ICANN Transcription
GNSO Next-Generation Registration Directory Services (RDS) Policy Development Process Working Group
Tuesday 26 January 2016 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of GAC GNSO Consultation Working Group call on the Thursday 1 October 2015 at 16:00 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.

Woman: The recording has been started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the first meeting of the GNSO Next-Generation Registration Directory Services (RDS) Policy Development Process Working Group Call on the 26th of January, 2016.

In the interest of time today there will be no roll call as we have quite a few participants. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect Room so if you are only on the audio bridge could you please let yourselves be known now.

Susan Prosser: Hello Nathalie this is Susan Prosser and I am on the audio bridge only.

(Mathew Quatrochi):   Hi this is (Mat) - go ahead.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you (unintelligible) Susan.

Man: Go ahead.

Nathalie Peregrine: Go ahead please.

(Mathew Quatrochi): (Mathew Quatrochi) - I just, I am called in. I am not on the Adobe.

Nathalie Peregrine: All right, perfect. Thank you (Mathew) - anyone else?

(Nathan Wilbacker): Yes, (Nathan Wilbaker). I am on the audio bridge.

Nathalie Peregrine: All right, thank you very much (Nathan).

(Kris Pelling): (Kris Pelling) is also in the audio bridge part in Adobe as well.

Nathalie Peregrine: Okay, perfect. Thank you very much (Kris). All of this will be noted and I would like to remind you all too please remember to state your names before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise and with this I will hand it over to Susan. Thank you very much.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you Nathalie. So I am Susan Kawaguchi. I have been very active in the (Who Is Issue) in general and participated on the EWG. I am also a GNSO council member and as the council liaison to this PDP and chairing this first meeting but later in the agenda we will get to a discussion of how to pick a chair.

So very important topic and thank you all who turned out to work on this. We have quite a bit of interest. There is - we have had 86 observers sign up and 124 members and still counting. I think people are still interested.

Just a reminder if you signed up as an observer you will be receiving all the emails but you do not receive the call in details as members or participants receive all those additional notifications but if you would prefer to change your status from observer and receive every notification from the working group you can do that easily and staff can help with that so only the members

received the dial in today so that may have caused a little bit of confusion on the list so just to clear that up.

There is a - we have a - quite a bit of work to do. I spent time last year with several of the GNSO - other GNSO counselors and board members trying to devise a working plan for this PDP. This is Phase One and we have - once we complete the work here in Phase One we have two other phases to move to.

So once again I think you all for participating. We are - as Nathalie mentioned we are not going to do a regular roll call because of the numbers but if there is anyone new and this is their first PDP and we have got a few members - woops, sorry I missed something here.

So actually if you have some - signed up as a member you will need the Statement of Interest, your SOI republished. Staff has been reaching out to those that didn't have those so if anybody has changes to their SOI that they need to update please do that as soon as possible.

So - and then on to the introductions. If we - if there are new members, new to the working groups in general and would like to step forward - a lot of us sort of know each other from previous working groups but we would like to get to know you too. We have about five minutes for introductions and you just raise your hand in the Adobe Room but we would love to hear, you know, just briefly your affiliations, where you are from, and your interest.

Okay, great (Continia). (Grace) do you have your mute on - okay we will get back to (Grace) in a second. How about (Holly Lamb)? (Holly), would you like to introduce yourself? Okay, let's get to (Scott) - (Scott Hollenbeck)? Does anybody have a mike that is working?

(Donna Costanaport): (Unintelligible) this is (Donna Costanaport). My mike is working - sorry.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible) I think mine is working fine.

Susan Kawaguchi: Well thank you. I am glad...

Marika Konings: Susan, this is Marika. Maybe it is helpful if Nathalie just in one minute
                   explains for those that are new on the call how they can connect their
                   microphone in the Adobe Connect so at least we can get the ones that want
                   to introduce themselves connected.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, that would be great, Nathalie?

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much and welcome everybody. This is Nathalie. So the
                    Adobe Connect Audio can be confusing so for those of you who have a
                    telephone close to you please refer to the email invitation. You have a list of
                    phone numbers on there and an audio pass code. For this working group the
                    pass code is RDS which you will need to say to the operator who will then put
                    you through to this audio conference.

                    If you don't have a phone next to you - you can use the Adobe Connect
                    Room Audio. To do that you click on the telephone ICON at the very top of
                    this Adobe Connect Room and follow instructions - this will activate your
                    microphone. One you have done that you will be able to speak via your
                    headset. You will also be able to mute your microphone by clicking on the
                    very same ICON which will now be a microphone ICON showing you that
                    your microphone is activated.

                    If you have any issues please private message me by clicking on my name,
                    Nathalie Peregrine in the Adobe Connect Room Attendance List. I am there
                    as a host and I will be able to assist you. Thank you and back to you Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you. So should we set up - I am not sure (Grace) have you enabled your microphone yet? And (Scott) how about you? Have you been able to get through? Is that you (Scott), no? How about (Miguel Perez)? No, it looks like we have - well you have got your microphone blocked but.

(Holly Lans): For what it is worth this is (Holly Lans). I finally ended up calling in and I think that worked.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay (Holly), please introduce yourself.

(Holly Lans): I apologize. I feel so, you know, being on the ICANN Committee you would think I would be - have a little bit more tech savvy but yes, my name is (Holly Lans). I am a relatively new associate to the firm of Smith, Gambrell and Russell located in Washington D.C. and joining the committee with my colleague (Jim Bycoff) who is not on the call yet, who has been very active in several PDP's and I am very excited to join. I - we represent the International Olympic Committee in domain (name matters) so we are sort of looking out for their interests.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, welcome (Holly).

(Holly Lans): Thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: How about (Stewart), your microphone is not blocked so are you there (Stewart Clark)?

(Stewart Clark): Can you hear me?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes.

(Stewart Clark): Wonderful. I am (Stewart Clark). I am dialing in from windy Dublin. I came to the ICANN face-to-face at the end of last year. I - that was my first ICANN. I

am interested in getting involved and this is my first PDP and I am just representing myself.

Susan Kawaguchi: Great, welcome to the PDP. (Donna Alli), would you like to introduce yourself? Woops it looks like your microphone is now blocked. (Adin) and excuse me if I - are you there (Adin) I may not be able to pronounce your...

(Adin Berekelin): Yes, I am and you pronounced my first name at least correctly.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay.

(Adin Berekelin): My name is (Adin Berekelin). I am London based and I joined the NCDC in the (September 2015) after participating in the next (general) ICANN Program in Dublin last October. So this is my first time serving in an ICANN working group so I look forward very much to further engaging with other members of that community over the coming months and as a new member of the (community) I benefit greatly from any (lessons) or (successes) that you might be able to (sell) to me outside of this call as well.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, well welcome to the working group. From the European Commission and I - excuse me, (Tojabi Bast)?

