

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen**  
**April 20, 2016**  
**9:00 am CT**

Man: Recording has now started.

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the GNSO Futures call on Wednesday, April 20, 2016. On the call today, we have Tony Holmes, Rudi Vansnick, Osvaldo Novoa, Amr Elsadr, Rudi Vansnick, Rafik Dammak, Philip Corwin, Avri Doria, Denise Michel, and Frazaneh Badieli. And we have apologies from Jimson Olufuye, Sam LanFranco, and Matthew Shears. From staff, we have myself, Chantelle Doerksen, and Maryam Bakoshi.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much.

Over to you, Tony and Rudi.

Tony Holmes: It's Tony speaking, for the record. Thank you very much, Chantelle, for that.

It's fair to say that Rudi and I have been busy swapping e-mails, but we haven't actually spoken. So this is going to be interesting to see how we co-

chair this call when we're not sitting together and we don't know what each other is doing. But I'm sure we'll get through that.

In terms of the agenda, we did have introductions. I think we can virtually skip that with the introduction that has been given by Chantelle just now. The other items we have listed a discussion around the proposed charter, the election of co-chairs -- and we can discuss that point when we get to it -- review of earlier discussions during the intersessional meeting that we attended in L.A. and then a review of the initial questions that were posed in L.A.

They were the questions that were posed on the slide set that we quickly went through in that session. And the final item is proposed - sorry, it's not the final item. Then we have discussion around the proposed way forward. And the final item is actions and plans for future meetings.

Are there any additions or changes proposed for the agenda?

Rudi Vansnick: Well, Rudi for the transcripts, Tony.

Tony Holmes: Yes, go ahead.

Rudi Vansnick: Maybe one element that I was not able to join the GNSO council meeting last week. But if I'm not wrong, the proposal of the GNSO recommendations on the review of the GNSO have been discussed. And maybe one of ours was, I think, Amr could eventually help us to see if there was a decision taken or not. I don't know yet.

Tony Holmes: Okay. I think that's a good point, Rudi. So maybe we should slot that in between items 3 and 4 on our agenda. So that's between the election of co-chairs and the review of earlier discussions in L.A. Okay. Thanks.

Chantelle, could I ask you to show on the Adobe the proposed charter?

Chantelle Doerksen: Hi, Tony. Just one moment. I'm going to share my screen.

Tony Holmes: Okay. And welcome to Denise. I see you've joined us, which is good.

So while Chantelle is getting this on the screen -- we're here now -- it's fair to say that this was drafted particularly quickly. It was during one of the sessions that we had in L.A. I think it's had little attention since then. So I think one of the things we should do is give ourselves a period to look at this. We do have the option of adopting it straight away.

But I would prefer maybe saying that within the next few days if people have any real problems with this or comments on it, if you could circulate something to - probably to Chantelle to send to the list is the easy way so that we know it's gone right the way round.

But can I ask: Does anyone have any comments on the charter as it reads now? And I see that Amr has also put the link in so you can get it up on your own screens as well. Are there any comments upon this currently?

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript. I think that Avri has been doing some of vetting work and put some comments as Stephanie Perrin also has done some comments. Maybe you could ask others to eventually review these comments, too, so that we have a clear review on the acceptance of both (unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: Sure. I think that's good. The fact that you're on the call, Avri, would you want to say anything currently just while we're discussing this now to help us along that part? I see you've posted the question.

Avri Doria: I'm sorry. It's Avri. It took me a while to find my mute button.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Let me see. Yes. I guess I just asked the same question again in the chat, which is I'm trying to understand: In this case, why is it just a party house - I mean, non-commercial party house effort as opposed to a GNSO effort? And I asked the same thing in the chat now. And if we're talking, especially when we're calling it GNSO Futures Working Group, I guess I'm indicating confusion.

Tony Holmes: Okay. And I fully appreciate that. Tony speaking. Can I try and answer that from my perspective, Avri? I don't know how it will stand. But the issue is, I think that within the non-contracted Parties House, we have probably struggled with the current structure more than overall the GNSO has. And that was one of the reasons I think it was great to have this on the agenda when we met in L.A.

