

**Geographic Regions Review Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 05 October at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Geographic Regions Review Working Group on Wednesday 05 October 2009 at 12:00 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-geo-regions-20091005.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/index.html#oct>

Present:

David Archbold
Olga Cavalli
Fahd Batayneh
Cheryl Langdon-Orr
Paul Wilson
Zahid Jamil

Staff:

Rob Hoggarth
Bart Boswinkel
Gisella Gruber-White

Absent Apologies:

Janis Karklins
Carlton Samuels

Absent:

Carlton Samuels
Adiel Akplogan

Dave Archbold: Okay? Well officially good morning everybody. This is (Dave). Can I remind you please to give your name before you say things so that we can - the record is understandable? I will also try and to speak reasonably slowly which is difficult for me.

First of all, can I ask whether people did manage to get a copy of the agenda and the outline of the...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. (Cheryl) here. Yes.

Dave Archbold: Thanks (Cheryl).

Fahd Batayneh: Fahd here. Yes I did.

Dave Archbold: Thank you. We seem to have lost people.

Woman: They might be muted because of the noisy lines (Dave).

GGW: We have (Fahd and (Olga) on mute.

Dave Archbold: Oh okay. Okay.

Paul Wilson: Yes (Dave) I am here but I am sitting on mute (Paul).

Dave Archbold: Fine. Thanks (all). Okay. Well if we then look, excuse me, look at the agenda that (Rolf) thankfully put together for us, can we look at Item A which is the...

...just to look at the initial report and the feedback which we received which I hope you have all seen was really just one input which was advocating the creation of an Arab region, but really was not commenting or (unintelligible) even the content of the first report.

Woman: Um-hmm.

Dave Archbold: Rob I think that is a fair comment. Is it not?

Rob Hoggarth: That is accurate sir. Yes. Then you can all choose to interpret the lack of feedback as ascent and approval of the direction that the Working Group is

taking or you can choose to believe it is really at a point yet where folks are not really focused until they begin to see some real recommendations from the group. I am not in a position to judge which way that is following at this point.

Cheryl L-O: (Cheryl) here. Of course it could be both.

Rob Hoggarth: That is true.

Man: Hey you did good.

Bart Boswinkel: Hello this is (Bart).

((Crosstalk))

Dave Archbold: Hi (Bart). Good morning.

Woman: (Bart).

Bart Boswinkel: Good morning.

Dave Archbold: Were you going to make a comment (Bart) or were you just joining us?

Bart Boswinkel: I am just joining.

Man: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: I have time this evening.

Dave Archbold: We seem to have an intermittently very noisy line (Bart) just to forewarn you.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Hmm. I will go...

Dave Archbold: I am going to - sorry. I am going to interpret it that there were no outlandish comments in our first report at least. Very strongly we would have heard about it.

Have any of you discussed it within your own communities which is Item B on the agenda? Have you any feedback other than the official feedback as it were?

Cheryl L-O: (Cheryl) here (Dave). If you want a response from the (Alec) which Rob could also speak to - at large community ran a briefing call which Rob and I predominantly wrangled. And I think Rob it is a fair capsulation to say that they did not find anything particularly contentious and we will watch the space to see if anything excites them to respond to the next version of the reports.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes. The one thing I guess I would add there (Cheryl) and it is something that I CC'd you and (Dave) on is I think that call prompted some further interested in the Working Group activities just generally and so there...

Woman: Hmm.

Rob Hoggarth: ...was at least one email of someone saying well I am interested in what you are doing and I would like to find a way to participate. But I sort of left that in your court.

Cheryl L-O: Yes. (Is that) of course is a measure that people are not interested. It is just that they haven't read in the first report got something to get their teeth into but they are interested in being engaged, to answer my question of...

Man: Yes.

Cheryl L-O: ...I think it might have been both, not either or.

Dave Archbold: All right. All - sorry, (Olga) anything within the GNSO?

Olga Cavalli: Hello? Can you hear me?

Dave Archbold: Yes.

Woman: Yes (Olga).

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, can you hear me now (Dave)?

Dave Archbold: Yes I can (Olga).

Olga Cavalli: I will...

Dave Archbold: I am saying was...

Olga Cavalli: Oh no sorry. I want to mute because it seems like my line is generating some noise. We asked to the GNSO if they wanted - we raised the issue of making comments to the document from the GNSO perspective, but we have no responses to that.

So we thought that perhaps individually each constituency could make their own. But I think that this was not the case because there was only one comment in the document.

I do not know if if you have another thing to add to this.

: Yes hi. This is . Can I get in the queue?

Dave Archbold: (Shoot).

: (Okay so), from the BC - GNSO perspective, (Olga) is right. We have not had that much - any exciting comments or any queries, etcetera. I do not how to interpret that either.

I think that they have people watching and they have not seen anything, you know, striking come out of the reports. Probably that is one of the reasons. But the other thing is also I think there have been so many other things going on with regard to restructuring the OSC and others that I think many people - at least I can speak for in my own constituency, the BC, have been a little diverted.

