

GNSO New Meeting Strategy Drafting Team Meeting TRANSCRIPTION Thursday 09 April 2015 at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO New Meeting Strategy Drafting Team meeting on Thursday 09 April 2015 at 1300 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-meeting-strategy-drafting-team-09apr15-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#apr> (transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Volker Greimann - RrSG
James Bladel – RrSG
William Drake – NCUC
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Rafik Dammak – NCSG
Cherie Stubbs – RySG Secretariat (Observer)

Apologies:

None received

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings
Gisella Gruber
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Please go ahead; this afternoon's conference call is now being recorded.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much, (Tim). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the first GNSO New Meeting Strategy Drafting Team Call on the 9th of April 2015. On the call we have Volker Greimann, (Shelly Stubbs), Rafik Dammak, Bill Drake, and James Bladel. We

received no apology from today's call. And from staff we have Marika Konings, Gisella Gruber, myself -- Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Volker.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Nathalie. This is Volker speaking. Thank you all for attending this session today and I'll move straight along to the second part of the day, the confirmation of the rollover draft (unintelligible) the proposed timeline. As you know, the meeting structure will be changed in the coming - upcoming year, so we will have three different formats of ICANN meetings, a short -- standard -- a medium, and a long format. And I believe the short format will cause us the most discussion and pain because it will drastically require a change of what the GNSO and how the GNSO Council does its business.

Our role as a drafting team at this stage is to - is -- at least under my understanding -- is to draft a proposal for the Council for schedule or a draft schedule for the upcoming meeting structures for all three meetings. And propose that to the Council for a vote or a decision by any other means. However, I'm - would be interested in any other opinions as to the role of the drafting team. And I would like to open the floor at this time. Marika, you have your hand up.

Marika Konings: Yeah, Volker. So this is Marika. My understanding as well -- and I - eventually it may get to a vote -- but my understanding was as well that there's a first staff we would indeed prepare a skeleton schedule for the three meetings that we would indeed take back to the Council to at least get their endorsement on that. But that as a next step it would actually be shared with all the SOs and ACs for further conversation to make sure that there's no conflict or, you know, unnecessary overlap with, you know, how other groups may be scheduling their meetings.

And again, I think it's especially probably relevant in relation to meeting B as I think time is expected to be carved out for intercommunity work, which I think

- or my understanding is, at least, you know, joint meetings with other groups, their cross-community working groups. And of course when we can make sure that, you know, those events are scheduled at the same time as other SOs and ACs are planning those so that there's no conflict.

So I think one objective could be to indeed have such a draft available to be able to share that with the different groups in Buenos Aires and -- for example -- it could be a topic of conversation for the joint meetings that the GNSO has. For example, with the GAC and the CCNSO and based on the feedback that is received from those groups who I suspect are - may also be looking themselves at how to organize themselves, drafting team may need to reconvene and take that input into account. And then come up with a kind of final schedule that then indeed may be officially approved -- I guess -- by the GNSO Council.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Marika. As for the timeline that we're looking at, Marika you're very right in stating that we should have something for presentation by the time of the next Buenos Aires meeting. And we should be able to have a final version -- this is in my view -- at one of the telephone conference meetings between Buenos Aires and Dublin so that by the time Dublin rolls around we are on the safe side of having a plan of how to proceed with the schedule of the GNSO Council and the entire GNSO by the time the next year meeting comes - rolls around.

Marika has already been so kind as to prepare a draft document which I would like to ask you to just present and say a few words on each of the meeting proposals, with the focus of course on the short meeting and that should form the basis for our discussion for this meeting. And let's see where that takes us. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So this is a document that was shared with you I think two or three weeks ago the first time. And now I shared it I think yesterday with a slightly updated format with a - the possible draft schedule for completing

maybe a work item for the group. And basically what the document tries to do is first of all, you know, summarize for each of the meetings what the objective is based on what was in the meeting strategy working group final report.

And what you then see below and you can follow me along, I'm sharing my screen and all - maybe have your own version open. And then what I did, I basically copied from one of the recent presentations that (Nick Tomaso) gave to the different groups on how, you know, they expect the format of the different meetings to look. So I basically copied and pasted that.

