

**Transcription ICANN London  
Cross Community Working Group on Framework of Cross Community Working  
Group Operating Principles  
Monday 23 June 2014**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

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

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

John Berard: Okay. So welcome to the first face-to-face meeting of what is colloquially called the Cross Community Working Group on Framework of Cross Community Working Group Operating Principles which we have - are promoting the URL Shortener as CWG Squared.

So I would encourage each of you to begin using that trying to educate the rest of our ICANN colleagues.

My name is John Berard. I am - am I the real co-Chair or the...

Man: (Unintelligible).

John Berard: ...acting co-Chair? Did we...

Woman: (Unintelligible) vote.

John Berard: Did we vote? Oh we have...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

John Berard: That's first, right?

Woman: Yes. I think the...

John Berard: Okay.

Woman: ...Council will be confirming you guys as a formality this week.

John Berard: Yes, formality, okay, good. Okay, I am...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

John Berard: I am at this point acting (unintelligible) interim...

Woman: Pending.

John Berard: ...co-Chair pending co-Chair. My colleague, Becky Burr...

Becky Burr: Becky Burr what he said.

John Berard: Talk a bit. No, no.

Becky Burr: I'm Becky Burr. I'm a member of the ccNSO Council from (DOT-US).

John Berard: There you go. There you go. And I am a member of the GNSO Council from the business constituency.

The energy for this working group is - it might not have risen to the level of the energy of some of the other perhaps more controversial working groups. But as I was saying to Chuck earlier it represents an important bit of the plumbing of ICANN because we as an organization are increasingly seeing the appointment and the implementation across Community Working Groups

because the issues that are confronting ICANN, the areas that ICANN wishes to have a voice in cut across all aspects of the community.

And as we come together, we come together from different points of origin with different rules by which we have lived in terms of developing policy and even coming to a conclusion on things that don't rise to level of policy.

And this is an opportunity to for - this is an opportunity for everybody to participate in what they more aligned, consistent and I hope efficient future might be.

I'm also grateful that the room is as cool as it is which is real extraordinary. And I only had to ask three people how to get here so perhaps the signage is improving.

Anyway because of what I believe the momentous opportunity that lays before us is I'd love to know who each of you really are and what it is your think you would like us to achieve, what's drawn you to this. And because it's really important for us to demonstrate a willingness to share at the outset so that we can be comfortable in an unfettered dialogue as we move forward.

So I'll start with Edmon so I picked on you earlier so I'll give you the microphone first.

Edmon Chung: Sure. Edmon Chung here from (DOT-Asia), and I guess soon to be on - into the ccNSO (3.MO) as well becoming a member.

I guess this whole issue in fact I would call myself one of the first ones to bring it up in fact in the Sydney ICANN Meeting. I brought up in the public forum saying that hey we got to start working on this Cross Community Working Group stuff.

And I've had the chance to Chair, co-Chair a couple of them in the past. And understand the different working modes of the, you know, different SOs and ACs.

And I think, you know, the - and having a common framework so that we can have something to rely on when we - some consistency when we try to create these working groups and how and from consistency an expectation of how they would report back to the I guess chartering organizations or ACs is going to be a very important thing going forward. So that's I guess where I come from.

And I don't know whether - I don't think I'm going on the mailing list or anything yet but I'll be more than interested to do so. Thank you.

John Berard: And to your left. We're each saying who we are and our point of origin and why we've come to this particular meeting.

Rao Naveed: Actually my name is Rao Naveed. I'm from Pakistan. So I'm on fellowship so this is my first day. So I come here because yesterday, when they were describing the structure of this ICANN, I posed the question of how these separate communities can get interacted with each of those. And I found that there's a Cross Community Working Group so I came here to get to know how different people working in different directions or maybe same directions intersect with each of (them) to get to know what others are doing. So that's why I come here.

John Berard: Well thank you. Glad to have you.

Jim Galvin: So my name is Jim Galvin. Let me first say welcome to our fellow here. I'm very supportive of ICANN's Fellowship Program. I think it's just an excellent that they have going on and glad to have a fellow in the room here in this working group.

I come here representing SSAC. I also happen to be the SSAC Vice-Chair. And I kind of volunteered to be part of this working group in large part because I've been active in a couple of Cross Community Working Group things. I've actually had the opportunity to co-Chair also so I have some experience in all of that. I didn't see how I could escape being part of this working group having that particular history from SSAC.

And also my last comment is just to say upfront I apologize but I am going to have to leave a little bit early from this meeting. I have an SSAC responsibility to attend to but I will be here and active so in general thanks.

John Berard: Great. Thanks Jim.

Kristo Helasvuo: Thank you. My name is Kristo Helasvuo, I come from a little bit of multi-stakeholder background so I do have a little bit of NGO, little bit of business and academia. I came here because I was invited to participate in Cross Community Working Group.

And it is the first time for me to be at ICANN Conference. I had been on one earlier and I'm very interested about the globalization and the global governance issues so I hope to be able to contribute in a lot of this working group. Thank you.

John Berard: Well thank you for coming. Yes.

Cintra Sooknanan: Hi. My name is Cintra Sooknanan. I'm the Chair of the Internet Society Trinidad and Tobago Chapter. And we have members within the GAC, within At-Large, (local) and within (unintelligible) (CSG).

So the Cross Community Work and ICANN moving in the direction of the IANA transition I think it's going to become more and more important as well I've been on several Cross Community Working Groups and I've seen how

easy it is for them to fail simply because there is no guidance as to rules and procedure or, you know, how to (run) charter itself properly to begin with.