However, when this was raised in Sydney and it did raise a certain level of interest. So think that one of the things I have to do definitely as a constituency rep is try to get them more motivated into taking interest into this, bringing more of the information about this report to them. So I think that is one of the things.

And I think maybe other members could also try and attempt to do that. I know that the has done a very good job of that. So, but we - but I think in the (CSG) we may have to do some of that. So that is my sort of feedback.

And the GNSO I think we are still waiting to see what the interim report brings out.

Woman: I agree what you are saying. Yes.

Man: Yes.

Dave Archbold: (Paul) has it come up at all within the ASO?

Paul Wilson: (Look of) I have report back on this some result the progress meeting and the content of the reports and so on, but there has not been a lot of feedback. No. I am sorry to say.

Dave Archbold: No that is okay (Paul). Thanks. My view from the is that I had a chance to give some very brief comments at the last meeting but really I think the reaction was pretty much the same as your reporting. Yes fine, if that is what it says, but we are much more interested in subsequent reports from - we get into something a bit more meaty.

would you agree with that?

: Yes I would agree with that.

Dave Archbold: So I think I have got to do some more talking about this at the upcoming meeting to get some more feedback from . Okay. We seem to be all pretty much on the same place. So we have now got to move on. And I am looking at the next steps on the agenda, and Item A there, the direction for the interim report.

I hope most of you have had a copy of the outlying report that a lot of the work was done by Rob. So again, I am grateful Rob. I have already given you my apologies for the lack of effort I have been able to make of late, but it really has been somewhat difficult to get time.

The - Rob had laid down in that report the suggestion really that we split it into three parts. And if you have had a chance to look at that concept, I would be grateful for any feedback that you have got.

I am frantically flicking through here trying to look for this report. But Rob perhaps you can help me out here and go through the three that you mentioned.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you (Dave). Yes. I was just making an attempt simply to try to structure things because I recognize that you all have a tremendous amount of

flexibility I think in terms of the second go round with respect to the interim report.

My general thought was that the first step or important component of the interim report would be to review and confirm the conclusions that you made in the initial report.

You know, you essentially reached out to the community for feedback on that, laid out a number of very fundamental foundational points with respect to the research that was done, the application of the geographic regions framework. And that it was important to review that, in some respects because of what you have all just acknowledged that there are many in the community who have not really focused on this yet.

So they probably did not even read the initial report. So it is helpful to restate and confirm where things exist in the initial report and note that there were not any significant objections. And so you are proceeding along the outlines that you set out in that report.

Secondly, and I think you contributed a significant amount of text to the second part (Dave). It was, you know, then saying all right, if we accept all those foundational elements, if that is the direction that the Working Group is taking, now let's sort of look at that more fundamental aspects of the background and why the community developed the framework as they did and sort of do some exploration there.

And then I think the really critical element of the interim report which is to move things forward, tee up recommendations and at least the structure for the recommendations that you will be making in the final report. And that is to basically go now and review those various issues, make some of the tough calls as to which ones the Working Group really wants to focus on and begin to develop recommendations, obviously not making the recommendation in the interim report, but essentially giving the community the heads up that this

is the direction you are going. These are going to be the areas of specific focus.

And I think that will engender some significant community dialogue when they begin to see ah, the Working Group is beginning to focus in these, you know, 15 or 5 or 20 of the 25 areas that were identified.

And, so that is what I thought as just sort of a general approach to this second phase of your work. And as I noted I think in my email to you (Dave) and just sharing that based on some of your initial work, you can choose to say oh that makes some sense to go in that direction or, you know, adopt a completely different approach.

Dave Archbold: Yes. Thanks Rob. You did indeed make that point. So, you know, no suggestion that you are forcing anything on us. I quite appreciate that - grateful for the help.

Just one point before we start discussing that. I know some of you may feel I have gone on at some length on the history aspect, but I will come back to that a little bit later on. And I quite agree, it may need to be paired down.

But, let's look at the general principles and the shape of the report. Any comments on (Rob)'s proposal?

: Hi. This is . I would like to get in the queue.

Dave Archbold: Yes (sir). Go ahead.

: I think it is a good suggestion. I think that what it does do, at least one - the way I am interpreting the language is it gives us the ability to, you know, I know we have all been busy - to go back and sort of confirm and review some of the aspects of the first report. So I think that is - if that is what it means, I think it is a fantastic idea. That is one.

Two, I think - I will just - so I am just sort of dealing with 1.1, .2 and .3. Two allows us reviewing the underlying objective to the geographic. I think we need to sit down and discuss that. I completely agree with that strategy in the third, you know, identifying areas.

So in - I am basically in agreement with the way it has been structured. I like the way it has been put out in the report also. You know, it gives a history in part to the whole, you know, different periods as well. So I am in agreement with that.

What I just would like to add here is I think this - the work we are about to start now and I think maybe we should kick it off and I think we do intend to do that. And so, would require, I think, all of us really sitting together face to face. At least that is my inkling and my thinking about the way this probably has to be done is to sort of really sort of get to the crust of what it is that we want to deal with whether the different issues, if you want a raise.