And what I did is I added -- and you can see in yellow -- the - for A and C what the current format is -- or at least the current structure of GNSO related meetings -- and then for meeting B I just put in some things based on I think input that was received. And I think the discussions in Singapore and, you know, desire objectives for that meeting and then I put in some suggestions there that made for a starting point for the conversations for this drafting team.

So what I did then as well -- and as I said -- I added a kind of table that is, you know, the idea of it is to kind of block schedule so we could give in more detail information on what we expect to be scheduled on each day in the different timeframes. Again, with the idea being that this is something we may be able to share this will all our SOs and ACs so it's easier to see, you know, where there's potential conflict or, you know, potential overlap in similar kind of meetings that are being scheduled.

And again, for meetings A and C, I'm basically following the format as, you know, we currently run GNSO related meetings during ICANN meetings. But of course that's not to say that, you know, that needs to stay as is. You know, my understanding is that as we move to a new meeting strategy it may also be an opportunity to reconsider whether, you know, any of the meetings (unintelligible) around GNSO related meetings, you know, is still the most

effective or efficient way or whether there should be changes we may want to consider or, you know, think about.

So again, I think meeting A is basically fairly similar and, you know, the current normal ICANN meeting runs. It's a seven day meeting. I think as well at the - you know, the way the format is proposed I think it follows very much in line as how, you know, we run our meetings day one -- Saturday, Sunday - - I can see the GNSO working weekend sessions. You know, Monday is a welcome session. You know, there's a - I think a difference from a general perspective. I think the idea is that there will be two public form meetings -- one on Monday, one on Thursday -- so I think that's one of the innovations for this particular format.

Number of high interest topics expected for Monday, which is also similar to how the meetings are run today. What I've listed from our perspective we typically have, you know, our joint meeting with the CCNSO at the end of Monday, which, you know, in the new format I think everyone is - I think it's pretty successful and it's probably something worth pursuing. That's also the view, of course, on the CCNSO side. And we do sometimes have as well, you know, face to face meetings of either working groups or cross-community working groups may take place in parallel to some of the meetings on Monday.

Tuesday, you know, inter and intercommunity work, SOAC reports with community. You know -- again -- there may be high interest topics or GDD track that's run during that meeting. Of course, from the GNSO perspective that is the day when the stakeholder groups and constituencies organize their respective meetings as well as possible meetings with the board or other groups that they may have scheduled.

Wednesday is pretty similar. I think something new is foreseen is the SOAC reports to the communities. I'm not really sure how that will exactly look, if that follows the format which I think today has been done and more in the

format of presentations or slides that have been made available. But there may be specific sessions that they're foreseeing that will be given to the broader community. There's also inter and intercommunity work foreseen. And I think from a GNSO perspective that's typically face to face working group meetings that take place on Wednesday mornings and then the afternoon is of course a GNSO Council meeting and then typically late in the afternoon there is sometimes as well as working group meeting that take place.

And then the Thursday meetings, you know, board meetings, public forums, high interest topic, and wrap up sessions. And again, that's where the GNSO typically had the - it's wrap up meeting and we did sometimes have as well in the mornings some face to face working group meetings or CWG meetings. This is actually the six day format that maps to how the current ICANN meetings are run.

And then moving on to meeting B. And I think as Volker already mentioned, this is, you know, really different from how, you know, the current meeting is structured. And the idea is that it's really focused on SOAC and board work with, you know, the first day being a day focused on community outreach. And again, I think there's some conversation that may need to happen on what you understand to be outreach.

So I think in the report it was defined as activities that are conducted by SOAC groups or cross-community groups with the intention of increasing awareness and interest in ICANN from individuals and organizations outside of the ICANN communities. These activities are consistent with ICANN's function and mission. And then ICANN's global multi-stake policy is developed in a bottom up fashion, a process that is enhanced and strengthened by reaching out to external communities, educating them about ICANN and encouraging to participate as they wish.

So basically this - the format's for the B meeting -- as it's called -- is a four day format to where -- I said -- the first day -- Monday -- is intended to focus on outreach. And, you know, some suggestions I had put down here I think based on conversations is that, you know, this could consist of specific GNSO outreach related activities. For example, you could think of, you know, a GNSO newcomer session similar to the ones we currently run in the webinar format, you know, which could be, you know, combined with a stakeholder group and constituency inter-meetings. You know, possibly also specific, you know, policy updates or introductions to policy topics that the GNSO is working on.

