

GNSO Working Group Newcomer Open House session
TRANSCRIPTION

Thursday 06 March 2014 at 20:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

Coordinator: I would like to inform all parties that this call is being recorded, if you have any objections you may disconnect at this time - you may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much - good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the GNSO Newcomer Open House Session on the 6th of March 2014.

On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, (Gabrielle Rogallas), (Sarah Wildes), (Antonio Novato). From staff we have Marika Konings, Glen DeSaintgery, Gisella Gruber White, (Terri Aganew), (Joe Kapano) 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 Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Nathalie, its Mikey O'Connor and welcome all. We - I was sort of running a little late because we had a few more people that signed up and I was sort of hoping that they would join, but I think we'll get going and let them catch up.

This meeting is really for those of you who are new - so (Gabrielle), (Sarah) and (Tony) - you are the stars of this show. And so as I sort of rattle through the preliminaries, if there are things that have come up in working groups that

you're already a part of that you'd like to talk about or if there are topics that you'd like more emphasis on when you see the agenda that's coming, by all means steer me in that direction and that's where we'll go.

So with that let me just do the needful - there is a picture of me. For those of you who are going to the Singapore meeting the bling around my neck is the surefire way to identify me. Please walk up, wave your hands in front of me at any time - I'm always going to be chattering away with somebody but I really want to talk to you folks too. And I own two shirts - I own that one that you see which is in a nice dark red and then I own a blue one just like it. So imagine me as a fashion item for sure. And I'm on the G...

(Gabrielle Rogallas): (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Say again? I heard a little bit but not much.

(Gabrielle Rogallas): You are really trendy.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh yes very trendy, very trendy yes. Yes that's me for sure - cheap too. And I'm on the GNSO Council which is a body that keeps track of PDP process.

We sort of make sure that the process is working right and help people participate in it. And so if there's ever anything that makes you confused or uncomfortable and you have nowhere else to find an answer I'm always more than happy to field your questions by email or in person or on a call or whatever. And I love these newcomer open houses because it's a little less formal than the normal routine that we do. I think I'll just spin through the pictures of folks that you may have heard on the phone.

Marika's on the phone with us as is Glen today. (David) is fearless leader based in Istanbul - Marika and Glen I'm sure many of you already know. And just to sort of round out the group, there's pictures of Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund and then Lars Hoffman and Berry Cobb and Nathalie and soon we

should get (Terri)'s picture in there don't you think? I would think - he said nudge, nudge.

I sort have got ahead of myself but here's sort of the thing, flexible agenda is really for you and, you know, this is all about practical, useful, informal stuff. It's not anything that you have to be cautious about at all. And here's sort of the pile of normal stuff that we go through - a little overview of the policy development process, a little conversation about consensus policy and the picket fence and how that all fits together. Some stuff on the working group guidelines, primarily about the way that consensus is evaluated and so on.

We spend a little time with some of the mechanics of how this Adobe room works and stuff like that and then some pointers as to where you can find out more. Mostly that's links but if your questions lead me off in a direction I can sometimes go pretty afield on that. And so this is the point at which I stop the first time and just check and see if there's something that you either thought of before you got on the call or at the beginning or now that you'd really like to zero in on, this is the first chance that you get to steer me in some direction or another.

And then, you know, I'll sort of be pausing all the way through and asking that same question all over again. Because this is really - this is for you.

(Sarah Wildes): That should cover it for me, thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Good deal, that was (Sarah). Let's do the - has everybody gotten to play with the Adobe room stuff? For some of you who've maybe been quite on a working group let's just fool around with that for a minute.

So everybody who's on the call just go ahead and raise your hand. And the way you do that is right in the center top of the screen is a little button that looks like that little figure with a raised hand. And by clicking on it you get your hand up, by clicking on it again it goes down, so that's one - and

(Sarah)'s well ahead of the game. The - if you click the little downward diamond you can do all kinds of other stuff like applause.

