

**Policy & Implementation Subteam Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 24 September 2013 at 1200 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Tuesday 24 September 2013 at 1200 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: <https://icann.box.com/shared/static/uoaf35sgogglyvsa75de.mp3>

O

Coordinator: I just wanted to remind all participants at the conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect. For assistance press star 0.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Julie). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. This is the policy implementation sub team team call on 24 September 2013.

On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, and Amr Elsadr From staff we have Mary Wong, Markia Konings and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I would like to remind all participants to please say their name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much and this is Marika speaking. I just got the same message from (Michael), so replied to him the call information. I'll definitely look into what's - what the issues may be in him getting email addresses.

In the meantime I have created an email list for this group. So to make it easier and not, you know, letting anyone off or having to type all the addresses again. And you should have all received a welcome message for that.

So for now the sub-team consists of, you know, people today on the call. We have (Michael). We have (Olivier), Alan Greenberg. And then I think it's also one of the topics on the agenda for tomorrow to see if we can get some of this off from the contracted party houses. That's the group that's currently not represented in the sub-team.

And let me just see, we also have a dial-up number. Nathalie I'm just giving you the number of (Michael) so maybe (unintelligible) you can dial out to him.

Nathalie Peregrine: Yes.

Marika Konings: So what you see on the screen is the slide deck that's prepared for the discussion tomorrow of the whole working group where, you know, the main objective is to take the working group through the different required documents for reading or, you know, for understanding what this is all about.

And as well to try to identify where the different charter questions come in. And as I was doing that I actually thought as well like, you know, looking at the staff paper that we prepared, it got the discussion going.

As well they saw, you know, our experience to date with the PDP. That there may be certain steps for each of the charter questions that may be helpful starting points, or at least, you know, something the working group may want to look at as they start exploring those issues.

And as I said, that may be helpful as well for you as a group to look at because that may help inform how you develop the work plan. Because if there's certain required tasks are things that need to be investigated or explored that may be, you know, one of the elements that would come up (when we're done).

So let me just pick up on those items. As I said, you know, the detail of this I'll go into tomorrow. For example, the first question or first charter question is that, you know, the working group starts to develop a set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy implementation right at discussions.

Taking into account success in GNSO operating procedures. I think from the question here it's already of course obvious that, you know, a starting point will be to actually look at the GNSO operating procedures.

And, you know, specifically in there are of course the working group guidelines and the PDP manual that, you know, where you can find what our existing principles that are may be explicitly there, or maybe implicitly there that you could deduct looking at this question.

And then another reference point may be the staff paper that we proposed where we also started looking at some - proposed our principles that may underpin these discussions.

Again, these are more like kind of starting points for the working group. And there may be other elements or, you know, documents or, you know, maybe even external examples that the group may want to look at. But from our perspective, this may be something where you want to - would like to start.

Let me just see because, you know, (unintelligible) writing again. Nathalie are you setting up the dialogue for him?

Nathalie Peregrine: (Unintelligible) my fault (unintelligible) I haven't received a request from (Michael).

Markia Konings: I know, I sent you the phone number and Java.

Nathalie Peregrine: Okay, I see it.

Marika Konings: I sent him the email, but I don't know if he's having difficulties receiving emails from us. I'm not sure. But he said maybe if you can maybe dial out to him.

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: I'll call out (right now). Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much. So the second charter question basically asked the question, you know, develop a process for developing gTLD policies, perhaps in the form of policy guidance, including criteria for when it will be appropriate to use such a process for developing polishing other than consensus policy instead of a GNSO PDP.

And there a suggestion would be, because the GNSO has used ad hoc processes in the past develop, you know, advice or guidance. Even though those were not formal processes, they did use them.

And that may be a starting point, again to look at, you know, how those processes were run. You know, what were the good parts? What were the bad

parts? What was your experience with it? Is there anything we can learn from those or anything that we can take from those that may form the basis for such a process?

And some of the ones I've mentioned here is for example the FTI, which is the kind of a special trademark. I think (Mary) you may know the acronym. What was it again - the?

Mary Wong: Special trademarks is interest implementation. I don't actually recall. There's trademarks in there, that's for sure.

Marika Konings: Yes, actually it was a group that was formed after the IRT that made some recommendations. And then the STI was a GNSO led group with participation as well from others, looking at those recommendations in a very short timeframe. Turning those around and coming out with output.

And I think they did have some basic steps in their process as well as some basic requirements on who could participate. So again, it may be an example to look at.

Another one (unintelligible), which is the standing committee for improvement implementation, which is a new format that the GNSO Council is using for questions that relate to the GNSO review procedures.

Again, they work on a certain model. They are as well formed in a certain way of participation. Again, they serve as a model to look at. And so, and in this case there may be other groups that the GNSO Council has used over time that may be useful reference points, or at least a starting point for looking at what has used in the past, what worked, what didn't work and what may be, what can we take from there, you know, going forward.

And Holly I see your hand is up.

Holly Raiche: Just a comment in here. I remember during the discussion developing the charter that this looks like a linear process. But there may be times where in fact you would want a (unintelligible), some kind of consultation or some kind of discussion. Because what originally started this off was well, there were high-level principles and then the implementation, which was supposed to be implementing high-level principles probably should have been discussed because a lot of what came out of the process for the high-level principles, nevertheless needed further discussion.

So I'm just a little conscious that even though this looks like a linear process, there may be times when in fact you would - there would be some kind of consultation or whatever at various times.

So even though, I guess I'm saying even though it's linear, think about the possibility of different times and different interventions.

