

**Policy & Implementation Working Group Meeting  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Wednesday 05 November at 20:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Wednesday 05 November 2014 at 20:00 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-20140910-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr – At-Large  
Chuck Gomes – RySG  
Alan Greenberg-ALAC  
Greg Shatan – IPC  
Michael Graham – IPC  
Anne Aikman-Scalese – IPC  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen – ISPCP  
Tom Barrett – RrSG  
Amr Elsadr - NCUC

Apologies:

Avri Doria-NCSSG  
Olevie Kouami – NPOC  
J.Scott Evans – BC

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings  
Mary Wong  
Amy Bivins  
Karen Lentz  
Berry Cobb  
Steve Chan  
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Okay, all recordings have begun and you may begin at this time.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, (Laurie). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Policy and Implementation Working Group call on the 5th of November, 2014.

On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Alan Greenberg, Greg Shatan, Chuck Gomes, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen and Tom Barrett. We have apologies from Olevie Kouami and Avri Doria.

From staff we have Mary Wong, Marika Konings, Amy Bivins, Karen Lentz, Steve Chan, Berry Cobb 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, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, much appreciated. And welcome, everyone, to our Policy and Implementation Working Group call on this - what are we the 5th of November. Appreciate all of you joining.

And let me ask if anyone has an update to their Statement of Interest. Okay, not hearing or seeing anyone let me also ask is there anyone on the audio that is not in Adobe Connect? Greg, you have your hand up, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Yeah, I am both on audio and Adobe Connect but I do have an update to my statement of interest in that I have changed employers. I am now with the law firm of Ableman, Frayne and Schwab and no longer with the law firm of Reed Smith.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thank you very much, Greg. And as long as they will let you continue to be a great contributor we're okay with that.

Greg Shatan: If not, we'll have to find someplace else that will employ me because this is...

Chuck Gomes: That's right.

Greg Shatan: And much less rewarding financially but much more rewarding in many other ways than my day job.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...that just encapsulates the true spirit of the volunteer in ICANN. And I think there's a moment to pause to think about that because I'm quite sure you're not totally joking, Greg.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: No I'm not.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's right. Yeah, I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: I'm really not here carrying water for a bunch of clients who have hidden agendas, I really am here...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's right.

Greg Shatan: ...out of some guided or misguided element of interest in the larger good.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Greg and Cheryl. And remember to identify for the recording and the transcript when you do speak. I'll try to do it too as though as chair I certainly get tired of repeating my name but I'm sure you'll all bear with me.

So we - you have an agenda on the right there. And our first agenda item, Item Number 2 actually, is to review the implementation review team review table that Marika sent out earlier today.

And we're going to talk about that although we're not going to - Marika's not - she's going to do an overview but she's not going to read everything on that table.

Hopefully all of you can either read it or have a copy that you can read in front of you but let me turn it right over to Marika and ask her to tell us about this.

Marika Konings: So thanks, Chuck. So this is Marika. So what you see on the screen is indeed the document I sent out two or three hours ago, though I made a couple of small edits to the last section here on the questions, but we'll get to that later.

Just wanted you to know that this was a, you know, collaborative effort; we collaborated with several staff members that have been involved in implementation review teams over the years to try to get some feedback on their experiences and especially I think, you know, as we've also done for our initial discussion on, you know, ad hoc processes that the Council has used to kind of approach of, you know, looking at, you know, what were strong points, what were the weak points, what were the lessons we learned from those efforts.

And, you know, what are some of the questions that we've actually derived from that that the working group may want to look at. And I think it may be worth pointing out that probably from a time my perspective you probably need to read this table from right to left as the post expiration domain name

recovery implementation review team was actually the very first implementation review team that was formed.

And I think, you know, I'm not telling anything that surprising to anyone here but it was I think both from the community as well from staff side a real learning experience. I think as you all know the concept of implementation review team doesn't come with a lot of description or details in the PDP manual.

So I think when we started off I think it was from both sides trying to find our way around how would such a body work, I would be interaction with staff work, what were the expectations from both sides. And I think we learned a lot through those different efforts.

And I think the last one we're in now is the thick Whois implementation review team. And I think the main objective of this table was really to try to get you as well all thinking about your experiences. I know several of you have been involved in implementation review teams and maybe add to what we thought were strong points and weak ones or areas for potential improvement and some of the lessons we learned.

But again I think we're very interested as well to get the community perspective at it to that is the hope is that from this information we may be able to derive what our ideal or future state of implementation review teams should look like, you know, what are the basic principles that we believe every review team should meet or function on there.

