

Framework of Operating Principles Cross Community Working Group TRANSCRIPT

Thursday 05 June 2014 at 1500 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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-review20140605-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr
John Berard - (Co-Chair)
Alan MacGillivray
Becky Burr - (Co-Chair)
Ali Hadji

Apologies:

Natalia Enciso
Anne-Cathrin Marcussen
Avri Doria
Seun Ojedeji
Annebeth Lange

ICANN staff:

Mary Wong
Bart Boswinkel
Steve Chan
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Okay. The recordings have been started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Andre).

Man: Good morning.

Nathalie Peregrine: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody, and welcome to the CWG on the framework of operating principles call on 5 June 2014. On the call today we have John Berard, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan MacGillivray, and Ali Hadji. We have apologies from Anne Cathrin marcussen, Avri Doria,

Seun Ojedeji, Annebeth Lange and Natalia Enciso. From staff we have Mary Wong, Bart Boswinkel, Steve Sheng, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, John.

John Berard: Thanks very much, Nathalie. Welcome, all. I would like to start by thanking the staff for creating a quite useful working document that you see before you on the screen. It's the spreadsheet that incorporates the lifecycle of the working group, breaks it - identifies the areas of interest within each and then outlines against the six cross working groups that we have identified as examples on which we can draw how each of them address the particular issues.

The - you've had a chance I hope to review this document. What I would like to spend our time on today is that blank column on the far right. The reason I would like to do that is that we are gearing up for a meeting during London 50 on the Monday of the meeting and I would very much like to issue before the meeting a preliminary progress - or a progress report on our work. And I would like that progress report to identify the problem set that we think we hope to address because it is in publicizing the problem set that I think we will be able to generate a bit more cross-community enthusiasm and cross-community exercise.

I don't want to ignore, however, any incorrect information or inconsistencies that you personally know exist in the spreadsheet because of your participation in those cross-community working groups and so with (Jamie) and Alan if you could just talk a little bit about what you think is a reasonable plan, if there's any data in the spreadsheet that ought to be change and begin to frame the content for that far-right column. So I don't know which of you would like to start first but I'm encouraging volunteers.

Alan Greenburg: It's Alan here only to say that I'm embarrassed that I've never - I've only had a very minor role in one small working group on the ccNSO which actually very well. I think there are others that are perhaps of much richer history in this work than I and even Bart or Cheryl I think certainly come to mind from the cc community and I would pass the floor to them.

John Berard: Well, Cheryl, do you want to pick up the baton?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes just coming off mute. Yes certainly I will do a little speaking to this. I wondered though, John, in your desire to fill out the blank on the right-hand side and particularly because you want to have a as you say a problem set identified, did you want to take the time today to run in order through the sets of assumptions? Some of them will be ticker box yes and no. I've actually looked through and been engaged at various levels I think in each and every one of these.

And whilst there is -- how to say this politely; bugger it, I won't -- looking at the cells in some cases very little inflammatory or problem identified by the text as such, if you go down to things as simple as the question on chartered or not, we could tease out the fact that in some cases groups chartering organizations -- and I put that in inverted commas -- have caused problems for themselves individually and other parts of community in general by assuming either a greater or lesser ownership rather than working to have a particular equity in the command and control of things that may be identified in a charter.

The difference, for example, with the IDN fast track work for example where it quite reasonably and necessarily fell under a primarily ccNSO workgroup set of protocols, it could appear for example on the face of it as being a negative, where in fact it was quite positive and it was the nature of the work at hand that made that a positive experience. The absolute opposite to that of course is what could just be seen as a somewhat more significant set of issues was

raised in what would be better described as a co-chartering exercise that went slightly off the rails with the joint applicant support.

So I think we might tease out a little bit more if you just go down briefly and see if there is some more dips in color that can be brought in. Certainly from my absolutely biased point of view, the situations where a good deal of effort went into appropriately chartering an identifying need as part of the work plan and it's kind of a work plan and agreed scope and methodologies that'll make or break these things, is one of the identifiable. But to be honest, my biases are pretty clear. Things that are better designed from the beginning usually have better outcomes but they also have to be fit for purpose.

John Berard: Let me see if I can in my own hulking way repeat back what I think I heard you say and see if I'm correct. So the chartering presents one of the essential points of success or failure for a cross-community working group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Peel it back a little earlier, John. Even pre-chartering effective identifying of what the task is. In other words, what's the problem we're fixing. In jazz it was a lot stuffier. Yes.

