

**ICANN Transcription
GNSO Next-Gen RDS PDP Working Group
Tuesday, 09 February 2016 at 16:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is available on page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#feb>

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Next Generation Registration Directory Services (RDS) Policy Development Process Working Group call on 9th of February, 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, can you please let us know at this time?

Jeffrey Eckhaus: It's Jeffrey Eckhaus. I'm just on the audio at the moment.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, Jeffrey.

Stuart Clark: Hello, it's Stuart Clark. I'm on the audio as well.

Terri Agnew: Thank you, Stuart. Hearing no more names, I would like to remind all of you to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phone and your microphones on mute when not speaking

to avoid any background noise. With this, I'll turn it back over to Susan.
Please begin.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thank you very much. And just as a reminder, the - your SOI should be updated. There was a little bit of chat on the emails about that. And staff is willing to help anybody that can - is having difficulty getting in and modifying their SOIs.

So with that, the next item on the agenda today is talking about the leadership team and staff was very helpful and running two different polls, one on what the working group thoughts were - the leadership sees how it should be assembled.

And the other is on the candidate - that everyone that step forward to apply to the leadership team. And since I am one of those candidates, I'm going to step back and let Marika or Lisa - depending on Marika's status. She's having a little bit of an Internet problem. And explain the polls and the results of the polls, and then we can have a discussion after that. So Marika, do you want to take it?

Marika Konings: Yes, thank you, Susan. Hi everyone. Susan noted that I was having some Internet conductivity issues unfortunately the phone connection and Costa Rica still working so I'll do this via the phone connection and hopefully (Lisa) will be able to pull up the relevant documents and I'll just briefly be taking you through.

So as Susan mentioned, it was agreed by the working group that we would carry out to separate polls to get an idea or of you of the - a sense of the working group and relationship to on the one hand the ideal characteristics for the leadership team, and secondly, the candidates that have come forward and the potential endorsements of those.

So those two polls were circulated last week at different moments in time. And the first one we'll look at is the one relation to the working group - the leadership's characteristics.

And as noted in the email that was circulated before this meeting when (Wendy) asked a couple questions about the survey, the criteria that were listed here were those that we derived from the working group discussions on our initial meeting as (being the) characteristics that were put forward by the different members of the working group as being of importance to - for the leadership team.

And from the results, you can see that, although there aren't any real strong defenses between the different criteria, it does seem to suggest that the top two characteristics are, first of all, experience with policy and familiar with the issues that are being discussed, and secondly, to keep the leadership team small, three to four members, maximum.

Shortly after that, the criteria of including individuals that are active members of the GNSO was listed, followed by a track record in leadership or being active in past GNSO policymaking activities.

In the criteria that was ranked the lowest in this poll was whether the leadership should include individuals that are not affiliated with any GNSO stakeholder group.

So we had 68 working group members participate in this poll and we've been able to review those results, both collective results as well as individual responses through the link that was circulated on the (mailing list).

And, again, I want to emphasize that this was a poll. It's not a vote. The idea is that this just gives an idea of the preferences or those characteristics that are (deemed) important by those that responded to the call.

I think once we've gone through the results it probably may be interesting, as well, to see those that decided not to participate, whether they have anything they would like to share our where there was because they weren't in time to complete the poll, whether there are specific concerns or other issues they would like to flag that are not reflected or they were able to participate in the poll.

If we then next look at the second poll which basically asks the question which of the candidates would you be willing to endorse for the leadership team?

And again, it was identified here that, although the poll was open for everyone to participate in, 44 members of the working group participated in the poll and express their views.

And there was no limitation in the number of candidates that could be endorsed, so anyone could endorse from zero to all seven candidates as part of their responses.

And as a result of that poll, we saw that 95 - over 95% of those that responded, which equates to 42 responses supported Chuck as part of the leadership team. Then we had Susan with 68.18%, (Mikala) following with 63.6%, David Cake, 40.9%, (Annarae), 18.18% and then (unintelligible) with 16.9%.

So, again, I want to emphasize that this was a poll. The results reflected here are by those that participated in this exercise. And (I think it was) probably for the working group to make a determination of taking into account that feedback that had been received done the initial poll and the characteristics.

And review that in conjunction with the candidates that he received the highest endorsements of those that have responded to the poll, received the (alliance) with the views of the working group, also noting that may be helpful

to give an opportunity to those that weren't able to participate in the poll or decided not to participate in the poll, to share their views and perspectives on (this).

And as I don't have any visibility of the Adobe Connect from the - I don't know if it's worth handing it back to you, Susan, to at least manage the queue or how do you prefer to manage the conversation?

Susan: Thanks, Marika. That was really helpful. So, putting out to the whole working group, how do we want to move forward with the results that were received? There seems to be some clear indicators on how the leadership (team) should be assembled and that was assembled.