And the interesting thing is that if you click on one of those things and your hand is up it covers it up. So then when you take it down the, you know, the tick mark or something else, your raised hand will reappear. So sometimes people confuse the person who's running the call by having their hand up and then putting something on top of it and...

(Sarah Wildes): Do people really use these during meetings? I've never noticed like the applause or smiles or anything.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh really, oh well it depends a lot on...

(Sarah Wildes): I might just not have noticed.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I mean it's something to keep an eye on because certainly a lot of us use them and it's a great way to participate in the meeting even, you know, (Sarah) you're in a really tough situation because the calls you're on has so many people on them.

(Sarah Wildes): That's very true and...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, (I'll bet).

(Sarah Wildes): ...if I set a status, how long does it remain there?

Mikey O'Connor: The hand raise stays until either you take it down or I take it down. I can see a little gizmo so for example I'll take your hand down and oops there you go.

(Sarah Wildes): Oh it tells my, your hand is lowered by host.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

(Sarah Wildes): Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Generally it's a good idea to lower your hand when you start talking because otherwise we go through the - is that a new hand or an old hand conversation.

(Sarah Wildes): Uh-hum, yes I've heard that.

Mikey O'Connor: So where this digital hands show up, so it's generally a good idea to take it down yourself if you're a member but the host can do it and sometimes does. That also varies by the way - the person running the meeting.

The other way that is really good to participate in - (Sarah)'s ahead of the game here too and that is to chime in in the chat. And what I generally do when I'm running a meeting is I keep one eye on the chat and one eye on the hands. Because sometimes people will just have a short comment that they don't want to go through all the pain and agony of raising their hand and then waiting in the queue and then they just have a sort comment or a correction, something like that.

And so the chat is also a really cool place to hang out and it also a good place to participate in a big meeting. I mean this one's nice because it's so small that we really don't need to rely on the hand raising queue management stuff a whole lot, people should feel free to just break in the way (Sarah) did, but on a big call that gets chaotic and so that's another thing to do. Now I don't know how many of you are using the audio in the Adobe room, I notice that (Gabrielle) is and so another thing to learn how to do is what Marika has done.

You can see that Marika - the little red slash through her microphone means that she's muted her mic and (Gabrielle) why don't you try and do that. The way you do that I think...

(Gabrielle Rogallas): I did it already.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh there you go - you're way ahead of me. That's good because I don't - I'm not using audio and I can't remember how to do it from memory. When - let's see if I can demonstrate the echo phenomenon here - if I turn the speaker up on my computer than you hear all this echo.

Woman: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: That's why we meeting runners say, oh please mute and that's the...

(Gabrielle Rogallas): (What)...

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead (Gabrielle).

(Gabrielle Rogallas): You - well one problem, we had these with meetings in the office so in the end we start (calling) for everyone - headsets on the headsets so Logitech has really good quality, so the echo is canceled with the headset.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes exactly, if you have something like a headset that's fantastic because then it doesn't echo at all. And it's really tough for people who have portable devices like iPads or tablets of one sort or another because a lot of time the muting is complicated and difficult on those, so.

(Gabrielle Rogallas): Well, well - it depends on if you have a (live pad) or something with Bluetooth capabilities and you can have headset with Bluetooth and the you can mute with the headset.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's absolutely right, so anyway there's a little kind of maneuvering around the Adobe room - does anybody have other questions about the Adobe room as long as we're sort of on this topic? Because this is one of the things that we kind of like to cover in these and usually it's at the end but

we've jumped it to the front and that's fine. So if people want to try other things...

(Gabrielle Rogallas): Are there - is there etiquette around the chat window or the - like an individual chat that might not be expected?

Mikey O'Connor: Um the only etiquette that I'm aware of is the etiquette that you're sort of confronted on when you first login you get those norms of behavior that say, you know, don't trash other people, etc., etc.

If the - flow of these meetings varies a fair amount depending on who the leader is. So when I run a meeting it tends to be pretty informal and pretty chaotic. That's fine for somebody like me who's pretty comfortable. It can be pretty disconcerting for a person who's not as comfortable running meetings as I am - oh Marika I see your hand up, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika, just to mention on all the things that Adobe Connect and the things (more made) for the recording.