(Tojabi Bast):   Yes, thank you. My name is (Tojabi Bast). I work for the European Commission for the Direct General Migration and (Home Affairs) - I am working on Cyber Crime. As you can see in the member state - member's list I have an affiliation with the GAC Public Safety Working Group but this is the first time I am joining a working group on this particular policy issue.

Susan Kawaguchi: Great, well we welcome you to the PDP and (Schuetta) - I am not sure I can pronounce your last name - (Schuetta) would you introduce yourself? Okay, maybe we will move on to (Ara Rayasha). Would you like to introduce yourself?

(Ara Rayasha):   Can you hear me.

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, we can.

(Ara Rayasha):   I am (Ara Rayasha). I am from India, New Delhi. I (unintelligible) and I am on
                   - first I am on the working group with ICANN and I am also a (unintelligible).

Susan Kawaguchi: Well thank you for your interest and welcome to the PDP's. It looks like
                 (Graham Aloni)?

(Graham Aloni):   Yes, hello?

Susan Kawaguchi: Hello (Graham).

(Graham Aloni):   I am (Graham) - can you hear me?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes we can.

(Graham Aloni):   Okay, thank you so much. I am - also I was brought into ICANN
                   (unintelligible) and I (unintelligible) with a local (unintelligible) government
                   which we (unintelligible). I am also a member of the (unintelligible) and this is
                   my first time in the PDP's. I am here to learn and (contribute) to the extent of
                   my ability. Thank you so much.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you and welcome and one last one because we are running out of
                 time but we can also do some introductions in another meeting. (Paryann
                 Loginski).

(Paryann Loginski); Hello everyone, can you hear me?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, please go ahead.

(Paryann Loginski): Hello, can you hear me?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, we can hear you.

(Paryann Loginski): My name is (Paryann Loginski). I am based in (Doxia) Bulgaria. First of all I would like to thank responsible ICANN (staff) for approving my application to join the working group. I work in (process software GMBH) which is now part of the (unintelligible) group and we are dealing with Java based (software) products for the (unintelligible) with applications in (unintelligible) security, as well as applications in the (unintelligible) industry (unintelligible).

I (unintelligible) domain names conference in (unintelligible) which is how I (got interested in this topic) - this is my first ICANN meeting so it is very exciting for me to be part of this conference call and being able to participate and I hope contribute to (both development process).

Susan Kawaguchi: Well thank you and welcome to the PDP and welcome to all. We obviously have a very diverse group and that is great because this is a blog topic.

So one of the things which I would like to encourage all of the members of the working group to do is sort of look around and see who else - what other groups are under-represented. If you feel like there is, you know, and on the screen right now is a list of all of the members and you can also find this on the ICANN site and I think Marika may have sent that as, you know, in a prep email to everyone.

And - so you should look at all of the different groups within ICANN and may suggest to your colleagues that they join if you think we - there is more representation needed. Magaly did you have some - a comment?

Magaly Pazello: Thanks Susan - Magaly for the records and everything. I am going to channel Stephane because I know she is going to ask this but I will ask it first so I am just going to preempt her completely.

The question that Stephane is going to ask in one way or another so I am going to ask in my way is whether or not there is any representation from any data protection authorities within this group. If there is not full time representation from that does anyone know whether or not anybody from any data protection authorities have been invited to participate and if no outreach has been made to them specifically why hasn't that been made? Thanks.

(Peter Kempian): Can you hear me over the phone?

Susan Kawaguchi: Yes, and your name (unintelligible).

(Peter Kempian): Yes, my name is (Peter Kempian) and I am especially from data protection authority and I am representing the TPD which is Data Protection Advisory Committee for the Council of Europe so I am also very new at ICANN so - Dublin was my first ICANN conference. There I got involved and I am happy to participate in this PDP and my main interest is definitely privacy and data protection.

Susan Kawaguchi: Well thank and there is your answer Magaly. Let me - Marika could you tell us if we - ICANN staff has any outreach to others in the Data Protection Field?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. What the staff usually does is it sends out the announcements through the usual channel so, you know, ICANN Website, Twitter and newsletters and - but it is really up to the working group then, you know, to look and the thing is what we are doing now when, you know, that has happened to see whether there are any specific groups under represented or in a specific outreach you could if there is specific expertise available in certain communities.

Of course if you direct us to conflicts or in people in certain groups we are happy to do so but we were a bit hesitant to do that without any direction from the working group as it may be seen that we are, you know, putting one

group over another so we are looking to the working groups to provide us with some further guidance on that if you would like our support in that regard.

Susan Kawaguchi: So we should put that on the list to discuss and we can always have staff reach out Magaly and since you were channeling Stephane if you have recommendations then you might want to bring that up at the next meeting for us to, you know, decide on who should be - if we want other outreach done.

And if there is other - any other comments on outreach or representation? No - okay, so we are going to go on to - the next on the agenda is the scheduling of meetings. We picked Tuesdays because the PTFAI just wrapped up and 8:00 am worked good on the West Coast and several other time zones but we do have a broad representation from different time zones so we need to address that.

We are suggesting because of the topic for this PDP that we increase the time, the length of the call to 90 minutes over the usual 60. I know in my experience in working on other working groups, you know, there were times when we would do a 90 minute call but usually they were 60. I am not sure we can get through this PDP in a timely manner if we stick to a 60 minute.

So any thoughts on the lengths of the calls - does anybody oppose 90 minute calls? Okay, it looks in the Chat 90 minutes some people can't stay past 60. I appreciate that - your weighing in and there is some questions about public safety in law enforcement and it looks like we have a couple of members - the Chat is going a little fast but (Mick Shoring) is from the UK government so appreciate your participation there.

So 90 - the calls will be 90 minutes then unless somebody opposes that or lots of people oppose that and then we need to decide if we are going to start out with weekly meetings or do we want to consider the work of the CCWG

and the IANA transition and wait maybe until March to start weekly meetings over, you know, and maybe only have meetings every other week to start.

My opinion which is just one of me so - is that we should get started and to do a weekly call and then if people can't, you know, we can get through some of the mechanics of getting the working group started that way and by the time that CCWG is wrapped up then people can really dig in - hopefully, we will have the time to do that.

So any opinion on weekly calls or bi-weekly - or every other week to start - this is a temporary measure? Okay, so nobody is weighing in. Oh, I am sorry, Alan, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you. It dawns on me that we have an awful lot of people who are new to this and I wonder to what extent do we really need to take up perhaps a week or two for the people who are brand new and give them an overview tutorial or something on what all of this issue is.