John Berard: All right. And does - okay so there's two things here. So identifying the problem and then determining is the problem - does the problem affect more than one SO or AC, right? So if it does then it would - then you would look at it as a cross-community initiative. And then the other one is in the pre-chartering, can we define it specifically enough so that there - so that we actually know where we are going and when we have gotten there, which I think was part of the jazz problem. And if I'm trying - if I'm oversimplifying this, please feel free to tell me so.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't think it's oversimplifying. Ownership is always an issue though, John. I think we've heard in the corridors if not at the microphones over the years if it's about us, whoever us is, it should include us, whoever us is, in the processes. And I think historically there has been a temptation to have a

somewhat paternalistic view to some of these things to say this essential issue is the domain -- pardon the pun; it is deliberate -- of the J space versus the C space or is something that has greater industry or contract concern and therefore belongs in one house or identified pillar of support organization or other.

And I think part of the excruciating and sometimes quite annoying process that goes on in some of the longer PDPs for example where the breaks get put on processes and everyone's gone - have to go back and apparently feel like they're having to redo things again is when the quite desirable and necessary input from wider community, in other words everyone who's affected, comes in, often saying for example from one of the advisory committees.

GAC has been guilty, and I'll put that in inverted commas of this, quite frequently rather late in the process, whereby herding all the cats into one room and locking the door early on in the process and actually allow people to have at least the opportunity for a clear understanding of what the problems are, what the analysis of the problems are and why certain pathways are chosen.

So I think just saying - identifying who owns the problem or who it's going to affect in itself is fraught with danger. One thing that I noticed ccNSO seem to do quite successfully and early on even in things that are quite definitely their bailiwick, and the IDN work is an early example but it's far from the only one, is drag some of the rest of the community, ALAC in particular, along by saying we know you are also going to have say something to say about it so we're sticking a seat at the table early on, please try and come in fill but, you know, but don't bleat at us because you haven't been given the opportunity. You have, and that's not a bad thing.

It's annoying when the seats stay empty but it does give at least the - it forces the hand I guess, for want of a better word. An example there of course, and

Bart can embellish this a bit, is in what's pre-PDP or study group type work and the framework of the interpretation working group, looking at delegation, re-delegation which are terms in themselves that are going to be changed in the near future as a result of that working group, that affects Internet end user communities right down to the local level. It has a lot to do with governance. It has a lot to do with obviously the cc's, but, you know, being able to say you have a not only a need but a right and a place and space to be involved right from the beginning to ALAC, to GNSO, and to GAC, is probably wise.

Now GNSO doesn't necessarily need to pick up any of that offer. GAC doesn't need to pick up any of that offer. But identifying the issues and deliberately going out and forcing the hand throughout the process to get them engaged, I think makes a better product at the end. But I feel like I'm doing a monologue and you're just getting my biases and you've got a whole lot of really good horizontal issues here that you've identified, and maybe we can also look for similarities as well. I mean you've got a fairly granular approach and I'm responding to you at a very helicopter view.

John Berard: No, no, no. We'll turn to Bart. Actually you're next. But you're making a very good point. It is one that I have personally grappled with which is this notion of if a part of the community does not participate, shouldn't we make sure that that is active non-participation? Should there be a part of the process of building trust in the working groups that not only offers an invitation but requires a response that says no we're not going to participate. Because the sniping or criticism that comes from after a decision is made because there was a lack of participation can be perhaps muted if that lack of participation is made active as opposed to just passive. And, Bart, I'll let - I'll turn it over to you.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you. This is Bart for the record. Just to explain a little bit on the charter that staff has produced. Cheryl, you're absolutely right. What we didn't want to is provide some color and depth. What we did is using the lifecycle model that we presented on the previous call, and there are some details in there

already, and just look at the charters of these different groups and whether they were covered and what we know about the say the history of it.

So it doesn't include these more - so it's more of an organizational mapping than anything else and I think this goes back to what John just said and what you just said as well, the more the "politics" of it are not in this overview and that's I think something for the working group itself to add to a table like this or in other format, because I think then we have quite an overview of what is needed to start successful cross-community working groups.