We will - the leadership team should figure out how they're going to manage the leadership (team). The working group seemed to agree on that. So are there any comments or concerns? So, James.

James: Thanks, Susan, James (M). So I'm going to make a suggestion on the (past forward), so the data here seems relatively clear for the members that participated in the poll. I would suggest, you know, my feeling on this will be that this will be broadly representative of the thoughts across the working group.

So I would suggest that, you know, if there is no objection to moving forward with the four leading candidates that's for, you know, suggestion from (unintelligible), I have to (unintelligible) and congratulate him on - I think that has (declared him) to the landslide. And that we form the leadership team based on the four leading candidates and we, you know, start doing (their work).

Susan: Okay, thanks, James. And (Karnika) - (Karnika Seth), would you like to speak now? Are you on mute? Okay, let's jump to Amr and will come back to (Karnika). Amr, would you like to give us your opinion?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Susan. This is Amr. Can you hear me okay?

Susan: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: All right, great. Yes, I just want to say I largely agree with James but I would offer a friendly amendment to his suggestion and perhaps make the decision on the work - on the PDP working group's email list after the call as opposed to making it during this call. Thank you.

Susan: Okay, thank you. And (Karnika Seth). Sorry, we're not hearing you.

Terri Agnew: And this is Terri from staff. (Karnika), your mic is not activated by sent you a private chat to help you with this.

Susan: Okay, let's move to Jim Galvin and then we'll come back to (Karnika). Jim.

Jim Galvin: Thank you, Susan. Jim Galvin for the transcript. I guess I'm a little concerned. The (search) poll, you know, in my mind, really didn't show us anything significant.

Susan, I thought - perhaps I misheard but it sounded like you were suggesting that there were clear indicators from that particular poll given that there was, you know, statistically even results in all five of those questions.

I don't find that that poll told us anything, setting aside questions about (unintelligible). In the case of, two things - leadership on the (four leading) candidates, I'll say first that I don't - I'm not going to object so this is really just a comment.

I'm fine if the working group wants to go forward in the (task) that's been suggested, but I do feel compelled to state that I did not participate in endorsing one or more candidates.

I thought that it was just supposed to be an indicator of support to get it off the mailing list. I didn't realize that it was going to be a vote, per se, which is what it seems to be turning into.

We're just going to decide to take the four leading people that got endorsements. Maybe that's just my (failure) to understand how these processes work.

So I apologize for that is that is the case. And I observed further that 50% more people voted in the - indicated in the poll about characteristics than indicated in the endorsement.

We had 68 responses (or 444) here in this, so you know, a dramatic change would be possible if we indicated that how you endorse is going to determine who's going to be a leader. I just put that out there for a comment, not because I'm trying to object to the process and all at the moment here in terms of (who gets elected). Thank you.

Susan: Thanks, Jim, and just a few comments. I also did not seem the poll as a vote so we could now look at the results and decide, as a group, that you know, we just want to move forward and that was I think James' suggestion.

Amr suggested we put it out to the email list and come up with more discussion. But it is an oppor- this was an opportunity for people to, you know, indicate their agreement or disagreement and come to consensus.

So I think it's sort of given us some direction, but I do agree, it's not a vote and that was not what was intended to be. And with a number of people, you know, basically because we've got over 120 members of the working group, it is slightly over a third - around the third responded.

So we - if the working group and like to move this forward on the email list and, you know, whether - decide whether or not we want to vote or if more people would like to weigh in today about how the process should be - how we should negotiate this process, I'm very open to all of that.

Back to the - how the leadership team should be assembled, you're right, there was in a statistical significant trend but there were two top criteria that came out of that and it was experience and small size over affiliation of the leadership team.

But there're a lot of voices in this working group, so it would be interesting to hear from where people and especially those that decided not to take the poll or didn't - or just, you know, did not get around to it. I, myself, did not weigh in on the poll just because, as an applicant, I thought it was best that I not. So let's turn to (Karnika Seth). Are you able to speak now?

Marika Konings: Susan, could you also for me in the queue? This is Marika.

Susan: Yes. So let's move to you, Marika, unless, (Karnika)...

Terri Agnew: And this is Terri from staff. I'm still working with (Karnika) but we're almost there.

Susan: Thank you, Terri, very much. Okay, Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just want to note in relation to, you know, poll versus vote and just to note that (in the past) it (hasn't) been in the GNSO working group to try and avoid as much as possible a vote, but work around consensus.

And I think that's why we started, indeed, with the poll to see whether a consensus could be derived from those polls, you know, clear census for the group might fit and, indeed, a discussion on whether, indeed, that represents consensus of the group or not, I guess is what we're doing now.

Although it's always, indeed, the prerogative of the working group to decide if we do want to have a formal vote. That is always an option as well. I think, for my experience with the GNSO working group, there's a tendency to try to avoid that and actually work around consensus in conversation and discussion instead of making it (a vote).

