**Geographic Regions Review Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 04 May 2010 at 1200 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Geographic Regions Review Working Group on Tuesday 04 May 2010 at 12:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-geo-regions-20100405.mp3

On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may

**Present:**
David Archbold

**Staff:**
Rob Hoggarth
Bart Boswinkel
Gisella Gruber-White

**Absent Apologies:**
Janis Karklins
Fahd Batayneh
Olga Cavalli
Carlton Samuels
Cheryl Langdon-Orr

Coordinator:    The recordings have been started, please go ahead.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's Geographic Region's call on Tuesday the 4th of May we have David Archbold and from staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Rob Hogarth, myself, Gisella Gruber-White.

We have apologies from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olga Cavalli, Janis Karklins and Fahd Batayneh And if I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking but I think we should be okay on this call. Thank you. Back over to you David and Rob.

David Archbold:    Thank you, Gisella, very much. The draft agenda that Rob circulated has sort of been adopted for this call. And we'll start off talking about the interim report. And prior to starting the recording we had talked about the requirement in the report to assess the degree to which the uses of ICANN's geographic regions continue to meet the requirements of the relevant stakeholders.

And the question now is how do we incorporate that into the report? And Rob, you were suggesting that this really involves the drafting of an intermediate section somewhere between the historical area and the new work that you have drafted. Was that - am I right?

Ron Hogarth:    Yes sir, you know, if you check what we've drafted to date we've got your historical section which does an excellent job of pointing out how, you know, the framework has reached the point where it is today. And then we've got the staff-drafted section that focuses more on the trees.

If your section is, you know, the overview and then we compare the forest versus the trees we've really got the details in that matters drafted section. And as you pointed out in our prior discussion, you know, the area that's missing is sort of that general overall health assessment of the geographic region's framework and sort of what's being teed up in the beginning of the interim report is here's our general assessment of where things are.

Is it working? Is it not? What's working well? What's not working well? And that section still needs to be drafted and included in the report. Before we started the recording you stopped me from jumping in and volunteering to draft that section or at least take a crack at it.

And, you know, I think that that would be certainly something that needs to be incorporated into draft before that right now in the tentative schedule would

be circulated on 17 May. We may want to work on some drafting prior to that timetable.

You know, again based on the tentative schedule we've got this current draft open for working group members to provide comments up through the 10th of May. And, you know, just thinking out loud here one of the ideas there may be as working group members comment they could contribute or suggest language or a course of direction for that drafting for the next version that would be bullet points or talking points for that health assessment section.

David Archbold:  Right. Yeah. What I have started working on but was not in a position to circulate to anybody because it's still being developed. It's almost a series of questions so it's not in a finished format. But an example of what I'm talking about when we're talking about is it fit for purpose is I think we've got to look at - going back to sort of our original report the various uses that we were talking about.

So if we look at one particular use, I mean, geographic regions were first defined as an aide to ensuring the broad international representation of the ICANN Board and with no other purpose. Yeah?

And we've got words coming from the historical context that the board should reflect the geographical functional diversity of the Internet; that it should be sufficiently flexible to permit evolution to reflect changes in the constituency of Internet stakeholders.

So Internet has changed in the last 22 years. There's been no changes to regions or the associated procedure for appointing board members. So the question must be the working group has to take a view on whether this primary use of geographic regions continues to achieve its purpose both now and in the foreseeable future, i.e. the broad international representation of the ICANN Board that reflects the makeup of the Internet constituency.

Now is it doing that now? And even if it's not does it matter? And I think that's the sort of questions we've got to get an answer to.

Bart Boswinkel: Dave, Dave. Sorry.

David Archbold: Go ahead Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Do you have - I think what is worth is just to leave the document as it is say what Rob produced and start working on the - say on these type of questions, try to find an answer because what you'll - probably you'll see is there will be an overlap in finding these answers and all the historical material and other material we've got in this document. And then later on try to merge it.

David Archbold: Yeah. Yeah. I hear you.

Bart Boswinkel: It's one of the dangers I foresee. I'm very sorry, I haven't read this one. But scrolling through it, say, we've got now 33 pages. Maybe you can reduce it by 1/3 but incorporating say the core elements it will become unmanageable that's the danger - say that's another view of this document and including say because I think that's the call of the working group task is to assess how is it functioning now and how should it function in the future geographic regions.

And that's the type of questions you just raised.

David Archbold: Yeah. But I haven't got the answer.

Bart Boswinkel: No, no I know but it's...

David Archbold: I can raise the questions but I haven't got the answers.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, yeah, I know but the first point is is getting the questions right.

David Archbold:     Yeah. Well I'm very happy to try to work on - or continue working on the questions or the questions as I see them.

Bart Boswinkel:     Yeah.

David Archbold:     The rest of the working group may not be happy with that - with what I think they should be but that's the second issue.

Bart Boswinkel:     Because I think, say, what I see - if you go back to the (CL) meeting if you go back say over the - say with the whole survey and everything else we still haven't got the questions right. That's my sense.

David Archbold:     Right.