And then what we did as well...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Marika, this is Chuck.

Marika Konings: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Let me jump in just a second. Go ahead and manage the queue while you're giving your overview. And I see Alan's hand's up.

Marika Konings: Right, let's jump to Alan then.

Alan Greenberg: I could certainly have waited. I just wanted to complement Marika on her skilled phrasing. And I'm looking lessons learned under the very first one, the post expiration domain name recovery where she writes, and I quote, "Regularly scheduled updates from staff to IRT even if just to inform the work schedules on - the work is on schedule might be helpful."

That could otherwise have been phrased, don't go for a whole year without talking to the IRT and then present them with a fait accompli. So the wording is quite direct. And, yes, that lesson has been learned and newer IRTs have done it much better. Thank you, Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Alan. So it's nice to hear that you're confirming some of our areas for potential improvement.

Alan Greenberg: I wish I could write things as tactfully as you do.

Marika Konings: And then basically, as said, you know, if you look at the bottom of the table, you know, the questions that the working group may want to consider so I think based on our lessons learned I think we identified some questions that we believe would really benefit from, you know, further guidance or clarification from the working group.

I think both from a staff perspective as well as a community perspective I think especially looking at, you know, managing expectations to really make sure that I think from a staff side we know what the community is expecting

and also from the community side to understand, you know, what the expectation is and the role is of an implementation review team.

So what I did do quickly before the call was actually go through the questions and try to identify which of those we actually already have covered at least to a certain extent in our - the questions that we identified and which of those are maybe new questions or may be sub questions to some of the broader questions that we identified.

So and I think, you know, I think first of all like do you think those questions are valid? Are there any other questions that you think should be added? And again, I think it specifically looking at people that have been involved in implementation review teams. Are there any things that we've missed year? And, you know, how do we move from here to answering some of those questions and coming up with some potential recommendations.

Before hitting the floor back to you again Chuck, I definitely want to open as well, you know, the floor to some of my staff colleagues who has said, you know, have been actively participating in many of these groups and may have other perspectives that they want to share on this.

As said, you know, we've collaborated on this effort. And as you may understand as well from, you know, from a policy side we may have different perspectives or experiences as from, you know, the GDD side so you do feel free as well to jump in or ask any questions that you may have from staff on the table that we've put together here.

Chuck Gomes: So this is Chuck. Is there anybody from the staff team that worked on this bill wants to speak up, please raise your hand if you would. This is Chuck again. Marika, it sounds like you did such a good job they don't have anything to add.

So before we go to the questions is there any discussion that anyone would like to enter into with regard to this? Again, we're not going to go through and read it together, we don't need to do that. So even if you haven't had time to look at it but if you have a question or a comment before we focus more directly on the questions please raise your hand.

Now while I'm waiting for that let me make a couple comments myself. First of all with regard to the first main road which is methodology for selecting membership, one of the things that I think will want to keep in mind as we do develop some principles or guidelines for IRTs is that a first step in any IRT I think will need to be, or at least one of the early steps, is to identify the type of expertise that is needed for a given IRT. And it won't be the same in every case.

We talked about flexibility last week, and we will need to be flexible there. But I think that will be one of the first steps that needs to be done with an IRT will be to identify the types of expertise that is needed.

Now obviously we are always going to want some expertise from the PDP working group so that we have that continuity. But there will oftentimes be needs for special technical expertise and operational expertise in terms of the registrars or registries who will have to implement the policy.

So I'll throw that out and let's see if anybody else have a question or a comment to add to that? Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think just - I think it's specifically reflected as well as one of staff's lessons learned if you look at the composition of the group you see as well that where we originally started out was basically invitations would go out to the original PDP working group.

And I think that really with the idea in mind and that was also something I think that was quite extensively discussed in development of the revised PDP

was really to focus on those people that developed the original policy recommendations as the role of the IRT is really to make sure that the implementation is, you know, conformed the intend of the policy recommendations.

And the concern was if you would actually open up the IRT beyond the original PDP working group members that there was a very high risk of redoing some of the policy conversations that people would actually come in and say, well but why did you recommend this and not that and, you know, have you actually considered this. And basically having to, you know, redo or basically people trying to maybe reopen as well some of the things that were previously considered.

But as we went through some of the IRTs we realized as well that, you know, I think first of all it's quite difficult as well to, you know, keep the same momentum going that, you know, members that were involved in the policy development working group were there because they were interested in developing - into policy. They're not necessarily interested in, you know, being involved in the implementation.