And I think one thing you may want to think about as well is that, you know, is that a whole day meeting or -- for example -- you know, could you structure that meeting in such - the day in such a way where, you know, the morning is focused on induction, you know, training, education, and -- for example -- the afternoon could be, you know, practical experience or, you know, participating in certain efforts, you know, such as, you know, stakeholder group of constituency meetings whereby newcomers are specifically welcome to, you know, observe and see how those groups actually work and how they can participate.

But again, I think that's one of the main elements, you know, as a drafting team may want to think about on how that should look. And again, this is probably also an area which, you know, closer - close coordination will need to happen with other groups, you know, to see what they are planning with regard to that. Because I don't think either that we're looking at a competition between the different groups and attracting a (unintelligible) as well as these should actually be, you know, maybe ICANN wide sessions like they're running the newcomer sessions at the moment, you know, possible with specific tracks that could focus on, you know, different SOs or ACs.

But again, I think that is one of the ones where (unintelligible) probably we need to go into on how that could look and as well how that would be, you know, most efficient in the fact that from a GNSO perspective.

And day two is intended to focus on intra-community work. So again, you know, one option here could be that that would be the GNSO policy session, similar to, you know, the updates that are now provided over the weekend. Joint sessions with other SOs and ACs could be part of that. Day three is a similar format that could -- for example -- you know, focus on stakeholder group constituency policy sessions, you know, cross community working group face to face meetings.

And then day four is intercommunity work. So again, the suggestion here would be that could be, you know, working group face to face meetings or joint sessions with other groups. And maybe as a closing meeting to close off the four day event would be maybe a GNSO Council meeting that kind of wraps up and, you know, basically prepares forward for the next meeting.

And again, I mean, I left this empty as I think this is the one where, you know, your input is really needed to start trying to fill out how that may look, you know, from a kind of 90 minute block at a time each day perspective. And that may, you know, provide us with some further details on how such a meeting could look.

Then there's meeting C, which is the annual meeting as we currently know it. So the proposal is that that would be a seven day meeting with two days dedicated to intra-community work, one day dedicated to intercommunity work, one day dedicated to internal SOAC work, CC interaction, or both, two days dedicated to public forum, AGM opening session, high interest topics, and then one day for wrap up meeting activities.

So again here I looked at the - what they had put together from meetings team perspective; scroll down better. So here you can see here as well I think

for the first six days -- from my perspective at least -- was fairly similar as how the current meeting is run. And as such, I've mapped out as well with, you know, the meetings as we currently run them during an ICANN meeting.

The main difference seems to be the day seven -- which is the Friday -- and what I've added for now -- but again, you know, of course this is all open to discussion -- is, you know, we typically run at the end of the annual meeting the GNSO Council development session as an induction sessions for new council members. And as I understand it we're planning to continue that going forward. So that could potentially be the activity for day seven and, you know, specifically focus on those new council members that take a seat at that meeting.

And again, what I did - I just, you know, filled in the time slots based on, you know, how meetings are currently run. But again, just want to note as well that, you know, these are just suggestions based on current practice and it's of course up to the drafting team to update that as you see fit. So I think that's in a nutshell what I've tried to put together in this document. And of course if you think another format -- another way of approaching that -- would be more helpful, it's of course up to you to decide.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, Marika. Very nice presentation of the current state of affairs. I see that there's a queue building with James at the front. But I would like to ask everyone to just raise their hands in the Adobe so we can get a good discussion going. James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Is there a queue or is it just me?

Volker Greimann: Currently - I said it was building, so it's currently you. So I hope somebody else will raise their hand after you.

James Bladel: Oh, that was optimism that it was building. So just wanted to extend my thanks for - to Marika for her presentation and providing an overview of the

meeting structure. Just a thought here as we get started at the outset of this project. You know, I understand meeting A. We probably don't have to put a whole lot of brain cycles into meeting - format A because it's what we know and love today.

Meeting B I think everyone has identified is going to be the challenge because we are supposed to be smaller, lighter, and more streamlined. And so shoehorning in the Council's work there is going to be challenging. I just want to point out that meeting structure C may also be - I don't want to overlook the potential that meeting structure C may also be problematic for Council meetings as they stand today and even adding a development session.