Because there are always concerns around that as well, you know, because working groups are, of course, open for anyone that is interested in participating and the (unintelligible) working group of certain groups to get to certain results.

So again, I think that what I would like to encourage is to think about how to come to a consensus and agreement on the leadership team and maybe, indeed, there are other steps that need to be taken before the group is able to get there and maybe try to get to a formal vote as (as well as there may) be other concerns that we need to address in those cases.

Susan: Okay, thank you, Marika. Good point. I'm also noting that (Alex Deacon) has made a suggestion in the chat that we (vote) Chuck in this chair by acclamation and let them decide the makeup of the co-chairs. So that is a possible way forward. There're quite a few plus ones on that. (Karnika), are you able to talk now?

(Karnika Seth): Yes.

Susan: Good.

(Karnika Seth): Yes, (Stephanie). I'm sorry for the initial delay but now I'm on the microphone, so I think just basically the (unintelligible) forward to (unintelligible) there.

(I must listen) to each one of them. But just to be fair to the members who have not had a chance to say put in, like, (unintelligible) or as, you know, the (name to members) to (lead) the team.

I would just see - it's my suggestion that we could allow them to, you know, give their (views) within such a short time window and then (build this whole) (unintelligible). I think - do you think this is a fair suggestion? Hello?

Susan: I'm sorry, I was on mute. I was on mute. Is that Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, Susan, this is Marika. From a technical perspective, they would be able to reopen the polls and have people for certain amount of time fill in the polls as, indeed, the issue was that people didn't have enough time or, indeed, didn't understand that the (unintelligible) was important as part of that. So that is, you know, if the working group decides that it is worth keeping the poll open for a bit longer, we're able to do so.

Susan: Okay, it does look like there's at least 12 plus ones on Chuck being voted in, you know, a general consensus for Chuck as leader. So we should take that into account. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Susan. Michele for the record. Chuck for president, all hail to Chuck. Jokes aside, I think, look, it's pretty clear since the get-go that Chuck would make a fantastic leader for this group moving forward.

And that, you know, and selling Chuck as our new glorious leader, ASAP, is probably a good idea. And that then whatever details around this entire thing around co-chairs, vice-chairs or whatever terminology people are happy with is something we can sort out.

But being perfectly frank, I don't think we really want to be moving into having a third or fourth call where we're still discussing that because if we do, I

suspect that the attendance of the call the week after will be down by about 90%. Thanks.

Susan: Okay, thanks, Michele. Always a clear opinion. And James Gannon.

James Gannon: And - thanks, James Gannon, so my suggestion is probably along the same lines but I'm just going to say why. So, you know, given, Susan, that you're in the position of being council liaison at the moment but also wanting to be involved in potentially a co-chair role, I think that, you know, there's clear consensus across the group that he is going to be on the leadership team.

And from a process point of view, I think it would be best for yourself and for staff if we pushed Chuck into the position of being able to manage this process of how to form the rest of the leadership team.

You know, it's clear support for Chuck to be on the team, so allow, you know, himself to then get in and start managing that process. I think that's - you know, I think Michele has a point that we need to kind of close this off and not go reopening polls and gathering more information.

You know, we really need to start moving forward at this stage. And I think, you know, putting Chuck into that position of being able to start managing that process is the first kind of step forward to that.

Susan: And I agree with you completely. So it looks like in the chat that there are a couple of minus ones on reopening the poll. So should we all agree that - you know, I guess we're at the point where we need to decide if - we take this out to an email thread for a couple of days and decide on Chuck and then let everything else follow with Chuck's direction or do we just agree today on this call and move forward with Chuck as chair of the working group?

It looks like people are saying that the email thread may not add as much and, (Karnika), is that a new hand? Would you like to say more?

(Karnika Seth): When - I think in order to save time, I just feel that it's going to be useful if we just have the (main chair) as Chuck because I know that (unintelligible) and I don't mind if (co-chairs) and, you know, other chairs, if they are appointed, apart from Chuck being there. I just am open to the idea.

Susan: Okay, thank you. And then, Michele, a new or old hand?

Michele Neylon: New. Brand new. Shiny and new. And apologies if I'm deafening you all.

Susan: You are.

Michele Neylon: As somebody else pointed out, I got my office sound proofed a couple of months ago. I forget that sometimes that means that I end up deafening everybody on the phone calls.

Two things - one, as a previously said, putting Chuck in his chair, I think we all agree with that. And on the entire thing around reopening, not opening polls, people submitting any criticism or objections or whatever, how about we meet half - somewhere in the middle.

If people have issues with Chuck as chair, that they put that on the (mailing) list within the next 48 to 72 hours. If people have an overwhelming urge to reopen polls, same thing.