I think there are a lot of may - there are some members at least, me for instance, who want to understand better how, you know, ICANN does actually deal with geographic, you know, and representation and (lot of search) and others.

And I know there is a report out there, but maybe it will be useful to have a very quick run through (Axel) in our meeting. And I sent out an email earlier saying I think it is necessary also to make sure - I am sorry about the background.

It is necessary to make sure that we have enough time when we are in Seoul face to face to be able to do that maybe in more extended time. That is what I would like to add.

Dave Archbold: Fine. I agree with an awful lot of what you said and I wonder, a lot of people are going to be around later in the week (Axel), i.e. Thursday or Friday.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl L-O: (Cheryl) here. Yes (Dave). And I think that a couple (unintelligible) sort of indicated that on the list that I am wondering how much we might be able to leverage input from beyond the representative work group. When we have an opportunity such as a face to face ICANN meeting, it would be nice to perhaps indirect with a community beyond our own group or find the mechanism between the beginning. It is the meeting in the end where we can have a way of inputting if we are limited to another small meeting - what we can collect from our communities at that time.

Dave Archbold: Yes. So I mean what I was hoping for was that we would have a meeting towards the start where we could discuss many of the issues, could go out to our communities. And then perhaps have another meeting towards the end where we could feed back that response and again spend some time perhaps longer working out where we were going.

I am always very conscious of that 7:00 o'clock meeting. Tends - we tend to run out of time because people have a lot of things starting usually about 8:00 o'clock, sometimes earlier.

Woman: Yes (good).

: Yes, this is . I completely agree with that. And I have no issue with having a meeting early in, you know, at the 7:00 o'clock in the same hour or sorry same time as the previous schedules, but we definitely definitely need a second follow up meeting at the end of the week. (Thursdays) looks like a very good time and date to do it because then I can, you know, through consistency for instance we can bring back a lot of the feedback from our

constituency when you have had a face to face meeting, even ask them possibly to participate if we can.

And I completely agree with (Charles)' view that maybe we should reach out to the board of community when we have the opportunity at the face to face meeting.

Dave Archbold: Well what about scheduling? I mean I personally would prefer something either on the Thursday or the Friday. I do not care whether it is during the day or even in the evening where we can sit down and have some discussions without constantly feeling that we have got to rush and head off to something else.

Man: We can certainly do that (Dave). I mean the challenge and the reason why we (wouldn't) be Tuesday placeholder (unintelligible) has worked in the past. That is always a matter of shoehorning.

Man: Hmm.

Man: And I think they are all right. Later in the week, the schedule seems to free up. You only see some bigger blocks for example Thursday morning, the public forum starts at 8:00 am but there are not a lot of other conflicts there.

So I am sure that we have some good flexibility. The only thing that you all need to be concerned about is potentially when you all are planning on leaving. So - but otherwise I do not see that as being a major difficulty at all in terms of getting meeting space, just a matter of you all's schedules and finding the time.

Dave Archbold: Can we very quickly just go around to people on the call and check when they are leaving. This is (Dave). I am not leaving until Saturday morning.

Cheryl L-O: (Cheryl) not leaving till Saturday morning and (Deesler) runs my life anyway so she just tells me where to go and what to do and when.

: It is here. I will be happy to say I will be there for the board meeting on Friday anyway so yes.

Fahd Batayneh: Okay (Thad) here. I will be leaving Friday late at night so I will be there.

Paul Wilson: (Paul) here. I expect to be leaving on Friday sometime.

Zahid Jamil: (Dave) this is Zahid. Hello?

Dave Archbold: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Zahid Jamil: I will be there on Friday so I am available for meetings.

Dave Archbold: Anybody we haven't got (announcement)?

Woman: Well we need to check with (Carlton).

Dave Archbold: Yes.

Man: And (Janice).

Dave Archbold: And with (Janice). Yes.

(Cheryl): (Janice). Hmm.

Dave Archbold: Oh wait a minute. It seems like we will have a fair number of errors. So can I ask you Rob, can you speak with the powers that be and see what we can schedule?

Rob Hoggarth: Sure. And then (Eva) and I can collaborate on a (doodle) scheduling pole to offer you guys a number of options. And just for the folks on the call, I heard both voices for early in the morning or later in the evening. I think that is great.

There is also, you know, the sense of potentially doing something during the day, but I know there are a number of things happening, certainly on Thursday where there is, you know, interest of community wide participation like the (DNS Abuse Forum) the public forum.

So if you would like, we can target potential scheduling on Thursday and Friday or just focus on Friday. We will talk with the folks from the meeting staff after this call. As we produce the actions report, we will just flag for (Carlton) and (Yanus) and (Ariel) as well that they provide some initial feedback in terms of if they are still going to be in town that week and if so (unintelligible) for a day.

Cheryl L-O: Rob (Cheryl) here. Just to that and as a side gazer actually runs my life when it comes to meetings anyway because things are shoehorned in. Usually from about 6:00 am till midnight, and I can assure you that on Thursday mornings and outside of those in the middle of the day, I am already fully booked.