If we have people who haven't been following it and there has been an awful lot to follow, just diving in and starting to talk about substance may well be not the best way we can use all of these people and that would perhaps address the issue of - for many of us not having to start right away also.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, good point and Magaly.

(Matt Letreche): Sorry this is (Matt Letreche).

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, I will put you on the list (Matt). Magaly.

Magaly Pazello: Thanks Susan, Magaly again. I - much as I hate agreeing with Alan I will actually agree with him this time around. I am not sure what the best way of handling this could be and I would be open to something, you know, something which could be discussed with staff or whatever but I would agree

that trying to get people up to speed so they can take that energy and interest and do something useful with us might be a better use of our collective time now rather than trying to move forward with what is going to be a very, very complex and contentious discussion which is going to last quite a long time and don't worry Alan we will disagree very soon.

I did - I am not sure of the best way of doing it but I think trying to get people up to speed on, you know, the complexities of what has been discussed already around who is because I think for those of us who have been engaged in this actively for a long time if we have to revisit discussions we have already had 10 or 20 times in the past it is probably not a very good use of our time. Thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, and then (Matt).

(Matt): Yes, I just wanted to second what the first individual said. I am pretty new. I have tried to delve in to many of the documents that you guys have provided and although, you know, I have given it, you know, a good old college try - I mean it can be very difficult but at the same time, you know, I don't know if you need to take time explaining it to us just that there were - I don't even know, some more simplified maybe background documents but, you know, whatever takes up less of your time I think is all I wanted to add.

Susan Kawaguchi: So EWG did put out some video facts and we could have staff send those links out - that might be a place to start. They are short, they are concise and - but we can also have staff put together a short tutorial. There is a lot of reading that staff provided so Kathy what is your viewpoints on this?

Kathy Kleinman: This is Kathy Kleinman, Non-commercial Stakeholders Group. I wanted to - just several points that have gone by very quickly Susan and Happy New Year to you and to everyone on the call.

Okay, so first I think the idea of reviewing materials is a good one. There have been a lot of discussions over many years. I would urge that the Who Is Review Team Report be included in this. It is very important and it also is a summary across many years, as you know Susan, of work that has been done in the community so I would strongly urge that that be added.

I think reading is good but Webinars and places people can ask questions is even better so we should do that. Regarding the calls I like once a week because it sets up a rhythm, it is easy to remember, particularly if we took one time and I don't understand why we are starting with 90 minutes - I think 60 minutes until we go into harder questions might be good. Ninety minutes is a huge slug of time for a lot of people in the middle of the day. Thanks, bye, bye.

Susan Kawaguchi: Good comments Kathy and then thank you for that and Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks everyone, great start of the working group. First of all let me start off by disagreeing with Kathy. I think 90 minutes is needed. With this many people on a call in 60 minutes you could barely get the introduction in and then we are really dealing with issues in my experience in working groups when you have heavy issues especially 60 minutes is really short. But I will respectfully, Kathy, disagree with you on that one.

With regard to the suggestion in bringing people up to speed who haven't been tracking the issues involved here I certainly support that but I think we have to have a balance. We could literally spend six months just brining people up to speed with the amount of material and the amount of history that goes on with this. So I think we have to find a balance of helping people get up to speed, pointing them in the right direction and guiding them in terms of the most important documents to review and with doing the things that a bunch of people have suggested in terms of whether it be Webinars or presentations or whatever and then last of all let me say I think there is a presentation associated with this meeting. This maybe is the first step to

doing that so hopefully later in the agenda we will have time to go through that - thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi. Thanks Chuck that is some good points and I do think that maybe devoting the next meeting to an overview with the - who is the history in the Who Is Issues and oh, by the way Kathy the Who Is Review Team Report was included in those materials so if people can look at their - the initial member email for the working group and see that as a reference.

So I would think the way to move forward is to have staff put together some short tutorials and resend all of the resources that they have sent in the past, including the EWG video facts so people hopefully can take a look at some of that next week or within this week and maybe do a tutorial call next Tuesday. Does that seem agreeable? (Konan Poffey)?

(Konan Poffey): Hi, this is (Konan). Yes, look what (unintelligible) because it is good to (unintelligible) and the personality and my (unintelligible) things have to be spread out, you know, separated and because the (unintelligible). So we can just (unintelligible) is my position but is what actually...

Susan Kawaguchi: (Konan) this is Susan. It is a little difficult to understand you. There seems to be some noise. Could you restate that a little - maybe a little bit of - further away from your mike? I am not sure what will help.

(Konan Poffey): Okay.

Susan Kawaguchi: Or you can put your comment in the Chat too.

(Konan Poffey): Actually what - yes okay. I will (unintelligible) the Chat message.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, so (Konan) is going to do that in the Chat. Okay, so anyone else that would like to comment on the background materials or how we refresh people or provide the tutorials that we think are needed? Magaly.

Magaly Pazello: Hi Susan, Magaly again. Look if anybody - if you need anybody to help with this - I mean I am like yourself I served on the EWG so I am more than a little familiar with the subject matter and happy to help if anybody wants any help or if anybody is in a European time zone I am quite happy to answer people's questions up to a point - thanks.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, thank you. Magaly is a great reference on all of this. All right, so next - so I am not - I have heard a little bit of disagreement on the 90 minute call but no one else besides Kathy so I am assuming silence is golden and 90 minutes isn't completely objected to and that next week will be more of a briefing call and we will work with staff on that.

The other issue with the meetings is we do have this broad time zone and staff's suggestion was that one out of every four calls so the fourth call of every in rotation would be in a different time zone and because we do understand that Australia, Asia, it is difficult so any questions or input on that? Okay, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I was going to note that Australia isn't even on the chart that you displayed.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Ignoring that since we clearly can ignore Australians. Sorry, but I have just gone through a process of trying to reschedule the ALAC which has representation literally around the world and it is difficult and no matter when we pick somebody is going to be up at 3:00 in the morning but is only reasonable that it be rotated somewhat. Thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, thanks Alan and Marika did you have a comment on this?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I just wanted you to know that the charge you see on the screen is based on the date that we had two days ago and, you know, (Kyle) just informed us today that he is actually in the (unintelligible) time zone so after this call we will update this chart to make sure we have everyone in there that, you know, that wasn't covered before has signed out - signed up after we developed this chart and make sure that, you know, once the leadership is in place they have a clear overview of, you know, where the membership is based and based on that information and, you know, staff will be able to at least give some guidance on what may be potential option for that (unintelligible) the rotation of that fourth meeting.