When we've raised these issues -- and I think it's been done on a constituency basis; it's been done on a stakeholder's basis with the board and the GNSO review team -- it's never really got the traction or the attention that it needed to. Certainly the fact that in the last review they scooted around all the issues to do with structure, I think highlighted that.

One of the reasons I believe it's good to have some initial discussion within the house level, is that I think if we can look to discuss or agree a common set

of issues that we want resolved, then we can pitch them and involve the other parties. I do think it needs to broaden out, and that may happen quite quickly.

But at the moment, I think there is benefit from us discussing this as a house. I think probably some of the things we can agree on are what the issues are. I don't expect us to agree on the solutions or the answers. But actually getting some strength from having that combined attention drawn to the fact that as a house we have real problems with the current structure would quite a step forward.

If you have those discussions within the whole GNSO, I think some parties within the GNSO are going to be far happier with the structure as it is today than some of the rest of us. So it's really trying to get that elevated to a level where hopefully I think we may be able to say, on this set of issues -- and we can have some discussion about what they are -- this particular house, which is half in theory of the GNSO, actually has these issues it wants to raise and wants to have some discussion around. We don't seem to be getting that when we have it pitched at the stakeholder group level or a constituency level. So that's my take on that.

Does anybody else want to comment on that?

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript. Maybe to add to your comments and remarks, non-contracted party has the most complex one, also a number of constituencies and takeover groups inside it while the contracted party is much smaller. I think they have less discussions about the structure of their house itself. That's one of the reasons why the initiated idea of having that discussion in L.A.

And maybe to pay attention of the (unintelligible) in a different direction. We could eventually call it the NCPH view on the GNSO Future to put it in a little bit different perspective.

I see, Avri, you have your hand up. You have the floor.

Avri Doria: Yes, I do. Thank you. I can certainly understand the reason for the NCPH to be talking about this among itself and certainly us having a hold to further discuss this, I think is a fine, a good idea. I'm glad I joined.

But in terms of creating a group with charter within the house construct on a problem that really is much broader, on a problem that extends to things like the new GTO, the brand and single use and other types of gTLDs that may or may not have a place within the GNSO environment, when looking at the various kinds of service providers beyond the ISPs that don't necessarily seem to have an appropriate home within it to basically take the broader discussion of what the problems are and be inclusive.

It seems like the discussion needs to be broader than just one house if we're talking about things like charter and working groups. Certainly, us having chats about it and coming to common understandings because we aren't a house is a useful thing. I just really have doubts about chartering a group and turning this house construct even more solid by now getting into processes such as having working groups with charters and stuff like that. I think that's another piece of this that concerns me.

Thanks.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Thank you, Avri. And I certainly have some sympathy for some of those. Sorry. Who wanted the floor?

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan. I joined the call a few minutes ago. Can I get in the queue?

Tony Holmes: Sure. I see - Denise, you have your hand raised. If you'd like to take the floor.

Denise Michel: Yes. Can you hear me okay, Tony?

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Denise Michel: Thanks, Tony and Rudi, for sharing this call and its group.

I think that charter generally is fine. I would suggest we add perhaps a consideration of next step. That could include bringing in - opening it up to additional groups. But I think it's important that we start somewhere, and I think this is a fine starting point being part of a challenge that GNSO and particularly the part of the GNSO has is that we have the previously board-mandated reorganization of the GNSOs or the board-directed GNSOs three years ago.

And then we have this most recent Westlake review. I think it's appropriate for the GNSO to take back some control and initiative from the bottom up, so to speak, of discussing what the challenges and problems are and what we think some of the solutions potentially could be.

So I think this type of approach of taking the initiative is a good place to start. And I would suggest that we not dwell too much on the charter and process and jump more into a discussion and brainstorming as what we see at the key problems or challenges and some ideas that we might want to discuss and pursue to fix them.

Thanks.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Thanks, Denise. Greg?

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record since there is a record.