I think everyone here got in safety, that when you log into Adobe you basically use the guest option and type in your name and get in. Some people confuse it with typing in the password which is used for the conference page and other Adobe Connect.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's absolutely true and (while)...

(Gabrielle Rogallas): (I am) kicked out and then I came back.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes now there's two of you - there's...

(Gabrielle Rogallas): Yes well...

Mikey O'Connor: Now you get two votes. One of the things that you can do if you want is you can change your name I think in that - let me remember how to do that. Anybody remember how you change your name? Because that's another fun thing to do, is if a person comes in and they - as Marika said, they've typed the password there's a way to change...

(Gabrielle Rogallas): It's under - yes I found it, it's under (Activity List) box on the right side of the screen there's an icon with a dropdown selected it and then it will appear, edit my info.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh good, okay because that's not showing up for me and maybe that's because - oh I bet it's because I'm logged in under my credentials.

See -- oh that's another little tip -- see how some of you have little blue shirts that by the way I find very attractive and some of us have gold colored shirts in our icons. And that's because we are logged in to Adobe with credentials, the blue folks are folks that have logged into Adobe as guests. And I'll bet because I'm in with credentials I don't have that option available to change my name. But yes there we go - (Gabrielle) is now a guest and changed his name, exactly.

And one of our frequent attendees, Volker Greimann who's chair of - or is the let's see he's the Vice Chair of the GNSO Council and a member of the Registrar's often changes his name to something like the masked shadow or something like that and then we castigate him and say, stop that. So anyway that's another option if you accidentally come in with the password we will correct you on that.

Because one of the things that we're trying to do - oh and another thing, change your name to a letter that's low in the alphabet like Batman and then you're always at the top of the list - another tip. We are trying to preserve the transparency and so we do like to have people actually operate under their

real name so that we can keep track of who's who for the transcripts and for the recordings and so on.

And so if you accidentally forget and come in as guests, don't feel bad we are going to give you a nudge and say please change your name to your real name. And so those are good, I'd forgot about those. Okay I think what we'll do is we'll dive into a little content, we'll see how it goes and then if you're either bored by the content or think of something that you want to take us off track with, by all means take me off the track.

Raising your hand is probably a good way to get my attention when I'm actually yacking - talking, but there we go. So I've got two pictures of the process of the PDP that you are now a part of; this is the old one and this is the new one. And the new one is one that I'm working on in another working group and I want to try it out on you. So I'm first going to do the old one because this is the one that's in all the documentation and so on. But then I want your reactions to this new one that I'm trying in another working group.

So let me get my little arrow fired up here - so at the beginning of the process, before you all join a working group this top row is the part of the PDP where we are essentially launching a PDP, trying - especially the Council is trying to figure out whether this is a PDP that needs to be launched, etc., etc. and that process usually starts at the very beginning there with the request for an issue report which describes the - the policy issue that people want to make policy for.

And also determines whether that issue is something that's really in the scope of what the GNSO can do in the PDP. PDP is short for policy development process - if you learn no other acronym than that, that's an important one to know because it's used a lot. And so generally the issue report is prepared by staff at the request of several different kinds of people. Those requests can come from within the GNSO constituencies or from the Board or from other advisory committees and SOs - supporting organizations.

And the process as to what happens next is a little bit different for each one - I'm not going to go into those details. And Marika's in the chat with a good link and is also noting that we often use the same work process to do things that aren't going to develop policy or at least are going to make recommendations that will have to be followed with formal policymaking. So there's - this is a process that we use several different ways.

Then we presume - presuming that the issue report comes back and says yes it really is something that GNSO can do then we get the process started and among other things that's where we write a charter for the working group and (format), which is the next thing. And for those of you who have just joined, some of the working groups that just started up you probably responded to the massive outreach that we did over the course of, you know, Twitter, etc.