So just want to assure everyone that, you know, we haven't intentionally left anyone off, this is just based on data that is already outdated because we have more people signing up in the meantime.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, thank you Marika and, you know, staff is always trying to catch up with the rest of the community as we submit things so. So I think we have - we are agreeing on some sort of rotation so I will work with staff on trying to figure out how that rotation could work and we did look at different times but we will put that out to the list and people can comment on that but we will do a rotation and that we will continue the time slot of 1600 UTC's.

All right, I think we are going to move on to Principles of Transparency and Openness. The Working Group Guidelines, ICANN's standard guidelines insist that we always or we agree that we always will operate under the principles of transparency and openness which means that the mailing lists, our publicly archived meetings are publicly archived and meetings are normally recorded and transcribed and SOI is required from each of the working group participants and those are publicly posted.

So just so everybody understands that that is the reason we ask for you to provide your full name when you start to speak so that the transcription can get that and all of the calls you can listen to. If you miss a call you could

always listen to it or see the transcription - read the transcription later and those are very helpful sometimes when you - after a lengthy discussion sometimes it is hard to decide where we all came out in that - so that has been helpful to me in the past so as long as everybody understands that and please update your SOI's as needed.

So I think we are on to the most important part of this call, to me at least, is election of Working Group leaders. Chuck had a very good suggestion on the list and I think that - Chuck would you mind introducing your suggestion for leadership of this Working Group. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I would be happy to Susan, thanks. And let me first of all thank everyone who chimes in on the list because there has been I don't know how many dozen responses on the list with regard to that and my suggestion was fairly simple that we have a leadership team that have one representative and I favor, I uses the term representative cautiously because their role as a leader would not be to represent their group, okay. Let me be very clear on that.

But there would be four members of the Leadership Team, one from each of the GNSO Stakeholder Groups and for those that are new the four groups are the Commercial Stakeholder Group, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, the Registrar Stakeholder Group and the Registry Stakeholder Group and I fully understand that not everybody is associated with a Stakeholder Group and that is perfectly fine and does not limit your participation in the working group activities so it is important that we are clear on that.

But one of the things we have learned over the last 15 years with regard to who is - is that there are certain stakeholder groups that are on different sides of the issue with regard to registration data and having someone from each of those groups who is fully aware of the differences of opinion will be very helpful in the leadership teams demonstrating within the working group as a whole.

There are different points of view and provided that those four leaders are willing to collaborate with each other having the understanding of their differences and with the objective of cooperatively working together to lead the whole working group I think that creates a very good dynamic for the challenges that we have in front of us.

Now I think there is a couple of configurations and some of those have been discussed on the list as well in the last 24 hours - it can be a Chair and three Co-Vice Chairs or it could be two Co-Chairs and two Co-Vice Chairs.

As some of you know I was a Co-Chair on the Policy and Implementation Working Group which admittedly wasn't nearly as big in terms of participation as this one nor nearly as controversial but we use the two Co-Chair and two Co-Vice Chair model very effectively and I gave other examples of the collaborative leadership that has been used in recent years within the ICANN community as a whole and within the GNSO in particular.

So that is essentially what I am proposing. If there are questions I would be happy to respond to those.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks Chuck. And I do agree that this PDP is much too large to just have one Chair and no other support. I think on the CPSAI we, you know, due to (Don) being able to change this in his circumstance he had to step away as Chair and then we had two Co-Chairs and it was amazing the amount of work that (Don) was doing on his own prior to that so I do think that sharing the load is preferable. Alan would you like to comment?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I support the Co-Chair concept. I think that actually works better than Chair and Vice Chairs because it does provide a better balance. I appreciate Chuck's analysis of - that the leadership should try to balance the immovable forces that are in play on this subject. But the GNSO has a stellar regard of having Work Groups and Work Group Leadership open to anyone in the community who is willing to work and I have no clue whether there are

people outside of the GNSO who will volunteer for a leadership position in this group. I know I am not in a position to so I am not jockeying for a role but I think sending - saying that the leadership positions are only open to the GNSO I think sends just the exact wrong message we want to - to going forward.

I think that the GNSO has a marvelous record in the past and I really don't think that we want to say we restrict it to just GNSO people. Thank you.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, anyone else. So Donna your question that is in the Chat. I will maintain a role as liaison as long as I am a council member so I would - but I will participate in, you know, in my own capacity also in this working group - (Stephane) would you like to comment?

(Stephane Carin): Thank you (Stephane Carin) for the record. I hate to disagree with Alan on - I appreciate his comments but I think this a huge working group on an extremely fractious issue that has a lot of history. Everybody is welcome to join the group but I really strongly believe that we cannot have just about - rather we cannot have the leadership wide open. It is a GNSO working group. It would be appropriate to have some kind of balanced representation from the GNSO take up the leadership positions in my view.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay thank and you - woops (Summer) went away - (Santis) - (unintelligible).

(Ahmer): Excuse me sorry, this is (Ahmer) - did I miss my turn?

Susan Kawaguchi: I - all of a sudden your hand went away so I thought you - and maybe it is just my view. Okay, (Ahmer) please go ahead.

(Ahmer): All right, thanks Susan. This is (Ahmer) and yes, I just wanted to point out that the way I read Chuck's suggestion and I personally agree with it so I will say that up front but I am - the read I read his suggestion was not to exclude

non-GNSO affiliated members of the working group to participate in the leadership team. It was just a suggestion and the suggestion will not be imposed on the working group members but it is just a topic for discussion and obviously I don't believe that a leadership team consisting of only GNSO representation will be the results of this discussion if we don't have broad agreement within the working group so let's try not to frame this as an exclusion of members participating.

I also wanted to point out that this PDP will most likely continue for an extremely long duration of time and we will be working through phases -- three phases specifically -- after which recommendation will go to the GNSO Council. And there may be a need -- or perhaps an opportunity to between these phases -- to, sort of, try to determine how effective the leadership team was. Some members of the leadership team may need to drop out for one reason or another or this may not -- whatever leadership team we come up with now --may not be a permanent one.

But I do think there is merit in Chuck's suggestion. And I think all he is asking for, and Chuck please correct me if I'm mistaken, it's for the Working Group members to consider it, so it's just a suggestion.

Thank you.

Susan Prosser: Thanks, Omar. And I agree.

And I think in in this PDP between the length and complexity, there will be a lot of leadership opportunities.

(Sanjit)?

(Sanjit): Hi. If I -- I'm looking at the presentation that Chuck emailed up PDF. And if I jump directly to the second paragraph, is there anybody that has an objection to Chuck's rationale for this proposal? Forget his proposal for the minute, but

something in the rationale for proposing it, is wrong. I think it might be whatever quality developments that take place here has to be approved by the State Charter so that earlier we can get of whether the leaders or others or the earliest we get members of those Stakeholder Groups to agree or disagree, the less work my work based on data.