So as much I would love to say that I will not be going to our board breakfast to come to a breakfast type meeting, I guess on a Thursday I will be at the board breakfast, not at a GO work one. So something during the Thursday day or Friday day is going to work far more effectively from my perspective anyway. And I would suspect (Carlton)'s.

: This is . Can I step in? Yes? Oh okay. I guess so. What I was thinking was I completely agree with (Cheryl). Having an early morning on a Thursday would be - would also be difficult. I think there are and other days our early

breakfast meetings tend to usually clash with things that are happening or being scheduled at the last minute while we are there.

So, I would also recommend something either later in the day or something else even on Friday would be perfectly fine with me - just wanted to add that. Thanks. Or possibly even two meetings, one early in the week and one later in the week.

Dave Archbold: I am assuming we are going to stick with the scheduled one. Is it - it is Tuesday morning is it Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: That is correct. Tuesday at 7:00.

Dave Archbold: Yes. So I am assuming that we stick with that and this is additional meeting later in the week.

: Yes. That works fine. This is . That works fine.

Dave Archbold: Okay. All right. Out of that I think we have got so far some people happy with the format. I have not had anybody come out against the format. So if we have any counterarguments at the moment or counter suggestions, can we have them now please?

Stony silence.

Man: No that was amicable silence. That is how I interpret it.

Dave Archbold: Okay. So we have got a general format that we appear to be all agreed at - with. We have agreed that we need to talk more in Seoul. That is good. Okay. Let's go back to where we are then.

Fine we can talk early on in Seoul, but the more we have had thoughts about the direction we are going and perhaps doing more work, the (foresel) the better off we will be.

One of the suggestions that Rob had made and indeed we have - Rob and I have discussed earlier was whether it would be worthwhile breaking up into one or - or two or more groups to look at particular aspects of the report that perhaps we could then subsequently pull together. Again, comments are welcome.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: You are getting...

Dave Archbold: Well don't (tell) us.

Woman: ...right because I think I have got an indoor flood happening so I am distracted. No it is all right. No. Okay. Fine. I am back again. (Right)?

:

Hi. This is .

Dave Archbold: All right.

:

Can I respond to that?

Dave Archbold: Yes. Yes. Please.

:

In my experience to mean I think that these are all interrelated aspects. And maybe I am not so aware of the various issues that we might be discussing here, but my feeling is it is better to go in the group. We are small enough as it is. And at least initially we should pan out stuff as one large - one holistic group. That is my suggestion.

And then later on if we feel that, you know, we are comfortable with this, we can break up into smaller groups. But I am not excited...

((Crosstalk))

Dave Archbold: ...basically too early you are saying.

: I think it is too early, yes. Thank you.

Dave Archbold: I think that may be fair comment because we have not had an opportunity either to look at a complete outline or indeed to discuss it any depth. And with this all coming down the line, what three weeks is that all?

Woman: Yes.

Dave Archbold: Perhaps it is something we - if necessary we can plan at the second meeting at Seoul, sort of a takeaway from Seoul. Okay. Let me talk a little bit. This is not strictly on the agenda - a little about my thoughts and some of the sort of semi-problems I feel I have encountered in trying to put some pen to paper on some of these issues.

I keep finding that almost my biggest problem is that I repeatedly want to dash off into writing solutions rather than identifying the problems. And I am finding that quite difficult.

Woman: Um-hmm.

Dave Archbold: And I am not sure how to make that easier. Let me give you a sort of example.

I put together this history bit as far as it has gone so far. And one of the reasons I took some time to do that was to get a real attempt to understand

how we got to where we are now because I think a lot of it has not been so much by design as almost by accident and I think that is part of the problem.

In our first go through, in the first report, we identified different uses that regions were being put to. And even where we talked about, I cannot remember the words we exactly used, but for elections. Even within that there are different side tracks.

For example, with the ICANN Board, it is not about constituencies at such at all. In the main it is about general makeup of the Board. And that is where we came from.

It was you look at the overall Board and you make sure that there is good geographic distribution amongst the members of the Board.

You go to the other extreme where I would point at my own organization, and you are actually using the regions to define an election's constituency which is something quite different although it is still part of the overall representational gratification if you like.

And I think at some point during the development of both ICANN and the Bylaws, people have said okay we have got this new organization coming online, be it the or be it ALAC. And we know we want geographical diversity. And oh we have already got this thing called regions, let's grab hold of that and apply it to what we are doing here. And sometimes it has worked and sometimes it hasn't worked. So that is one reason why I am looking at the history.

I have also gone back and it appears very clear to me that at the time of the green paper and the white paper etcetera, regions and the makeup of regions were seen quite clearly as being something that was dynamic and should change or was expected to change as the Internet and participation in the Internet changed.

Of course it hasn't. Since the green paper there has been no change in the definition of the regions or generally speaking in the makeup of the regions. It has been frozen in time. And I do not think that was the original intent.

It may not be wrong, don't get me - I am not saying that. But it is not following, I do not think, the original intention. So I have been trying to document as a need to really where we are moving to.