Also, you know, there's sometimes some lag between when the Council adopts the recommendations and actually implementation starting because you have another public comment period, you have the Board considering, you know, you have the handover to staff. So there's some lag time before that work actually starts. And that also means that, you know, people start moving on to other projects or may have lost interest in the topic itself.

And then, you know, on top of that you also have indeed certain areas where certain expertise is needed that is not necessarily found in the original working group where you often have more policy-focused people and not necessarily, you know, technical expertise.

And you see that, you know, going through the different IRTs and now coming to the thick Whois IRT we really realize that we need a specific kind of expertise to assist with this effort that requires additional outreach and engagement of people that may not have been originally involved in the PDP working group.

So I think that's a recent evolution from the staff side that we've seen and, you know, specifically to your point, Chuck, that indeed in certain cases we will need to go beyond that original group of PDP working group members because, you know, either they're no longer there or not interested or they don't have the right expertise or, you know, represent the directly affected parties that you do want to have involved in the conversation.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. And in the case of the thick Whois PDP I complement the working group on that one because they specifically stated in their recommendations that the impacted parties needed to be included in the implementation part. And of course that is happening as we speak. So that's very important.

And I see that - I think it's Cheryl that agreed with everything you said because her - she's got the little green check mark...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that was deliberate. I'll take it down now because you're talking.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. All right the - now before we go to the questions that I want to focus on next, I'd like to make a suggestion for next step on this other than dealing with the questions and that is if staff could pull out the items in this spreadsheet that are potentially a list of elements of a set of principles and/or guidelines, for our next meeting that would be great.

I think a lot of those are going to come from the strong points row, the potential improvement row and the lessons learned row. But we can condense it down into a small list of things that we're going to want to - that will form the starting point for a set of principles and/or guidelines for IRTs.

Cheryl, you're up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi, thanks. Cheryl for the record. I just wondered whether we needed to pick up on a point you were making, Chuck, about experts. It's been a conversation with a couple of - not so much IRTs but other working groups where people perhaps - and this is at the chartering stage, I will admit - the community, some people in the community are still confused and questioning as to the role of bringing experts in and who selects them and by what criteria does one establish that one is an expert.

And there's a little niggling worry in the back of my mind that says is this another chink in the armor that we need to protect so that we don't end up with what we're avoiding as Marika outlined talking about the IRTs in the very first place and that was to not redo a PDP process by people taking this as a second opportunity to reinfluence outcomes to ways that were not in fact consensus supported in the first place.

So I just wonder whether in the questions we might want to look specifically at from an IRT perspective what if any criteria and to whose standards and to what purpose experts are brought in. So that's the only thing I want to highlight. Thanks, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Cheryl. Let's add that as a question or maybe more than one question - in our list of questions because I think that's a very important point. And we're probably going to have to re-emphasizing that in our final report to make sure that people understand it's not an opportunity to go back and try for things they missed in the PDP.

Karen, please.

Karen Lentz: Thank you, Chuck. This is Karen Lentz. I mainly just wanted to support the comments that Marika and Cheryl were making and you too I think about the necessity of including, you know, affected parties who have the expertise particularly in - when you're talking about a registry or a registrar system or interaction.

As we were - as the team was working on this chart about recent IRT experiences I was kind of thinking back a really long time ago to the kind of assistance group that we had for implementing the registrar transfer policy.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That goes back clear before - sorry for interrupting, Karen, but that goes back to I think before 2004.

Karen Lentz: Yeah. But, you know, I remember it working really well, it was a pretty small group of people and it was people who, you know, were interested in, you know, making sure that the policy did get implemented and that, you know, the customer experience was smooth and all of that.

You know, so it was very focused and so I note that a lot of the discussion in the group currently is about in terms of the IRT is around, you know, making sure there was continuity with the policy and interpretation and all of that which is important but I also, you know, don't want to lose the, you know, the idea of the focus group that's working on getting things done. So...

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Karen. I think that's critical. And I think we - as Marika pointed out that as you looked at the evolving of the recent IRTs from right to left that that began to be recognized more.

Alan, it's your turn.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Just a brief comment that, you know, to some extent these things work very well if everyone is of good will. We've talked a bit about people trying to get a second run at the policy and certainly that kind of thing is possible if you don't have a good balance on the IRT. It is conceivable that someone on the IRT would say no, no, you know, what we really meant by this was, and of course give their position which might not have been the real consensus position.

I don't think that's likely to be real common but it's going to be important as we try to document these things to make it clear that we really do need some level of balance on the IRT to match the balance that was in the original PDP.