This is a Working Group that has been consultative now, but be sure of what to replace of who is supposed to call an agreement between (unintelligible). Speaking as the reason why I'm attending this, I'm speaking as an individual user and my one interest is to whatever quality is developed, as long as it's opening to accept? And we don't do too much data hiding. But by that's the other reason. So that's sort of my requirement of me and my recommendations as well.

But would I would like to ask is of the rationale that Chuck has given. Is there anything object able in that? Forget whether the two leaders or six leaders and which group they come from and whether they called or Vice-Chairs or Co-Chairs. I find the rationale quite non-objectionable. Fine.

Susan Prosser: Thank you (Sanjit).

Holly?

Holly Raiche: I think I have to agree with and disagree with (Sanjit) and have to go support Alan. I like the proposal of having most of the Co-Chairs. I think it's really going to be necessary, but I think we have to go more probing than just being involved. And that's because technically, we are a multi-stakeholder organization but this is just its only group that actually should have the executive leadership. I think we have to broaden that because there's so many people in ICANN as (Sanjit) (unintelligible).

Susan Prosser: Thanks Holly.

And (Donna)?

(Donna): Thanks (Susan). Donna Austin.

I just want to -- I agree with Chuck and I agree with (Liz) that putting some comments in the Chat.

So I don't necessarily have a concern about whether the representation comes from the GNSO or whether it's independent. I think there's value in having independence. I think we don't want any more than four on the Leadership Team. I think that's a pretty good number. But I would ask that -- this is going to be a big deal. And I think it's important that we have people in these leadership roles that are actually qualified to do the job. So its people that have had priors in, you know, being a Chair or a Co-Chair of a Working Group in the past I think will be important.

So to (Liz's) idea in the Chat, I think, you know, let's do a call. If we can agree that four is a good number for the Leadership Team, and I call it a Leadership Team because, you know, whether it's two Co-Chairs and two Chairs or whether or it's, you know, one Chair or three Co-Chairs. I think a Leadership Team can sort that out between them -- among them.

So perhaps the best way forward is to, you know, do a call for volunteers and see who's interested. And then we can whittle it down from there. I think would be perhaps a way forwards. Thanks.

Susan Prosser: Thanks (Donna). There's are good, great suggestions.

Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And great discussion. I respect everybody's view on this.

The key point in my mind for the Leadership Team, whether it's doing it across the four SGs or not, is I think it's important on the Leadership Team to have a combination of leaders that are on different sides of the issue. So that they can grabble as a Leadership Team with full understanding of their differences. And then it makes it easier to lead the full group which will also have the differences. So where it's one person from each Stakeholder Group or not, what's important in my opinion, is that it's a mix of people from both extremes, if I can use that strong word. We know we have two extreme positions with regard to who is, okay? And they're both important. And in my view, if I was a Leader, I would want people from both sides to balance it in terms of the leadership. And I think that's important.

So whether -- I'm not dogmatic of terms of it being one from each SG. That was a natural. Because historically in mind -- because historically you can name which SG was on which major side of the issue. And so it automatically would give different perspectives, which I think is very important.

So let me just stop there and say that's the most important thing in my mind. I think and (Donna's) right. We need to have qualified and effective leadership. And what I'm adding to that is let's have some from competing sides of the issue, if I can use the word competing there. So that we can grabble with the issues as leaders and then in the same way that the whole group going to. And I think that will facilitate our success going forward.

Susan Prosser: Thanks Chuck. I absolutely agree and Marika has put up a slide on what's involved in becoming a leader. And I urge everyone to read that. That was -- you can also find that on the ICANN website. But it does take quite a commitment.

Alan? After Alan we'll probably resolve, you know, decide on what we're going how we're going to move forward with this.

But (Alan)?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. It's (Alan Greenberg) speaking.

I did something in my email and my intervention which I relatively rarely do, that is, disagree with Chuck. I mean we can disagree on subsequent issues but we rarely disagree on how to over -- how to manage this process well. And I'll agree completely with what Chuck just said. Just to reverse it.

I think both sides -- the two sides of the equation-- need to be represented in the management team. I don't think it should be restricted based on Stakeholder Group. And I strongly agree with Chuck and Liz that quality management and people who have experienced this and can do it are worth their weight in gold. I've seen Working Groups dissolve into shambles because the leader didn't really didn't have the ability to control the group or lead the group. So I strong support everything Chuck said in the last intervention.

Thank you.

Susan Prosser: Thanks Alan.

And (Sanjit), is that an old hand or a new hand?

I'm going to just -- I think it's a hand.

So it looks like we have a lot of agreements that we need from -- we need a leadership team that is diverse, whether or not they represent parts of, you know, directly represent a Stakeholder Group within the GNSO is still up for discussion. So what I'm suggesting -- and this actually some we're suggesting this in the Chat -- is that we will still call for volunteers to Leadership and see what candidates we have. And since we've already designated next week's call as a tutorial, then come to an agreement on the

Leadership Team, or closer to an agreement, in two weeks' time -- two meeting times. So I'll let (Steph) decide how we should go about doing that.

(Liz)? Looks like she lost audio.

I'm just advocating that we take into account all of the discussion today and diversity of points of using to be important. And we may or may not limit the affiliation. We continue this discussion on line. We do a call for volunteers and I'll have staff figure that out and exactly how we're going to do that. And then in two weeks' time, make a decision hopefully on Chair.

Once we see who steps forward and would like to participate on the Leadership Team, then we'll have a better idea of affiliation and diversity that we're looking for and also all of the strengths of the Chair that is up on the screen right now.

Does that sound like that works?

Chuck, you have your hand up?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Susan). This is Chuck.

And I just want to add one thing to what you said. I think if people volunteer if in fact we're going to want the diversity in terms of points of view with regard to who is. That it would be helpful that they gave us a little information in terms of, you know, what side of the issue they lean towards or whether they don't.

Susan Prosser: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I don't know how you do that exactly because it just came to my mind. But that would, I think, be very helpful information for us. Some of us know certain individuals on our Working Group and where they stand. But in some cases,

we won't. So I'll leave it to you to suggest maybe how that happens or maybe
Marika or (Lisa) have an idea there. But I think a little bit of information in
terms of where they're coming from with regard to the who-is debate would
be helpful.

Susan Prosser: That makes a lot of sense. So what I'll do is I will work with that, and we'll
come up with a set of criteria or questions that we would like volunteers to
respond to so that the Working Group can make an informed decision.

Holly?

Holly Raiche: Great (unintelligible) Chuck.