((Crosstalk))

Ron Hogarth:        That'd be a good exercise, Dave. I mean, consistent with just the thought that even this last draft - even if it ends up getting thrown in the ash heap there's still a value in, you know, just spurring the conversation and discussion. So even if you came up with three or five questions and that prompted another five questions from other working group members that would be some good fertilizer for further discussions.

Bart Boswinkel:     Yeah. And I think what you have right here just scrolling through the document is you've got say the background material is there and moving forward on the issues as well. But the issues that - I think there are some overarching questions there. I don't have them but...

David Archbold:     Yeah. Well I know how tight on time I am so...

Bart Boswinkel:     Yeah.

David Archbold: ...what I can commit to doing is I can try to pull together statements that create the logic that run down to a question...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

David Archbold: ...and put in the question. I'll then go and do the same for the second question. I don't have time to wordsmith it so as it all flows beautifully if you see what I mean.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Ron Hogarth: Dave, just earlier - this is Rob - just earlier in just your conversation you, you know, I thought laid out some very good points. We could even in this call, you know, I'll go back and pull the transcript or Gisella and I can have that produced where even if you just want to talk stream of consciousness right now we could, you know, we could literally take that and put it in some written form to circulate to the rest of the working group.

It all depends how you want to work or even if you just want to, you know, we can provide you with the recorded line, you can call in, you know, late and night and just, you know, stream of consciousness.

David Archbold: Yeah, no, let me have a go at...

Ron Hogarth: Okay.

David Archbold: ...addressing this question issue and circulate it in the first instance to you and Bart perhaps to review and see if it makes any sense at all. And if it does we can then circulate it out.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. And I think what I'll say - I'll promise you I'll read it over the next couple of days, this document...

David Archbold: That's assuming you've got it in the next couple of days.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah I know but the main one as well...

David Archbold: Oh right, right, right, right.

Bart Boswinkel: ...from Rob. So I lost track of all the working groups. And, no, and based on - see how they fit in, the questions.

David Archbold: Right. Can I take advantage of you being on the call to pick your brain for a minute, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

David Archbold: Can you give me an historic perspective on why the ccNSO has observers from the area, you know, the regional groupings?

Bart Boswinkel: Regional organizations?

David Archbold: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: It is - is the recording on or off?

Ron Hogarth: It is on.

David Archbold: Right, do you want to answer that after the recording's gone?

Bart Boswinkel: Let's answer that one after the recording is gone.

David Archbold: Fine. That's just some background I need.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

David Archbold: Okay so I know I'm sort of cutting it short but I think as far as the first item on the agenda is concerned then we're expressing tremendous thanks to Rob and - for what he's done.

We're asking for feedback from the rest of the group on that. In the meantime I'm going to attempt to draft some of these questions in as good a form but it may be pretty rough as I can which I will then circulate to Rob and Bart for their immediate feedback and then hopefully subsequent circulation to the group. Does that sound like where we are?

Ron Hogarth: It does with one additional question, Dave, and that is what do you think the timeframe is for you to be able to realistically produce this?

David Archbold: I will have it to you by Sunday at the latest and hopefully it will be much earlier than that.

Ron Hogarth: We will use that as the outside timetable.

David Archbold: Yeah.

Ron Hogarth: We'll let you...

David Archbold: By doing that it gives me a Saturday to work on it if necessary.

Ron Hogarth: Okay. I'll put May 10 as the - and that'll be consistent with - well, yeah, if you do it May 9 and we give you quick feedback that'll be consistent with the proposed timetable of 10 May for written working group member comments.

David Archbold: Right.

Ron Hogarth: And so we could treat those questions as your written comments contributing to the draft. Great, thank you.

David Archbold:     Okay. Let's move on quickly then, survey. And here I have got nothing to contribute I'm afraid. Rob, can you add anything?

Ron Hogarth:        Yes, certainly. The only hope that I had was that I circulated the link to...

David Archbold:     Yeah.

Ron Hogarth:        ...the working group email list on Friday. The expectation was that working group members agreed that they would be the conduits for reaching out to their individual communities. So the ball's in the court of the various representatives on the working group to now reach out, promote the survey to their member communities.

                    We've got, you know, a little over four weeks for the survey to be open which is probably longer than traditional. But I think that's appropriate for this stage. I am still waiting on the translations for the sample invitation letter.

                    That invitation letter was purely a sample; nobody should feel constrained to use it. You all have your own individual cultures of your SOs and ACs so whatever format working group members think is appropriate for their groups.

                    I will be keeping records and publishing the level of participation from the various ACs and SOs so that'll be I think the driving force to motivate working group members to reach out to their communities.

                    And as I said that survey will be open through June 1. And I will give, you know, progress reports on a week to 10-day basis as we start to get replies in just giving you the general report on how many people are responding and from what communities.

David Archbold:     Fine. Okay thanks Rob. I think we can move on then to the proposed timetable. And I - we have touched on this briefly; I think we should stick with

what you propose at the moment. My gut feel is that it will probably slip but let's aim high.

Ron Hogarth:      Certainly. As we talked about before we started the recording to the extent that we think some sections - and this may be after the next call of the working group - if we think some sections will remain fairly static I can get the translation started.

