

**Policy & Implementation Working Group Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION**

Wednesday 18 December 2013 at 2000 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Wednesday 18 December 2013 at 2000 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-policy-implementation-20131218-en.mp3>

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

Operator: This call is now being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect now.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you ever so much. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening, everybody. This is the policy and implementation working group call on the 18th of December, 2013.

On the call today we have Gilean Robb, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, (INAUDIBLE), Michael Graham, Jonathan Frost, Phil Murano, Chuck Gomes, Alan Greenberg, (INAUDIBLE).

We have apologies from (INAUDIBLE).

From staff, we have Marika Konings, Mary Wong, 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.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Nathalie. This is Chuck. Welcome, everyone, to the call. Nathalie, if you'd go ahead and do the roll call, that would be great. I'm sorry. You just did the roll call. I'm looking at the agenda without thinking. So thank you very much for doing that.

Jonathan, I don't know if we got to welcome you on our last call. But Jonathan Frost is with us today as one of our newer members. We do welcome you to the group and everyone else as well.

And so the agenda is in front of you there if you're in Adobe Connect. Let me ask. Is anyone not in Adobe Connect? Okay. Good. So, please, raise your hand there, or click on an Agree if you want to agree or a Disagree if you want to be disagreeable. Just kidding there.

Let's go ahead and see if anyone has any statement of interest updates.

Michael Graham: Chuck, this is Michael. I will be submitting a revised one to reflect my new unemployment status.

Chuck Gomes: Unemployment status. Okay.

Michael Graham: Well, it is to say self-employment and working as an adjunct professor.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay. Good. So it's an unemployment status that you have chosen.

Michael Graham: Not entirely voluntarily but with great glee. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well, good. I'm glad that there's glee with it. That's good. Okay. We'll just watch for that. Thanks for letting everyone know on this call, Michael. Appreciate that.

With regard to the agenda, are there any suggested changes to the agenda? Okay. Not hearing none or seeing none, we'll assume not, and we'll go ahead and go forward.

Let me ask this question though. This is Chuck again. Did we try a callout to Olivier?

Nathalie Peregrine: This is Nathalie. We're trying to dial out to Olivier. We're having problems getting a stable line. But we're still trying.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Nathalie. Appreciate that.

Okay. Going on then to the definition sub-team status report, and I'll turn it over to Michael.

Michael Graham: Okay. Thank you. Yes. I did hear from Maureen, and she unfortunately has had a setback with her leg breakage. So she sends her regrets and asked me to go ahead and cover where we were with the definition.

Unfortunately, we had had a meeting scheduled for this past Monday but were unable to complete it. We did not have a quorum. I believe it was Marika, Nathalie, Cheryl, and Wolf were the only members who were able to make it. So that's been put off.

And, Marika, I don't know if you saw my e-mail asking if we could perhaps see if either next Monday or the following might be possible.

In our phone conference on the 9th, the sub-team had a very productive and very spirited discussion of the definitions that we were working on and how to approach them and how to approach, especially, terms that would have what we're referring to as a dictionary-- or generally accepted is the wording that we're now using-- definition and then have another significance or a particular significance in the context of GNSO policy development process. And I think the way that we have come up with that-- if you're able at some point, if you have not already, to see the draft, I believe that's open to all the members of the workgroup-- to see the draft that we're dividing it so that terms such as policy is defined first as policy.

Here it is on the screen, the generally accepted definition. And then that's followed by GNSO policy, where all the terms that we're looking at to the extent that they have a definable meaning based on GNSO or ICANN documents, we're using those definitions.

And the same is true then with some other terms that we have added where we've had policy development before. We have policy development and GNSO policy development, policy advice.

The discussion there was very interesting in terms of the differences between requesting advice and seeking guidance. And so we've actually split that definition to clarify it so that it's policy advice as sort of a generally accepted meaning. And then GNSO policy guidance, which is connected to, at least at this point, with the charter and the request that we consider whether or not some sort of guidance procedure might be in place.

We basically got through-- to implementation in our discussion on the 9th, and we're going to pick up at that point with the hope of nailing down at least the proposal for definitions that we could bring to the workgroup as a whole at the same time with an open invitation to anyone on the workgroup in looking over this document that's posted and that's on the Wiki. Any comments, suggestions, criticisms would be very helpful for us.