I would add though -- I would like a bit of excitement about the (unintelligible).
There's some of us who have been involved for a long time and I think for this
Leadership Team, we really need people who have at least a little bit of
background with this issue. And then can provide that background in
perspective in as part of the Leadership Team.

Thank you.

Susan Prosser: And that is another good point, Holly.

Okay, so I think I've noted several different criteria we're looking for. So I'll
work with staff today and hopefully get something out tomorrow to the list.
And then we can refine that and do a call for volunteers. Does that make
sense to everybody? Anybody disagree with that?

Well it looks like they do -- like no disagreement at this point.

So Item 7 is Background Materials. So we started into this a little bit earlier.
But I'm going to let Marika take over here and talk about the replacement of

who is. Looks like Stephanie, sorry Marika. Looks like (Stephanie) has her hand up.

One last comment Stephanie, or one more comment?

Stephanie Parrin: And yes. (Stephanie Parrin) for the record.

Just a point of clarification (Susan). I wasn't quite sure. When you and staff before we were looking for volunteers, had we agreed on the structure? Because in the email that Chuck had up there, there's several different models. Some people may not want to volunteer as a Chair. They might be willing to be a Vice-Chair, if you see were I'm going with this. But otherwise you could say okay, you're volunteering in an unsorted pool based on what you're willing to do. You could do that, I suppose. But I think we need a little clarity.

Susan Prosser: So, you know, my thought was that we would -- when we develop this criteria that we're going to ask people to provide information on when they volunteer -- that that would be a key question. If we have someone that is clearly experienced and willing to Chair along with Vice-Chairs, then maybe the Working Group can decide to go that direction. So we can just add that to the list of questions for the volunteers, just a net. Unless you think we -- do we immediately need to look at the pool of volunteers to know if we have a strong Chair candidate or we need, you know, this is going to be quite a lot of work. So Co-chairs may make more sense. But I think looking at that pool of volunteers and what they are willing to do would inform that decision for the Working Group.

Does that make sense to you, Stephanie?

Stephanie Parrin: Okay great. Absolutely. I'll put that in the tab. That makes sense. Perfect. Thank you.

Susan Prosser: Okay. So I'm going to hand this off to Marika and she'll present an overview.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much, (Susan).

So what's staff has done and put together a short presentation on some of the basics that everyone in the Working Group is expected to know about which relates to first of all, the Policy Development Process. Then looking at the Working Group Charter. What is this Working Group asked to do. And then briefly looking as well at the genus of Working Group Guidelines which are expected to divide the work and operations of the Working Group.

And we've already discussed, we'll be working on some more in-depth materials that we hope to be able to represent during next week's meeting. But hopefully this won't have any stop-serve as a starting point. And then, of course, if they're any questions at the end of the overview or that may occur to you after this call, always feel free to reach out to staff and we'll do our best to answer your questions.

So we're briefly focused here on three different aspects that are the foundational materials for the operation and function of the Working Group. The first looking at the GNSO Policy Development Process. And I know for several of you this is the first Policy Development Process that you are participate in. And I want to introduce this opportunity as well to present a little advertisement that we're planning a Webinar, I believe next week. And that we'll go into more detail on the GNSO PDP or what are some of the requirements. And what are some of the potential outcomes. And that invitation will be sent to this Working Group so if you want to go into more in detail you certainly encouraged to attend that session.

For the purposes for this meeting, I just to point out that the part of this graphic to really show that the Working Group phase that were currently added is just one part of the Policy Development Process. And several steps have been conceded this Working Group and most notably publication of the

final issue report that hopefully all of you had an opportunity to review and read. And this stands as part of the Working Group. The Working Group itself again is not the end point of this Policy Development Process. After the Working Group has completed its final report, there's still a number of steps that will need to be taken before the Policy recommendations would move into implementation and complete the process.

So looking at the Working Group space and some what are some of the required elements. And again, I want to emphasize here these are minimum requirements. There's a lot of flexibility in the Policy Development Process for a Working Group to develop its work plan and carry out its work as it seems a best fit. If you are to review that additional information on the document, that needs to be published for public comments. If they are additional needs to reach out to certain groups to get their input. That is all, you know, part of how you want to -- how you can devise your work as part of your work plan. But there are minimum steps that are required to do to complete this part of this process.

So first of all, there's a requirement at an early stage of the Policy Development Process to reach out to the GSFO Stakeholder Groups and constituencies to ask for their input. This can take, you know, the form of a questionnaire that the Working Group may devise. It can take the form of sharing with them the Charter Questions and asking for their input. Again, it's up to the Working Group to discuss what is the best format to do so. And maybe worth pointing out as well that's part of it.

The Council deliberations on the Charter of this Working Group. Is also pointed that it may be worth asking for specific input in relation to the Charter and the questions that are being asked there. And again, that may be something you would want to consider as you reach out to those groups for their input. And again, it may be -- to ask them whether they want to have any confirms of earlier input that has been provided and that is also available as part of the background materials that have been provided to you.

In addition to that, the Working Group is also solely first to seek the payment of other ICANN Advisory Committees and supportive organizations. Again, it's up to the Working Group to decide, you know, what shape and form that takes. You know, past Working Groups have used for example a similar template or questionnaire that they have used in the Stakeholder Groups. In certain cases, more specific questions were developed. For example, in outreach to the Security and Advisory Committee, there may be specific questions that relate to that aspect that the Group may want to ask their opinion on at an early stage.

And again, that input that is provided as part of that feedback is expected to be considered by the Working Group as part of its deliberations and addressed as part of the Working Group's initial report. Of course, in addition to all the other materials that the Working Group is expected to have reviewed in conjunction with some of the questions that are being asked from the Working Group in the Charter, which we will get to next.

Based on all this information, review of materials, discussions, I hope that the Working Group will, of course, come to consensus on its recommendations or the questions that are being asked in the Charter and publishes an initial report that outlines those positions for public comments.

Following the public comments here, again it's the obligation of the Working Group to review all the comments received. And basically respond to those comments which is being done through a public comments review tool which basically maps all of the comments and gives the Working Group an opportunity to review each of those comments and analyze what their perspective is and also indicate, based on the comments, what the Working Group decided to do. Did you make any changes to your report? Is it a point of many being addressed? Or is it the point that it was considered, but the Working Group is in agreement. Again to show a record of how public input has been considered and addressed.

And then final report that compiles all the information is then submitted to the GNSO Council for advice and consideration. And one thing to point out here -- and that is something that the Working Group will need to consider as part of its discussions of a development of work plan -- is that for this specific PDP, your work is broken out in three different phases. So you may want to consider using these requirements in each of those phases or whether there's another minimum requirement sent out over initial phases. Then again, that's a point for consideration as the Working Group continues.