And going back to the IDNC working group and the FOI working group, probably if you would add the FOI to this one for example, you should have included the DRD which is the delegation, re-delegation working group as well, because it set the whole series of issues which is almost a parallel structure as what happened with the IDNC working group where you had a GAC ccNSO working group that identified the issues. And both the IDNC and FOI were building on the work done before. So you first have identification of issues and then another working group addressing these issues. So - but that's probably too much details for the others.

But I fully concur with you say having this depth and color is something similar as John is promoting is more I would call it the politics of around and how to engage people and the outreach that is needed to make a cross-community working group successful. But recapping, this is only mapping charters, so this is recorded history. We didn't look at the final reports or anything else, just the charters.

And what is interesting already is seeing the evolution of these charters which are - looks reasonably stable now if you look on the say organizational methods of including other SOs or different SOs and ACs and on the closure and what goes in between it's a matter of the working group. I think that was just by mapping these charters was one of the easy conclusions you could draw that the invitation, so the chartering bit and the closure bit is probably

the most needed and needs the most attention in order to create successful working groups. Thanks.

John Berard: Cheryl, do you want to just agree? Yes, okay. I see that (Becky)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I often find myself agreeing myself with Bart, so don't be too surprised with that.

John Berard: I see that (Becky) has joined us. Miss (Burr), if you want to offer comments both as introduction and enlightenment.

(Becky): Yes thanks very much, and I apologize for being late. And I think Bart's sort of characterization of what this chart does as opposed to what may be recommendations that come out of this is an important distinction, so as I understand that we're really looking at the history right now and the question about sort of active nonparticipation is really a going - it's an observation that many of us might have about how the working groups have worked in the past.

I see that there's a suggestion about requiring sort of active nonparticipation. When we come back to that when it's sort of more directly on the agenda, I would very much like to phrase it in a different way, because I actually think the bigger problem there is that people are formally and officially participating. Groups are formally and officially participating but not in actual fact really participating. And that's a bigger problem than the we're just not going to pay attention to it.

John Berard: Well, (Becky), this might be a - and Cheryl I'll just offer a quick response to (Becky) and then we can turn it over to you. My hope -- I mentioned this before you came on the line -- is that we could prepare a progress report that could be issued broadly before we get to London and serve as a stimulus for the participation in our session on the Monday of the London meeting. And I

was hoping that that progress report might focus on the problem set that we've identified.

And if active nonparticipation I think if you want to refine that now, that'd be great, because I would like to include that or some variant of it as part of the problem set for our meeting. I also in my own notes here note that Cheryl's point about ownership being essential, the need for everybody to speak the same language, this unified language point again that Cheryl made.

And then we were talking broadly earlier about the pre-chartering problem statement and scope so that when a particular SO or AC is contemplating a working group that there is sensitivity enough in the individual SO and AC to appreciate that what they're about to jump into ought to be approached from a cross-community perspective, and that might be where a checklist that we might create could be helpful for individual SOs and ACs to give them some guidance. So, Cheryl, I'll turn it over to you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. And - Cheryl for the record. My point back to what (Becky) just raised was this specific - what you triggered in me, (Becky), was the points that we probably need to identify about resource management from within the component parts and the government advisory committee, in fact most of the advisory committee, would be a good example of highly limited human resources with in fact in some cases barriers existing to their ability to be engaged at a ongoing and granular layer simply because of other well in the case of the GAC the way they need to come together to meet and who can speak on whose behalf and how things need to be set up. And there's a lot of sensitivities and things that need to be considered, but it's not just limited to GAC.

It comes as a problem when we look at the - a large advisory committee from its global perspective because it's quite possible to get highly effective and highly maladaptive regional bias coming in where you've got, you know, a unified group of thoughts coming into a process which is only representative

of for example Northern America as opposed to a small island and developing states. And all that sort of stuff comes into play.

So part of it is also I think recognizing that the support organizations who have in some cases stood on a very bright line, dare I say almost a battle line from time to time, and said this our business and we need to do this now because it suits us and our program, sometimes get out of step and it may be by accident, it may be design. This can cause then some of the hey why didn't you engage with the wider community earlier type issues that I think the tendency towards more cross-community working groups or the desirability for more cross-community working groups has been borne out of.