The most important thing that I think we as a sub-team would want to reiterate is that these are working definitions, hopefully, to enable us to carry on discussion without getting too deeply into the weeds when we're just trying to say something so that we can get into the weeds on principle on some of the policies and on some of the procedures when we reach them. That's our goal. I know that, when you go over the last meeting of the principles sub-team, that that's been a discussion there as well.

So we recognize in putting these definitions together that this is like the work plan; really, a living document that will begin so that we can speak with each other. And then, hopefully, at the conclusion of the workgroup's work, we'll have a clear understanding of these definitions. I suppose that would be part of whatever report, then, that we would produce just so that it's clear what those definitions are.

We were talking the other day, and I proposed to Maureen in an e-mail-- if we are able to get another sub-team phone teleconference either next week, the week following, or even the week following that, what we would like to be able to do is to have our draft in a state to be presented to the workgroup for full discussion by the next workgroup phone call, which, my understanding, is going to be the 8th of January. I think that's realistic. But that's presuming we can get in at least one more phone call before then.

Chuck Gomes:

Thank you very much, Michael. This is Chuck. And, by the way, thank you for picking up for Maureen while she's recovering from the broken bone. I really appreciate that.

Just before I ask a question I have, let me suggest that, if anybody has any questions or comments for the definition sub-team, please, raise your hand. This is a good time for that.

Let me welcome Brian Winterfelt, who joined us I think.

Has anybody else joined besides Brian since we did the roll call?

Christina: Hi, Chuck. It's Christina. I'm waiting to join the Adobe Connect.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Good. Thanks, Christina. Appreciate that.

Michael, I have a question. And forgive me for not having looked back at the minutes from the live meeting we had in Buenos Aires. We talked about this, I think, in our last working group meeting. But where--? There were several terms that were suggested in our live meeting. Are any of those terms in this list that's displayed right now?

Michael Graham: Let me look very quickly. I'm not certain that any of them--

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is Cheryl here. I can jump in on that, if you like.

Michael Graham: Go ahead, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Yeah. The answer to that, Chuck, is no. They're not because they would have been on our agenda for Monday, and Monday didn't happen. So they are on our agenda for, hopefully, the following Monday.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Cheryl. That's helpful. And so those will be considered. And it doesn't mean-- This is Chuck again. It doesn't mean that we have to come up with definitions for all those. But I think, at a minimum, somewhere in our documentation if we decide not to define any of those terms, it would be good that we had a notation to that effect and explaining why we didn't just so that the people that participated understand that we did take into consideration their suggestion even if we decided not to give a definition. Thanks. I appreciate that, Cheryl.

Michael Graham: Chuck, it's Michael again. Yeah. I think that was supposed to be on the agenda. And I think, going into our next phone call, what we'll do is try to put together a draft response because most of those terms we did discuss two or three meetings ago. And I think we can recover the rationale why we didn't believe most of them were appropriate for the definition at this point. But we'll put that on the agenda for the sub-team.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. I don't know how many from the definitions team are on this call. But, Marika or Mary, how many people have responded to the doodle for the 23rd for the definition sub-team?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. We actually didn't do a doodle poll. But we suggested to reconvene at the same time as we had been meeting; so, Monday at 2000 UTC. And we actually asked everyone to confirm and respond to the e-mail whether they could make it or not. We know that Cheryl and Wolf are available, but we're still waiting to hear from the others. If the time works for Michael, I'll be sending out a reminder after this meeting, so everyone has an opportunity to respond. And we can make sure that we have sufficient people to hold the call on Monday.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. This is Chuck. Again, before I call on Alan, the-- Is there anyone on the call who would like to respond right now that you can make that call if you're on the definitions sub-team or want to be on that sub-team? If so, why don't you click the Agree button so that Marika can get that information. I'll scroll down just to see. Michael, you can make it? Is that your agree hand there?

Michael Graham: Yes. I should be able to make it. I may be in transit, but I'll be able to stop and--

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Appreciate that. Alan, go ahead. You're up. And you can make it, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I can. And, if the time doesn't change like it did last time, I may even actually be on the call. I got very confused I'll tell everyone because I had it for the original time at 2000 instead of 1900. And then I called on early in what should have been the end of the call, and there was no Adobe Connect there either. So I was thoroughly confused.