Are - I think we have all agreed, right from the very outset that the principles of geographic diversity is a good thing. We have looked at, I think briefly, the - and I have forgotten the, you know, the ICANN goals which to give further than just geographic diversity it was geographic and council diversity lots of others words.

And I personally do not feel that the regions thing does much more than look at the geographic diversity. I do not think it looks at the council diversity. So there are a whole lot of issues there that I hope will lead us to some key issues that we can look at.

For example, I think we can even look at the fundamental question of why are we using regions at all for this function or that function? Is there something better or there even a need in some areas?

And that is the kind of questioning I would like to get onto. And as people have said, I think is probably done better face to face. So I am quite looking forward to debates that we can have at all.

I have rambled on. Would anybody like to kindly contribute? Back to a stand of silence again.

: Hi it is again. Can I step in?

Dave Archbold: Please do.

: Oh I agree with everything that you have said so far. I am in agreement with that. But I decided to break the silence nonetheless and just to sort of say yes. And I think it is important that we in our face to face discussion consider what are the objectives. I mean why is it that we are - regions are important, lay down something simple after that and move forward and say all right.

Well if this is, you know, these are the reasons why regions are important, you know, to what extent should they be important in representation participation other than operational issues. And I think that is sort of a very logical way to go forward rather than just sort of say well yes we must have regional diversity but we should actually know why we want to have regional diversity and what are the criteria for (ASI). I agree with you completely.

Dave Archbold: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Dave Archbold: Yes (Ed Can).

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. I mean because I was - I think what you just said reflects say (Yanus) what (Yanus) raised during I think one of the first face to face meetings that there was - this is underlying the categorization we used as well.

It is more look into the functions of geographic regions than something else. That why do we have general - why is there a need for functional regions and what role does it play in order to have a more (over) arching goal. And it is maybe a good thing to discuss the more (over) arching goals and the func - and from that derive the functions of geographic regions and then have a look at how it is implemented and how it could be implemented.

Dave Archbold: Absolutely. You say just what I was trying to say (Bart) as ever.

Bart Boswinkel: I will go back on mute now.

Cheryl L-O: And somehow the concept of (Bart) being on mute for any length of time just does not really work for me. Just one question that rises so while I was listening then was I wonder if it would be useful for us - it would be delightful to have had - to be able to do it before Seoul but if not at Seoul that those that suggested an (injuring) constituency day to do a little temperature taking with our community.

Where some of our communities are more or less dependent for a variety of things and different outcomes depending on the geographic regional structure that we have been created, in the case of the at large advisory committee which is highly linked to the ICANN geographic region, a change to that has significant effects on us, on how we function, right down to how large we are and everything else that follows from that.

But also, perhaps each of the communities uses or does not use wishes or doesn't wish to use the geographic regions for various outcomes.

We have done a good job so far actually. And can I think the community's lack of responses is telling us that, you know, they do not see that we haven't done a good job as identifying what these are at the moment.

Can we not do a five or six, you know, stage? Do you have a short survey format or something we can put together (that is Rob) where we ask immunity, what uses they see value in to their part of the ICANN community in the use of the geo regions or not.

I am talking real short survey. Is it of use yes or no to your community? Does it benefit or not? Yes or no. If it does, how? If it does not, how now? What would you like it to do? What wouldn't you like it to do? Identify three problems if you can. Yes. That level of stuff.

Rob Hoggarth: We can certainly pull something like that together (Cheryl).

Cheryl L-O: Well Rob I would be happy to apply and see what we can do there. And, I know it is not going to be a, you know, a fully analyzable statically relevant study but it might be an interesting temperature taking exercise.

:

Hi. This is ...

Dave Archbold: Yes.

:

...and I completely agree with that. I think it is a great way to start and to get interest moving in - at least in my constituency and maybe even in the GNSO more.

Dave Archbold: My only slight reservation is will people know what we are talking about if you see what I mean.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl L-O: Well I have done...

Dave Archbold: The trouble with short surveys is that you are not getting background.

Cheryl L-O: ...I got so they will know what, you know, it is up to each of us. That is the whole concept of having leads in a cross community work group. It is their job to make sure they do know what we are talking about.

Dave Archbold: Fine. Point taken. I think it is a good idea.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl L-O: Rob?

Fahd Batayneh: (Cheryl)?

(Cheryl): Rob I guess we need to do some drafting.

Fahd Batayneh: (Cheryl)?

Cheryl L-O: Um-hmm.

Fahd Batayneh: Do you want to do it prior to the Seoul meeting or make people aware during the Seoul meeting - Seoul meeting it is coming? So you could even do it...

Cheryl L-O: (Thad) look, you know, in a perfect world I would love to say to it before but in a reality check staff will run off their feet aren't you (but to quit) now in Seoul.

Fahd Batayneh: Yes.

Cheryl L-O: I do have this fear of having total burnout occurring at the beginning or during ICANN meetings and I prefer to avoid that if possible.

Fahd Batayneh: No. It is - there is another reason. Say if (I will think conduct) that touch upon (Dave)'s concern as well if we would send all this working group would send a survey right now without an introduction to it, then people would go, say the responsiveness on that...