And here I'm talking from around particularly really around 2008 and '09-ish on but you've seen them more and more because of the nature of the work coming out. Now part of that could be addressed if one looks at some of the work done by the early accountability and transparency review team looking at the amount that's put in to get the government advisory committee to establish at least some frameworks for better operating procedures with other component parts of ICANN.

Now that work is ongoing but a lot of it has been done. So you've got the GAC board working better together. You've now got far better potential for GAC and GNSO to work better, and of course it's slightly unique with GAC and ccNSO because of the nature of the ccTLD operators and their local sovereignty anyway. But I think just identifying and accepting that sometimes, you know, work has to be done because it needs to be done now but a good problem identification, a good communication program which pushes information out to all of the -- sorry, Bart, I can't help myself; I'm going to use the term significantly interested parties. Just slow deep breaths. It's all right, Bart. Little in joke for the...

(Becky): That was (Becky).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh it was you, (Becky), was it?

Bart Boswinkel: This is more (Becky). This is more (Becky)'s point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I knew you'd enjoy that, (Becky). And just sort of make sure that there's a set of checklists as you suggested, John, not just at the beginning but throughout the process. And if you look at the difference in terms of time between the IDN work for example and some of these lighter efforts that have been identified for our analysis, you've also had huge changes in even workgroup practices within for example and quite specifically the GNSO.

You know, it was during the dark distant days of the very effective and successful cross-community working group that gave us the fast track to IDN ccTLDs that also we were building the guidelines for how policy development working groups, study groups and study teams would operate within the GNSO. And I know that a lot of language that went into that documentation that built the model we now operate in the GNSO work was very deliberately designed because we knew of the success, the failures, the tensions and the experiences that was going on within that ongoing cross-community working group of the IDNs, the ccTLDs because, you know, Avri and I were holding pens on a lot of that and we were also working in this new fangled area of bringing GAC and ALAC and a whole lot of other ACs and SO interested parties even external to ICANN along for a ride.

So proper planning prevents a piss-poor performance I guess is where we're coming from at this point but we do need to recognize that not everyone can have the resources to get to people actively or passively participating. And we need to perhaps be greater training on the managers of the process.

Now I don't necessarily mean in fact the chartering organizations. It may mean the chartering organizations, but it's more likely in my bias view to mean the day-to-day managers of the situation, in other words, your leaders of your work group and your staff support to have a checklist let's say.

And thou shalt correctly reach out to all groups that were originally identified as being with a vested interest or otherwise. And reach out to all of our groups again because you may not have recognized that in the beginning that there was a vested interest.

And that if you did, back then they may not have had the time, energy and the inclination to get engaged. But you got to keep proactively pushing stuff out. I'm going to shut up yet again. I know I've given (Vicki) a heart attack using...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Buttons.

John Berard: So (Matthew) I'll turn it over to you. But before we do, we haven't heard from (Hagi) on this call. And I was just curious if you have a comment you wanted to make? Or I see (Becky)'s pulled her hand down. So (Hagi) is there anything you want to add to the conversation at this point? And I don't hear anything so (Becky), you want to jump in?

(Becky): Yes, I just pulled my hand down because you had recognized me. And I usually forget to do that. So Cheryl and I are definitely thinking along the same lines in terms of the some groups no matter what will participate less actively.

And, you know, in some cases in a disappointing way. And so you do just have to keep pushing information out so that they're aware of what's going on to the extent that you can make them aware of it. And, you know, have the opportunity to speak up if issues become to take, you know, if things jump up out at them as being problematic.

But going back to your comment John on the need to, you know, on the - on sort of putting out some materials in order to generate participation, and I

actually think, you know, we are moving into a world where everything that's happening of significance and not, that's an overstatement, but the most significant issues that ICANN is going to be dealing with in the next 18 months are going to be dealt with by cross constituency working groups of one variety or another.

And so all of the issues of a sort of what do we know about, you know, where things have gone wrong. And so what you need to take care of or avoid or be aware of. How you allocate resources and ensure that, you know, there are sufficient resources across the interest groups at the appropriate level of skill set because, you know, you need writers. You need thinkers. You need all of that, you know, kinds of the varieties of skill sets there.

And I don't know what time we are scheduled for for our public session. But I actually do think that this should be one of the most interesting sort of utility and tool sessions that we can have in London.

John Berard: I believe it's at 1:30 on Monday. Is that right (Mary)?