Marika Konings: Right, exactly. And I think that, you know, is a very good point and something to consider because it may be that there's not, you know, one size fits all models for providing policy guidance.

But, you know, one outcome may be that this working group would propose, you know, a variety of options that depending on the issues at stake, the GNSO Council may say well we pick Option 8 for this question because, you know, we need to develop it within two months.

Or, you know, we pick Approach B for this one because, you know, these are the circumstances. So it's definitely, you know, I don't want to suggest here

that there's only one possible process that would be the outcome of, you know, one of the recommendations.

I think it would be very well possible that it would either be kind of menus of options or for example, one kind of process, but within that process you have different options depending on the needs or, you know, the timeline or the urgency of the topic that is being debated.

So what I think that's, you know, a very good point. It's something that definitely would need to be factored into to the work plan.

Holly Raiche: Thank you.

(Michael): Marika it's (Michael). For some reason I finally got on.

Marika Konings: Hey (Michael). We're glad you made it. There must be something...

((Crosstalk))

(Michael): Yes, well I kept sending out emails because I did not get the call information. So you may be sending to my old the number or my old address.

Marika Konings: Yes, we need to check because we created a new - a (matrix) for this now. So we'll double check which email address we have there because I think the call details did go out to everyone.

But I said, you know, maybe it's the old address. Or they're getting stuck in your spam filter for some reason. But we're glad you're here. Just to, you know, catch up where we are we actually, as we were missing some members we decided just to get started with the call until you would come along.

And what I've done so far is actually take people through some of the slides that prepared for the session tomorrow. As I was preparing my presentation on the background documents and, you know, trying to fit in where the charter questions that into the current process.

And some, you know, thoughts occurred to me on potential starting point for some of these charter questions, which I thought they help as well your conversations of developing a work plan.

So that's basically where we got started. But if you prefer to, you know, go back to the mind at first, or if you want me to start again or just, you know, finish where I was and then pick up from there.

(Michael): That may be a good place. Is it at the same Adobe Connect?

Marika Konings: Yes. Yes I did - because I replied to your message that the meeting details as well as Adobe Connect. But if you didn't get that either there is definitely something weird going on.

(Michael): I've got my other Adobe Connect. Maybe this will...

Markia Konings: Yes it's the same one.

Man: There you are.

(Michael): I was waiting for the response.

Man: I see you now.

Woman: There he is.

Marika Konings: So maybe you can catch up. I'll just go one - if you're - would you like me to continue?

(Michael): Yes. Yes I can see you. I see where you are. Yes go ahead.

Marika Konings: I'll just take one step back then because we just got, you know, the first charter question talks about this, you know, overall set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy authentication rate of discussion.

And we said an obvious starting point is already in that charter questions, looking at the GNSO operating procedures. And I think you might be looking at the GNSO working group guidelines and the PDP manual to see if there are any implicit or explicit principles in there that you could already deduct from what's currently there.

And then also the staff discussion paper also identified some principles that you may find useful, or at least, you know, as a starting point to look at. And that may be a first step in the work plan to tackle Charter Question 1.

Then we looked at Charter Question 2. And we know that this is talking about, you know, developing recommendations for a process for developing gTLD policy.

You know, we're not talking about consensus policy. And the suggestion I made there would be that you may want to have a look at other ad hoc processes that the GNSO has used in the past and dealing with issues that didn't require consensus policy.

And the STI is one example of that, as well as the SCI. And as well for a look at, because we also made some suggestions for a possible process in the staff discussion paper. So that may be another point to look at.

And then Holly made a very important point as well that of course one of the potential outcomes of this may not necessarily be, you know, one size fits all kind of process that would take different steps.

It may be that you either have different processes that would apply depending on the situation or the timeline or the urgency of the matter that, you know, the GNSO Council could basically pick and choose from that range of options, each of which would, you know, clearly outline what they require - our minimum requirements would be over the steps.

Or for example it would be a kind of, you know, one overall process. But within that process you can either (stick in) stats or (astern) elements as you please.

So I think that - I don't think at least from my perspective, I think the intention is that it could be only one kind of approach that could be used. But in outcome may be that there are different kind of processes that the Council could explore at, you know, when they either get a question of say, you know, should we go into a PDP or is there another mechanism by which we can do things?

Or at this stage where your, for example, in an implementation (ready) discussion and you say okay, we have identified that this is a policy question. How can we deal with that?

And then again you go back to the question do we need a PDP? Or is there another mechanism by which we could address that question? And looking ahead, let me see. As I said, the slides I'll cover in the meeting tomorrow. So they go more into some of the other questions as well.

But I'm looking at the last three charter questions. Those really deal with more that implementation related questions like talking about, you know, the framework for implementation related discussions.

Criteria to be used to determine when it actually should be addressed by a policy process, of why it should be considered implementation. And as well, the further guidance on how GNSO implementation review teams are expected to function and operate.

So again there are possible, you know, likely a starting part would be to look at the PDP manual. You know, what is currently there? How much information is there that can, you know, provide the starting point, or at least determine where - what are starting basis.

You know, review recent implementation review teams. We used implementation review teams for the recent implementation of the post expiration domain name recovery, the IRTP Part C.

Again hearing, although it's a little bit, of course were looking at a very different kind of approach, the new gTLD program. Again, you know, the STI I think was one of those mechanisms that looked as well at implementation or questions.