You know, as some people have said you get very tired by the end of the PDP and want to be done with it and - but there is some need for making sure that we maintain all of the paths forward. So it's - I don't know how you word that but it's something we're going to want to think about as we do it. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Well my question to Alan is, how do you make sure that happens? Because I think that's something we've seen in some of the recent IRTs, I think it's really difficult to, you know, keep the attention focus of those that are not directly affected by the recommendations or indeed that has no real interest in implementation.

You know, is it sufficient that they are subscribed to the mailing list? Do we consider that sufficient balance? Because, for example, the way it works in, you know, on PDP working groups there's usually an assessment at the start of the call, you know, do we have enough people? You know, is there appropriate balance? And if not, you know, we cancel the meeting or, you know, we go out and get additional participants.

What we've seen in recent IRTs, and I think that's, you know, a bit of a challenge or a struggle for staff is what happens if no one shows up for the call? Does that mean we wait with implementation or we just interpret that as meaning people are happy as things are progressing and they don't see a need to show up to the call?

I think, you know, what I think we've been doing is basically saying - and put out things to the list and saying well this is the latest version and, you know, if we're not receiving any comments this is what we're going to do next as a kind of, you know, flagging that this is moving forward. But I think that's some of the challenges or where, you know, additional guidance might be helpful.

How do we indeed ensure that we do have that balanced participation and how can staff interpret that indeed lack of attendance or lack of comments? Is that, you know, not having time or not being focused on it or does it mean, you know, go along as you were because we don't have any concerns at this stage?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. This is Chuck again. Cheryl, you're up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi, thanks. Although I thought Alan was going to answer some of those questions so I'm happy to cede to Alan.

Chuck Gomes: Alan - this is Chuck again - would you like to respond to Marika's question?

Alan Greenberg: I certainly can. But I don't really know the answer. If people are disinterested there's not a lot you can do. Now typically on these groups there is some continuity on a staff level also or at least I hope there will be. So, you know, if someone on staff is one of the lead people on the PDP, you know, and they sense that the IRT is providing an imbalanced view as it were, you know, maybe they need to beat the bushes and get other people involved. I don't - I'm not sure I know the answer. It certainly is the potential for problems, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Cheryl, your turn.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Cheryl for the record. Okay, the reason I put my hand up, and I'm glad I heard Alan first because I certainly don't have a panacea but I believe that we do have some ability to build confidence in this part of the mode beating the bushes, as Alan puts it, and making a particularly either at the beginning or at critical points in the implementation process making the very proactive - sorry, my dogs are now going to bark, apologies for that - call out to say we do not believe we have suitably balanced representation, etcetera, etcetera. Very valid and should be done.

But I think the lynchpin to confidence here goes to building a strong and robust transparency aspect to it and that's where what you said you've been doing, Marika, and from a staff perspective and that is ensuring that to the list at least, and I note that at least is in my view in capital letters, to the list at least one is getting, from a staff perspective, very regular clear and intelligible updates on exactly how progress is going and indeed raising any critical decision points and questions that are foreseeable in the near future.

And now that second part of what I said is possibly an embellishment on what has been happening. But what that allows the great unwashed masses of our stakeholders and interest groups to do is keep a eye on what's going on and indeed have that system of silence is probably agreement. What it allows ICANN the entity to do is to ensure that nothing is done behind closed doors. And there's not much more you can do from that.

However, I did say list at least, there may be an argument for, in some cases, where it is merited, to push to the wider community some updates at particular milestone or rolled up milestone points in a implementation process.

And there may be, just to bring attention, and there may be a - one or two mandatory phases in a very particularly important or radical set of

implementation and changes where one does have to actually be able to, in inverted commas, prove you have at least reached out to ensure the representation from primary stakeholders or affected parties has been done. And I'm going to get off my soapbox now. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Cheryl. No, that was very good. I put myself in the queue because I wanted to ask a question related to what we're talking about right now. Especially in cases where there may not be a balanced group of volunteers from the PDP working group that are willing and able to participate in the IRT should we have the IRT or Council or - we can deal with who does it later - but should we have them identify a couple liaisons from the PDP working group that would serve in a neutral role to kind of help people stay on track?

Now, Alan, I think you're right that staff will help us do that. But I think it'd be good for us to ask - answer the question, should we also provide for the opportunity to identify a couple liaisons from the working group that would facilitate that neutral role with regard to what we're talking about right now.