I have to say I kind of agree with everything I've heard, even though some of it has been contradictory in a sense, or at least complimentary. I think there is a value in bringing the non-contracted groups together to have discussion group. I think ultimately, probably sooner rather than later, want to figure out either this group expands itself or whether it suggests a related group of which this perhaps is a subgroup that would include both contracted parties and the homeless perhaps as well.

Denise Michel: Denise Michel. I got cut off.

Greg Shatan: And so I think there is a place...

Denise Michel: GNSO review.

Greg Shatan: There is a place for this discussion, but there is also...

Denise Michel: Denise.

Greg Shatan: And I think after that, we'll need to include the bigger group. But if we get our own house...

Denise Michel: GNSO.

Greg Shatan: ...we'll be better off than we are now. Thanks.



Tony Holmes: Thanks for that, Greg.

Avri, if I could come back to you. It's Tony speaking. I think part of what you said for me is maybe there is a view that we're making this more formal than it needs to be. And I certainly support the suggestion -- and Greg underlined it as well -- that we need to broaden the debate as we go along.

But just to have some initial discussions -- and I think you used the word "informal" as well -- maybe we should re-term this group and the title that came up from Rudi. Maybe we should add to the front of that an informal NCPH group. And that might overcome some of the problems, because all I'm trying to do here initially was to get some agreement amongst us of what needs to be fixed -- and we could probably do that in the old way or we could probably find a meeting room to do it -- but really to kick it off and give it some impetus.

So if we take that approach - maybe we don't need a formal charter but we need something that we can all agree to, to say this is the remit of that group, whether we call it a charter or whether we call it something else doesn't really matter. It's making sure that we all understand what we're trying to do here.

So if we take that lighter approach, does that fit better with your view of where we should go, Avri?

Avri Doria: Avri, again. Sorry. I'm so slow to find my unmute button.

Certainly, us continuing an informal discussion is fine. I think if we want to start with something like an informal statement of what we think the problem we're talking about is, there is absolutely nothing wrong with that. I think once

we start calling them charters and amendment and members, we cross a formality border.

But, yes, taking much of the wording that is included in the proposed charter and sort of cutting it down to here's a statement of the issues that this informal group wants to explore, yes, I think that's fine.

Thanks.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Tony for the record. Thank you for that. If you could leave that perhaps with Rudi and I and Chantelle maybe to do that, to have this - you used a great term, actually, informal statement of work and cut it back to fit with that, then we will do that and post it for review, if everyone is okay with that. I think that gives a way forward or more we had under the item of proposed charter.

Okay. Now I'm going to rely on the advice of others for the next item as well, because moving on with our agenda. The next one is the election of co-chairs. I don't have any particular stake in the game here. But I do feel quite strongly that it would be helpful if we have at least one chair from each of the stakeholder groups within our house.

So the first thing I'd like to just throw out there is: Does everyone agree that this group should have two co-chairs rather than just a chair? Does anyone disagree? Yes, it's Tony for the transcript. Does anyone disagree with that?

Rudi Vansnick: Tony, just a minute. I saw Greg has his hands up. Maybe he wanted to speak before we jump into this point of the agenda. Greg, do you want to add some comments to the previous point?

Greg Shatan: This is Greg. I put in the chat that I thought maybe the term "discussion group" was one that might fit what we're doing rather than a working group, informal working group. At least discussion group has been used before in ICANN.

On the current topic, I think two chairs or co-facilitators is probably better than one. But, of course, if we don't have two volunteers to do it, we'll do just fine with one.

I don't know, but the working party terms gives me, in turn, just because the only - it's been used twice in very different circumstances; one with the GNSO review working party. And then there is also, which was, I think, charter by at least the GNSO. And then there is the human rights working party, which is chartered, if at all, only by the MCSG. So I don't know. I feel like that's a term that's being abused a bit. So I'd like to go back to stick with discussion group.

Thanks.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Thank you, Greg. I see we have Denise and then Susan in the chat. Denise, please?