You know, we had the straw man which may be too controversial to use that as a model. But again I think there has been, over the past there has been

approaches on how to deal with these questions. And they may help inform the discussions. And not necessarily of course reopen those debates, but actually looking more at, you know, what worked, what didn't work and what may be some of the elements that we would like to see in any potential recommendations our relationship add.

And again in the staff discussion paper, what we did actually is look at, and it specifically rate the little bit on the, I think the Charter Question 4 is when you're in an implementation process, you know, how do you determine at some point whether, you know, what process do you determine to consult with the community?

And whether you need to go through a more policy related process or an implementation consultation mechanism? And what we did in the staff discussion paper, we actually looked at the process that is included in the new applicant, or the new gTLD applicant guidebook. Whether there's a process in there that talks about what if we need to make changes to the applicant guidebook.

And what process do we use for that? So we actually looked at that and kind of modified that as a potential vehicle that could also be used for implementation related consultations or conversations.

And again, I think here as well, you know, I think Holly's point is very important that we probably need to take into account that it may not be a one-size-fits-all because I think policy recommendations, as well as implementation come in very different flavors and means.

I think we should be careful as well not to, you know, mandate that any implementation process needs, you know, five public comment. You know,

just to name something while in certain cases implementation may be very straightforward.

If the working group comes up with, you know, very concrete language on how a policy needs to be modified, you may not even need an implementation review team. It may just be, you know, staff go away and make sure that gets into the contract.

And, you know, post by when contracted parties need to meet that obligation. So I think again we need to be sensitive there is this is our one size fits all? Or are we looking at a kind of menu of options that, you know, the Council direction or community direction would need to be invoked or used?

So I think that was at least, you know, my take looking at these charter questions. And, you know, from our - from the papers we prepared and as well, you know, the PDP manual.

And as I said I've taken - take in the past some of the things that may be useful for you to look at as you start developing the work plan. And kind of like starting point to be able to address each of these charter questions. So that's all I have to share for now.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank Marika.

Man: Yes Marika I think that's really good in terms of putting together some of the referrals that we'll need to do in reviewing these and the approach. And I agree totally with Holly that in the end I'm much more of a not ad hoc, but I have a feeling that there are - is not going to be a single solution.

And somehow our end product has to reflect that. Then the question for us, and then for the group as a whole is what is the best method, I guess were herding cats.

What is going to be the best method for trying to put these things together for answering these questions in a logical sort of way? And I think going through these and going through the various materials and the links that you sent out I think are, you know, the essential place to start with an understanding of what's gone before. Then trying to put together the answers to these questions.

But then the question for us is what would be the approach that we should take as a group to actually move towards this? And then also what sort of deliverables do we think, at this early stage, are we going to be pointed toward?

Nathalie Peregrine: And we've got a hand up (Michael).

(Michael): I'll go ahead. I have to multitask here. Holly go ahead.

Holly Raiche: It's just a thought, but another - an additional approach may be tools as to how you get from A to B. For example, the PDP process has got some steps in it. One of the steps is preparing paper and getting comments.

But it may be that for example in a very short space of time you want to get people to be able to read or understand something, and a webinar may help. Or it may be that adjunct is a webinar.

Or it may be that you can, at an ICANN meeting, achieve certain things that you would take far longer to do over an email. Or it may be that there are other tools.

I'm just wondering if part of what we're looking at is are there different ways to communicate depending on different circumstances, as well as a kind of, well instead of just a process, it may be that a process - one process will involve a bunch of tools. Another process will involve different tools or a different mix.

And I wonder if that's a way of kind of teasing out what different processes might look like. And not completely different processes, but just to come in different combinations of different things that we'll wind up with agreement somehow.

I don't know if that makes sense, but that's what I'm just wondering if that helps. I don't want my hand up.

Man: Well again yes, I think, yes that's probably something to work towards, (Amir).

(Amir): Yes hi. This is (Amir). Yes I think Holly has a pretty good - I think it's a good idea to use different tools. And when looking and trying to think about how we want to take the work of this working group forward and how we want to deliver and what it is were supposed to be doing.

I've been trying to think about where it is we want to be when we are starting. And well I'm hoping that the presentation that Marika will be giving on tomorrow's call will be a pretty good step towards having everyone just start with a common understanding of what it is were dealing with.

And sure, there will be a lot of homework I think for all the members to do in terms of reading up on the difference, you know, policies and documents. I

think webinars is a pretty good idea as well, especially to maybe not just keep us informed but also others we want participating with their views and opinions. Whether were talking about external experts or different constituencies and (ACs) in the community.

And that takes me to my second point, which is the feedback that we would like to get from the community. I think for this working group specifically, this might require more than one model and point, which we should ask for feedback.

Looking at the mind map, I was thinking that will the basic requirements - I'm hoping most of this is going to be covered during Marika's presentation. And of course with everyone reading up on the material we've been asked to read up on.

But the working group tasks, I think it might be a good idea to - for the chairs of the working group to address the letter for the outreach for the (SOs), the (ACs), the constituencies.

Get as much feedback as possible. Now I don't know how helpful this will be, but it might give us a starting point on where folks see what it is were supposed to be dealing with now.

But after we complete the working group tasks, I think we might want to share this information. Again, maybe in the form of a webinar like Holly suggested. And accompany it with documents that we should work on and ask for feedback for a second time. I think this would be a relatively constructive way to get meaningful feedback from everybody.

Aunt looking at these tasks as well in that charter questions, I was thinking that perhaps with the working group tasks starting from the third block of review of sampling of previous implementation efforts, all the way down to the end.