Cheryl L-O: Yes.

Fahd Batayneh: ...they would be manners.

Cheryl L-O: It is the sort of thing that they connect it can be done almost as a pre-straw poll at the face to face meeting led by each of us...

Fahd Batayneh: Yes.

Cheryl L-O: ...if the opportunity is offered to us depending on how much we control and how much input we have to our constituency or community agendas.

Fahd Batayneh: Yes.

Cheryl L-O: But I for one would like to see that my community would go all right, okay, well, you know, 24 of us have had a say on this, now we are going to take this and find out what the many, many thousands that we represent think about it too. So it would be a first step over - an output that will prep the community for being more reactive and interactive with the comments when we put out the interim and of course the final report.

((Crosstalk))

(Dave Archbold: Yes .

: Yes. I think that it is just a question about timing. It will be nice to have - sort of have - be able to have and put into what the questions are going to be. If we can have some decision what the question is going to be and within the group at least before the Tuesday, we can - I can at least use the Tuesday to do the cross constituency and the constituency of sort of a presentation etcetera, and talk about, you know, what these are questions, and could people within the next hour or something respond.

((Crosstalk))

So if we could do it before that, that would be fantastic if we can get a response to that too.

Cheryl L-O: Well from my perspective, (Cheryl) here, I am even more selfish than that. I would want my community discussing it in our one day workshop on a Sunday.

Dave Archbold: Well that would be great.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Actually it sounds fantastic.

Dave Archbold: If you can come up with some draft flying out to Seoul, that would be wonderful and then we could all use it throughout this whole week.

Cheryl L-O: Um-hmm. Okay Rob you and I have got a date.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes. My goal would be to have - pull that together this week so that, you know, then (Cheryl), you would have a chance to look at it and we could share it with a broader group of working group members...

Cheryl L-O: Um-hmm.

Rob Hoggarth: ...so you all would have your own week to sort of look it over and contribute feedback back to that.

Cheryl L-O: Okay. We shall be starting or in directing in a virtual environment then.

Dave Archbold: That is great. Thanks for that (Cheryl). That sounds excellent.

Cheryl L-O: It is all right. It is just if you all are not on Google Wave yet you see, once that becomes the standard behavior of interaction, then we will not have these problems.

Dave Archbold: We will always have time problems. That is what we will. And so, okay, I am going to move on at this stage to (new cap) because Rob is always concerned about preparation and publication cycle for the interim report.

I mean I think we have already come to some conclusions on that Rob. I mean we are looking for a real working session (axle), both for ourselves and interaction with our community - respective communities.

We are not going to be in a position to put together a final draft until significantly after Seoul would be my comment. And I think everybody would agree?

Man: Yes.

Dave Archbold: Yes. The general I think silent consent. So Rob...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl L-O: Can I ask what you mean by significantly after Seoul though?

Dave Archbold: Oh...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl L-O: After Seoul - how significant is it? How much after Seoul?

Dave Archbold: Right. And that is why I was going to go back to Rob who is our timekeeper as much as anything else. Looking at the calendar, we are getting close for example to almost Christmas time by the time we come back from Seoul. I am sure the shops will be saying it is so many days till Christmas. Are we going to get this done and a report out pre-Christmas?

((Crosstalk))

Man: There is another question as well is whether you want to use the face to face meeting to discuss say the interim report or not. If you look - go back to the

charter and the whole timetable in the charter, that was structured around the face to face meetings in order to get as much feedback as possible.

Cheryl L-O: Yes.

Man: So in that case, say if you say the - and I think the very practical and other reasons why we cannot make an interim report before the Seoul meeting, you are looking more at the Nairobi meeting to have it say as part of the public comment period.

Cheryl L-O: I think having a public comment period - (Cheryl) here, sorry for the transcription - of having a public comment period that encompasses a face to face meeting is hugely valuable. I wholeheartedly agree with that.

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob. And so that - from a practical standpoint what it does, and certainly based on the discussion you have been having is simply move forward your charter timetable by one ICANN meeting.

Cheryl L-O: Um-hmm.

Rob Hoggarth: So instead of concluding or having a final report in the early 2010 timeframe, the February timeframe for the Nairobi meeting, you would be looking at moving that out to the next meeting in Europe.

So I guess my sense there is you have discussed practically and given the actions you are discussing, from a practical standpoint we will be moving forward from that perspective. I guess then what I would be asking for is conformation so that I can be drafting something up for (Dave) that would communicate back to the Board the heads up that the charter timetable will be moving out by one ICANN meeting.

Dave Archbold: Yes. I think that is the only realistic conclusion that we can come to. Having said that, it would be nice to get the next report out for public consultation

significantly before the Nairobi meeting so that they have ample time rather than we are rushing it at the last minute.

Cheryl L-O: Well (Cheryl) here, especially because I have seen something as important as the final report is going to come out in all three languages. My community would very much appreciate it in at least five UN languages and that all takes time.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob again. And certainly we did that with the initial report. I think it was a very useful exercise and we will just continue to do that at every phase of this working group's efforts.

Man: Yes.