And the reason I say that is because I'm concerned that meeting format C -- which we also have never tried and is unknown to the community -- will fill up with seven days of actual sessions and community work and what we will end up doing is we will get back into the practice of having two day GNSO Council meetings prior to that seven day format and meeting format C -- at least for those participating in the Council sessions -- would, you know, grow to become a nine day meeting.

So I think my - I guess we should probably keep that in mind that those days that we have earmarked there for Council development in the two weekend sessions on Saturday and Sunday, they may not be open the way that they are now in meeting format A and it may be - we may be facing some difficult decisions with that structure just as we are with B as to how much of the Council - traditional Council work we can cut in order to squeeze it into that format. Okay.

Volker Greimann: Thank you James for raising that. And I think -- I'm putting myself in the queue here so we can go on without a break -- one thing that we also need to consider is to avoid as much overlap as possible. And I -- as you said, James -- it's very important to understand what is the non-GNSO Council part of the

meeting structure actually mean in how they are filled with information at that time. Because we may learn that there will be certain slots that are of interest to the members of the GNSO Council or the GNSO in general that would then overlap with certain sessions that we have carved up for ourselves.

So for example, we're looking at what will happen for us here in the meeting C -- the wrap up session on Friday -- that can mean a lot of things that would be in the interest of the Council to attend (unintelligible) Council at that time is not present. And if GNSO leaders are not present because they are taking part in the session, that may be to the detriment of the council. So we need - really need to understand what these other parts of (unintelligible) before we go into the finalization.

But in general, for meeting C I would agree that the structure here would probably work. With meeting A I had one concern, which was that the face to face meetings of the working groups were now limited to Thursday. Just scroll up through the schedule there -- thank you -- no, I meant the timeline, actually. The next page. Yes. Whereas currently we also have these meetings on Monday -- the working group meetings -- having them all - oh, yes, it's Wednesday, sorry.

Having them all focused on Wednesday would mean that there would only be three separate slots -- according to this schedule -- that could be filled with working groups. And as many members of the Council and many GNSO members are double dipping into many different PDP working groups and other working groups at the same time, this might cause some overlap that would be very desirable to avoid. So maybe filling up some of the time on Monday as well would be beneficial to just remove the stress of having everything in one day. I'll stop here and yield to Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks Volker. Now we - so just trying to see how we can maybe - can you hear me?

Volker Greimann: Yes, very...

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. So I was saying - so I was saying I was thinking how we can really proceed in more maybe - I mean, to find out progress quickly. Because I understand we have to - people have several concern with (unintelligible) meeting A, B, or C. But if - I think if we can start -- for example -- to - I mean, to - I think whereas which session we think that we need to have in every meeting. I guess -- for example -- the GNSO Council session is something that we cannot really drop.

We have the least of - the must and then nice to have and so on. And we can work in - for each meeting. And if we make things more easy to add or drop, I think it's an opportunity really even to rethink the structure of what we have now for example the weekend. But we can (unintelligible) (unintelligible) the working weekend's (unintelligible) we have, should we just give them (unintelligible) and so on.

So if we can start by trying to see what we want to achieve in each meeting, it would be nice to have and work around that.

I see that we may have asked to start moving around the blocks, so we have this trust from (unintelligible) and then we can start categorizing this issue.

Volker Greimann: Thank you Rafik, good point there. I think it will be essential once we start to get this ball rolling on the discussion on these different topics (unintelligible) that we have a categorization of what we deem to be most important, less important, and (unintelligible).

But I would like to try to keep this session today as near overview so we can get all up to speed and see where we are at and get a basis of the discussion going so to speak.

And next up I have Marika and then Bill. Marika, go ahead please.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I was just adding on to what Rafik said I think something you may want to consider as well in addition to (unintelligible) and then define, you know, what you must have or is nice to have. You may also want to identify, you know, what our meetings that shouldn't be scheduled at the same time.

And again, thinking of, you know, when you shared it with the broader community so that, you know, it becomes clear as well that, you know, if there is a GNSO Council meeting, it shouldn't conflict with, you know, public forum or a Board session, or - as well that that would allow the kind of mapping against proposals from other groups. And say, "Oh well, we actually said that, you know, for these meetings we shouldn't have conflict with these types of session," but we actually see that there is a conflict.