Personally, I don't really care one way or the other but if you think we need to have word movement because at this - otherwise, as I already said, it's going to be rather tedious. Thanks.

Susan: Okay, thank you for that opinion. And, Chuck, let's hear from you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you all and thanks for the confidence. I really do like working with leadership teams, so one of the questions I have is, am I correct in assuming

that the leadership team can decide how to organize at whether it be a chair and three co-chairs, or two co-chairs and a chair.

I would like clarification on that. And then secondly, with - and I think Amr, first, and then others have supported it, made that suggestion. We don't even have half of the members on the call, so I think we ought to give it at least 24 hours for people to respond if they have any concerns or to ask questions or so forth.

The same time, I do think, like others have said in the chat, that we do need to get this thing moving. And so, if we give 24 hours, then - that's not a lot of time, but hopefully people are watching the list and they can do that.

And the reason I say 24 hours is because the - that will allow possibly a leader's call Thursday or Friday so that we can then start, you know, decide how we're going to organize and also decide - maybe start thinking through a work plan, some work plan ideas and so forth so that we can take care of that.

And that would be my recommendation, but I would like clarity to make sure that whoever the leaders are, that we could go ahead then and decide how to propose to the working group the way we were organizing our leadership roles. And I'll stop there. Thanks.

Susan: Thanks, Chuck. Those are good points. Marika, can you clarify on Chuck's question, on whether or not poll indicated that chair versus co-chair or how the structure of the leadership team was indicated in the polls?

Marika Konings: Basically I think in the polls, we basically referred to leadership team. We didn't ask any questions on chairs versus co-chairs, but if I recall well from our previous conversations, I believe there seemed to be agreement within the working group that that was something for the leadership team to sort out themselves.

I do recall that several of the candidates, in their criteria, we did asked them to indicate whether they had a preference for chair, co-chair or vice chair role, and I do believe that some people did specifically indicate that they were only interested in a vice chair position or something that they were happy with the leader role.

So that maybe looking back to, you know, to that, especially for those that came out in - on the top. And as I understood it, it was something for the leadership team itself to discuss and see how they would prefer to organize themselves and report back on that to the working (group).

Susan: Does that answer your question, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Sorry, I was on mute. This is Chuck.

Susan: Okay, and I do agree with the 24 hours. I think we do need to move on with this, but let's go to Alan Greenberg to see - get his opinion.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I'm saying this with full knowledge that I was one of the people who objected to what Chuck originally proposed. I have complete faith in Chuck.

I would suggest we appoint him as chair, senior chair or whatever the words are. Different people have levels of comfort working with a chair and vice chair versus co-chairs.

If we're going to make him responsible for this, I'm happy to allow him to pick the leadership team he's going to work with and decide what the structure is.

He understands the need for someone with leadership experience. He understands the need, I believe, for picking people for not going to be strong advocates for one position but able to lead the group somewhat impartially.

And, you know, there are other criteria, too. We need people who actually have good communications because someone who can't get on the phone call each time is certainly problematic as a leader.

But I have complete faith in Chuck and I would put it openly. And I'm happy to say 24 hours for anyone objecting, and then let him run with this. Thank you.

Susan: Okay, it looks like we have consensus on Chuck and - but also a consensus on leaving this open for another 24 hours which I think is a good way to move forward.

In the next 24 hours, we'll - anyone can weigh in on the other numbers of the leadership team, if you have opinions on that and haven't weren't able to participate in the poll. And at that point, at the end of 24 hours, we'll leave it to Chuck to lead us all down the path on this RDF. Do you agree with that, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that's fine.

Susan: Okay, so if there are no other objections, I think we'll move forward with the next agenda item which is the review of the working group membership. And Marika, remind me, I'm not sure we have numbers - we do - we did have a chart earlier on where the working group's membership - what affiliations everyone stated in their (SLI).

But we do, as a working group, have a responsibility to look at the working group and determine if we don't have the expertise and the numbers that we may need to do this work.

So does anybody have any thoughts on - if you look at the membership and any thoughts on where we're lacking, any members, any expertise, any experience? It looks like Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Susan. And then I'm finally back here and seem to be able to upload the latest version which should be hopefully coming up on your screen shortly. Just to know that the latest count that we have is 138 working group members with 96 observers as part of this effort.

Of those, 54 have identified themselves as individuals, so not specifically associated or representing GNSO stakeholder group or constituency or another supporting organization or advisory committee.

Then there are (70) that have identified as affiliated with the GNSO. They're representing the different stakeholder groups and constituencies. And six members from the at-large community, one from the ccNSO, two from the GAC, two from the (SSAC) and two from the (ISOC) and one from the (RSAC).

And it may be worth noting in this (context) that, although affiliation may be a part of the picture, as we do have a large number of members that have indicated they are here participating as individuals, it's hard to assess on this basis, what their relevant expertise or input may be.