Mary Wong: That's right, 1:30 London Time.

(Becky): Well we should definitely try to make sure that, you know, that everybody is aware of that including the folks in ICANN who are taking a laboring ore on some of the transition projects.

John Berard: No I agree. And again, jumping the queue here, I - that's one of the reasons why I wanted to issue a progress report that speaks to some of the things that we've identified.

And we've got a growing (list things) here. Making sure that the areas of concern are fully defined. As you said, the allocation not just of the resources, but appropriate skill sets. This notion of ownership, as active non-participation of the pre-charter and considerations, speaking the same language.

Making sure that there is active - not just active participation but active non-participation. And that doesn't even begin to get at what Cheryl was mentioning earlier, the political issues that surround some of these crossed into the workgroups.

So I think it we're all on the same page there in that regard. I would like to come back to Alan who admittedly is - has little experience, but has vast experience with regard to getting people of different point of view to work together from a political perspective.

Alan is there any - are there any strategic concepts that you think we should make sure that we consider in trying to knit together a policy or a set of procedures for cross community working groups?

(Alan McGilfrey): Well if I had to make - sorry, this is (Alan McGilfrey). If I had to make any comments, it would be that I don't think we should be aiming for a one-size-fits-all set of procedures because they have to be adaptable to certain situations. In other words, some situations require something elaborate, others more simple.

I think we should be more striving for something like a checklist. In other words, make sure you consider this factor and actively discard it for example. So that would be - so I'm going to repeat myself by saying you have to adapt to the circumstances.

But even though we could have some set of perhaps key factors or key things that have to be included, and I think we've already made a lot of progress on that on the piece that (Mary) sent out originally. There are some key things that working groups have to put in their charter.

And maybe that's where we can go is sort of key requirements and issues that have to be actively considered, though would not necessarily be a specific requirement.

John Berard: Thank you (Alan). That's good advice. And (wouldn't you know) the checklist that would - which would require active consideration and active discard would be an interesting approach which mirrors this active participation and non-participation. Bart you're up first.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, just to add it to what Alan said. So what I'll do is the ccNSO has what is called a guideline for setting up working groups, but also a template. And I think I promised it earlier on. After the call I will send it to the working group as an example.

And what it does is it's specifically called a guideline to allow working groups to deviate from so what is included. It is not a, say it's not built in concrete. It's just a list for consideration.

And if you want to deviate for a particular group, do it. It's just - but be aware. And if you want to, please add rationale or something. It strengthens the charters of working group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I just follow up on that?

John Berard: Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Bart we should stop getting in the backend of my brain. It's scary when you do that. What I was going to ask is can we identify in the fact, because actually like measurables as well, any effect on outcomes?

Or can we make an assumption that there will be a better effect on outcomes for cross community working group with things like a mutual understanding of

the language, that main English versus French versus Russian there, the glossary of terms, et cetera, et cetera is established early on.

But also during the history that we're looking at just on this page of analysis of what happens when and how it all went with each charter, with a lack of thereof in some cases.

I know, as staff probably painfully that there's been a difference between having the guidelines of that Bart was just referring to for ccNSO, which are (last) touch and necessarily solid because we're not actually a support organization and community of interest that it serves.

And the still guidelines, but more freshly developed guidelines in the scheme of things because I think I'm post-2009, '10 and '11. The guidelines that now exists for the same sort of thing out of cc - out of GNSO world.

And to be honest, unless you had someone in a chartering situation and did for example happen in the DSSA because you had (Chuck) and Cheryl and (Chris) who literally, you know, worked with staff and the best out some guidelines that everyone managed to agree with and call you charter.

We actually brought those new singled concept things that we knew GNSO was going to be accepting as guidelines into the conversation. We were obviously...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And the same from ccNSO. Now right now we still have a situation though where the chartering organizations, whether they're ICs or SOs any cross community working group may very well be and remain unaware of the existing guidelines that are expected to be operated with an age of that they are component parts.

So maybe what we need to do is also have a desirable outcome from our work to take the best bit of these sorts of guidelines and see that there is the guidelines that exist at the end of our process.

And not - they are built upon and familiar to people who work with either what happens in the ccNSO or the GNSO or the GAC or the ILAC. And I just think that exercise in itself, while it's separate from what we kind of have in front of us here today, might be very, very worthwhile.