So we'll need to, you know, work together to see if there's a way to, you know, avoid that conflict. Because again, I think it goes partly as well to the point that James was making to think, you know, at least from my perspective, I don't think the idea should be or hopefully won't be that indeed we have to move the GNSO Council weekend or GNSO weekend sessions but even before that seven day meeting, but it should be, you know, part - if we believe that is an important part of GNSO work, that should, you know, remain as is. And I think from my perspective, does fit within the framework of the meeting.

But indeed, it would need to be made clear that those sessions cannot conflict with, you know, meetings that GNSO participants are also expected at.

And again, I think that goes back to the whole idea that - and this maybe something to think through as well on how best to do that coordination with other groups to make sure that there's the least amount of conflict.

But I think the same also applies even within the GNSO. Because we've also seen for example where, you know, stakeholder group and constituencies may schedule their meetings throughout the week that they sometimes also conflict with, you know, sometimes the GNSO working groups.

So I think a way of trying to find as well if there's a better way of structuring or organizing that planning where, you know, maybe we need to carve out as well certain time slots where we say, "Look, you know, those are specifically for, you know, stakeholder groups and constituencies to have their specific, you know, workshops or, you know, interest groups or, you know, however those groups are organized to have their session to try as well to avoid that they overlap with, you know, other GNSO efforts.

And I think, you know, that to comment as well on the point you made earlier, Volker, and the A Meeting maybe having more working groups meetings on Monday, again there the challenge is that currently Monday is scheduled as their high-interest topics that are often topics on the agenda that everyone wants to, you know, listen to or participate in, which sometimes makes it hard to schedule working group meetings.

So again, if we want to have more meetings there, we really would need to carve out time and make sure that, you know, that would be a slot where, you know, maybe at the same slot where other groups then have their intra-policy activities so that there's no direct conflict with certain sessions that, you know, everyone is expected to attend or participate in.

Volker Greimann: Thank you Marika. I'll go straight to Bill and then James.

Bill Manning: Thanks. Actually what I was going to ask really kind of connects with what Rafik was just saying.

You know, this is very helpful with what we've got right now. But it's also for me very hard to get my head around the flow because a lot of people in our

community and me personally do more than just go to GNSO related stuff. And if you can't kind of like get a visual on what all the other parts of ICANN are doing at the same time, it becomes very hard to think about how the time could be optimally organized.

So I was just wondering, you know, because we do want to de-silo as much as we can too I think.

Is there any version of this break (sic) that the Staff has done that expands beyond the four? I mean you've got like the four tiles under each day that are related to the GNSO. Is there a version that also would show like what's going on in other parts of ICANN land with the GAC or others, how they're schedules might align alongside these so that we can look at this more holistically rather than just within our own tunnel?

Volker Greimann: Okay, I'll do something now that from what I said before, I'll yield to Marika (unintelligible) change. Thank you Bill.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just to respond to Bill's question, as far as I am aware, nod yes, but I'm assuming, and I think from some groups, you know, they are basically in the same puzzle (sic) as we are trying to come to terms with, you know, what will happen in 2016 and how that, you know, will align with their schedules.

So my assumption is and the hope is at least that by Buenos Aires we will be able to compare notes, and at that point be able to, you know, put the different maps together and hopefully sort of, you know, to avoid that or have the least amount of overlap.

But I'm not aware of any other groups already having, you know, something like this in place or kind of finalizing how they think it should look. I think we're all a little bit in the same situation following I think the presentations that (Mic

Tomasa) gave at the last meeting I think everyone started to think about and realizing that this course is coming sooner rather than later.

Bill Manning: Right. Okay just to make the obvious point. I mean there's always the risk that we could go down the road a bit sort of building this on a standalone basis. And then when we start to see what other parts are going on, we realize, oh my God, there's all kind of conflicts and we have to realign everything we just did.

So trying to work holistically from the front end I think - or at least establish some kind of back-and-forth communication on that I think would probably be helpful. Because otherwise we could end up burning a lot of cycles that then have to be reburnt.

I'm making an obvious point, but anyway.

Volker Greimann: At this point, we currently have a situation where this training is now rolling down the tracks and we have let's say ten different engineers trying to build their carts, their wagons, for the train. And in the end we'll see if they fit together once we reach the station that we have.

