That's the one that Chuck put together.

Marika Konings: Oh okay.

J. Scott Evans: I think that we can - under Item 3 can we not change B2 to purple and B1 to purple because we've completed those. We've got us a list of lessons learned. We've done the strong and weak points. We've just now finalized a list of lessons learned. Any thoughts, comments, concerns? Anne agrees.

Okay so I think we can do that. And then Marika, should we - I think at this point we can go to - we need to finish out Deliverable 1 so we need to look at those questions for 1C. And, Marika, can you bring us up to date on where we are on this document because I missed a call or two and I think that's when you were focused on this document and so it would be helpful to me if you could just bring us up to date on this document here.

Marika Konings: Yeah, so this is Marika. So the questions that are highlighted under Section C in the document that you have on your screen were a number of questions that were raised in the staff discussion paper. As we were going through it we did realize that some of those were not specific to this deliverable but more appropriate for others so I think those we flagged and basically are intended to move to, you know, when we get to those deliverables.

And what we also did is actually added the input from the Registry Stakeholder Group that was received in relation to some of these items. And I think we basically left off at Item E and we were discussing Item E which talks about there should be recognition of the potential for overlap and responsibilities between an SO, AC and ICANN such as when an issue can be subject of a PDP where it still may be appropriate for staff or the Board to act.

In ICANN's multistakeholder bottom up policy development structures the inability to reach consensus on key issues could produce (unintelligible) by the default preserve the status quo instead of enabling badly needed change. Example of this might be vertical integration issue or the changes to the RAA.

In addition there may be instances where competing policy advice is given by different SO ACs. How the Board expects to handle such situations. And one question there was at least on the last point that's probably not in the scope for this working group to address but the question of indeed, you know, having competing policy advice issues is something that of course could occur.

And we've seen it actually happening recently with actually policy recommendations, not even just, you know, policy guidance or advice as we're now looking at.

There are a couple of notes that are already in that in there that we've added. And I'm not sure if we still need to go further into this issue or whether we can move on to Question F.

J. Scott Evans: All right, team, what do you think? Cheryl says go to F. Others? Is everybody comfortable? Yeah, I don't know if it's in scope for us to answer that second question but there's nothing, you know, that that last question, how the Board expect to handle such situations. But there does seem to me, if this is occurring, we - somebody needs to come up with a mechanism or a suggested mechanism for handling those situations.

Okay, let's go to F. F, one distinction to consider between formal capital P policies and little capital - little policy may be expected longevity of the policy. For example, formal policies under the new GNSO PDP can only be modified after implementation by undergoing another formal PDP.

This results in formal capital P policy becoming everlasting and long lasting. In contrast could a little small P policy adopted to meet the need of a specific circumstance, example, the Conflickr response, evolve based upon changing circumstances or experiences with the effectiveness of a little P policy?

The Registries say yes. Policies or procedures that are developed to address very specific circumstances should not be continued if the circumstances change. They should be modified or ended as the circumstances change.

Now I can't tell from the Registry comment if they're talking about all policies or little policy P or big policy P because it's the beginning of a sentence.
Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I just wanted to provide a little bit more context or indeed I think the thinking behind the question because I think it partly talks about the fact that what we've now been looking at is near - is basically a response mechanism. When the Board asks for something or where someone else asks for something and that, you know, currently the GNSO doesn't have a formal mechanism to provide such feedback (unintelligible).

I think what this question asks is as well should that alternative process also be a kind of lightweight PDP. Where we are looking at, you know, policy questions but that either don't require a consensus policy because they're not seen as indeed, you know, requiring contractual changes or creating new obligations on parties but there are, you know, certain policy questions where the GNSO may want to make recommendations on either for, you know, ICANN to act on or as, you know, suggestions or best practices to certain groups.

So I think the question is partly like what we're looking at now the policy guidance or advice process is that something that is only intended to be used in response to a specific request or is that also a mechanism that could be used as a kind of lightweight PDP process that the Council can invoke as well for new kinds of issues or, you know, issues that have evolved out of something else where there is the sense that something should be done not specifically in response to the Board asking for it or another group asking for it but why - with which the GNSO may act.