Chuck Gomes: Alan, this is Chuck. Has your confusion been removed?

Alan Greenberg: Well, the meeting changed. I hadn't taken note of the change. And, if this one is still scheduled at 2000 and stays there, then I'll be there, barring unforeseen, of course.

I was going to comment on the-- when I raised my hand, it was a while ago-- on the definitions of-- that were suggested in Buenos Aires. And, yes, we did go over them. A number of them we did decide really didn't need definitions in our context. It wasn't directly related to our subject matter sufficiently to warrant us trying to come up with a definition. But we did review them. And I don't think there'll be any problem putting together a history after the fact.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Appreciate that. Any other comments or questions on the definitions sub-team update?

This is Chuck speaking again. If there are-- assuming that the plan goes as reported by Michael, we should have a first cut of the definitions by the 8th of January. Is that correct, Michael?

Michael Graham: Yeah. That's correct. And I would anticipate that, to the extent the workgroup wants to discuss it, that it will take some time for clarification perhaps and then also for discussion.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck again. That would be great. Even if you're not totally finished, I think it would be good because you're right, I think, that it will take some time for the full working group to review those and go over them and discuss them. So, even if there's some more work to be done, I think it would be helpful if we had (technical difficulties).

Thanks for the smile, Cheryl, and thanks for joining us, Bertrand. I'm sure you could understand all of that. So next time we need the operator to identify herself for the transcript on that.

Okay. Thanks for correcting the problem. I appreciate that.

Thanks, Michael, for responding to my question. So we'll look forward-- and the leadership team will obviously prepare before the meeting on the 8th. But I would think that probably a big part of our agenda for the whole working group on the 8th could be devoted to the definitions so that we can help that team in moving that forward.

So any other questions or comments on the definitions sub-team's status report?

Hearing none, then I will go to the principles sub-team's status report. Because no one else has stepped up to be the lead coordinator on that one, I went ahead. And I'm assuming the duties with the understanding that, if anybody still wants to take that over, I'd be glad to let them do that.

I thought we had a really good first call. There were some excellent comments. We didn't get very far down our list of proposed principles at that time, but I think we laid some foundational groundwork that will help us in not only coming up with principles but in the way that we organize them.

And, in fact, I think Cheryl is going to be sending something to principles sub-team shortly that will be a big part of our discussion tomorrow-- in our call tomorrow. So is that going to be possible, Cheryl, to get your feedback to us before our call tomorrow?

Good. Thanks. Appreciate that. Would you like to speak too or just agreeing? Okay. Thanks, Cheryl. That will be great because we-- Cheryl made some suggestions in our call last week that were, I think, very fundamental in terms of what we're doing. So I look forward to the call tomorrow and picking up where we left off with a little more detail and information. So thanks for Cheryl, and thanks to everyone in that sub-team that is helping on the principles thing.

If anybody on that team wants to add anything with regard to principles, now is a good time. Or, if someone else has a question or comment, please, raise your hand.

Okay. We're moving right through the agenda. Let's go to our meeting schedule for the first quarter of 2014, which is being posted now. Everyone I think probably received this already. And we made an adjustment in terms of alternating chairs because I cannot make the meeting on the 19th. So Jay Scott will take that one. And then I switched with him on another one. So you can see the schedule right there. Please, put these dates in your calendar to minimize chances of a conflict to the extent that you have any control over that. I know sometimes things happen that are priority that we can't control. But, if everyone on the work

team would-- in the working group would, please, put these dates and times on your calendars, that would be great.

In fact, let me ask this of Nathalie. Is it feasible to send out a recurring meeting request through the 19th of March so that people can just respond to those? What's the best way to help people out and make sure these dates and times get on their calendars?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think one of the issues with sending out calendar invites is that, depending on how people's systems are set up, they don't always tend to come up at the right time. So I think that's a bit our hesitation in sending out calendar invites to working group lists is that sometimes causes issues. So, to really avoid-- we have it all in the policy calendar, so people can maybe print that out or get all those dates in there. So people could print that out and have that handy or do the invites themselves in their calendars. But there have been issues where we've tried to do that where things would come up in different times depending on the time zone or people expecting the invite being in a different time zone and then messing things up. So that's a little bit the hesitation we have in, I think, doing that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika, for that clarification. That's helpful.

Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Nathalie has had absolutely no problem doing this for the ALAC and at large community, primarily because we insist that everything is done in UTC time from the master calendar. And then it's up to the individuals' calendars to convert. And, so far, there haven't been reported problems with that. I think I'd like to have a belts and braces approach to this-- that we get Nathalie to run out our cal's, as she seems to be able to do and certainly organizes my life in no less than three or four different places in ICANN with absolute efficiency.

And, if there is an issue, ask everyone to double check with your either master calendar or your hard copy. It seems to me that the issues should be resolved at the edges. In other words, people can set up their own calendar in whatever fruit-based, Android, or Microsoft system they're running to either accept them, delete them if they're of issue, or do them manually. But, for those of us who enjoy having other people run their lives, I think it's a great thing. It certainly was something I'd like to support.

The other thing I'd like to say on the calendar thing is, if you have these dates in the master calendar, which is in the Mylcann space, which is a separate thing, that will also help other staff not put clashing doodle options out. I'm noticing more and more clashes coming where, certainly, I'll hasten to add, not any of the staff involved in the (INAUDIBLE) policy development (INAUDIBLE) and the at large community. Other staff are seeming to not look to that master calendar yet. So if-- when we make them look to that master calendar before they put out doodles-- if everything is in there, that will help greatly as well.

Thanks for your indulgence on that additional bit, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks a lot, Cheryl. This is Chuck again. And Aubrey checked agreement with what you're saying. It makes a lot of sense to me. Marika, please.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. In addition to the issues already pointed out, I think, (INAUDIBLE) already confirms that that has happened as well. (INAUDIBLE) also points out that it doesn't work for mailing lists. And I do appreciate that people like us helping them organize their lives, but, at the same time, we'd like to push a little bit back because I don't think we're here either to be people's personal assistants. I really want to try to protect the secretary a bit, who already has a lot of responsibilities and a lot of efforts they undertake in supporting working groups. I think trying to help people getting invites in their calendars may be one step which will cause a lot of work for them and, as said, may add additional complications in getting that in the right time in people's calendar. So I would like to push a little bit back on that one and just encourage everyone-- we send out many reminders. It's on the GNSO calendar.

To Cheryl's point, from the policy (INAUDIBLE), we do have a shared calendar where we check on other meetings going on and try to avoid that as much as possible or at least try to see where there is significant overlap and avoid those times. So we're really trying to make an effort here to make sure that people are aware and get it timely in their agendas. But I would like to push a little bit back on us having to send individual calendar invites to everyone to get it in their diary.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. This is Chuck again. Let me try and come up with a compromise here. If a message could be sent out to all working group members asking them to put a recurring meeting at the time that we regularly meet on Wednesdays, that I think is kind of middle ground. So allowing Marika to push back on Cheryl's suggestion a little bit but, at the same time, encouraging people to put a recurring, biweekly meeting at the time we've designated-- that can always be changed if we make changes. But that would be-- I think that would be at least helpful to make sure people get these meetings on their calendars.

Anybody object to that, including staff? Okay. Then let's do that. I know, in my case, the sooner I get things on my calendar-- and I can do it myself and will. But that would be great.

Marika, please?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. As I said, as I understand from Nathalie, I think we cannot do it to mailing lists. We can try and send out, indeed, a recurring invite to the mailing list, but it may not be possible then to import it for people individually. We're happy to give that a try.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. All I was suggesting is send a message to the mailing list; in other words, to all working group members, asking them to

put a recurring meeting on their calendar at the time we designated. I was not suggesting actually sending out a calendar invite.

Marika Konings: Perfect. That's no problem at all. We can send the list out and encourage everyone to add it to their calendars. Perfect. That works.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: One little thing that would help me-- I'm a Luddite. I tend to do things manually-- is the GNSO master calendar-- I know, on occasion, when there's changes there, the changes are flagged in red or something. More recently, when there's a change, it's just quietly changed. And, therefore, a quick scan of it at the beginning of the week or at the beginning of a day doesn't note changes. If that's something that can be done conveniently, that would be really, really nice. So, for instance, when a meeting changes from 2000 to 1900, if that's noticeable as opposed to just being a different number, that would be useful to us Luddites.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. This is Chuck. A link to the GNSO calendar with any comments with regard to how you recognize changes could be included in the message that is sent out requesting people to create their own recurring calendar item.