Oh yes, we should coordinate at some point. We should first have an idea of where we think we should end up or which way we want to design our wagons so-to-say before we contact these other groups. Otherwise, we will be left with (unintelligible).

James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Hi thanks Volker. And just kind of building upon comments from Marika and from Bill.

You know, I think the reason we have a weekend session was because the Council was fairly confident that there would not be any conflicts with other

community events or sessions on the Friday - or sorry, the Saturday and Sunday prior to an ICANN meeting. And I think that that's changed in the interim and now that we do have actually have conflicts on the weekend.

You know, I just would, you know, go back to the statement I think that Bill made which is, you know, understanding what other groups are doing and what all the moving pieces are going to be important.

And this is why I'm more concerned about Meeting Structure C than B because Meeting Structure A is normal; Meeting Structure B, well worst case scenario we call back to adding a day in front of Meeting Structure B is a four-day meeting because a five-day meeting. And everybody grumbles but we make it work.

Meeting Structure C, however, I don't think we can assume that those extra days we currently have allocated as weekend sessions actually belong to us. And I think that we're going to have to figure out what, you know, what we want to accomplish in those days and what else we can reasonable expect will be in conflict with those days because I don't think we can lay claim to them.

And Marika has got her hand up so hopefully she's going to prove me wrong.

Volker Greimann: Yes thanks James. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, so this is Marika. I'm not even sure if I have an answer to James, but part of my perspective I think as well is putting your claim there and saying, "This is what we understand, you know, is a first step in making that claim."

But indeed, looking at Saturday and Sunday, I mean it does communicate inter-community work which then, you know, is what the GNSO weekend sessions are. But indeed, as you said, it also now has outreach and new commerce.

I mean new commerce is currently already there on Sundays and those, you know, typically run in parallel to, you know, the sessions we have and more specifically targeted that at people that are there at the first meeting and where intersessions that are run. So that's something that's already happening.

But indeed, the outreach one is where we have seen certain meetings being scheduled on the Saturday where indeed that conflicts with some of the work we're doing. And the question is indeed is that something that is acceptable/desirable, something to be avoided, or is there something that we can accommodate for example in our planning of the weekend session that would make that easier as well.

So again, I think it really goes back to the conversations of the broader community and to think as well, you know, the holistic approach as Bill has referred to earlier.

And you know, one of my suggestions in the Chat was that, you know, maybe a next step could be as well in parallel to us looking at this is for the Drafting Team to actually reach out to different SOs and ACs to just inform them of, you know, this activity that has started within the GNSO. And that, you know, the intention is to, you know, share at least our thinking with the other groups, you know, in view of making sure that we can synchronize and avoid conflict.

And also ask at the same time, you know, how other groups are approaching it because maybe there's a way that we can already, at an earlier point in time, you know, connect with the different groups and their planning or, you know, share notes. Because as you said Bill, you know, maybe if we can share this format with, you know, another group that's already doing it in one of the other SOs and ACs, maybe that will help their thinking as well or may help them to say, "Oh, let's not do anything on that day because actually we're already out of sync with the GNSO."

And I also had a specific question as well because indeed if the idea is that we, you know, have this ready for sharing, you know, with the broader community in Buenos Aires, should we foresee a kind of planning/working sessions with representatives from the different SOs and ACs to just, you know, try and see. Can we bring this together and how are other groups thinking about this or maybe it doesn't necessarily need a session because I know that there are a lot of meetings already being planned. Or maybe that's something that surely after Buenos Aires could happen as a kind of - I don't want to call it a cross-community working group but maybe a cross-community drafting team that kind of brings indeed all those pieces together.

Volker Greimann: Thank you Marika. Yes, I think that would probably be a worthwhile session to schedule for the meeting in Buenos Aires first. It's always (unintelligible) to participate and gets obstacles out of the way that way, and that way we could also have all groups present their current thinking on how they would structure those days and try to figure out how to avoid as much conflict as possible.

Yes, I see the queue is empty. Does that mean nobody else wants to raise their hand at this point or wants to make a contribution? I think we have heard a lot that we need to let sink in at this time.

James stated in the Chat and also ultimately that we will probably have to look at Meeting A and B as well Meeting B. So I might have been wrong in the earlier assumption that we were only focusing on Meeting E for maybe 80% of (unintelligible) time.