Denise Michel: Thanks, Tony. I agree with Greg. I think discussion group is a fine term. Tony, if you and Rudi would agree to continue to be our facilitators, I think that would be great as well.

Thanks.

Tony Holmes: Thank you. Susan?

Susan Payne: Yes. Can you hear me?

Tony Holmes: Yes. You're fine. Thanks.

Susan Payne: Good. Thank you. Sorry. I was a bit late joining the call, so I may have missed this as it was talked about at the beginning. It was just about the participants in this group. As far as I could tell, the invitation went to those of us who at the intersessional. And that was probably because that was where we kicked this discussion off.

Is there any specific reason to limit to those who attended the intersessional? I know from the IPC, for example, we had some people who were very involved in the GNSO to review and have been very involved in the discussions the IPC has been having the structure. So it seems to me that it would be beneficial for them to be here and have the opportunity to be a part of this group.

But I didn't know if there was some reason why it was being limited to just those who'd attended the intersessional.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, Susan. It's Tony for the record. You raised a really good point. And we struggle with this a little bit, knowing who to send the invitations to. We didn't know whether to send it just to the chairs of the constituencies and stakeholder groups and let them deal with it, how they feel appropriate.

So we took the easy way out, which was basically just to send it to people who attended the intersessional. That was really just to kick the thing off. It is open to everybody. I think the concern we had was making it manageable on one front and making it representative. So it should be open to everybody. And if there is anybody within your constituencies - and we have to rely, I think, from here on the people who are basically responsible for running the

constituencies in the stakeholder groups to spread the word out. And if people want to join the group, I would ask that you spread the word. And those people should contact Chantelle just to be added to the list.

But it's a good point you raised.

Susan Payne: Lovely. Thanks. I wasn't sure, but it seemed to be that there might be others who might have more (unintelligible) to bring to this...

Tony Holmes: I'm sure that's true. The more help we get, the better. So that's for sure.

Okay. The word "facilitators" was used. I think it was you, Greg, who used those. And I like that far better than co-chairs. If we're keeping this informal, then I think co-facilitators is the term to use.

At this stage, we should open it up and ask if anybody else from either house or either side would like to be a co-facilitator. Or if not, does it come down to Rudi and I to carry on? And I'm totally open on this. I assume Rudi is the same as well. So now is the time for people to comment on that or put themselves forward or make a proposal.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, Tony. Rudi for the transcript. I agree. Let's see if they have some other candidates. Otherwise, as mentioned, I'm still willing to continue with you or with anybody else who would do this work. I think it's a process that will take some time before we go get - review the results out of it.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Thanks, Rudi. I like the term "rap group" as well, Greg. But I don't think we're going to be doing much rapping for a while.

Okay. For now, certainly, Rudi and I will carry on facilitating this informal group. And I think we've made some progress today in getting a good understanding of where we are on here and what needs to be done.

So moving on down the agenda. The next item was the one we added in from the GNSO discussions that were held because there was a discussion in council around GNSO reform. So could I ask somebody who is on council who debated in those debates now to lead on that? Who took part in the council debates?

Rudi Vansnick: I suppose the councilors. I see Amr was present. We're not willing the point to people, but that's what I see. Greg was also on the council, I think.

Tony Holmes: Okay. So Greg or Amr, neither of you are showing people. So can we ask you just to give a quick recap on what was discussed at council that relates back to this topic?

Amr Elsadr: Amr.

Tony Holmes: Great. Thank you very much. Please go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Hi, all. Thanks. Just to be clear, (unintelligible) adoption of the GNSO working party, the assessments of the GNSO review, correct?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes.

Tony Holmes: Yes. That's correct.

Amr Elsadr: Okay. Great. Well, last Thursday the GNSO council adopted the SS (unintelligible) provided by the GNSO review working party. There was an

amendment to the original motion to take into consideration one piece of feedback as a result of the webinar held Tuesday of last week.

I see Denise is on the call today. So that was actually one of Denise's inputs. And the council adopted it. There was a lengthy discussion on whether that amendment would appropriately capture all the input that was provided during the webinar or not. But they just sort of - that was really the one significant change that was made to the working party assessment.