(Sara)'s raising a question, why are some of the working groups PDP and some not? Hang onto that question for when we get to the picket fence here, I think it will make sense. But I'll give you a short version now.

(Sarah Wildes): Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: The formal policy development process is basically a contract negotiation between the GNSO and ICANN and the contracted party.

The registries and registrars have signed contracts with ICANN that have in them a socket into which consensus policy is inserted. And so the formal PDP changes that consensus policy and as soon as the PDP is done and implemented, all registries or registrars that are affected have to abide by those rules as part of their contract - that's what they've agreed to do. And Marika's getting ahead of me here and if we aren't doing that then we still use this process because we like the process, it's a good one.

But it's not going to result in a change to consensus policy and so we highlight that by saying that's a non-PDP working group. There are other - there's other ways that we can work but a lot of times we like using this process anyway and so we just highlight the difference that way. And we'll get to that in a bit further down. So then the working group starts - you are all in working groups now and one of the very early things that a working group does is it gather - does one round of public comments.

You'll see that public comments happen several times in this process - they happen in the beginning and they happen in the middle and they happen at the end and the context is a little bit different. At the beginning these are essentially soliciting opinions from all the stakeholders in the research since. Sort of saying, look world here's the problem that we are trying to puzzle our way through, let us know what your opinions are.

Give us any thoughts you have in advance because we would like to, you know, this is like the first pass through our research project, gather as much information as we can. So the goal of this first one is really to get that information, whereas the one in the middle is really more of a reaction to the work that we've done in the working group. Now we've written our report, we want to go back to the community and say, so how did we do? Can you live with what we're proposing or is there something that really has to change?

So it's not research anymore, this is now public comment to determine whether we've gotten it right. And then the last one is aimed at the Board - the Board is the official body that actually makes the policy happen. We in the GNSO prepare those documents and make a recommendation to the Board, but the official moment that a policy is policy is when the Board approves it. And there that round of public comment is a lot more aimed at will this - the Board's decision in general terms is will this policy hurt ICANN or the DNS?

And if the answer to either of those questions is yes then the Board will vote against the policy. In general what we like to see is if anybody along the way -

- any approval body, the GNSO for example approves the Board approves -- we in the working group would like to see disapproved things come back to the working group to get reworked. But that doesn't always happen and so the three sets of public comments are all done in the same format but they have subtly different meanings.

So in the case of for example data and metrics for policymaking which (Tony) is on with me and (Miguel) is on and (Gabrielle) is on we're about ready to go out for some public comments because we've formed. And while we are getting our work plan sorted out and so on we're going to go out to the world and ask for people's opinion about that and then our work will start in earnest when we prepare our initial report.

That's the heavy work of a working group is that one tiny little box there and then we'll publish a report, public comments will come back, we'll revise our report and forward it onto the Council. And there the conversation in the Council is also more procedural - the hope is that the working group has come to consensus already. And so when the report comes to the Council it's a consensus report - it's either full consensus which means everybody is in favor or it's consensus which is a many (beer) discussion as to all the different nuance meetings, but we'll get to a formal definition of that in a minute.

And if that - if the report comes to the Council at consensus then the decision the Council has to make is whether the process was correctly followed. And if it was and the working group is at consensus then the Council almost always approves the report and forwards it onto the Board. The Board as I mentioned before has a slightly different decision, they do check just to make sure that the process was followed but they really count on the GNSO Council to rigorously check that.

Their view is different - their view is will this recommendation hurt ICANN or hurt the DNS in a way that the working group overlooked? And if they find

something like that then they are - they don't approve it. Now that's the ideal process - well no then the final part of that process is the implementation process. And especially for those of you who are on policymaking PDP working groups, you may want to join the what's called implementation review team that's usually drawn from the people in the working group plus a few others to be a resource for ICANN's administration as they implement the policy.

They may have questions, they may have - the working group may have overlooked something. In some cases the working group has done something that is impossible, you know, there are all sorts of things that come up in implementation that the working group may not have noticed or understood and the implementation review team is really the community's participation in that implementation process. So I want you to hold all that in your head, now I want to try out my new picture and see what you think.