So there - it may be worth for the working group to have a closer look and especially thinking there about the statements of interest, to see what kinds of expertise are available and present in the working group so it is possible for the working group to make a determination of whether there're certain groups or certain expertise that either lacking or underrepresented, and that for which additional outreach may be helpful or needs to be carried out by the working group.

Susan: Thanks Marika. And one thing we did discuss - Marika and I and (Lisa) discussed was maybe creating a small team to take an in depth look, so that's just one thought in how to move forward with this. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks Susan. Michele here. Try not to deafen everybody. I'll try to talk quietly. Just one thing as a kind of practical question. I realize that several of the ICANN policy staff are following this group and providing support and all that.

The question I suppose is one of - around timing and operationalizing whatever the hell comes out the far end of this. So I suppose the question is, you know, how is that going to work in terms of be it the Registry or the Registrar liaison team or whoever it is is touched on by the output of this working group and also related to that ICANN legal?

I mean, the kind of situation we've seen in the past just to explain why I'm asking this is that stuff kind of gets moved along, moved along, moved along and something can come out the far end of a PDP and then when you go to operationalize it you realize that well actually it's not going to work particularly well. Thanks.

Susan: So Michele just to clarify your suggestion is to ask ICANN legal to participate or at least monitor the...

Michele Neylon: More to make sure - sorry. More to make sure that they are being kept up to date on what's going on. I don't - I wouldn't expect them to dial in to every single phone call.

They would lose their minds but it wouldn't - but let's just say hypothetically, you know, let's say that we all agree that Registrars and Registries or Registrants and God knows who else or ICANN or somebody needs to do something that for some reason or other is in direct breach of, I don't know, an ICANN bylaw, the bylaw or something else, California law, some tax law.

I don't know, something - some that caught the, you know, this literally cannot be - cannot happen for whatever reason. That's what I'm - kind of ask here. I think Marika probably has a wonderful answer. Thanks.

Susan: Okay thanks. Thanks Michele. And Marika do you have an answer for us?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I do have an answer. I don't know if it's a wonderful answer but at least it's an answer. Just to know that, you know, of course we're very well aware that, you know, other teams within ICANN may be impacted by this and need to be consulted on on a regular basis.

But there are a number of staff members I think that have signed up at least as observers to this list so they're at least up to date with the conversations. In addition to that we're having a monthly internal coordination call, but of course this is not the only WHOIS effort that is ongoing so we want to make sure as well that internally we have an overall picture.

And of course in the different milestone moments in time we'll also make sure to consult with our colleagues to make sure that their input can be provided.

However with regards to looking at how the working group is expected to organize its work to meet the expectations from the staff side, that their participation is probably going to be more relevant or needs to be more on a more regular basis, especially in the second phase so we can of course get there - looks more at, you know, how to implement and what are some of the requirements in that regard.

But of course that does not mean that we're - we won't be consulting with them at this part of the process. And of course if they're at any point and specific point the working group wants to take forward to specific colleagues or the comments that have other responsibilities within ICANN we're of course more than happy to facilitate that as well.

But we're definitely very conscious that it needs to be well coordinated with the different departments within ICANN that eventually may need to leave off an implementation of the impact of the work.

Susan: Okay thank you. But I think we have a couple of action items here. One is that we - somehow the working group will look at the current members and - to determine what expertise we're still looking for, and that may be in a small, you know, creating a small group which makes sense that if we - if there are volunteers that'll take a look at that and weigh in on what expertise we're missing and also recommend who we might reach out to would be very helpful.

And then also the second action item would be consulting with policy staff and I think that we should do that maybe on a regular basis. You know, obviously having them - as Michele pointed out having them on the calls may not work but we could reach out to them, you know, every month or every time we hit a milestone or we think this needs input from ICANN staff and the legal team.

So I think there's two action items there. There is a discussion about the SSAC and so in the chat it looks like there may, you know, we're not quite sure on whether or not we have SSAC members.

And Jim Galvin is suggesting that we make a formal request to SSAC to provide someone on the working group. Chuck did you have a point to make?

Chuck Gomes: I have a suggestion. This is Chuck speaking. With regard to the small team that you're talking about looking at the membership to see if we have any gaps that we need to try and fill for certain areas of expertise, I note that we have seven volunteers for leadership positions.

And assuming the three that are not selected on the leadership team after our 24 hours would be willing to do this, that would be a great place for them to be - contribute as leaders for our team and not that that would be the only thing that they would do as leaders over the time of the working group, but if they would be willing that might be a good thing.

Now it wouldn't be - it wouldn't have to be restricted to those three or however many of them are willing to do that, but they could work with a staff member and so forth and kind of take the lead on reviewing the composition of the membership and look for gaps and suggest ways that we could reach out to any gaps that we find.