There's a - for example, you can identify where language may be a real problem because of the use and terminology such as liaison, capital L or lowercase L, adjusting documentation because liaison, capital L or lowercase L means very, very different things to the different ICs and SOs.

So, you know, we really possibly need to go right back to basics on some of this as we're building outcomes. But right now let's just get the problems properly identified as well. Sorry, I'm a little excitable about this topic as you may imagine.

John Berard: Well, I mean the meeting started at midnight, so I certainly can appreciate your participation maybe here more than you can. We - I'll defer to my interim co-chair, but my feeling is that we are moving towards agreement on just how to approach the meeting in London.

What it is we would like to get out of the meeting in London. And it strikes me that certainly everybody on the call is in agreement that this issue of cross community working group framework of operating principles is more important than perhaps a number of people on the call might suggest.

And my sense is that if we are successful in preparing for the London session that we'll be able to generate a bit more enthusiasm, which will be appropriate to the matter.

One of the things that we'll need to do at the start of the meeting in London is to select the real chairs instead of the interim co-chairs. And one of the things I'd like to do is to have people nominate or even self-nominate so that to the first item of business is to do that.

And then we can get into the substance of the session. So (Becky), I don't know if you might want to - anything either in support or in opposition to your candidacy, but I'll turn it over to you.

(Becky): I think it's always wonderful to have many different volunteers in the community. If called upon, I will serve.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I just dropped my (Adobe). And so I don't know whether my hand went up before it went to try alternative server and giving me a little connect symbol. But can I just say something to those of you who've worked with me before?

You will not be surprised to hear me say this is not a picnic. Managing these processes takes experience. It takes trust. And it is not something where every man and his dog and your great Aunt (Mary) should - sorry (Mary), should be saying, I'd like to lead that because it's going to look good on my CV.

We need proven, established chairs who can drive a process and take the community a longer with them. And I personally don't see that it should be your first order of business in a public meeting.

I think you should be going to the public meeting saying with any interim chairs and we have the support of the existing working group to continue in the full-blown (realm) because it does need to be balanced.

You're both doing a decent job. You both bring trust. And I see more time wasted going through the I might look good thing I could do that crap, and it is crap, then is spent on the actual work of some working groups.

So let's cut the crap and adjust confirm you two with the two primary chartering organizations anyway. You may wish to extend an invitation to another co-chair or vice or whatever term, again my (cheer) factor on that is really, really low.

The title is just, you know, my (go) sometimes. But at the moment you've got your two SOs clearly working for mutual and beneficial outcomes with experienced leaders. Let's run with that.

You might want to see if you can draw some more support at that admin level from some of your ACs as well. And Bart knows very well be forced that in the DSSI.

And having forced that thou shalt all share the leadership model, yes, one or two people work a lot harder than everybody else. But the model is what's important here.

So I wouldn't be suggesting that we democratically and, you know, when I say the term democratically, and I do that deliberately I open new doors for, you know, for everyone to say I like to be a leader. Not at all.

(Becky), John, you are doing a good job. Let's just get on with it and ask a couple of others to join you. But, you know, keep up on the politeness and let's just have people we know and trust. Was that to...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: I take your point. I take both your point this. Certainly, as (Becky) has said, I have a keen interest in this and would certainly be more than happy to continue to serve as the real co-chair.

I am intrigued though, and have from the beginning thought that a third co-chair from an appropriate SO or AC would be a good idea. And, you know, I mean the ALAC certainly would be an appropriate co-chair for this, although, you know, there are other options I suppose.

But that would be my first instinct. And we can talk about this...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I actually do think, I mean to the extent that, you know, this is critical work and getting sort of the significantly interested, sorry I didn't...

((Crosstalk))

(Vicki): Off the table is probably a good idea. So John, I too would welcome the notion of, you know, of a leadership, you know, co-chair from ALAC as well.

John Berard: Before we get off this call, somebody's going to have to explain the significantly interested parties.

(Vicki): But then we'll have to kill you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh no (Vicki), one day, one day.

((Crosstalk))

(Vicki): Does framework of interpretation working group interpretation of RFC 1591 on delegation and re-delegation is 1591 says of top level (dement), which is one of the - that process has been an incredibly long, hard-working process where we do discuss the definition of a significantly interested party for months on end.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Minutay), absolute (minutay). That's incredibly important. It's incredibly important to get right. And it's a really good example where language is a vitally important and how one interprets the language you're using is vital in this process.