As I noted, you know, the translators can - in an ideal circumstance maybe do about 2000 words a day. And so depending on how meaty this document gets obviously if we want to meet the timetable of having the document published before the beginning of the Brussels meeting we want to stay as close to the timetable that we've got set out as possible.

You know, we begin to see that there's going to be some delays in the timetable. You know, it's just a matter of us making a decision as early as possible so I can get the appropriate update paperwork into the board and manage board's expectations as to the progress of the group.

I don't think it will be fatal not to have the document out before Brussels but I think all efforts should be made to do so at the very least so that we can have conversations with the community in Brussels.

David Archbold:   Absolutely. And I was going to say that leads on - skipping the next point on your agenda but to the potential session workshop in Brussels which I think would be a great idea. But it does presuppose really that there has been something made public by then to me.

Ron Hogarth:      Yeah, at the very least we'll be able to publish the results of the survey. And, k what I'm trying to do is take a page from what I observed with past organizational reviews and other sessions where, you know, being able to add to the record of the working group a public forum session where there is, you know, a general description to the community about what's going on.

And then an opportunity for community feedback through the microphones or through remote participation I think would be a useful additional set of data points for the working group as they contemplate - as you guys, you know, contemplate the final report effort for the rest of the calendar year.

So, yeah, if no one really objects to that point or if you do think it's actually a good idea, Dave, what we can do at the very least is get a placeholder so we do have, you know, an hour or 90-minute session in Brussels where tentatively the agenda would be we'd get as many working group members as possible, you know, sitting up on the stage.

I'm delighted to hear that you're considering going to Brussels because I think if you could do, you know, your 10-minute overview, that original slide presentation you shared with the working group in Mexico City I think it was that would be fantastic.

Because, you know, with the animation and sort of the audience being able to see historically how the geographic regions diverge from the original plan to where they are today I think would really not only be of interest informationally and educationally to folks but would, you know, provide some inspiration for comments.

David Archbold:     Yeah. I think having a session is an excellent idea. So certainly from my perspective if you could try and book such a slot it would be great.

Ron Hogarth:        Okay I will get that as a placeholder on the schedule. It will likely not be Monday or Tuesday but a Wednesday or Thursday session of that week. So, you know, working group members can plan their schedules accordingly if at all possible to still be in Brussels on Wednesday and Thursday I think we can pull that off.

David Archbold:   Yeah, I mean, my - assuming the timetable is the same as it has been of late from the ccNSO point of view Monday will be tech day and Tuesday and Wednesday will be ccNSO days. So Thursday would be a better day from my perspective I would have thought.

Ron Hogarth:   Okay that seems to be - ends up being the most flexible day for a lot of folks so I'll target that day.

Bart Boswinkel:   And the one - it is filling up rapidly.

Ron Hogarth:   Yes.

David Archbold:   Yeah, it always does, Bart, always does.

Bart Boswinkel:   Yeah it does.

David Archbold:   Then if we are going to have a public session as it were then a working group meeting in Brussels should be in advance of that ideally.

Bart Boswinkel:   Yeah.

David Archbold:   So that our act is got together.

Bart Boswinkel:   So probably suggest again a breakfast meeting?

David Archbold:   Yeah, that would be fine.

Ron Hogarth:   And I'll shoot for a breakfast meeting Wednesday or Thursday and then the potential scheduling of the session sometime on Thursday.

Bart Boswinkel:   Yeah, on Tuesday.

Ron Hogarth:   Oh Bret...

((Crosstalk))

David Archbold:    ...Tuesday, yeah.

Bart Boswinkel:    I said Tuesday, yeah, a breakfast session. It doesn't really matter does it?

David Archbold:    It doesn't matter what day as long it's before...

Bart Boswinkel:    Yeah.

David Archbold:    ...the public meeting. But I'm sure all the breakfast sessions are filling up as well.

Bart Boswinkel:    Yeah.

Ron Hogarth:    We're just looking for critical mass not for 100% attendance although that would be wonderful if we could get that.

David Archbold:    Well yeah.

Ron Hogarth:    Okay well - yes, I will proceed with that planning and we'll refine that over the course of the next four to six weeks.

David Archbold:    Okay, that will be great Rob. Okay we have dealt with agenda items. Any other business? I have...

Ron Hogarth:    I have observed - just from a scheduling point of view and for working group members who may be listening to this recording that - and it's not fatal that folks weren't able to participate in this call. You'll recall that basically the agreement on the last call was to say let's have placeholders for working group calls every three weeks leading up to Brussels. And so this was that first targeted date.

David Archbold:   Yes.

Ron Hogarth:   The next date after this will be on 25 May so that will be three weeks from today. And then the next call after that will be the 15th of June for folks who are putting, you know, things in placeholders on their calendars. And I will circulate a, you know, a report on this meeting, just the bullet points of the decisions reached.

And obviously, you know, we've got the email so I hope that everyone will be able to comment via email on the draft document and on matters that we've discussed today.

David Archbold:   Okay good, thanks Rob.

Ron Hogarth:   Thank you.

David Archbold:   Okay well I think if that terminates the official business if we can have the recorder off we have some informal chats with Bart.


END