Right now where things stand is that just basically an ongoing dialogue between the GNSO council, the working party members and to the boards organizational effectiveness committee on how the OAC is planning on sort of handling or managing the recommendations from the independent examiner. The independent examiner had their recommendations. The GNSO working party, the assessment of those provided sort of feedback on what the working party believes the OAC should do with the recommendations. And that a number of priorities just prioritize those recommendations during implementation.

So the ball, as far as I see it, is really in the OACs courts right now. They need to take into consideration a number of different inputs, whether they're working parties or inputs from other stakeholder groups and constituencies over a course of several meetings where the independent examiner at Westlake interacted with the community and take into consideration the report itself and the recommendations made. And how dialogue will continue between the committee and the OAC in the future is really something we need to hear back from them on.

I think that's all I have for now. But if there are any specific questions on this and I could shed some light on, I'd be happy to try. Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Tony for the record. Thanks, Amr. That was helpful. I think we needed to understand where council were heading with their discussions. At the same time, I think it leaves the way clear for us to continue the sort of dialogue that we started when we met in L.A. So having that clarity was useful.

And it leads us on really quite nicely to the next agenda item, which is really a review of the early discussions during the intersessional. Chantelle, are you in a position where you could bring up the slide pack, the presentation that we gave in L.A., Rudi and I? So I think that covers part of that ground as well.

Okay. So if we go to the next slide, slide 2. This looks at the issue of structural. And certainly initially it was considered out of scope. It got quite a strong reaction. It got a strong reaction from participants in this house as well as others. But only later did it get considered.

So if we can move onto the following side 3. Yes. So not considering this and then seeing the strength of the comments that came back with more than 120 unsolicited comments saying it was pretty complex and difficult. And there were other suggestions to abolish the two-house structure and a whole raft of things in there that should have opened this up for debate.

And if we move onto the following slide after this, there is a list of views that were fed back to the review team. That's the one. They (unintelligible) all over the place. Some said do nothing. Others favored abolishing the house structure. There were specific recommendations or comments made with the NCSG, even up to the stage of abolishing the GNSO completely and restructure ICANN.

So for me, that would have said certainly, you can't ignore this. You need to do something. But the reality was in conclusions. And I think we need to go



on a couple of slides for that. The conclusions went down the part of saying that another round of structural change isn't warranted. They weren't convinced by that at all. That's really where we were left. There were higher priorities to deal with.

And in ICANN, there will always be higher priorities no matter what you're dealing with. So we got to the stage where we wanted to try and get some action on this. And what that led to was some questions that we posed during that session, which we didn't have the time to fully look at or concentrate on.

So I'd now like to go to key questions and discussion slide in this pack. I think it's a couple of slides ahead. Okay. Now there are a number of questions that follow on here. Out of these questions, and we can quickly go through these slides, if we can get some indication from these questions of what are the key issue and what needs to be tackled, then I think that we're at the stage where we can choose.

We can either start having a discussion on a house basis around those issues or as to how we address them. Or that may be the time when we look to broaden out this discussion overall. But the key thing here has to be how far you can get in terms of a house view that these are the key elements that need to be addressed?

And as I mentioned right at the start of this chart, I don't think we're ever going to get to a stage where we all agree on the solutions. That's a goal that we're just not going to reach. But agreeing on the questions and what needs to be tackled is a fundamental step along the path

So I would suggest that what we do is not go through these detailed questions now. But we actually ask Chantelle to circulate them to the list. And we have an open period where we request feedback. And then from that, Chantelle and Rudi and I can try and pull together some themes out of that, which we can present as we take that forward.

So just to quickly look at where the questions are, could we go to the following slide? It's key questions and discussion. Quite an important issue there is: Can we fix the current problem within the two house by (unintelligible) or structure? And could the problems be solved by restructuring the non-contracted Parties House or even between the CSG and the NCSG?

If we can get to a stage where we can agree where we're going on those things, then I think we've got the fundamental points for a much better discussion.