So I just throw that out for working group consideration as an idea. I really always love to have people who are willing to spend the time as leaders, and we're going to end up with three that won't be on the formal leadership team. But if they would be willing to help us in this area I think that would be great.

Susan: That's a great idea and I'm just checking the chat to see if there's any - does anybody want to weigh in on Chuck's idea on the small team? It looks like we got to press 1.

A couple pressed 1 to - for Chuck's idea so let's move forward with that and if we can - if staff can make a note of that or maybe you did already. So it looks like we have action items to work on the reviewing of the working group membership.

Was there any other comments or concerns on the - reviewing the membership? Okay so I can quickly move on. So last week I was on vacation so I was not on the tutorial session provided by Marika and the rest of the staff.

And I was wondering if there were any questions or concerns about the tutorials and feedback for staff. Was it helpful? Anybody have an opinion? Michele.

Michele Neylon: Michele again. Okay as I've shared the fun and the pleasure of working closely with yourself and Carlton and others over many, many moons I probably wasn't the target audience for the tutorial.

What I was going to say though is that if the people who have issues or who are confused by any of the subject matter that was covered at the call - on the call last week you're probably not alone.

I think it might be a case of if people are confused by some of these things, which is kind of normal that maybe they're afraid to just say that they're a bit confused because there - it is a huge amount of information and there's a - it's full of acronyms and it is - it can be a bit overwhelming to say the least.

If anybody has any queries, I mean, maybe put it on the list or ask a furry friend or something. I don't know. But I thought the idea of the tutorial was very good and hopefully was of help to people. Thanks.

Susan: Thanks Michele. Anyone else? Okay it looks like it - that was a successful session last week and thank you to staff for putting that together. And it looks like we - it's also available on the ICANN Web site.

Terri has given us the link in the chat so anybody else that would like to review that would - could do that during the week. And Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just need to encourage everyone that wasn't able to attend to at least review the slides and some of the recording and/or transcript.

I'm hoping it is useful. Of course if there's certainly questions that may come up after you review those materials should also feel - always feel free to reach out to staff and we'll do our best to answer any questions you may have.

And just maybe also a reminder for everyone to think about or identify whether there are any other topics that may need a - similar background tutorials where we may be able to help you with that.

You know, there's a lot of information already available on the wiki but if there are certain topics that you think will invest in a - conversations are helpful, we can of course assist with that.

Susan: Okay thank you. And I think we're done with the tutorials and let's move on to the outreach to GNSO SCs and SOs and ACs for early input. So we really have not started our work plan yet, but it would be good to get a discussion going on what we may consider asking all of the community for their input.

We have to - once we request input we need to allow 35 days for a response so that could push this out a little ways. So it'd be good if we could look at - if everybody's looked at the charter is there anything missing or limiting in the charter that you would like that we should include?

And then the charter right now as it stands does not limit any topics and there are some questions, and do we have all the general requirements? Are the purposes correct?

Lots of questions could be asked so it'd be interesting to hear from the rest of the working group if they have an opinion. And Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Susan this is Chuck. And I'm going to throw out a few ideas here to get that moving because I know we do want to get out the request to the SOs and ACs right away.

Assuming that we're able to get the leadership team functioning quickly, which I think we will based on what we've mapped out, I think a good first task for the leadership team would be to come back with some recommendations with regard to what we would ask for input initially from the SOs and ACs.

And that wouldn't prevent input from the - anybody from the working group in that but at least it would kick start it hopefully by our next call, which I think would be important and then we can have a discussion of it in the full working group.

Some principles that I think are important that I'll throw up to the group to debate as well are I think we need to - I think we will need several requests for input from SOs and ACs over the course even of Phase 1 so that we don't first of all overwhelm them with information.

If we were to in our initial request for information ask for comments on all of the requirements areas in - and the questions that are asking everything, it would be really hard for most SOs and ACs to respond effectively in 35 days, which is the time limit they would have.

And so also I think it helps us as a working group if we get input on this - areas that we're going to be specifically focusing on in the near term and then come back for questions on other areas that we'll consider closer to the time that we will actually consider them.

So I throw those ideas out and certainly a volunteer for the leadership team that's not even finalized yet to be tasked with coming back with some suggestions for what we might ask for first.

And of course understanding that input from anybody in the working group to the leadership team on that and ultimately approval by the full working group in terms of what we go out with would be understood.

Susan: It was a great suggestion. And Marika did you have input?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I just wanted to note in a more general point and also, you know, triggered by some of the comments in the chat and I think, you know,

Mary already pointed that out as well because there was some conversation in the chat on a single representation versus affiliation.

And again I want to make clear that those that participate in GNSO working groups participate in their individual capacities. And I thought, you know, affiliation may be noted but just more of a, you know, check for a working group chair to make sure that there's broad representation from different aspects of the ICANN community.