Cheryl L-O: Rob you know how much time it takes and you know how much bottlenecking happens before meetings when all sorts of policy things are, you know, coming out and trying to be hopefully translated. So, you know, I think sooner rather than later would be the ideal.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes. In fact what I will do - this is Rob again - is draft up a new timetable based on the discussions that you guys have had at this meeting and circulate that to (Dave) in his Chair capacity, then he can provide that all to all of you.

And one of the significant components that certainly I would recommend based on our experience with the initial report is perhaps expanding the minimal duration of the comment period from 35 days maybe moving that out to 45 days. If you are now looking...

Cheryl L-O: Um...

Rob Hoggarth: ...at the Europe meeting that might work better.

Cheryl L-O: Rob I could pretty well ensure you that the at large advisory committee would exercise its right to call for that if you so desired. Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Well and I think it would be helpful to get feedback from you and others (Cheryl) whether that time period should be 45 days or longer and then based on that, I think, you know, working with (Bart) and (Dave) I could come up with a good draft of...

Cheryl L-O: Hmm.

Rob Hoggarth: ...future timeline that would, you know, provide ample opportunity for public input.

Bart Boswinkel: (Cheryl), (Cheryl) this is (Bart) again. And so I understand correct - how much time would you normally need say if you have a face to face meeting and to provide comments on a report?

Cheryl L-O: Once we have it in any particular given language we can do it if it is very complex 45 works just by the skin of its face. If it is not particularly complex, it could certainly run a 30. The main thing is we do community briefing calls.

Now they take usually about 14 days out of the 30 just to brief the leaders and the people that are involved and then our regions meet in a monthly cycle which is why 45 works and 30 does not.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Cheryl L-O: The serious things - and to go out beyond that, it can be quite advantageous which is why we have been asking and will continue to ask for some

preemptive information so we can be briefing and communicating issues in terms of preparatory conversation with the community. Which is why the public - the community call we did with Rob on the reports that were already done by this work group was so useful.

And Rob correct me if I am wrong. I think we had sort of, you know, more than 20 but under 30 people on three language channels that day, so that is, you know, serious output.

And each of those then go out to their five regions and it takes 30 days for them to have their monthly meetings. Some meets - Asia Pacific meets at the very end of the month. North America is the first (cap of the) rank that meets in either the end of the first or the beginning of the second week of the month. So that is why the 45 works better than 30.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. No. No. It was just a - say if you - if we go and - if the working group is going to expand the public comment period, is a - it is more question when do you want to have it published? If you have it published 45 days in advance of the face to face meeting and five days of public comment, there is after the public - after the Nairobi meeting, yes, that does not make sense. That was...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl L-O: Yes. Well that is the way we need to look at the...

(Bart Boswinkel: If you can...

Cheryl L-O: ...at the timetable.

Bart Boswinkel: If you can or maybe (Nick) has it or somebody else from supports the say the schedule, then we can take this into consideration. Rob can take it into consideration.

Cheryl L-O: I am sure (Gazler) is already talking why in his (Skype) world on the 24 by 7 chat space alerting the staff to these as we are speaking.

(Bart): Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Well I will take that as a to do out of this meeting to collaborate with my colleagues in the policy staff and come up with a timetable that I will talk with you about (Dave) and then we will circulate that to the broader group.

That factors in a - moving forward the charter of the group to the Europe meeting in mid 2010 for the...

Cheryl L-O: Um-hmm.

Rob Hoggarth: ...the final report.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Fine.

Rob Hoggarth: And I think with everything else going on with both IDNG TLDs and some of the other work that is happening, I think that there will not be any complaints in the community for that additional time to think about this.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl L-O: Rob if we make sure - so it is (Cheryl) here. If, again being totally selfish in my community's perspective, but then after all that is why I am here, if you can ensure that (Hardy) is also part of that timetabling. Because her role as interim support, she is very much part of ensuring that the monthly agendas with each of the region is populated in advance with preparatory stuff so that when it comes to public comment calls coming up from the ICANN side that

we are not staffing from a non-prepared state, especially from Africa and the Latin American and Caribbean regions point of view.

So, she can actually take two measuring cycles, one in preparation and then the second one to get the feedback from the (ILS)s. So the more that she is involved in in looking at that scheduling, the better from my perspective anyway.

Rob Hoggarth: Certainly (Cheryl) I will do that. I am traveling to Los Angeles this week so I will meet with her in person...

Cheryl L-O: Oh brilliant.

Rob Hoggarth: ...to talk about that.

Cheryl L-O: Brilliant. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: And (Dave) do you think that that works for you and the and (Paul) for you on the (ASI) side?

Paul Wilson: Yes. That should work.

Man: Yes, it does for me.

Rob Hoggarth: I am little bit...

((Crosstalk))

Dave Archbold: Okay thanks Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: ...GNSO. Yes certainly. I am a little bit closer to the GNSO world. So I think that I do not want to speak for (Sahid) or (Olga) on that but I think that that

works out from the GNSO but I was asking you guys just because I am not as familiar with that part of the community.