Any other comments or questions on the calendar for the working group meetings?

Now, for those who are leading sub-teams, I think it would be helpful if similar things were done so that the sub-team meetings could be put on people's calendars by themselves, as well, going forward so that we help people out as much as we can while at the same time allowing them to take some of the responsibility for this.

Okay. Seeing no more hands or hearing no one on the meeting schedule, we're now down to any other business. Do we have any other business except for wishing one another a happy holiday time?

Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. That's definitely a good point, as well, and I definitely (INAUDIBLE) that one too.

I just wanted to mention that we did send out the notices to all the GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies asking them for input on the charter questions; so, maybe encouraging the different working group members here that are part of those groups to work with their respective groups to hopefully get some input. And I think we gave a deadline. I need to double check. But I think it's somewhere toward the end of January to provide feedback. So I just wanted to note that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. It's Chuck again. I recall the same thing, the 31 January deadline. And I'll try and spur that on in the registry stakeholder group. If each of you in your own stakeholder groups or constituencies would-- and

the ALAC has already responded, so I don't think we need a response from the ALAC. That would be very helpful.

Jonathan?

Jonathan Frost: I didn't mention at the time because I hadn't checked my calendar. But I would-- I'd like to join the definition subgroup if that's still possible.

Chuck Gomes: I think that would be great. Is there anybody on the definitions sub-team that would object to that? I'm saying that somewhat facetiously, Jonathan. I'm sure they wouldn't. If staff could send Jonathan the details for that, that would be great. Thanks, Jonathan. Appreciate you volunteering.

And it's possible, too, by the way, to-- if someone wants to join the principles sub-team, we're really just getting started, so it's a good time. So feel free to let us know.

Jonathan Frost: Oh, is that the one that you called for volunteers for?

Chuck Gomes: I don't recall which one-- what I was talking about. Let me just go over the two sub-teams that are in operation right now.

The definitions sub-team that Maureen was leading until she had her injury that Michael gave the report on-- those were the terms that we had up before that they're working on definitions. And they're going to propose those definitions to us on-- at least a first cut in our working group meeting on January 8.

The second sub-team is the one that I'm leading right now. It is on developing some principles of policy and implementation. And we've just had one call so far.

Does that help? And do you know which one of those, or both, that you want to be on?

Jonathan Frost: Yeah. Based on that, I think I'd rather join the principles just because it's so new.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That's fine. So staff will send you the information on that. Thanks, Jonathan.

Any other business? While you're thinking, let me ask if we've heard anything else with regard to a response from the GAC. I know that we're going to contact Olaf as the staff support person there. Have we heard--?

Yes. Marika, go ahead. Are you on mute?

Marika Konings: Sorry. Trying to get off mute there. This is Marika. Yes. Just to note that I know that Olga has followed up internally, as well, with Heather. And I know that Olaf has also reminded Heather of this request. I know it's being looked at and being worked at. But I'm not really sure if there is actually going to be a response or some standard input. But at least

they're very aware that the request has been made. And I'll follow up again with Olaf, as well, to see if he has any further updates.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marika. This is Chuck again. That's all we can do is just try. We can't force groups to give us input. But we want to at least give them adequate opportunity and remind them a few times so that we've at least reached out as best we can.

Jonathan, is that an old hand?

Jonathan Frost: It is an old hand. I'll take it down.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Okay. Good. I'm not seeing any other hands. So, if there's no other business, we're going to-- I'm going to give you some time back, unless you don't want it. We could make-- try and stretch this out if anybody doesn't want time back. And, again, I'm just being facetious here.

Let me ask if Jay Scott has anything he wants to add as co-chair of this group and as the one who will be chairing the next meeting on the 8th. Jay Scott, do you have anything to add?

Jay Scott: I don't. Thank you very much, Chuck-- except to wish everyone a happy holiday.

Chuck Gomes: And I do the same. Thanks, everyone, for participating in the group. And, please, feel free to make contributions online in between meetings because that facilitates things going forward. Happy holidays to everyone. And, those of you on the principles sub-team, we'll talk tomorrow.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Chuck. Season's greetings.

Speaker: Thank you, everyone. Happy holidays.

END