So I'd just throw that out as a question that we may want to capture and come to some sort of a decision on later. And I'll turn it to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Well I'm not sure there are really a lot of neutral people on most working groups. I mean, there's normally a Council liaison but as often as not that person doesn't actually participate in the discussions. So I'm not sure we could really do what you're saying. And then there's no guarantee that person actually is paying attention.

Chuck Gomes: Alan, if I - this is Chuck. Let me respond to that. I agree with you that people generally aren't neutral. But from what I've seen most people can assume a relatively neutral role if that's what they're tasked with. And they can wear a couple hats, one where they're neutral and one where they're not. So I agree with you that we may not be able to find somebody who's really neutral but

from what I've seen, a lot of people can function in a relatively neutral role if they know that that is needed.

But, your point is well taken. Let me turn it to Greg.

Alan Greenberg: Well and if...

Chuck Gomes: Oh go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: ...Chuck, if I may continue for a moment? I'm not sure it's many but certainly there are a lot of people who can do that. And I think the chair is probably someone who would be a good one to try to buttonhole to maintain the continuity.

That's someone who obviously cared enough about the process to put a huge amount of effort into it and typically is in a position to reflect all of the different opinions, whether they believe them or not is a different matter. But so that's certainly something you can do to try to maintain the balance that you want. But, again, we're still dealing with a volunteer effort and possible burnout.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck again. And I think you make a very good point to the extent it's possible the chair or a co chair, if there is one, from the working group might be a good person to coerce into the role if we can. So - but anyway that's a very good point. Thanks. Greg, you're up.

Greg Shatan: Hi, it's Greg Shatan. I guess one of the things I'm grappling here with is kind of the timeline here at which in terms of a liaison the PDP working group I would assume is kind of wrapping up or has wrapped up and the IRT kind of takes place afterwards. So they're not really liaising; the PDP working group essentially goes out of existence I think and gets replaced by the IRT.

That said, it's important I think to have, you know, continuity of membership on the IRT from the working group and probably particularly important for the reasons just discussed that the chair of the working group serve, if at all possible, on the IRT. But I think calling it a liaison is probably not quite the right characterization of the role. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: This is chuck again. Thanks, Greg. You're absolutely right, and we don't need to call it a liaison. But whether it's a representative from the group or what we can deal with the words later. But good point, thank you. And Cheryl, it's your turn again.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Cheryl for the record. You just triggered something that's been riveting around in the back of my mind for quite some time in all of these gatherings as community to work for the greater good exercises that we put ourselves into.

And that is that I suspect that we are not, as an entity, and here I'm talking ICANN-wide, but certainly in the policy bodies and I'm including all of the SOs here, not giving enough public - and I'm going to use the word "credit" carefully - to the importance of these groups to attract and to continue to attract enough variety, respect, for what's put into them and efforts that the volunteers make.

Part of me thinks that not having - that having the burnout issues and not having, as you say, the necessary people wanting with the right talents for neutrality and representational roles to continue because they're volunteers and they have real lives occasionally, part of that I think is a recognition of volunteering problem.

And there may be something systemic that can be done. But it would perhaps need to be a pincer approach so from our work group perspective, we probably need to set up a set of criteria and establish some guidelines that show how important what this thing is, is and show how vital is to have

human touch points between what has gone on in the PDP and what needs to go on in implementation.

And that value proposition for that role is seen correctly by the community we may not have as much of a problem. As I say it's just one of those things that's been rattling around in my ICANN part of my files in the brain for some time but we don't value volunteering effectively or well and that might be part of the problem. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Cheryl. Chuck again. And what I'd like to ask you to do, Cheryl, and you can do it now if it's possible but it can be done after this meeting as well, but if you could put that into a question or questions that can be added to our list here for a higher teakwood and that would be great.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Oh go ahead, Cheryl, did you want to say something else?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, I'll just say Cheryl here just taking that as an action item. Thank you.  
Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. One of the additional challenges with that is that or, you know, attracting volunteers and I think as I explained before that PDP working group finishes the moment it hands over its recommendations to the Council.

But between that and Council adoption, Board adoption and staff been doing the handover and I think that is usually and - I think what we started off with that, you know, we would go ahead immediately after Board adoption and, you know, send out a call for volunteers to try to be as close as possible to the completion of the effort to people, you know, so people would still remember.

But we realize as well that often that it's too early because, you know, I think as Karen was pointing out as well in the chat it's really important that we are able to define the scope of the work and are able to comment may be in a call for volunteers, you know, highlight what are the specific areas of expertise that we think would be valuable for the effort.