Again, here just rather briefly provided again the overview of all those minimum requirements that are contained in the PDP. But again, the Working Group is free to go above and beyond those minimum requirements just as needed for you to carry out your work.

There's something as well for further reading if you're reading and want to go into the details of PDPs that the PDP is abided by actions of the ICANN Bylaws. And then there's a part that called the PDP (unintelligible) that's part of the GNSO Operational Procedures that they may complement the part of the Bylaws and goes into more details on some of the different requirements and steps and how those are to be expected to be carried out. And then there's also an overview in the form of graphics that may help you see the PDP from start to finish.

So again, we're looking at the Working Group Chart. And again, it's one of the foundational documents of the Working Group. So if you haven't gone through it yet, please read this document in detail as I expect to divide the work and deliberation of the Working Group and, you know, the team as it comes to expect to come back with and being able to outline out you can address all the questions and issues that have the outlined in the Charter.

So basically many of you are aware of the Charter and the way it's set up. And the proper training worked and developed by the Board and GNSO

Council Working Group that was formed to make you look at all the work that had been by the Expert Working Group and as well, determining how that could be done in the core development process recognizing that it's, of course, a complex issue with different aspects that need to be reviewed. So based on that conversation, that Group agreed to divide the work up into three distinct phases which Phase 1, being the phase that would add the Policy Requirements and Definitions, some of the if and why questions. Phase 2 would look at the Policy and Functional Design, you know, the what. And Phase 3 would be the Implementation by, is the how phase.

Alright. Part of that discussion that was also made by Twitter that would be specific decisions (unintelligible) by the GNSO Council where it would decide whether if sufficient process would be made to move onto the next phase. So in that regard, you know, from the Charter perspective for this presentation, I'm just focusing on the Phase 1 part of the work that will be the main focal part of the Working Group, you know, starting off at Phase 2. And basically will be the next conversation that the Working Group has completed its work on Phase 1, the GSO Council will take that work and look at the Working Group's recommendations and decide at that stage whether or not, you know, is time to move into Phase 2, at which will move closer to the requirements of Phase 2.

So on this slide, you will find some of the questions that are expected to be addressed by the Working Group as part of its innovations and that the report it produces. So the two main questions are Phase 1. What are some of the minimum requirements or details you want registration to ask? And secondly, is a new policy framework and next generation on this needed to address these requirements? And if not, how does the current list model meet these requirements?

And so as part of its deliberations on these questions, you're expected to consider, you know, at a minimum a lot of different questions. And I won't go into detail here, as I'm sure we're coming back to those. But just to point out,

you know, all the different aspects have been already covered as part of the Charter. And also in the final issue report, to go into detail on these different aspects and provide at least some information what has already been considered in this regard.

And again I want to point out that, you know, at a minimum for both the first action and the second one. If there are additional elements that the Working Group at least needs to be covered, there's no restriction in that regard as these are our minimum requirements and minimum questions that the Council expects to follow in pursuit in your communication.

And the report also clearly outlines what are the information both of you are expected to consider out of this information and again, you know, with kind of our minimum. If official information sources it needs to considered, you know, should be pointed out and we try to gather as much information as we can on or write on the first stage. And we all encouraged to look at that and indicate to ours to others which we believe are any questions missing there. There's that noted in each area from the previous are also defined in the final issue report and information is provided there. And the Working Group is strongly and opted to consider as well the recommendations by the Expert Working Group in its final report. Again, including but not limited to there's other information that is relevant and the Working Group is strongly encouraged to provide that as well.

And the process framework also looks at the time sequences to ensure that the dependencies are addressed and create opportunities for a potential panel of Policy Development which is, of course, subject to resource availability. Again, if there's a way to certain things in parallel for the Working Group to consider as part of your work plan issues. Consider what is the best way for addressing some of these issues.

Then we do the final report, execute the tutorials as well the member statement to be served as the foundation for the PDP, which I hopefully have

the ability to send more time on that on next week's call. But in the meantime, please look at those materials as a lot of extra time has been put into the providing, not only the report itself, but easier ways of digesting that information and materials.

In addition, the Charter also points to a number of other efforts that are either ongoing or in their end stages. And they have an impact on deliberations of this working Group that will help as inspirations which include the work of an implementation of the 2013 REA and implementation of the (unintelligible). The Privacy and Proxy Services adaptions, issues, recommendations as well as confirmation and (unintelligible) recommendations.

I don't know if I've already noted before, asset issue has been discussed over many many years as one of the relevant input that has been provided, (unintelligible) takeover groups and constituencies as well as supporting organizations and advisory committees over the years. And that will provide a helpful backdrop to a lot of those different positions that will be expected in this Working Group as well as how informed and in the discussions and deliberations. Again a lot of that is covered in the final issue report as well as posted on the weekly page.

So this is something that wasn't part of the Process Management Development as well as in the Charter -- was basically type the map work clearly. How does the different phases align? And there's actually a chart as well that goes into more detail again as one of the big topics that will hopefully help to facilitate the Working Group deliberations and development of the work plans to address these different times. Again here you can see clearly as well the visible triangles where the different decision points also Chiefs of Council are expected to take place. And I hope this provides some further ideas of how these different elements are willing to be addressed going forward.

And again this literally some of a Charter a Working Group should examine all the requirements for the details of the registration data and directory shows at a high level. And for Phase 1, it is recommended that due to interdependencies, all areas should be considered together by a single team. For example, the PDP working Group should consider whether the PDP registration data should continue to be acceptable for any purposes, whether its data should be acceptable only for specific purposes. If the PDP Working Group decides the matter should also recommend permissible uses and purposes.

And having said that, the single team reference leaves some staff perspective. We don't think that we need that everything needs to be done with everyone at the same time. It just means that, you know, recommendations do need to be considered together by this new Working Group as there are obviously interdependencies that need to be addressed and need to be considered. But that makes opportunities for some work to be done by sub-teams or in parallel as long as, of course, the overall package is considered by everyone and also the connection can be considered.

As noted at a conclusion of Phase 1, the PDP Working Group's output is expected to be submitted to the GNSO Council for approval of the recommendations regarding if and why a next generation audience needs to be replaced with. But if the Working Group has concluded that a new Policy Framework is indeed needed, then that input should include the requirements to be addressed either in the framework and next generation RDS. However, if the Working Group hasn't concluded that the existing new assistants can adequately be addressed in the environment, the Working Group is also expected to confirm that and define any necessary changes that are needed to the exiting Policy Framework.