And again just to point out as well that if you look at the flow chart for a PDP it does clearly outline that the first step that, you know, if indeed the Council identifies that it's not intended to result in consensus policy it may use other processes. But those other processes are currently not defined.

I think the question is is what we're looking at now in trying to develop could it also qualify as one of those other processes as the Council decides on how to address a certain issue that would form an alternative path to a PDP.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Marika. I see we have two hands up. I'm going to go with Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. You know, as per the Chinese curse, we live in interesting times. Just a little while ago I don't think the GNSO would have taken up any discussion that wasn't clearly gTLD-related very strongly. The GNSO is now getting involved in other things and believes that occasionally has to speak on other things.

And I don't think it's unreasonable that any process that we've developed which is suitable for policy development could be used for something else. I don't see any reason to restrict it. So I think we're doing good work which might be of use to the GNSO in its endeavors outside of the formal policy development. So I don't think we need to explicitly allow for it but I think it could well happen.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, can I be heard this time? I bet you I can.

J. Scott Evans: You can.

Avri Doria: So I think (unintelligible) I think I'm largely agreeing with Alan. I think the way things are already stated, and I probably should just put my hand down at that point but I wanted to try talking. I think that if the - as the rules already say, other processes can be used.

If we define "other processes" I doubt we're going to define it in such a way that says it may not be used. I would hope not. So, I mean, I see it as pretty

simple as, yeah, if we define a process, that can be activated by a request there's no reason (unintelligible) GNSO Council itself. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, you dropped off there but I'm assuming you said to summarize, this is J. Scott summarizing Avri who blanked out there just for a minute, that if we came up with a process for handling - when we receive a request there's nothing that would prevent the GNSO from using that in other circumstances that same process. Yes, okay. So that's what she was saying.

Okay, you just - you fell off at one point and there was a blank in that. So I tend to agree with Avri. This is J. Scott. That - and we could indicate that in our recommendation. Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, J. Scott. Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I think - and I'm (unintelligible) - let me start that again. I am in absolute agreement with Avri and Alan on this. But I just wanted to make the point that what this allows for is quite necessary agility. And I think agility is something that we're going to need more of in the future.

But I do think we should come back to what the Registry Stakeholder Group said here and that is of course it doesn't mean that these things move on in perpetuity. You know, that procedures are developed to address very specific circumstances and should not be continued if the circumstances change. I think that balance between agility and adaptability is very important and I'd like to capture that somewhere. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Thanks, Cheryl. All right, I don't think there's anything that prevents us from making a recommendation that, you know, pointing out the very points that Cheryl just made about adaptability and agility and finding that if this process is one that offers that this could have uses for the GNSO beyond those that it was originally designed for if it effectuates a solution to perceived weaknesses with how the GNSO handles particular issues.

So - and I think that could be noted in our report, you know, to put the seed there. I mean, I think Cheryl and Avri will have to correct me but we said the same thing with regards to the Working Group Guidelines I believe that while they were specific to GNSO working groups they could be used by any group to conduct a committee or working group that they were not specifically, you know, and we encouraged people to do so because it gave a framework in which to have - offer an orderly process. I think that's sort of where we ended up. Marika was, I think, our staff liaison on that.

And so, yeah, and we encouraged the CCs, you're right, to consider them as well. Cheryl, you're correct. She says this in the text chat. So - and so I think that that same sort of flexibility with regards to how this is used will only be reinforced if we are cognizant enough to make that recommendation explicitly. I think it gives it some ability.

And my personal opinion the basic issue is whether the - whatever mechanism we come up with is trusted by the community because I think if it's trusted by the community then everyone will be very supportive of its adoption for broader application than whatever chartered application it might be initially proposed for.

And that's the crux. And that will have to do with not only what we recommend but also in how that comes into play over the - once it's put into play. All right, any other comments here? Tom is a registrar. Do you have any particular thoughts with regards to this one? Okay.

So I think then, Marika, we are finished with looking at and deciding the questions that we need to ponder. Yes, ma'am, I see your hand is up.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just to note indeed we've completed C but we still have as well D, E and I think we still need to - we have F as well and I think then we're supposed to go back as well to B which I think we said we would leave as the last item to come back to.