And of course that can always be, you know, complemented by the IRT if they believe certain expertise or groups are missing. So ideally that would only happen probably after the staff has done its handover, so that you know, to GGD team can identify as well like well this is the expertise we already have in-house but these are some of the things that we probably will really need in order for this to happen.

But if you look at the timeframe between that and, you know, that PDP working group you're probably quickly talking about six months. So how can you make sure that, you know, that gap doesn't mean indeed that you've lost all the interest from PDP working group participants but also that, you know, they haven't forgotten about what was actually discussed.

And, you know, I even notice that myself when we sometimes go into IRT meetings and someone asks like well, you know, why did we recommend that again? And I basically have to go back and dig into my email because I do recall that we spoke about it but I don't remember, you know, six months or a year later who said what and why it actually ended up there.

And I think that is one of the additional challenges of, you know, IRTs and how to - and I don't know what the answer is because I think that's one of the realities that in order for us to be able to identify what expertise we need it automatically means that we're probably much further out from where the original work - PDP working group was, and those people have, you know, already moved on.

So I think - and I don't know how to address it or what the right answer is but it's just I think one of the realities that we are dealing with at the same time.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Marika. Alan, your turn.

Alan Greenberg: I'll add one more wrinkle to it. It's not only the lag time to get it started, it's the actual time it takes. Some of these implementations take an awful lot longer than people imagine they're going to. And perhaps the best case is the thick Whois one right now which once the group got to the point of having a rough timeline that timeline - it's currently scheduled out about 2.5 years.

You know, this is really difficult to get commitments and people's memory to function over that kind of timeline. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. This is Chuck again. And good discussion going on in the chat as well. I'll let you look at that. With regard to the lag time, and this kind of goes back to a suggestion that Michael made in the chat, should we maybe have - maybe recommend a change to the working group guidelines that would suggest that the PDP working group in their final recommendations try to identify someone who would be willing to serve in the capacity that we're talking about to make sure we have that continuity.

And anyway that's just another thought on that regard. Very good discussion on this. I think this is all going to be very beneficial as we start pulling some principles and guidelines together for IRTs.

What I'd like us to do now is to focus on the questions in the next-to-last row of the spreadsheet that's on the screen. And if you're like me and I have a bigger monitor than my laptop, but it's pretty hard to read. So I'm going to ask Marika to kind of go through the questions. And it will come back and discuss them later but identify which ones we've already - and she's done this I think in the spreadsheet. But I can't see it on mine.

So, Marika, if you could go over those and identify which ones are already included in our list of questions for Charter Questions 3, 4 and 5, that would be very helpful and then we can talk about them a little bit.

Also let me point out that this leads right into Agenda Item 3 today which is to continue review and discussion of the charter questions. So Marika, if you could go through the questions and flag the ones that we've not covered yet that are new, that would be very helpful.

Marika Konings: Sure. So this is Marika. So what you see indeed in the bottom table - and I'll send out this updated version with the notes from today's meeting. I tried to flag for some of the questions that I think are already covered in the questions we had originally identified or even if they weren't specifically identified I think we are ready touched upon those.

So, you know, balancing indeed between experts, input and participation and ensuring that participants are familiar with the original policy recommendations and PDP working group deliberations I think we already discussed that extensively now.

I think we already also spoke about it under Questions A and B. So, you know, the optional versus mandatory version and how IRTs should be expected to operate. What should be the modus operandi for IRTs, and I think that specifically, you know, of course Question B that we already had.

Should and IRT or implementation effort proceed if even after outreach there are no sufficient qualified volunteers to ensure that key affected parties are participating. I don't think we have a specific question on that. Maybe that's partly covered under B.

I know we touched upon it as well during our last meeting I think under A where, you know, we discussed even a, you know, a team of one could form

and IRT and, you know, if there is no interest in participation maybe there's a sign that the community doesn't believe there is a need for an IRT.

So again I think that's something we do need to address at some point. And I think we are detached upon it today as well. But what if we don't have enough volunteers, you know, is it then just that we publicly post and, you know, allow people to speak up if they believe that, you know, it's going off track or indeed should there be this designated liaison that at least there's always one person at least that, you know, is following this and is able to flag things to the Council if they believe that there is a need for further consideration.

How should feedback via - oh no, 4, what mechanisms should be used to formally object? And I think that's Question D where we're talking about how is feedback as well as flagging of potential issues to the Council by the IRT and managed.

Number 5, how should feedback via public comments on proposed policy language be handled where attempts to change the consensus recommendations are evident? And I think that's also probably covered partly under Question D. And I think there, you know, we may touch upon as well I think some of the experiences we've had to date with the IRTs.