Dave Archbold: Good. Okay. I am conscious of the time as ever. So I am going to draw things to a close unless we have any other business. I will add that I am going to continue working on the draft and will circulate things out to you hopefully in the days between now and Seoul.

I feel the more that is actually on paper that we can discuss, it helps concentrate the mind. I am not suggesting that mine is the right answer, but if there is something is on the ground it is easier to discuss. Any...

Olga Cavalli: (Dave) this is (Olga).

Dave Archbold: Yes (Olga).

Olga Cavalli: All right. Could we summarize our next steps just because I was somehow lost with the updates definition and I really - I would like to have it clear in my mind which are our next steps.

Dave Archbold: Sure.

Rob Hoggarth: (Dave) would you like me to summarize or are you...

((Crosstalk))

Dave Archbold: Yes. If you - that will be fine, by all means. Go ahead Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. In terms of decisions that have been made at this meeting and sort of next steps, first the working group members have generally approved the format going forward for what the interim report structure will look like.

Secondly, working group members have asked to have staff schedule a second meeting in Seoul to take place on Thursday or Friday. And I am going to take the laboring over on that and I am going to schedule a two-hour block. And then you guys can - if you want to meet for a shorter period of time that is great, but we will shoot for a two-hour block on Thursday or Friday of Seoul meeting week.

Cheryl L-O: Um-hmm.

Rob Hoggarth: Prior to Seoul, and it will happen from a staff perspective this week, we will be drafting up a survey document that will be used as a temperature check from the community basically asking some general questions about the value of the geographic region's framework for community members going forward.

The working group members on this call have agreed moving forward to push the charter schedule of publications out to achieving a final report at the European ICANN meeting in mid-2010 so that the effect of that will be that the discussions, further discussions on the preparation of the interim report will take place in Seoul.

And then a publication's schedule will be determined in Seoul looking at completing the interim report before the end of the year. And, you know, we will put out a draft publication schedule that you can all agree to there.

I think those are the major highlights. So in terms of short term (Olga), I will be working on getting the meeting scheduled, a draft survey and collaborate on (Cheryl) on that, and following up with all of you about the schedule for Seoul.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much.

Dave Archbold: Yes. I would add to that - this is (Dave). I will try and add to the skeleton report and circulate that before Seoul. I am doing that not to force my ideas on anybody but just to give us something to discuss.

If anybody else wants to make any contributions to that report, feel absolutely free to email or circulate to us all.

Okay people. Any other business? There being no other business, the meeting is adjourned. Thank you one and all.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl L-O: Excellent. Excellent (Dave).

Olga Bye-bye.

Cheryl L-O: Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: : Have a good day. Take care. Bye.

Cheryl L-O: Rob can you hang on for a moment please?

Rob Hoggarth: Certainly.

Cheryl L-O: Thank you dear.

Man: Okay bye folks.

Cheryl L-O: Two questions. When you say this week, when are you actually getting into Marina del Rey because that gives a - your afternoon is my morning time where we could tête-à-tête with this towards the end of the week?

Rob Hoggarth: Oh great yes. That would be great. I am traveling tomorrow evening. So I will be getting in late Tuesday evening Pacific coast time. And maybe...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl L-O: Okay so on sort of your Wednesday in India, we might be able to start sort of bludgeoning some of this into some sort of outcome.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes. I would hope to have something when, you know, during my plane ride, working on...

Cheryl L-O:): Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: ...something then.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl L-O: Hey. I assumed you would already have the draft done by the time you landed. Come on.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes. So that would be great. And maybe I can wrangle (Heidi) into...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl L-O: Yes. I can see you sitting at the side of (Heidi)'s desk and after sort of, you know, beating it about the head until we are relatively happy with it.

Another question was do you have a Gmail address. If you don't, would you care to get one seeing as I have seven invitations I can give to people to play with the very advanced copy which is very, very (beta) of Google Wave.

Rob Hoggarth: That would be great. If you would just send it to me at Robhogarth@gmail.com...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl L-O: Okay. So all one word.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl L-O: Okey dokey.

Rob Hoggarth: The R-O-B...

Cheryl L-O: That is fine. It is just when I only have seven and I have invited Avri. I was thinking I might invite (Ken).

Rob Hoggarth: I am honored to at least have...

Cheryl L-O: And I would like some of the at large staff to play. I want to be very, very, you know, very, very fussy about who I share with at the moment seeing as it is very, very, very, very, beta.

Rob Hoggarth: I am honored to be a part of that (august) group.

Cheryl L-O: Well, you know, anything that makes collaboration on policy development better in the future has got to be a good thing. I figured you would have a vested interest in that.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes ma'am.

Cheryl L-O: All right. I will put you in my list and then it is up to Google to accept you.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay great. And I will follow up with (Heidi) and have her take the laboring (aura) and, you know, figure out what is a good time on Wednesday...

Cheryl L-O: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: ...to chat with us.

Cheryl L-O: No. That would be fine. Okay thanks Rob. Travel (light).

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Thank you.

Cheryl L-O: Bye.

Rob Hoggarth: Bye-bye.

Cheryl L-O: Bye.

END