I was thinking maybe it might be a good idea to divide up the work and to sub-teams amongst the working group. Try to move in parallel with the stuff, taking into consideration the question - the charter questions we need to answer.

And periodically during the full working group meetings, let's share updates, get feedback from the rest of the working group members. And then again, when all is done, get a second round of feedback by outreach of the community.

I'm hoping this - it seems like there's just so much to do and so much to look over and so much to consider. And there are probably going to be a bunch of potential different linear processes that we - that might need to be considered.

And they might need to be considered in conjunction with each other. And so just it feels like, to me it feels like we all need to be at one points together when we're starting the work. We need to just keep everyone as informed as possible. And keep getting feedback. Thanks.

(Michael): (Michael) here. I think that's a tremendous idea. And in part by think whether or not, in fact I'm sure we didn't express it in talking on the leadership side with what we wanted the subgroup to do.

I think in part, forming this was to help explore a model for, as you suggest, breaking some of these subjects, some of these explorations into subgroups for exploration in more detail. And then coming back to it.

I don't know what you're all experience it is. I have not worked with a group of this size. But it seems to me that while we might have some extremely interesting discussions try and to get 30 people to make a decision over the telephone calls.

Woman: Right.

(Michael): That's asking for chaos. I like that idea. And I also agree with you in that I think the place to start is very much definitional. Understanding what it is that we are talking about.

And I think in some cases, and maybe to a large extent, understanding the question is going to be as important as coming up with the answer for this. And, you know, I think both the small group's idea and the idea of presenting this out into the community and using their feedback is very good.

I think what we need to do perhaps in thinking about this and coming up with a working plan is considering at what points we would want to ask community comment from the various (Ass) and (SOs) - (ACs) and (SOs).

And on what types of topics that we might go at. I was trying to think early on, based on the mind map where, you know, division of labor might come in. And I think that's something that we should look at and see if we can come up with some answers. Marika you have your hand up.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just try and to maybe look as well and how the working groups have maybe approach this because I think, you know, the task of developing a work plan basically is trying to define how we are getting from, you know, where you're starting to answering your charter question and identifying as part of that process, you know, what your different milestones are.

And set timelines around that. And, you know, identify who should be responsible for what. So, you know, other groups haven't even started with looking okay, so what are the charter questions we've been given?

Are, you know, should these be broken out into different groupings? Are we able to group them together? And I think, you know, as you've seen on the slide for example these three charter questions that are up now may be a natural home of taking those together. While the other two may be more separate questions.

I think one of the questions you need to answer then is, you know, is indeed a sub-team approach a desired approach? There are definitely pros to that because, you know, you work indeed in a small group. It may be easier to get work done.

But at the same time there's always the risk as well that a sub-team may be marching ahead without the rest of the working group following. So when the sub-team comes back to the broader group that people say well, this is not what we expected. And we don't agree at all.

So again it's, you know, making sure that you find that balance between if you decide that sub-teams would be approach to take. How to manage that. How to make sure it works.

Of course, if you have several sub-teams at the same time it's also resources, both community as well as staff. You need to schedule calls to follow up. So it's something to take into kind as well as you do that.

Also considering should indeed certain questions run in parallel or is it necessary to answer one of the charter questions before you can actually get to the next one?

Or need all of these be considered in a package deal? So in that sense, you know, doesn't it make more sense to do everything with everyone or are there certain parts that can be broken away and can't be dealt with separately?

Again, certain parts may need to be done before starting with some other parts. Or I think that's basically the puzzle that the sub-team has been tasked with, looking at the questions you need to answer. Thinking about what needs to be done in order to answer those charter questions.

Determining as well what the linkages between the different questions. And then as well looking at the resource question. Indeed if you would decide that everything should have a sub team and everything should be done at the same time, do we really have enough people to do that? Or are there enough volunteers? You know, we do have a really big working group. But does it also mean that people are willing to serve on sub-teams and spend time on that?

And then again think as well about the question of if you go down a sub-team route, how can you make sure that all the difference parts stay connected in a certain way? And you don't get into a situation where a sub- team spends a lot

of time and effort coming up with something which from their perspective is really, you know, the answer.

And then basically, you know, gets shut down by the (overall) group because they don't see it or they don't understand what happened in that sub-team to come to those kind of conclusions.

So I think those are some of the elements that you'll need to think about as your sub-team to really - as your task, which we need to develop a proposed approach work plan.

And if that's helpful I can share with you some of the work plans that other working groups have done. Although I think most of them are a little bit more straightforward as they are, you know, there's PDP working groups. But again some of them did break out in sub-teams.

Some of them basically what they did as developing the work plan was basically just identified per working group meeting what would need to be discussed. Basically saying well, we may not have sub-teams, but what we do mapped out is, you know, in the first meeting we think these questions need to be addressed.

In the second meeting this is what we need to tackle. And the third, and basically work and that way through the schedule of meetings. And ending up with okay, at this point in time we, you know, we have received the feedback from the different groups.

So at that point we can start reviewing feedback received. At this point we think we need to have, you know, a public checkpoint where I think we have a

webinar or a workshop or an ICANN meeting where we provide, you know, some feedback to the community on where we are.

So I think there are different ways of tackling it. And it's definitely not an easy task you have ahead of you. But just need to share with you some of the questions I think you need to be thinking about in order for you to be able to build that work plan and come up with a, you know, approach that you can also defend of course to the broader group as to how you've come to that proposed approach in tackling the charter questions.

(Michael): Thanks Marika. Yes, so which brings us to the question, anyone have an idea? I mean...