And at least from my experience I think that's where the IRTs have been really helpful and very constructive where indeed comments came in asking for changes to the policy recommendations and where the IRT was basically able to say we already discussed that, we considered it, you know, you can go and look here but this is where we ended up up there, which of course is much more difficult for staff to say but I think where, you know, that backup or the feedback from and IRT there is crucial for making that determination.

And Number 6, how to maintain continuity in the issue even if the development of implementation plan takes longer than originally anticipated. I

think that again comes back to the conversation we've had today, it's not a specific question we have identified but probably something we do want to think about and maybe have some recommendations around.

How should GDD staff respond to a stalemate regarding ambiguous language in a recommendation from the working group final report and subsequently approved by the Council and Board? And I think it's not something we've covered either here but I think it's indeed basically the question what if recommendations in the end come to the GDD team and they don't really know what to do with it, is that really then the IRT role or - are indeed the policy recommendations not sufficiently clear.

Eight, and I think it goes, 8, 9 and 10, I think go again a bit as well to the conversation we've been having now, you know, what is appropriate level of knowledge for participation in an IRT? And, you know, is participation in the PDP is that adequate or, you know, is additional knowledge or at least registrar or registry operations knowledge adequate?

So I think that goes again around the question of expertise required, should there be minimum requirements for someone to be able to volunteer for a PDP? And I think we probably touch upon that as well in Question B.

But it may be helpful for the next meeting if I would maybe incorporate some of these questions as kind of sub questions underneath our main questions so we don't lose or, you know, forget about those.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marika. This is Chuck again. And I really like your last suggestion there. We've got questions floating around in different places with differing numbering schemes and so forth and I think if you could do what you just suggested in terms of putting the sub questions under the main questions and so forth and lumping all of the IRT related questions, regardless of whether they come from the charter or some of these new questions,

together I think that would be very beneficial for us in proceeding with discussing the questions.

By the way, with regard to Question 10, I would just suggest one minor edit. Knowledge of registry and or registrar operations, okay, are they adequate. And of course the thick Whois IRT is a specific example of that. It's really registry expertise that comes into play in that when rather than registrar.

Often it's, with regard to the IRTP PDPs, it really was largely registrar expertise. So again it will vary. But I would just modify that Question 10 slightly in that regard. Any other general discussions before we take a few minutes to start going through these questions?

Okay, not seeing anyone. We talked about Question Number 1 in the first column there which is, should IRTs be mandatory? My perception from our meeting last week is that we haven't reached consensus on that. At some point we're going to need to come up with - try and reach some consensus on how we want to answer that. We don't necessarily have to do that right now but we will need to come back to that one.

Question 2, should an IRT have a designated GNSO Council liaison? That actually came up today in quite a bit of the discussion that we've had in this meeting, so we certainly started to discuss that.

Let me go over to Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. Triggered by your previous point on not having reached a conclusion, what I have started doing is taking our notes and actually trying to start, you know, transforming that into a kind of, you know, potential chapter for our initial report basically flagging, you know, or highlighting what are conversations were.

And my idea was maybe for the next meeting to try and write up some maybe, you know, preliminary conclusions or, you know, preliminary recommendations based on that conversation which may form a starting point for, you know, the working group to further define that.

And I think at least on the mandatory or not IRT question, at least for my note I think we did come to some kind of agreement or at least as I have written it down, as say, you know, in principle they should be mandatory that there should be exceptions possible if the Council decides so.

So again I can maybe try to write up some of that and push that back to the group so you can see if that reflects what was discussed or discuss how you want to change that and that may be a way as well for each of those questions trying to go through and as you see I've been trying to capture the conversation. But I think as you said as well at some point we need to try to get to what are we actually recommending.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much Marika. This is Chuck again. And I take you up on your offer there. And let's make sure that's early in the agenda next week with regard to the should IRTs the mandatory question.

Okay, any other general comments or questions? Okay, how do you think the best way is - I'll finish my question, Amr, and then I'll turn it over to you. Does anybody have any ideas how the best way to proceed through these questions might be from a practical point of view?

And I'll come back to that but first let me let Amr speak.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Chuck. This is Amr. And apologize for being late to today's call. I'm coming into this conversation a little late on whether IRTs should be mandatory or not. I don't recall the specific language but if I'm not mistaken I think there are provisions in the GNSO Operating Procedures on actual PDP working groups or PDPs being postponed or canceled in the event that there

isn't - under certain circumstances such as a lack of interest from participants actually joining them.