But it doesn't necessarily mean that those individuals are officially representing those groups, although in certain cases they may serve such purposes if they have been designated as such by their respective groups.

However this effort was reaching out at an early stage to the different stakeholder group constituencies as well as ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committee that at the moment where formal input is requested from the different groups as a way for those different groups to provide their perspectives to the GNSO Working Group as they start their deliberations.

And as it's noted in the GNSO PDP manual it's expected that the working group does that at an early stage, because it's important that such input is received at an early stage and as such given due consideration as part of the initial deliberations.

However as Chuck noted as well it's really up to the working group to decide how you want to structure that. And, you know, from past experience some working groups have just shared charter questions with different groups and asked for input on that.

Others, you know, work out some more detailed questions in certain cases that have been as well more targeted outreach for example, you know, a certain question specifically related to the security and stability and those might be put forward to the SSAC which may not be relevant for other groups.

It can be done in the form of your work template, a survey so again there's a lot of flexibility for the working group and it's important that you think through what is the information that will be very useful to get at an early stage, and as well how to facilitate the different groups to provide that information.

And as noted, you know, groups should have at a minimum 35 days, but still for certain groups especially of course if there's a lot of information being asked it may take some time to put that information together.

Especially as well as if it is intended to be a formal position in certain cases it also may require a sign off or even a vote by certain groups to be able to provide that input.

So those are some of the things you may want to take into consideration as you think about this specific aspect of your work.

Susan: Thanks Marika. Those are all good points that we will have to keep an eye on. And it looks like we definitely have an action item as Chuck has suggested that the leadership team will come back with recommendation on next steps.

Not sure how quickly that will happen but we can work that out. Chuck can work that out. So if anybody has ideas and thoughts on questions, and there is quite a discussion on SSAC going on in the chat earlier on questions that we should give to a specific constituency or stakeholder group, then please put those on that.

You can speak now or you could put that on the email thread. That would be helpful just to help the leadership team create those recommendations. So does anybody have any other comments on the outreach? Michele.

Michele Neylon: I'll keep it brief. Michele again. Yes we - I know that part of a normal thing is to do outreach to the various SOs and ACs. It's probably a bit premature to be worrying about it just straightaway.

I know that if you send anything to the Registrars at the moment with - which mentions WHOIS the reaction won't be very pleasant. Thanks.

Susan: Okay, we'll keep that in mind. Thanks Michele. All right, I think we should move on to the development of the mind map. Staff has put this together so I am going to let staff present this.

Marika Konings: Thanks Susan. This is Marika just getting off mute. So what you see on the screen - and don't want anyone to get scared by the different boxes and the different lines.

We didn't share that to you - with you prior to the call not to overload you with information but it's something we'll share with you shortly after the meeting.

Just to give it a little bit of background, you know, one of the requirements of the working group is to develop a work plan basically which you outline how you're planning to tackle your work.

And in facilitating that aspect several working or previous working groups have used a mind map approach to facilitate brainstorming and thinking out loud of how to tackle the different charter questions and - which then allows for an easy way to move things around, group things together and have the working group think through, you know, what makes the most sense in managing your workload.

And from the mind map then it's relatively easy to pull that into a work plan, and again the mind map at the end of the process can also serve as a tool to go back to and actually check, "Well did we actually do everything we said we

were going to do and if not, you know, how can we make sure we cover those aspects?”

So what staff has done as a first step is that we basically have pulled the initial or basic information that is contained in the charter into this mind map. So you see there the Phase 1 or Phase 0.

We've actually labeled it Input to the PDP Working Group. It talks about, you know, reviewing the key inputs, and also required for the charter that talks about this aspect of reaching out at an early stage to the different ICANN Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committee and key stakeholder groups and constituencies.

And again, you know, we're able to add here additional ideas or suggestions. You know, Chuck already noted this may be evolving or they have to come back as well in the different other phases if specific input is needed.

And then in the Phase 1 it's basically tackling the requirements as they're outlined in the charter, so again this is solely based on what is currently in the charter and as a starting point for consideration.

Those are one - we're noting that we've made the assumption here that as a Step 3 in that process there would be a public comment period on the initial report followed by a final report basically following the different steps in the PDP process, although here of course they're working in principle in three different phases, although there's a clear decision point at the end of Phase 1.

And I have to note this is actually already an outdated version because what we also did is actually add a bucket at the end of - at the bottom of the page to highlight that.

Of course it's also normally if the group comes to agreement and there's consensus that indeed a new framework is needed a Stage 2 and a Stage 3 is part of the conversation.

Obviously items that may come up that - may have to be parked in those Phases 2 and 3 so we'll also be able to use the mind map to do so. And so staff's suggestion would be that we actually circulate this mind map after this meeting so you have a chance to look at this, you know, at your leisure.