Woman: Cheryl's got her hand up.

(Michael): Oh Cheryl, you do have your hand up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hello (Michael).

(Michael): Good morning.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, sorry.

(Michael): Good evening.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good evening. May I have a go at this piece?

(Michael): Certainly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you kind sir. And I do apologize. My hand went up and down so many times I can't blame you for not noting it at all times, because I kept having to reboot the screen because Adobe Connect gets very flaky at least with my system and with this unsatisfactory Internet connection that we have in my country. But we won't start on that will we Holly?

Holly Raiche: No we won't.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay this is Cheryl for the record. I think you've all made some extremely important points and I think listening carefully to the experiences Marika's outlined is very, very important for us all and particularly for this sub team it would I think be quite useful to have a look at other work plans.

However what I was going to suggest is that we look at the Work Group charter under Timelines and Deliverables, the Section 2 part under Deliverables and Timeframes and of course one of the deliverables is our projected work schedule, which is specific work we've been tasked for - tasked with.

Now whilst we'll be creating a projected work schedule as one of the primary deliverables, that in itself will have to take into account all of the other - some component parts that it has as other deliverables.

We need to know at least in rough projection when we would be wanting to put a final recommendation report through to Council for example. So I guess what I was going to suggest is that we ask ourselves a couple of really, really basic questions as well like how long do we plan on working on this?

Are we working till London? Are we working to beyond that? Put a few primary milestone and punctuation points into that thumbnail chart, in mind

map or whatever, not necessarily have it completely engaged with the last section in the current mind map yet, which does have the subtasks and timelines and timeframes waiting for us to put in.

But let's try and even at this meeting now if not on the list or whatever sketch out a what do we want to do between now and Buenos Aires? What do we want to do between now and Singapore?

What do we want to achieve as Maria suggested even right down to a meeting by meeting? But I'd like to start with the when are we planning on finishing this in a perfect world?

I'm not suggesting that we need to rush because I don't think we can, and this is a hugely complicated and very important issue for us to be working on. But it would be nice to be able to at least put out a proposal of a by June 2014 we will be. Thank you.

(Michael): Yes I think that would be excellent and that would give a certain focus to the entire endeavor, sort of approaching it from the other side rather than setting forth what we're going to do and then deciding when.

Based on that we set up a when and have some of those milestones out there and I think, you know, to the extent that we can find within the charter questions and the deliverables a logical progression in what needs to be done.

And in some cases I think they're parallel and, you know, acknowledge that. But to try to set up something for going forward, you know, it certainly would behoove I think the group to view this with some degree of deadline focus insofar as otherwise I think we could all spend a very long time enjoying ourselves in the weeds. And...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And if I may (Michael) we as a sub team can't afford to do that. We don't get to answer the questions that the Work Group needs to grapple with. We just get to say in what order they should be done and by when.

(Michael): Right. And also the - some of the methodology and I think we've already...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely.

(Michael): ...you know, pointed out a couple of those...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

(Michael): ...you know, Webinars, using subgroups, approaching a community. And so yes for us we have our deadline, which is basically Buenos Aires or a week ahead of that.

And the intent was the hope that in a face-to-face meeting hopefully to be scheduled in Buenos Aires that progress could be made there in finalizing, you know, the understanding at least of where we would begin with a schedule that we'll somehow develop.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Get the group to buy it and see whether or not they want to make modifications.

(Michael): Right, and be able to do that face-to-face.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

(Michael): Part of the problem I think is, you know, we can discuss any of these questions and the potential answers at great length. But if we don't know why we're discussing those what is the next goal that we're trying to reach with our answers, you know, we will not be linear.

We will be circular and not progress. I don't know. In a Working Group of this sort with this important a question, I don't know. I suppose the closest I could use would be the model from the metrics team.

And that as I recall took either a year and a half, two years. What was that Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It wasn't the full two years. It just felt like it.

Holly Raiche: I remember part of that.

(Michael): Yes I came in at the good part.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

(Michael): And the structure had already been determined and the - so it was a matter of finalizing the approach rather than creating the approach.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But in a way (Michael) that was less complicated than the issues we have...

(Michael): Oh yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...because we were creating rule concept in response to a set of particular questions. There was not the compare/contrast review and opinion pieces that need - that the Work Group needs to bring into this.

So yes I think we should be clear up front. Is this going to be a two-year effort for the Work Group or do we think it is or not?

(Michael): Well - and I suppose as you say both the complexity and I think the longer-term importance of what we're doing merits a good amount of thoughtfulness. And then I think also building into the process a community outreach.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Holly Raiche: Yes.

(Michael): Even by raising some of these questions I think we will be providing some great resources for PDPs and Working Groups going forward and all of our approach to the policy and implementation issues.

I don't know how many on this call have gone out and tried to look for sources of other information on other NGOs or governmental or organization approaches to determining policy versus implementation or policy and implementation, but there's an awful lot out there.

Holly Raiche: Yes.

(Michael): And with an awful lot of different approaches to it, and I think that too is part of the process, part of that defining process. Marika you've got your hand up.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I agree that setting a deadline helps to, you know, plan the work but it's of course a little bit of a cheek and eye discussion because if you, you know, set your timeline somewhere it depends on how much work needs to be done in that timeframe and how you do that.

So I think to, you know, it probably needs to be tackled in tandem and it may be the kind of thing where you come back to the Working Group as well and saying like, "Look, from our perspective looking at what we think the work that needs to be undertaken for us to be able to tackle the charter questions, taking into account that we do have a requirement to publish an initial report for public comment, that we also want to build in sufficient time to have, you know, consultation with other groups.