So if we can move on again to the number 3. More questions here. And some of these relate to possibly some of the alternative ways of doing things. The move towards working groups. And a critical thing right the way through this, particularly within our house, so much more, I think, than in the other house is this issue of voting. If the need for voting was reduced, would that alleviate some of the problems?

And for those who were around when this structure was discussed in the first place, the argument that came from the board, not from the people that were working on the structure, but from the board themselves, was saying we're going to get to a stage where you don't need to have so much voting. So it becomes somewhat irrelevant. So don't worry too much about voting in the future.

Well, we've never gotten to that stage. It's never really happened. And that's a key element of this discussion we're going to have now. Can we ever get to that stage? Is there a better way of doing things if we move away from that? So I think these are all good questions.

If we can go onto key question 4. This, again, takes account to some of the changes we've seen over the recent period, the increasing number of CCWGs. From my own perspective, I think that we've achieved a lot through CCWGs. And in some cases, I think that's helped ICANN in a much better way than we could ever have hoped for when we were working in our silos and we didn't have that interaction.

So we should look at those questions and see how they pan out, on whether we should put more faith in movement forward that way.

Now there is one more slide on here. It's number 5. Will reform of the GNSO achieve the best answer for ICANN? Or do we make it broader? To make the fundamental changes and to make ICANN better, do we actually need to look at ICANN as a whole and the relationship and interworking between those groups?

If ever we get to that stage, of course, it's absolutely essential that we do involve all parties. We couldn't possibly look to have any of those discussions without doing it on a broad basis. One of the key questions is: Is it the time for this now? There will never be a good time to do this. There will always be something that's taking priority. And having put all the attention or a lot of our attention into IANA and the follow on activities that are stemming out of that are still quite substantial.

We've also got a whole raft of other work building up as well. But if you're looking for a GAC to do this, I don't believe you'll ever find one. But these are questions that we should really ask and have an answer for. Because they're going to issues that other people pose if we try and broaden out this discussion and involve them.

So what I'd like to table here is the approach where for those of us on the call and anybody else as we mention is open to join this discussion from within our house. But we circulate these questions. And we ask people to come back and put in some response, not as a constituency, not as a stakeholder group but individual views at this stage. I think it would be more varied and more welcome to move this forward.

So can I have some feedback and comments as to whether people think that's a reasonable approach, to move forward and try and advance this work down that path? Would anyone like to get in the queue to comment on that?

And if you have another approach, I'm really keen to hear that as well. But I think that answering some of those key starting point questions should actually point the study down a path that we can engage on a much better way.

Rudi, let me turn to you for a comment to see that you're happy with that approach. Please go ahead.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes. Thank you, Tony. Rudi for the transcript. I agree with the majority of what you have bringing up so far. I think it's important that we start having first discussions on: Are these the questions? Are these the key questions? Or are there still some others?

Maybe we have to validate first which of the questions, the key questions. But I saw Amr and Denise have their hands up. So I see Amr has your hand up. You have the floor.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks Rudi and thank you, Tony. This is Amr. I think it's a good idea to sort of as a first step have everyone go over these questions and give input on whether they're the right questions to ask, whether there are other questions, you know, missing questions, whether some of these questions need to be changed. That's a good thing, and I wholeheartedly support doing this more thoroughly on this call.

I do have just one objects that I would like to note at this time because I see that - and forgive me, I'm only seeing a lot of this for the first time. But I would caution against sort of just building on what input was provided via the independent examiner in terms of structural changes as they are.

I've done relatively a decent degree of work with studies and such. I think it's important to always critically appraise a study before actually taking anything that comes out of it as a given. So apart from sort of taking a close look at these questions, I would take a close look at whatever information or output from the Westlake review before sort of using that as a building block for this group's work.

I think it would be important for us to look at these bits of the study ourselves and sort of decide how we're going to use some of this information, not just take it as a given. And I say that because a lot of the substantive work in the study on the structure that did not lead to recommendations is not actually reviewed by the GNSO review working party because the working party, at least in its last few months focused a great deal more on the actual

recommendations as we all know that structural changes were not within the scope of the last review.