This is basically exactly the same process but it's laid out a little bit differently and I want to see if this is clear, not so clear. I apologize for the slightly fuzzy graphics, I just realized that these are a little bit out of focus and that's my fault because of the way I made this presentation. But this is pretty much the same stuff - if I get my little arrow going. At the beginning is the issue framing cycle. We do the first round of public comments, we initiate, we form a PDP, we do another round of public comments - we're using that same little graphic.

And the reason that I'm pretty keen on this rendition is that we've highlighted the four phases of the process. So there's essentially a part of the process that is figuring out which policies we want to work on and getting the process underway. There's the working group work part where we develop consensus around what we want to do. We then refine it a bit and make sure that its fine and endorse it. And then the Board approves implements - approves it and implementation takes place.

And then the whole process starts over again because there's a new issue that's been found as a result of life continuing on. And so I'm keen on this because it shows how this never really ends - this policymaking process is really iterative, continuously refining policy. And it also, you know, gets at the notion that there are phases of this work that are a bit different. You know, the kinds of things that we do in the beginning are quite different for example than what happens in the working group phase.

Now where you all are is in the working group phase and you are surrounded by those other three things. And hopefully this will give you a better roadmap as to where your work sits in and you can sort of follow along. I mean some of us follow these and we get excited when the Council approves them, you know, and say hooray the Council approved it, but that's not the end. Then, you know, it's oh hooray it got approved by the Board, so thick Whois for example just got approved by the Board.

And then the final hooray happens when the policy is actually implemented and sent off to registries and registrars to do. So I'm going to pause at this point to see if there are questions that came out of either of these pictures that you'd like to explore in more depth.

(Sarah Wildes): So I think the pictures are about equally clear in terms of how the process happens. But the second picture suggests that the process sort of continues in a circular fashion for the same policy.

So you might just want to look at how can you make it more clear that it - once a policy is implemented then the identify an issue isn't going to be for that same policy. You know, they mean it doesn't circle back into itself.

Mikey O'Connor: That's good.

(Sarah Wildes): Just something to consider. I'm curious and I don't want to take too much time on it, but I am curious about situations when the Board might turn down

a policy that is brought to them for a vote. So it's already been I guess endorsed by the GNSO but then the Board denies that. How often does that happen?

Mikey O'Connor: Well we've got a good example of that going on right now. And that is that GNSO just pushed along a final report on the handling of names for IGOs and INGOs.

International Governmental Organizational - Organizations and International Non-Governmental Organizations is a good example of one where the Board is confronted with a problem because the GNSO has produced a report that is in conflict with advice from the GAC - the Governmental Advisory Committee. And this picture is actually coming from a working group where the GNSO and the GAC are trying to figure out ways to head off collisions like that in the future.

Because what happened with the GAC was they didn't participate - I don't - I want to be very careful not to make this sound accusatory but their participation in the process was quite late, it was at the end of the process. And as a result we didn't - one of the things that I am very keen on is that for the working groups to really work right they need to have participation - active participation from everybody who's a stakeholder and we didn't have that in this case - we missed the key point of the GAC in that report.

And as a result now the - it's a collision at the Board vote and in the past that's happened more often than we prefer and we're working very hard to avoid that, but it does happen. Similarly it sometimes happens at the GNSO deliberations as well, although I think we've gotten pretty good at avoiding that. But we're still working on these collision right at the end where the process hasn't really accommodated all point so view quite right.

And the Board basically is the policymaker, they are the tiebreaker and ultimately it's up to them to make the decision. And the policy hasn't served

them well up to now in some cases, so we need to make that better - but that's an example.

(Sarah Wildes): Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: (Tony)?

(Antonio Novato): Hey Mikey, how are you?

Mikey O'Connor: Hey (Antonio) - let me just pick up Marika's got a bunch of stuff in the chat.