We think that, you know, the shortest timeframe we could do this will be X amount of time but that would mean that there is time made available during ICANN meetings to have face-to-face time or schedule some blocks of time either at conference calls or even, you know, consider if face-to-face time is required.

Or, you know, if we're doing it in the rate, you know, the normal pace of a Working Group having, you know, we're meeting now every two weeks. You know, we do meet for 90 minutes, which solves every two weeks.

We anticipate that, you know, seeing the amount of work that needs to be done that it will end up here." And basically you can put that back as well to the Working Group or even the Working Group could put that back to the Council and saying, "Look, this is our work plan.

We have an Option A and an Option B and Option A is, you know, for you to have your recommendations by London for example. But it does mean that,

you know, you'll need to make available the resources so we can either, you know, take some time at an ICANN meeting to come together or have a block of time on calls or, you know, see if there are funds available to actually do face time.

Or, you know, you can accept that it's one year further out taking the normal pace, you know. The choice is to you. We're just offering what we think needs to be done and consultations that need to be factored in. So this is what we've..."

(Michael): What is - just so I know - I do not know the meeting schedule coming up. I know there's Buenos Aires. London's after that I believe.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, Singapore is after Buenos Aires. It's in March and then London in June.

(Michael): Oh okay.

Marika Konings: And then it's Los Angeles and I presume...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes and then L.A.

Marika Konings: ...October/November.

(Michael): Which would be a year out.

Marika Konings: I mean, this is Marika. If you look and I'm happy to share that, I mean, because enough people are very eager to, you know, do things quickly and, you know, have reports on the table as soon as possible.

I think - but what we need to be realistic as well that indeed looking at the schedule of meeting, you know, every two weeks and noting that as well. For example now we're, you know, having at least till Buenos Aires to develop the work plan.

We're probably not really doing any substantive work yet. You know, we have gone back to different SOs/ACs and asked them for input. We don't know yet what will come back.

If nothing comes back there may be nothing to review but if all of them send, you know, 50 page documents we may need to review, you know, for the next six months.

So again I think in your work plan you need to build in this kind of flexibility of saying, you know, the middle ground of saying, "Well if we get feedback we may need to spend three or four meetings going through that, which if we don't get any feedback well those four or five meetings can be spent on some of the other substantial work and move in there."

So I think you need to - when you develop the work plan there needs to be enough flexibility to anticipate for some of these different elements happening.

But I think at the same time we need to be realistic because if you look at timelines for how long it takes for Working Groups to come to initial report, I think in most of the cases it is, you know, it takes up to a year because this does take, you know, discussions and here in this case, you know, we've discussed as well do we need to have some external experts at the start who, you know, come from a different environment to talk to us about this?

Do we start indeed investigating or researching some of those other examples of, you know, ad hoc processes or implementation related efforts that again may take some time before we actually have results or data from that that can feed into the Working Group deliberations?

So I think we need to be ambitious but at the same time also realistic that some of these steps may take time and, you know, we'll need to factor that in in order to have a realistic work plan to put back to the Working Group, which then will, you know, share - be shared in the Council as well.

And then still if people say, "We can do this fast or we can always consider okay, what do we need for some of this to potentially go, you know, quicker or move along in a quicker pace?"

(Michael): Right. And I think too from past experience when we put out something for public comment, then after we receive those comments there's going to be a week or so.

Okay so if we continue with the every other week meeting so we get the responses, after next one we might begin discussing and it may take certainly two weeks. And again we're dealing with...

Holly Raiche: Two weeks? It'll take longer than that.

(Michael): But - no, two meetings. I'm sorry. That's a month which is again the challenge of dealing with some of these things in the large group, and I think in thinking about on the process side what sort of things would be better to deal with on the small group, bring it to the large group for discussion if that would actually, one, be a better way to crystallize our thought; and two, still

permit, you know, a broad discussion of the issues without going off the rails.
Holly you have your hand up.

Holly Raiche: Yes. Yes just a couple of things. I think to moving forward, which is a term I hate, I think just distributing Marika a couple of work plans so we can actually have a look at what we're talking about, I mean, I'm just thinking about where we go from here.

Looking at a couple of work plans for say some more complex issues and then the meeting, which you keep saying is tomorrow but not in our time. The next meeting of the full group is to get agreement that, you know, what is it that we as a small group are going to do?

And are we for example - have we actually agreed that it's going to be the Working Group that develops the work plan and then people agree to it or, you know, how are we going to develop the work plan? I think we're the ones who are going to do it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes with an agreement.

Holly Raiche: But if we're going to do it then we need to look at work plans and we need to think - we need to come up with some kind of recommendations, for example the - what Marika was saying.

Do we have to start with high-level principles? Is that a - just the main task or can we do different - can we - can there be different Working Groups? I think that's kind of where we have to start.

I mean, that and Cheryl's kind of well what kind of timeline are we working to are the two real questions where we have to start.

(Michael): Right.

Holly Raiche: And I think that Marika if we could have a, you know, a look at a couple of work plans that will crystallize our thinking as to what it is that we've got to produce, and try to match the working plan with the charter questions and try to just figure out what work is involved in each of those things, what kind of consultation.

And then we can start to actually formulate - come up with something that we can put to Buenos Aires if not before to get, you know, to really start on producing some results. Oops I'm sorry. Don't want my hand up. I want my hand down.