So since no one else has done this work, it may be worthwhile for this group to sort of just take a look at what - because I did see quite a bit of information on earlier slides from the 360 review and so forth.

So that's it. Thanks.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, Amr. Tony for the record. It's a really good point, because if we get into some of the broader discussions -- and I'm sure that's going to happen at some point -- there is an awful lot of stuff in the Westlake report that does have a bearing on that. So we should certainly look to use that work wherever we can and build on that. Totally in accord with that.

Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes, Tony. Well, I just see that Marilyn Cade has joined us in the meeting, too.

About the question of having a wiki space, I think it's the right moment to keep that wiki space so that people that are not yet part of the group can (unintelligible) what is on the table, what we initiated and comment still on some of the points to help us getting the building correctly designed so that we can start doing the work that is in - respective of this group.

Having the wiki space will allow anybody from outside to have a look at it and maybe trigger some people to join us.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Tony for the record. Yes, agree totally. We need to be transparent with this. I think it would be helpful to do that.

So what came out of that discussion was, I think, a request that we review the questions. And that gives people the opportunity to add to them or delete them or modify them. So if we set a date maybe of about a week perhaps, seek input on that by the 29th of April, then that would give us something to work with. And I think we need a few days to look at that and pull together some form of direction, which would be down to Rudi and I to do.

Then we need to set up another call. Or otherwise you could rely on us just to circulate the list of amended questions pending the input that's coming to the list. Which is the preferred approach out of that?

Rudi Vansnick: Tony -- Rudi for the transcript -- while we are going to have our wiki space, maybe the 29th is a bit short deadline. If we set up the wiki space, people can have an easier look. They don't have to look into mails. And we can already see what's going on from that side.

I'm just wondering if the 29th is not too short and...

Tony Holmes: Too quick. Okay. If we're going to go down the wiki route, then I think it's a valid point. We should certainly provide Chantelle with the opportunity to set that up. And we should also need some time to notify people within our respective groups. So maybe add another week onto that.

Chantelle, would that be acceptable to you to set up a wiki page and to close it for comments, which would be - just trying to look at my diary. That would be on the 6th of May, if we say comments on the list of questions by the 6th of

May. And then we can set some direction, depending what comes out of that, whether we need to set up a call or how we need to go.

I see that you've commented on the question on issues to be the first three key challenges and then three key challenges facing GNSO.

I think they're valid points, but it would be helpful if we could set up the wiki page. And you can feed that in there and I think that's a good discussion point.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript. I think that the wiki space will allow us, also, to add some links to previous work that has been done as Amr has mentioned. I think it's good if we have the ability, that everybody has the ability to have a look at what has been discussed already in the past on this issue of GNSO structure. Probably, it would be very helpful in the further discussions.

So I think that the wiki space is the perfect place to start off. Maybe for you and me and then tell also to draft a next agenda for the next meeting.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, Rudi. It's Tony. I think that's a good way forward. I can see Chantelle is also saying that works. So that gives everyone the opportunity to engage in this. It gives those who aren't on this call the opportunity to come back. Those who want to engage, they can join as well.

So I would suggest that we've got a way forward for that. And if we can work with Chantelle to make sure that everyone is hooked into that process, then I think we're in a pretty good position to move this forward.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript. Maybe an additional question. Maybe the last question. Should we make a kind of former communication to the contracted party



house about this setup? Or should we just go on and not make any official comments on it?

Tony Holmes: It's Tony. I would also like to seek some feedback on that as well. My own view is that I think at this stage we haven't really got anything to say to them other than we're just kicking off a review looking at where we are and some views from our particular house to get a discussion going. We haven't got any concrete issues to work with.

I think that's a really good question. My preference would be to consider that question, again, on the second call when maybe we'll have a better idea of the issues we're going to be looking at because there will be some commonality that comes out of the review of the questions.