And to be honest...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I die in the ditch standard for your - for John's and your reference.

John Berard: I see. I see. I understand that. Now, Mary, you've had your hand up for a while. I apologize.

Mary Wong: No, no not at all. Didn't want to jump in when the momentum was going so well. I did have a couple of follow-on comments to Cheryl's, including the last one that she made. So I hope I don't a jumble up the order.

Going back to where we are now and where we want to be for London, (unintelligible), (Steve) and of course John and (Becky) and we're trying to come up with something that can spur discussion in London.

One thought I had was to maybe take some of these suggestions. And some of them are fairly general, high level type. But in today's discussion there's been a couple of more specific ones.

So what I was hearing was that we seem to be driving towards, in terms of outcomes for this group, a template, a sort of checklist or guidelines that we would then say future cross committee working groups, you know, here is your template, guidelines, et cetera.

That's at a very general high level. Specifically there were a few other suggestions. And some of them are in the notes part over here on the right. The last one that I heard was about the chairs.

And it seems like if you go through this set of selected CWGs on the list that I think most people agree, it's just logical and it makes sense to have co-chairs for each cross community working group.

So that may well be a specific recommendation that we end up with with this group. I wonder if you would also want to throw in some, I'm going to use the productive, maybe that's not the correct word, you know, suggestions.

In this builds on Cheryl's last and ultimate point that certainly for a number of groups, you really need veteran or experienced chairs and co-chairs for a number of reasons.

And perhaps for cross community working groups, that's more critical generally speaking than others. The one thing that we could think about throwing out there is not only co-chairs, but experienced co-chairs.

So that's my specific suggestion. For the co-chairs for this group what I was thinking was it seems to me that what we have is a nomination of John and (Becky) by Cheryl, seconded by (Alan) to continue to the co-chairs of this group.

We can write that up as a message to the list and ask for nominations or self-nominations for a co-chair or co-chairs either in lieu of them or to assist them. That's just to dot all the Is and cross all the Ts. And those are my comments John.

John Berard: Well thank you (Mary). We are at the top of the hour. I don't want to...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Before you do, sorry John. And my hour is later than yours. I disagree with you (Mary) in the last part of what you said. I don't think it should be limited to the working group list, which is necessarily already small and not as inclusive as it needs to be.

I think that is an order of business that you could reasonably explore in the London meeting. And you certainly need to proactively reach out to the ICs and might I mentioned there is also another SO, right, to see whom they would like to contribute to the leadership of this very important foundational activity for this group.

So I'd be, you know, asking for experienced leaders to be put forward from all the component parts that would make up a future cross community working group. Now we know some of them may not send anybody. That's okay. Will stick a blowup doll at the table and that that's fine.

But push it. Really, do not just say, you know, we had the choices in (LA) listed, and therefore it's been advertised. That's a big pitfall in my view. Anyway, I don't disagree with you often (Mary). This is just one of those times.

John Berard: That's a very good point Cheryl. And in fact, in seeking to address the active participation and active non-participation, it's not just seeking people who can serve as leader, but also people from each of the SOs and ACs that can serve as active participants.

You know, that would really be helpful as well. So I'll - (Becky) and I can work with the staff to get that put together. And we'll try and deliver on a progress report that establishes a provocative agenda for our meeting in London. Now Cheryl, you'll be there.

(Alan) will you be in London? Well we'll find out. I guess we can add that to the list of questions when we circulate a note to this - the working group (Mary).

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: Great. I'll see you there. And I hope that (Ravi) will be there and...

Woman: Yes.

John Berard: Some of the others. Great. All right, let's wrap it up right now. Anybody have any final words they want to offer or can we just bid everyone...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Adieu works well. When you put your listing out of these questions John, can you make sure staff also remind everybody the timing of the London meeting? For example, I am likely to not be in the meeting if I've got competing interests from a nominating committee.

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: Nominating committee does not start until Tuesday though, does it?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. We'll be interviewing from Saturday beforehand.

John Berard: Excellent. All right, well thank you all for joining us this morning. And we'll see you in London.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: See you then. Bye.

Woman: Thanks everybody.

Woman: Thanks everyone.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Thank you.

END