(Michael): Cheryl do you want to add to that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes I do. Thanks. It's Cheryl for the record. I - I'm going to start sounding like a broken record here I think. We've got to be really careful that this work team that we have constituted here whose job is clearly to put the work plan together for full group discussion and deliberation and hopefully endorsement after a bit of polish at the Buenos Aires meeting sticks to its knitting.

We don't get to do the work of the Work Group in miniature. And I want to, you know, we're just going to have to watch that so carefully. I'm not concerned that we'll be doing our work in parallel while a couple of meetings are held for the Work Group as a whole, because there's a lot of background stuff that all of them, us included, need to get on with, the presentation Marika's got planned for the following meeting, the - just the chewing of the fat which we're doing now even on this call.

Technically it's unrelated to our core business evidence. All that has to happen before the group dynamic settles and people get to know what everyone else knows as much as they can early on in the process, and that there's less need to establish ground rules.

But Holly I think we've got our mandate and we've got a timeline and it's really clear and we just need to get on with the job.

Holly Raiche: Stick with the first timeline.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So I'm not for taking it back to the Work Group and getting agenda time. I'm all for reporting in to the Work Group how we're progressing, and telling them to get their A and their B ready for Buenos Aires with whatever we give them a week to ten days out so that they can be deliberating discussion, policy, a little polish and then go for it. Maybe I'm just too jaded.

Holly Raiche: We've never seen it.

(Michael): Say again.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think Holly was trying to be polite.

(Michael): Oh.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So it won't work and I don't really believe her. It's - we've worked together a long time. It's okay.

(Michael): (Michael) here. Yes I agree. I think we've got our timeline and we've got our task, and at least for present I think we do want to focus on that. I had asked that we do this initial meeting just for an hour so I'd sort of like to wrap it up,

but I do want to ask Marika if - how realistic, or she maybe already has some ideas, would it be to find somewhere a couple of work plans that have been set down or flow charts maybe off of the mind map even that we'd be able to take a look at?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I've put in the chat I'll have a look at the thing you need there. There's several groups that I think indeed started with the mind map and then transmitted that into a work plan so I can share those.

I don't know if there's any group that's really comparable to this one also because we're looking at, you know, quite a, you know, flow of questions that are tackling many different areas and that may require further research I think as well.

And here we're in a bit of a unique situation as well and in, you know, the typical PDP there's always an issue report that kind of - that already scopes the issues and basically says, "Well this is, you know, what the issue is basically about."

And, you know, there is indeed a Staff discussion paper but it was more a kind of starting point for the discussion and things were identified. There are some areas here where, you know, further investigation may be needed before you actually start tackling the charter questions or actually are able to start discussing potential recommendations.

But again I think still looking at some of those other's models may be helpful. And as you'll see on the screen I've tried to capture some of the questions that were raised during the call that I think - and a sub team would probably need to try to answer another to indeed come up with our work plan indeed.

I think if we have answers to these kind of questions hopefully it wouldn't be too difficult then to actually start filling it out, because I think then you're really looking at a kind of - just a table where per week you identify what needs to happen during that week, by whom, is it the sub team, is it the Working Group?

So I think - but first identifying some of those basic questions. You know, can you tackle the charter questions all together, separately, how do you tackle them, sub teams, the whole group?

And again in some of those cases it may be as well where you make suggestions or ask the questions to the Working Group. In certain cases you may need to go back and saying, "Well, you know, from our - we want to propose that this is - we're going to tackle all - every charter question with a sub team that comes back with concrete recommendations to the Working Group."

And just say, "Well we want to test that before we actually go down that path with the Working Group," and see if - indeed if - or you can do this all in the mailing list.

It doesn't even need to be on a call. But if there are certain big decisions or answers you're going to give to some of these questions where you think it will be good to have at least a sense from the Working Group whether that's the right approach as it will determine, you know, the next steps you take in developing the work plan, I don't think there's any problem either in having that in between consultation or just, you know, putting out a question to the Working Group saying, "Look, this is the direction we're heading.

You know, let us know if you think we're heading in the wrong direction," because then now we can still adjust our course without too much work. But if we're now working basically as a sub team for, you know, one month and month and a half and we just deliver the end product to the Working Group and they just turn around saying, "Oh but no, this is not how we think we should do it," we're basically going to have to start from scratch.

So think we need to make sure as well that's an iterative process and some of, you know, maybe - indeed (Michael)'s on the call. You may already want to share some of the questions that we believe we need to tackle as a sub team, and see if there are any initial reactions from people saying, "Oh well, no way we should be using sub teams," or, "Yes that's definitely the approach," or, you know, "Definitely we should tackle charter questions one by one instead of doing them all at the same time."

So maybe there are in some sense in the Working Group on certain things that may help, you know, direct a bit your work as well.

(Michael): Yes I think some of those would be worthwhile, and if you could let us know what you can find. I know that in most of the materials that I've reviewed at some point there is a even brief discussion in some cases of how the PDPs or the Work Groups went about their business.

So even some of those very general things I think would be very useful. What I'm thinking - because of the time limit that we have and hopefully you - all of you before you raise your hand and the large group realize we're sort of at task for a very short time and quite a bit of work I think, I'd like to sort of plan if this is a good time to plan a call again next week this same time, and in the meantime ask if we couldn't on our own and then through the email list to share our thoughts on a couple of things.

One of them I think staying with the mind map is what I call connect the dots. There are a lot of places where the questions and the tasks that we have of course correlate, and I think it's important for us to understand how that is working and the reason for that being there are an awful lot of possible points to approach from the mind map.