I think we should consider all the impacts of what (unintelligible) structure means for every meeting structure as much as (unintelligible). I might make an estimate (sic) of that.

Anyone? Okay. In that case I would just like to move onto number four which is to confirm the next steps and the next meeting slot.

I would like to lead into that with the comment that I've assumed the role of Interim Chair and (Marole) as the Vice Chair of GNSO Council.

But I would like to see a discussion of the leadership of this group if deemed necessary by the members. So essentially, would you like to elect the Chair or should we just continue on on this informal basis?

James Bladel: Hi Volker. You know, I would prefer that we keep this lightweight and informal. And if you are willing to serve as an Interim Chair or facilitator or whatever, I know that you have some absences planning and that others on this group or Marika perhaps can be, you know, impressed into service to keep the work going.

I don't think we necessarily have to get formal and have a Chair/Vice-Chair type structure. I think that we can - we're all veterans here and I think we can work it out.

Volker Greimann: All right. I just would like to raise the topic so we can decide on how to proceed if we want to be informal or formal. So I would be happy to continue on in this role if everybody wants that.

Yes, so seeing no one in the queue, and Bill said to continue; thank you Bill.

The next meeting. I think we probably want to have a loophole (sic) coming up pretty soon to just confirm the availabilities for the next meeting. I have notice that there is one conflict with the group that I also have to attend in the future with this timeslot that we have right now which would be the Selection Group, which is having their call at the same time that we are having this call so I would prefer rescheduling.

However I will not be there for the next four weeks due to parental leave and travel time. So if you want to keep that timeslot, me being the only one that would have a conflict, it would (unintelligible).

Any opinions on the progress and next meeting schedule? I'm not sure if we actually need a weekly meeting for this group, but I think we should have some regularity. So I personally would suggest to at least have a bi-weekly call.

Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm just wondering whether, you know, I know we usually, you know, have calls to make progress on certain things. But I think as the main task is to try and fill in the framework whether some of that we can actually start doing on email, and you know, try to actually do that, you know, before we have the next meeting. Because as I said, that's probably the main assignment we have at the moment.

I think people were supportive as well of their reaching out to the different SOs and ACs. I'm happy to prepare a draft for that, and if people think it's useful as well to at least, you know, tentatively box some time in Buenos Aires, I can also assist with that.

But you know, maybe we can indeed then try to see if, you know, schedule time in two weeks' time, and then we can do a doodle poll to see if we can find an appropriate time that works for everyone.

But maybe with the idea that we actually try to do work on the mailing list and - I don't know. I don't know if we already have people that are willing to volunteer to, you know, make some edits or add to the draft that I circulated as a first step or, you know, whether you would like (Lee) to start putting in some ideas and have people comment on that. Just trying to see what would be the most effective way of moving this forward instead of showing up in two

or three weeks' time on the next call and then realizing that we're actually in the same spot that we are today.

Volker Greimann: Thank you Marika. Bill raised a good point in the Chat that we will probably have to have something to work within two weeks. So basically it's a question of whether we need a meeting in two weeks probably depends on the work that we get down in the meantime on the mailing list.

I see your hand is up as well Bill, so go ahead.

Bill Manning: I was just going to suggest as a way to get started that I would indeed support the wonderful tradition of Staff taking a first crack and then we all dump on Marika and tell her what's wrong with it. Because I think if we wait for any of us to initiate, that might not - I think everybody is so maxed out with so many things that Marika, if you're able to give us some initial things to bounce off, pro and con, that probably would help the process along.

Volker Greimann: You're an evil man Bill.

Bill Manning: Well I've been out a spin.

Volker Greimann: Yes. So Marika, would you be willing to take the first crack at that and give us (unintelligible)?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Yes, no problem. If I can maybe along with that suggest that instead of in two weeks' time we actually try to schedule the next meeting in three weeks' time, because in two weeks' time I'm actually traveling that week. So that would be the week of - is it on the calendar the 27th of April.

Volker Greimann: All right, any objections? Hearing none I would say that this proposal has carried.

Well, that ends our schedule. I would like to thank all participants who were able to make the time despite conflicts and I saw Rudi that you had a conflict here as well. So thanks for bringing that up.

I thank all of you for your active participation and for your willingness to volunteer on this work. And I would like to give the remaining 12 minutes back to you and use them wisely. Thank you very much.

END