(Antonio Novato): Sure.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes Marika's pointing out that the threshold for the Board to reject GNSO policy recommendation is pretty high and it's based on whether or not it's in the best interest of ICANN or the community, so that's an important point.

However it's still uncomfortable even though the threshold is high, it's a diff- we put them - we the GNSO I think put them in a difficult position when we don't have those things incorporated. And then Marika's pointing out that the Board can come back to us for an explanation and we at that point do have the opportunity to change the recommendations. And, you know, it will be interesting to see what happens with IGO/INGO recommendation because it may be that it goes back to the working group, it may not - we'll sort of see how this all goes.

Yes we're going to end at the top of the hour and so those of you that have to drop off don't feel like you're missing any of the goodies at the end. This is actually my subtle way to encourage you to come back and we'll carry on with this. Okay (Tony) carry on.

(Antonio Novato): Yes thanks Mikey, this is great - I appreciate you guys taking the time. I just want to ask if you could talk a little bit further about the AC NSO statements

and the role that those statements play in shaping the work of the working group?

Mikey O'Connor: Let me go back to the old drawing just so we're still teaching to the textbook and not the draft.

The answer is that AC NSO statements happen similarly throughout the pro- well actually the other drawing's a little clearer, so let me use this one on this one. You'll see that at each stage in the process there is a chance for the ACs and the SOs to weigh in and in each case that is different. So in the research phase we're going to the ACs and SOs and saying, hey Security and Stability Advisory Committee, hey ALAC, you know, etc., what do you think? And it's really information gathering.

When we get to the initial report of the working group we're going back to them and saying, well here's what we came up with, we're pretty comfortable with it - what do you think? Have we missed anything? Is it, you know, are you okay with that, etc. When - no I'm sorry I skipped a step, so what we have is comments on the issue report, comments on the initial report and then comments on the final report. And so on this one what we're saying is to the ACs and SOs, so do you think this is important?

Do you think this is a policy matter? Do you really think this is in or outside the scope of the GNSO, etc., it's the process point. This is the one where they comment with the research cycle if you will it says. Because this is before the initial reports come out, so this is going out and saying what do you think? Then when the working group has produced its initial report this is where the community comes back and says, hopefully you got it right but if you got it wrong this is still a pretty flexible stage of the process because the working group can go back to work and come up with their final report.

The - if the changes are really substantive we might insert another public comment cycle in. You know, if something came in that was a huge

divergence and the working group went to work on their final report and that made a big, big change we might go back out to the community one more time just to make sure. But in general the course is pretty clear and the final report is pretty consistent and so we don't go back out until the GNSO has deliberated. And then at that point there's one last chance for the ACs and SOs to comment. So the role varies depending on which phase we're in.

(Antonio Novato): And do you typically find that they have substantive comments that are - that go beyond comments that might have come through any representative on the working group?

Mikey O'Connor: You get the consultant answer on that, it depends.

(Antonio Novato): Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, the hope is that the really substantive comments that are new and unique come in really early - one of these two phases preferably.

(Antonio Novato): Right.

Mikey O'Connor: Because those are the easiest for the working group to digest. If a major point comes in after the initial report, that's probably the fault of the working group chair for not having surfaced that one earlier.

You really try to avoid that because by the time the initial report has come out people have done a fantastic amount of work. And to have a giant course change that late in the process is really hard on everybody. And so you really struggle not to do that if you can.

(Antonio Novato): Yes that makes sense.

Mikey O'Connor: And so I mean one of the things that we are working on in our collaboration with the GAC is trying to figure out better ways to telegraph to the GAC

earlier, hey here's the issue that we're thinking about - please, please, please, please give us as much of your attention early in the game as you can because by doing that we avoid these troubles later on down the line.

But, you know, it happens - okay we're getting pretty close to the top of the hour, I'm going to push along. We're clearly not going to get through the whole agenda so I'm going to run back to the list and I'm going to just cogitate about this for a minute. You know, I'm going to let you all scroll on your own. You can roll through while I think about this. Are there anything on that list that you really want to hear about while I'm contemplating which ones I really want to talk about? Sing out if you've got something you really do.