What we need to do is to try to distill those down I think a bit to help us get direction, recognizing that once we're in the process, the large group is in the process, then we'll be shooting out to those other points as well.

So connecting the dots and then the other thing is to think on timeline. I think putting something together in that way - if it's not the answer that the leadership is asking us to come up with, at least it would raise some very important issues I think that in the large group in Buenos Aires would lead to some useful discussion, one, recognition of how long this will take; and two, trying to find solutions to meet even a lengthy if that's the case timeline.

So if all of us could do that between now and let Marika and I know if this time next Tuesday would be good for you, we sort of have a break because there will now - after the meeting, when is it, Wednesday, there will be two weeks before there's another meeting.

So we can work within that period without having to think about the other call. But I think if we can do those two things and share that information, and then when we come back together if there are other questions that come up in the meantime I'll send out emails as well.

And I'll just leave on this brief note. I think one difficulty with not only the subgroup - actually we have a task so we know what we're doing - but with

the large group is that whereas most Working Groups have a specific problem they are addressing, a destination they are going to and a solution they're going to offer, this Working Group is actually dealing with quite high level in dealing with definitional issues and general approach issues.

There is no single question we're trying to answer. We're trying to put together the framework for coming up with those questions and finding those answers, so I think it's quite different from a lot of the tasks.

So Marika if you would let us know if you could send out some of those materials.

Marika Konings: Yes (Michael) and I just had my hand up. On - the meeting for next week is actually from a Staff point of view or the challenge next week is we'll be in L.A.

((Crosstalk))

(Michael): All right.

Marika Konings: Policy meeting so it's a little bit hard especially because we'll be there 5:00 am to support that meeting.

Holly Raiche: Oh.

Marika Konings: I know. I know and we won't get any sympathy from the Australians on the call.

Holly Raiche: No. No.

Marika Konings: I think just - I think there are, you know, two ways we can do it: either try to find another time that may work for all or, you know, we can make the conference bridge available for all of you and, you know, you can discuss as - amongst you as a group and we'll just, you know, catch up either individually or at the next meeting as you prefer.

(Michael): That's a good thought. And that meeting - those meetings are all next week then?

Marika Konings: Yes and I'm actually - the week after I'm going to be there still as well till - I think till Wednesday so I'm - I may - I, you know, before our meeting starts we can definitely do it.

But I think early in the morning L.A. I think is in the middle of the night for Australia so we may - I don't know. I can look at the calendar.

(Michael): Yes. When we began our call today it was 5:00 am Los Angeles.

Marika Konings: Right. I mean, if there wouldn't be anything else going on it's fine. But we basically have a whole day of full meetings so that's, I mean, I probably will be awake by 5:00 am in any case because of the jet lag but still to really be, you know, productive of our meetings there and it may not be the best moment.

But I understand that, you know, we're all in different time zones so, you know, maybe we can push it a week out or as I said, you know, we can set up the call for all of you so you can meet and discuss.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Michael), Cheryl here.

(Michael): Yes Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm very keen to get on with the work like everyone else is, but we are going to have a fair amount of stuff to review and I think we could do providing we commit to do a fair amount on the wiki if we can share some tools and some concepts and things.

But there's no reason why we can't put out a suggestion if Marika and Staff can find a time that is going to work next week, not necessarily this time and do not worry about the Australians.

We will manage. We always do. It's got more to do with when it is in the month. For example Holly and I are now on calls for the rest of the night so this is not unusual.

But we just need to fit in with other calls, you know. So if you want to run a call next week and there is an hour that Staff can support, then that'd be brilliant but it would need to fit them I think rather than us.

But if we don't and we bump it to the week after I'm not all that concerned providing we, you know, get some work done on the list.

(Michael): Okay I think I would agree with that. I mean, if we can each of us do some of this work, and I'll send out an email later today with some suggestions on that approach, and also share either on the wiki or by email some of this information in terms of timeline and connecting dots and looking at that, I would be happy with that as long as we are continuing to work and actually sharing that information as we go.

I don't think working on our own would progress us very far. And Marika if you can take a look if, you know, if there are some little points of time in there that look like it would be realistic, shoot out a Doodle and let's see if we can set it up and if not do it the week following perhaps, even later in the week after you're back. So I think that we should...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think we might even need to be meeting weekly, but after that to pull it together for BA but that's okay. We can deal with it then.

(Michael): But - and I think we're facing right now the same thing that the group as a whole is going to face, and that is we need to do definitional work. We need to understand what it is, you know, go through the papers, not understand it merely because, "Oh I've been there and I've done that."

Let's take a look at what's down because that's where the issues arise it seems. And we can share that in writing and work towards a resolution using the wiki I think.

Holly Raiche: Yes.

(Michael): Okay so we'll shoot out a reminder of that and I'll also report on our progress and bring up some of those questions at some point during the meeting on Wednesday.

I keep forgetting what day it is. So thank you all very much. I really appreciate your helping out on this and I think, you know, once we've put this together hopefully this will be a model too for process for the work as a whole.

Holly Raiche: Well thank you.

(Michael): Okay. Well have a fun evening of telephone calls and I will talk with you all soon. I'm going to go and prepare my house for sale.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh okay.

Holly Raiche: Oh good luck.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good luck with that one. Bye.

(Michael): Thank you very much.

Marika Konings: Thanks everyone.

Holly Raiche: Bye.

Marika Konings: Bye.

(Michael): Okay bye now.

Holly Raiche: Thank you. Bye.

END