And already start thinking about, you know, are there certain elements that are missing? Are there specific ideas that you have and how the working group should tackle some of these questions?

And they also work - they work for everyone. As you'll see for each of the questions staff has created dedicated wiki pages that provide an overview of all the relevant information that has already been gathered in relation to those specific items.

So is there anything missing? Any information that should be added to that or that should be considered? So that can serve as a starting point and I said we can build on the mind map going forward.

And then eventually once the group feels that at least all the information, all the aspects of the work actually proceeds for Phase I it's covered in here and staff will work with the leadership team to then try to translate that into a work plan, which basically maps out how you're planning to tackle the different parts of the work and what information is needed, what kind of outreach or input may need to be sought.

So that's a way we would like to put forward to you as a way of starting this conversation and facilitating your discussions on development of the work plan.

Susan: Okay. A lot of work went into that and a lot of thought and thank you very much to staff. So does anybody have any questions? I did - so I did see in the chat that there was some confusion about how to get a copy of this.

So staff will be emailing this out when it's finalized probably later today and so you'll have a chance to study it. Marika will this also be on the working group part of the ICANN Web site so we could look at it there.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Yes we can post it on the wiki and as well as circulate it and I can circulate it in - both in PDF and for those that may have the software I'm also happy to circulate it in the mind map format if there's anyone that wants to work in that way, so either way we can make sure that it's available for everyone.

Susan: Okay that would be really helpful. So any questions or concerns with what you're seeing in the mind map? So I would suggest that we have another action item that the leadership would develop - start to develop a working plan for the working group from this mind map and, you know, obviously for the whole working group review to review it.

But staff has made an excellent start for us and there's actually been a couple of questions in the chat where we can go back and make sure that we're addressing those issues.

And then - but if the leadership team takes a first stab at it and comes back to the working group I think that will be sort of an organized way to go at this and to develop a work plan. Chuck do you have any thoughts on that?

Chuck Gomes: Well I - this is Chuck. I just put something in the chat there. Yes I think that's a very good idea and we will start doing that right away. In fact I've given it some thought over the last week and a half or so and we'll throw out some ideas to the other leaders, which all of - which the leadership team will then put out to the full working group for consideration.

Susan: Thank you. All right. I think we've come to the end of our agenda. Is there anything - Chuck you've got your hand up again. Is that...?

Chuck Gomes: I do. See what happens when you put me in this position? No what I'd like to request especially since we have a little bit of extra time is if the seven people who have volunteered for leadership positions could stay on the call for just a few minutes, we could talk about the message that we need to send out so that staff doesn't have to go back and forth and wait for all of us to respond regarding the next 24 hours and what feedback we would like to have from the - those who were not on the call regarding the leadership team finalization.

Susan: Okay that sounds like a good recommendation.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so if those that - the seven - I'm not a - I don't object to other people hanging on the call but you're not - you don't have to. Mainly I'd like those - for the - those seven people to be involved since we don't know yet what the final composition and won't for 24 hours of the leadership team will be.

So if all seven of them can - if you can't I understand but I invite all of the other six people and staff to stay on just a few minutes longer.

Susan: Okay and I'm hoping those - the others that have applied can do that. Our next step would be to confirm our meeting next Tuesday at - well it's 8:00 am Pacific Time -- and I apologize. I don't know all the UTCs -- and for 90 minutes. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just to note as well that that is one of the items once the leadership team is in place to look at the timing and potential rotation of meetings, factoring in the location of the working group membership.

So just to put it on the record for the leadership team once confirmed as an item to review and provide feedback on to the working group. But for now

indeed the suggestion is to stick with the same time and date until that has been confirmed by the leadership team.

Susan: Perfect. Thanks for the reminder on that. So the next call and - is next Tuesday at 8:00 am Pacific. UTC time will be sent out in the invite. If there's - no one else has any comments give you another 20 minutes back in your life, which everyone can use I'm sure.

And thank you for all the input and hard work and let's let the proposed leadership team remain on the call.

Chuck Gomes: So this is Chuck. Do we want to continue the recording? Do - I don't care if we continue the recording but if somebody on the - on - those who are staying on would prefer not I'll defer to your request on that. Is there - does anybody object to just continuing the recording?

Marika Konings: I think we first need to fix the audio Chuck. There's a lot of feedback and echo. All right.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Oh no. Let's maybe wait...

Man: Enjoy Marika.

Marika Konings: ...a few minutes. No this - I don't think so. I hope not. But Chuck - and maybe we're just finishing the recording as it does - is the - at the end of the working group meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Okay that's fine Marika. Thanks.

Marika Konings: Terri can you check what the...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...and stop the recording?

Terri Agnew: Certainly. Certainly yes. One moment while I stop the recording. (Vince) if you can please stop the recording and announce to us once it has been stopped.

END