So if this working group determines that IRTs should be mandatory maybe we could balance that out by also providing similar provisions that, okay, IRTs are mandatory but under certain situations they can be, I mean, we don't have to have them. Just a thought. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Amr. This is Chuck. Marika, go ahead and respond.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. And, you know, as I was looking back at the note on the last meeting before the call, I mean, some of the examples that, you know, we came up with as reasons why you may not need or want an IRT.

So example if the actual, you know, recommendations from policy development process do not require any implementation as such it may be the recommendations are recommendations to the Board or, you know, recommendations to the staff but unnecessarily having, you know, an impact on contracted parties that require, you know, contractual language or additional implementation efforts.

Or alternatively, you know, for example looking at IRTP, if you already have an existing IRT you may not want to create another one if you really see that there's duplication or overlap in membership or a very similar issue being addressed. So indeed that maybe specific reasons why at the outset there may not be a need for an IRT.

However, I thinking relation to actually closing one down I think that is probably another conversation or I think different from a PDP. And I think as we said before, I mean, as staff is leading or driving the implementation, you know, it can be forward on things if, you know, as long as there is a view that, you know, we are going along the track and no one has any objections and it conforms the intent of the policy recommendation.

So even though and IRT maybe they are in a kind of dormant state I think it's still very valuable to have them there. So and I think, you know, Cheryl made, you know, a really good point about that, as long as I think staff at a regular point in time, you know, provide updates and give opportunity to people to speak up if they believe that there are issues that need to be considered.

But if, you know, if there is no one speaking out, you know, we just make the assumption that, you know, well we're on the right track. But I think it would be a risk if we would actually completely shut it down because I think then, you know, there's no obvious mechanisms for anyone raising their hand or maybe, you know, maybe there are only certain concerns that come up in the later stage of the process; may be in the initial phases it's all very straightforward and the questions only come at a later stage.

So I think that's where we may want to be careful about actually shutting down if one has been created but I do agree that I think at the outset in certain cases there may not be a need to have one obligatory there.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Marika. Chuck again. And so with regard to the first question which is should IRTs be mandatory, and by the way, Amr, we didn't talk too much about that today, that discussion happened mostly in the call last week.

But Marika has committed to providing a position, I guess I'll call it that, based on the discussions we had mostly last week but I'm sure it'll include what we've talked about today as well and that will be an early agenda item next week for us to try to see if we can reach some consensus in the language we want to use with regard to that question.

So, let's plan on that for next week. And as we're getting close to wrapping up the call today let me first thank you all for what I thought was a very constructive discussion today, a lot of material came out that will I think guide us in our work ahead so thank you very much for that.

And let me also say we have our next meeting, same time same station next week. And then last of all I want to say if the rest of you are like me I'm a little bit behind on the policy implementation work. I'm sure Greg can relate to the challenges with regard to the IANA transition work that's going on because he's been very busy on that, and others have as well including Marika.

So - but I did start to review the - what is it, that GNSO guidance process, the GGP, that Marika send out quite a while ago and put some comments on it. So my plan is to, later today, to finish that with my comments and any edits that I thought might be helpful, to this full group.

And what I'd like to ask you to do is to review it yourself and add to comments, disagree with my comments, right in the document so that we can continue our discussion - have our discussion on that sometime in the not-too-distant future.

Marika, you have your hand up, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think your definition of a long while ago is probably different from mine because I think we set it out last week. But I think at this stage everything looks like a blur.

That I did want to mention that indeed, you know, a lot of stuff is going on. And although I think the last call we said that, you know, we were trying to do our best to get the other two manuals to you, you know, around the time of this call we do need a little bit more time.

I think we've already put quite something together so I am hopeful that, you know, towards the end of the week or early next week we'll be able to share those but hopefully we have your indulgence and taking a little bit more time than we had originally anticipated due to all the other things going on at the same time.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marika. Chuck again. And in the leaders' call we had before this meeting I told her it was just fine to take a little more time because I'm having trouble keeping up. So I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't think you're alone there, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I suspect that the rest of you feel the same way. So thanks, though, Marika for giving us an update on that. And let me just see if anybody has anything else before I adjourn the call.

Okay, thanks everybody. Have a good rest of the week.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Chuck. Thanks, everyone. Bye.

Marika Konings: Thanks, bye.

Mary Wong: Thank you, bye.

Greg Shatan: Bye all.

Coordinator: And that does conclude today's conference and parties may disconnect at this time.

END