J. Scott Evans: So we have D...

Marika Konings: Yeah and this is Marika. Again I think for some of these items I think for D, E and maybe as well F I think we just basically need to reflect as well I think because some of these are sections from the charter and we just need to make sure that we focus on those items that are of specific relevance to this deliverable I think is some of the questions will also come up in relation to some of the other deliverables.

So I think we just basically make sure that we, you know, cover those items that are more relevant to what we're talking about here while some of the others are still relevant questions but not specifically to this deliverable.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right, do we want to go - move on, everyone, to look at questions in the D? We might be able to get through those today or at least get started. Cheryl Langdon-Orr is willing to do so, so I'm going to take Cheryl on her word and we're going to move forward.

I think with regards to what lessons learned from past experience at least I think we've got a basis for that because we've done the chart; we've come up with our lessons learned, is that not correct? This is a tough crowd today, guys.

Yeah, I think you're right, Avri, these are good questions. And I think - I think that it's clear to me at least what are the consequences of an action being considered policy versus implementation. I think you could write an entire treatise on that.

But I think the crux of the matter is one requires formal PDP and one at least in the past has been that it doesn't. There's been a thought that it doesn't require that. And that's been the seismic shifting is when one - one group views it as implementation and another group views it as creating policy and

what formal or processes have to be followed in order to move forward. Am I incorrect in that?

Greg says he agrees. I think that that's sort of the crux. And I think - I think - yes, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, in terms (unintelligible) talking about the crux are we talking about just the past or are we talking about where we're heading? So the lessons we learn are things that point us to the new. While that may have been the case in the past is that something that we've also learned should be fixed (unintelligible) what the, you know, (unintelligible) questions is we started looking at what some of the past consequences are.

I'm not sure they've all been digested yet but certainly, you know, the starting to look at them has been done. But in terms of the consequences of changing that definitional mix I don't think we started doing that yet.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. And can you give - oh, Stephanie.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: I can't hear you, Stephanie.

Stephanie Perrin: Can't hear, eh?

J. Scott Evans: There you are.

Stephanie Perrin: Am I there now?

J. Scott Evans: Yes, ma'am.

Stephanie Perrin: Can you hear me?

J. Scott Evans: Yes, ma'am.

Stephanie Perrin: Oh very good. Sorry, I think I'm asking the same...

J. Scott Evans: I think we may have lost you again. Yeah, I think it's the Adobe Connect problem. If you're speaking through your computer we're losing you. So, Stephanie, we're not hearing you. If you'd like to write your comment in the chat box I'd be happy to relay it to the group. Now this is my company's product, Alan, I take that as an affront.

Alan Greenberg: Then you should get it fixed.

J. Scott Evans: Well it's worked - I mean, this is the only time we've had this problem on all the calls I've ever been on so. Okay so at this point I'm going to stop us because we're having some communication errors and hoping that they'll clear up for the next time. We can pick up here.

So our next meeting is going to be next - oh, our next meeting is going to be next Wednesday at 1900 UTC. Marika is very excited, for those of you that don't know, Holland is playing Argentina in the next few minutes so ending early only allows her to get to the pub faster.

But I would like us to pick up here. We'll have another meeting next week. I would encourage you all if you have members of your groups that are on this working group to participate so that we can have broad participation. We're going to watch the participation over the next couple of calls because we want broad participation and we're open to broad participation but that doesn't work unless people actually participate.

And so if you know people who are on here that aren't coming I would ask that you reach out to them and see if you can gently persuade them that - to, you know, as many viewpoints as we have will allow us to work through a lot of issues that we might have to do on the back end if we're not doing it up

front and getting those perspectives brought to the group up front. So I would ask that we do that.

So we will meet again 1900 UTC next Wednesday which is July 16. And I think Chuck will be leading that call for us. In the meantime I want to thank each and every one of you for your participation. If you have any comments that we couldn't pick up today or with regards to the mapping document or the work plan document or you think of anything else please post your comment to the list so that we can, you know, work on those and get those resolved before our next meeting next week.

Thank you all. And with that I'm going to ask for them to sign us off the recording. And thank you all for your time. Talk to you next week.

Avri Doria: Bye.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Bye.

((Crosstalk))

END