So at that stage, GNSO Working Group is expected to consider whether sufficient progress has been made to move into the next Phase. At that stage, it could also decide to refer some questions back to the Working

Group it believes there's still some missing parts or can consider that the Working Group has accomplished its Charter. The Charter also points out that in its consideration of the Phase 1 output of the GNSO Council should be guided by a set of questions that sets how well legal and concerns have been addressed and some minimum questions that are that are in there or imposed by the ICANN group that hopefully most of you know, has been initiator of this process.

And so, (Chris), why are details of the database registrations collected? What purpose will the data serve? Who collects the data? What value does the public realize that access to registration data -- of all registration data are available -- what (unintelligible) does the public need to access to? Is the newest protocol the best choice to providing that access? And what stakes are provided to protect the data?

In addition to that, the Council should also consider whether the PDP Working Group made suitable progress towards key goals and concerns in this Phase of the PDP Working Group. And the Charter also outlines a number of example questions that should be considered there. For example, you know, does it establish a compelling business case for next generation RDS? Do we need to redefine need for registration data? If we do, do the benefits outweigh the costs?

And looking at establishing a co-existent plan enabling space or addition over a defined period of time. And creating a viable approach to moving from who with and anonymous access to audience. Data access ensuring the datability, stability, and security of the next generation RDS. And measuring the effectiveness of the next generation RDS and reaching stated goals. And seeking buy-in from all the practicing parties, including Eco systems players, consumers and (unintelligible). So those are some of the questions that the Council will need to measure progress against as well as it evaluates in Phase 1 and decides whether or not to move this forward.

So I'm briefly looking at the GNSO Working Group Guidelines which is another part of the GNSO Operating Procedures. Again, very briefly, you'll all encouraged to look at it in more detail as it provides some important guidance is to how the Working Group is expected to operate and function and going forward. It is really there to assist the Working Group to be able to optimize its productivity and effectiveness overall.

So some of the elements that are of particular importance that are covered there are what's expected to be drafted by the first meeting of the Working Group. And most of that we've already covered here at today's meeting. And looks at the Working Group Member Roles and Responsibilities and it renews and updating its list of Subject Matter Experts. What is expected with regards to participation and representativeness of the Working Group. It looks at the process of responsibility, expected behavior, and norm. It outlines in detail standard methodology for making decisions.

And one point to point out here that we'll likely come back here towards the concluding phases of this Working Group is that this Working Group's operates on their the GNSO definitions of consensus, of which has been broken down into different levels of (unintelligible) work. Everyone agrees -- consensus is basically who is most agreed but a small minority may disagree. And there's as well, you know, strong support and significant oppositions. So there are a number of accreditations. But I think the important element to remember here is that the GNSO is expected to confuse consensus recommendations which do not necessarily mean full consensus recommendation.

And then it also looks at the appeal process. If Working Group members disagree with decisions taken or how does there made or they are mechanisms in place, but which they can be challenged. And it looks at what is available on the adjudication and collaboration tools. And it also reviews the products and expected outputs from the Working Group.

Again here, you have references to a summary of the Working Group Guidelines as well as the full documents which you're also encouraged to review.

I think that's all I had on my list to cover. It's a very short update. And I now if probably want advice on. So feel free to, you know, leave any questions that are pending, left off, or remaining issues or any questions you would like to see on.

And (Susan) back to you.

Susan Prosser: Thanks Marika. That was a great overview.

Are there any questions for Marika?

Omar?

Omar Kaminski: Thanks (Susan). And thanks, Marika, for this presentation on (unintelligible).

I have one question. And the reason I'm asking it is because if I'm not mistaken, this was an issue on the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation issue. Earlier in the presentation, Marika, you mentioned the early outreach the working Group expected to conduct through the different ICANN SOs and ACs for inputs on this PDP, as well as the traditional public comment periods.

Let's say that members of the Working Group, at any given time apart from the traditional one where we seek public comment, but any other time where Working Group members would like input from outside of the Working Group. Whether form the ICANN community or possibly beyond. Are there -- what is the process to do this? How would the Working Group go about doing this?

Thank you.

Susan Prosser: Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. As I noted, there's some minimum requirements with regards to additional things that the Working Group wants to do. There's a lot of flexibility and it really comes down to, you know, the Working Group discusses what they want to do and then discussing what would be the best mechanism for those. In fact, there's staff that's available to help with those if specific outreach needs to be done to certain groups. If you want invite certain people to come to a meeting to brainstorm certain issues. I think those are all, you know, options that are available to the Working Group. It just requires a conversation and as it aligns with the work plan and the outline of the work.

But again, there's a lot of flexibility. It just requires the Working Group thinking through what is needed. And also, you know, in certain cases if there's additional -- if there's costs involved of course that require an off conversation from a budget perspective. But it would you know total recommend the Working Group be part of the information of the work plan and how you have time to do your work to think about those things. Are there certain elements that you think may need to be addressed? You know, do you have involvement and participation that are some things that need to happen to think through it as part of your work plan so it can be factored in and planned for as well as sufficient time can be set aside, you know, additional things need to happen as part of your work.

Susan Prosser: Thank you, Marika.

And I would urge any of the Working Group members to, you know, start thinking about that now if we need additional resources of, you know, input. We should, sort of, get those lined up now and so we might suggest that on the mailing list.

We've got three minutes to go. And we've got two more sections of the agenda, so hopefully we can do this quickly.

Then next part of the meeting today is development of a work plan. I don't think we can get that done. But what we can do is we can suggest that the staff prepare the Mind Map for us. And they'll pull together the Charter and different information sources to provide a starting point for us. So if everybody agrees, we'll have them -- we'll ask staff to start working on that and we can also have lots of input on that as the Working Group.

So does anybody disagree with that? Moving forward in that way?

Okay, so we've got two pluses there so in the Chat. So we're going to move forward on that. And we can hear more about how the Mind Map has been used in other Working Groups in the meeting and the next meeting.

And so we have several different Action Items that have come out of this meeting. So our next meeting will be an overview of issues, sort of, a short tutorial. And we decided on 90-minute calls rotated. And for now, I think we are doing them every week. We can go back and think about that again.

And I'll work with staff on questions in a format for asking for calls for volunteers so that we have all the information we need.

We also do have a face-to-face meeting planned for the Wednesday afternoon, I think 4 to 6? If I'm wrong, Marika, let me know. Yes, on Wednesday of the Marrakesh meeting. So if, you know, hopefully those that are in just could meet to get together as a Working Group and we can discuss -- continue to discuss all of these things.

Is there any other questions or concerns before we adjourn? Doesn't look like it.

Thank you again for all of your time and efforts. We really appreciate it. There's been a vibrant discussion in the Chat which I always enjoy but can't always follow.

So thank you. And we'll talk again next Tuesday at 8:00 am Pacific time.

Thanks.

Please end the recording.

END