(Sarah Wildes): I'm going to vote for working group requirements because that's what I'm involved in.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay that's...

(Antonio Novato): I'll second that.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay let me find it - working group guidelines, right?

(Sarah Wildes): Sure, yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay so if you imagine you're in an organization and there's a procedure manual or some kind of work that you're doing, that's what the working group guidelines are.

And they're very detailed and I think there's a link to them coming up - yes so maybe so we could get that into the chat. But let me give you the highlights - basically in there are that list of I don't know nine or ten things that describe in a lot of detail how working groups work. And the chair of the working group's job is to make sure that these guidelines are met. And you as a member of a working group can treat this as the rules of the road and that's especially

important if you start to feel uncomfortable about what's going on in the working group.

Hopefully you never will but, you know, this process is about resolving conflicts because sometimes the point of view of the contracted parties differ from each other or between the contracted parties and the non-contracted parties. So these are conversations in which there's dis- there's built-in disagree and what we're trying to do is make that process open and fair to all.

And so if you feel as the working group that you're on proceeds as though you're being ignored or one group is dominating and others aren't, you know, really able to express their views or any feeling like that the working group guidelines is where you go look. Probably the first thing to do is raise it on a call. If you're uncomfortable with that raise it with the chair, if you're uncomfortable with that there is an appeal process where if you feel that the chair is not being even-handed you don't get to stop there.

You've got the GNSO liaison is another member of a working group that is somebody to whom you can turn and, you know, there are several layers of that process. And so much of what the working group guidelines are really aimed at is to make sure that the process is open, fair and even-handed and it's really the chair's job and the co-chair job's to make sure that that happens. I'm not sure I'm going to be able to get you through all the details, but you can see several important things.

This is the - one of the most important which is what we call the standard methodology for decision-making. The shorthand version is determining the level of consensus in the working group and that's one of the duties of the chair is at the very end to iterate through as many iterations as are required to arrive at a conclusion as to the level of consensus. And that last bullet says that their - describes the four layers. Clearly the goal if we can get there is full consensus which is everybody on the working group agrees, it says there you go.

Consensus is everybody agrees except for the folks who don't, but the folks who don't feel as though their point of view has been heard and adequately reflected in the results of the working group, this is a very fuzzy call, it's much more comfortable as a chair to call full consensus. Strong support but significant opposition is not consensus in my view. It means that there is a pretty big group of people who think this is the way to go but there is another group of people with a strongly-held view that opposes that.

And I find recommendations hard to bring forward with that designation. Oh Marika's lost her audio - we can talk about Marika - hot-diggity. She'll get back on soon, then I won't. Divergence means we can't get there and one of the important things about consensus is that I as a person who's done a lot of consensus stuff over his whole career field is that divergence can go one of two ways. Divergence in the middle of a working group just means we need to go back and work some more and try harder.

Divergence at the end means we really have no way forward - that this working group can't arrive at consensus and that's that - that's the end. And so divergence in the middle of a working group is a little bit different than divergence at the end. Divergence in the middle I view as a normal part of the process, those are the parts that I'm the most interested in because those are the places where we need to have the most conversation. Divergence at the end is different, it just means no we didn't get there on that one. And (Sarah) thanks for joining, it was...

(Sarah Wildes): Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: ...great to have you onboard. I think with (Sarah)'s departure we'll call it a close. I think that's also the last one in that slide there, the links - maybe we can...

(Sarah Wildes): I'm off - have a great day, thanks a lot everyone.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks (Sarah) - I don't know how we get those in the chat but anyway there's the stuff. And with that we'll call it a day and leave you hanging for next time.

(Antonio Novato): Thanks very much Mikey, thanks very much everyone - much appreciate ti.

Man: See you (Tony), thanks for...

Man: Thank you.

(Antonio Novato): Okay, have a great day.

Woman: Thank you very much, unintelligible)...

Coordinator: This concludes today's conference, thank you for participating, you may disconnect at this time.

END