Rudi Vansnick: Yes. Rudi for the transcript. No problem, Tony. It's just a question that I had in my mind. I see some reactions from Marilyn Cade, also, that we would first work on our house and then when we have something substantial on paper, on the table, we can then maybe focus on a management. And that's something that seems to me quite urgent that we want to get it. Having a meeting on this with eventually the contract party in Helsinki.

Tony Holmes: It's Tony. I totally agree with that. I think that's where we should be headed. And if we're at the stage where we have something to discuss, some concrete issues that we can put forward as a house when we go to Helsinki, I think we've made good progress on that. And certainly I've been in favor of broadening out the discussion. And I believe ICANN are open to that proposal as well.

We might want to think on annex call about putting a marker down to get some time on the timetable to do that and how it fits in with the revised

meeting schedule for Helsinki. But that is a good point. And if we can get to that stage, then I think this effort would have been worthwhile.

Okay. Let me open up. Oh, Rudi, go ahead, please.

Rudi Vansnick: Just to confirm as I had some contact and we had the leadership meeting, also, call last week, it's clear that for the meeting team we cannot wait too long before we try to get room and space available in the proposed schedule for the core day meeting. I would like to see if maybe - Tony, Chantelle and me, we can have a look at it to request a time slot and space in the Helsinki meeting planned because I know that it's not so easy to get something done.

Tony Holmes: It's Tony for the transcript. I'm very happy with that proposal. Is everyone else okay if we adopt that approach now and make a bid for a time slot now? Seems to make a lot of sense.

Marilyn, I see that you're making the point that time and meeting space is very tight for Helsinki. Well, that really underlines the fact that if we're going to do it, we ought to do it now.

I also accept your comment, Amr, as well that it's to focus on policy work. I hope we can still find a slot during that time for this as well.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript. On the Monday, there is the outreach also that is scheduled. Maybe there is some time space that can be used for doing that.

Tony Holmes: Okay. So if you can leave it with us, then we'll follow up on that and see what headway we can make. Okay. I think we've gone as far as we can today. And we've got something to work with now, which was the key thing to kick off this discussion.

So with that, we will open up the wiki space. We will certainly make sure everyone is aware of that and look forward to receiving some input. Rudi, Chantelle and I will work with that input and look at the next steps and come back straight after to advise how we're going to attack that. In the meantime, Rudi, Chantelle and I will work to get some meeting space.

Does anyone want to raise some final issues? Otherwise, I think we've gone as far as we can on today's call.

Susan, note in your comment in the chat. It's a good point. If we can't get the meeting space, we need to find another way to do this, and using Adobe seems to be a good way. And I would certainly hope by the time we get to Puerto Rico, we could have made some substantial improvements.

Chantelle, in response to your question, send a Doodle Poll for the next call. I think it would be best to look at the input that's going to come in by the 6th and then maybe send a Doodle straight after that. We'll have a better idea of what we need to tackle on the next call by then. So it's probably more appropriate to do it that way.

Rudi?

Rudi Vansnick: Yes. Well, I would like to thank Tony for all his efforts that he spends quite some time in getting this also on the table. And maybe also Chris, who is not with us today. But you two have been doing quite a lot of work in preparing this group of people.

I will also ask Maryam Bakoshi who is on NCIG, the secretary, she will also help some ICANN staff to go to some administrative work we have to do with

regard to Helsinki meeting. I know she is in first contact with the meeting team itself. They probably have some responses within the next 48 hours.

With that, we can obviously get to an end.

Tony Holmes: I think that may be telling us something. The hour is almost up. So I personally want to thank everybody for joining the call. I think we've got a good way forward. And look forward to working with you and moving this along. It's been a long haul to try and get some movement on this. So if we can work together to try and stimulate that, I'm sure we'll all be thankful for that at the end of the day.

So unless there is any other closing comments, then I think we should end the call now. So thank you. Chantelle, if I could ask you to stop the call.

Chantelle Doerksen: Thank you, Tony. Operator, you can now stop the recording. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. And enjoy the rest of your day.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, everyone. Good-bye.

Rudi Vansnick: Bye-bye.

END