So I think there's a lot of scope for this group itself and I think there's even more scope in terms of the kind of work that can be achieved with Cross Community Working Groups.

Natalia Enciso: Hello. My name is Natalia Enciso, I am an At Large member, former (elect) member and this is my first experience in a Cross Community Working Group.

And I guess I can say I am interested in (for bringing other versions) of the framework operating principles if I can say so. Thank you.

Geoff Duck: Good afternoon. My name is Geoff Duck. And in connection with other organizations the issue of certainly working across groups matters a lot. And my connection is very strongly with particularly the topics you have here but I'm very interested to see how you do actually - like some of these things work. So probably I'll be mostly regarded as an observer. Thank you.

Jill Duck: Hello. Jill Duck, out of Australia and I'm here as an observer if you would allow. Thank you.

John Berard: As long as you don't say anything to anybody (unintelligible).

Steve Chan: Steve Chan, ICANN Staff.

Man: (Unintelligible), ICANN Staff.

Mary Wong: Mary Wong, ICANN Staff. And if I may to newcomers, observers and friends to this group if after today you'd like to join the working group or be added to the mailing list, please let me know by the end of this meeting. Thank you.

Woman: I'm just going to add a couple of things. I, as a member of this ccNSO, we have used Cross Community Working Groups quite a lot to a very good effect. And I think we are in a phase of the world where the issues that we're dealing with are going to require us more and more and more to depend on those things.

So I think it's important for us to understand more about the variety of working practices that different parts of the community have. And to figure out what works well in a particular situation, what doesn't work well in a particular situation and actually just to enhance a sort of understanding and awareness about the alternatives for interaction out there.

Alan Greenberg: Alan Greenberg, At-Large Advisory Committee, veteran of probably more Cross Community or Quasi-Cross Community Working Groups than I can remember.

David Cake: David Cake. Vice-Chair - one of the Vice-Chairs of the GSNO and move into NCUC and NCSG.

Antony Van Couvering: Hi. I'm Antony Van Couvering from (DOT-CA). Actually Bart asked me if I would join this so I thought.

Woman: This is a real topic (unintelligible).

Antony Van Couvering: I was a bit amused by this because I've never actually participated in any working group. So yes, I don't know what he had in mind. But maybe it's the fact that I had a former life in government and I see many, many groups and committees and consultations that our colleagues have failed because there was not enough homework done upfront on what the rules of engagement are.

So I think that there's every real opportunity to deal with these issues and when you're not looking at a specific subject and, you know, and the regular battle lines are being drawn up.

So I think we have an opportunity to create predictability and certainty and actually just speed up the process because like you said, I think we're going to see a lot more of these Cross Community Working Groups as the issues get more complex and/or involve many stakeholders.

And I hope I can contribute so.

Man: It's well known (unintelligible).

Antony Van Couvering: Chuck Gomes will verify on the Registry Stakeholder Group. And I'm not there to join the group. But I wish I had time to because it's an area that I'm really interested in and have been since 2010. I've always been disappointed it's taken us so long to get this thing moving but I'm glad it's happening now.

So what I want to same first is I really appreciate those of you that are willing to work on this because it is really critical. It's not a controversial thing. We just need to have some guidelines that are in place when we form these groups.

And there are probably two very significant groups that are about to be formed on critical issues for ICANN and fortunately we have some experience like several us have referred to that's being used for those groups.

But it'd be really great if we have the results of this group in place already. So I thank you for taking the time. I do promise to watch you produce and respond and comment and everything. Certainly I'll be helpful on the side if I can be. And I'm sure you're all capable of developing some great guidelines and procedures for this.

So thanks again for committing to do this.

Rudi Vasnick: I'm Rudi Vasnick. I'm the (OCOC) Committee Chair of MPOC and a long-standing At-Large.

(Jose Santairis): Hi. My name is (Jose Santairis) and I'm representing a training company called Insight Learning. And I'm here to observe how the meeting is run.

Woman: We also have participants in the Adobe Connect Chat Room. And I believe that's Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen from the GNSO.

John Berard: Thanks for joining us Wolf.

What I would like to start with, well first of all, the importance of going around and taking the time to make these introductions is that mostly what we're going to do is going to be on the phone. And so it'll be more valuable - that conversation will be even more valuable if you have a mental image of the people who are talking and have over the course 90 minutes, develop some sense of who each of us is. It should make things go a little bit quicker.

Chuck's point about the fact that this is not controversial but important I think really underscores where we are right now.

In fact it may be that the - and the air at ICANN is already somewhat informed about the qualities of an effective Cross Community Working Group. The most recent example of course being the charter that was created for the Internet Governance Cross Community Working Group wasn't done with any consultation of any of those of us around the table. But was done based upon what seems to be a common book of thought about Cross Community Working Groups and it reflects much of the early thinking that we have had.

For example it speaks to specific SO and AC support so that rather than one organization coming at it from the left and another from the right, they come at it from the same point of origin.

It talks about certified participation and we've talked a bit about that where it's - where an effective group ought to have members that are endorsed, nominated, certified by the body from which they - that they represent.

And it also speaks to this - a notion of certified nonparticipation. One of the difficulties in a Cross Community Working Group is that some group or groups might not participate and then take issue with the results of the group. So the question is, did they not participate because they didn't think it was a good idea? Did they not participate because they didn't know? Did they not participate because there's only a handful of them and they can't spread themselves that thin?

But in - and what we're seeking to do is to know that upfront. So it's not only do we want the participation to be real but if you're not going to participate we'd like to know that you - that that is a deliberate decision.

So it will help everybody - it will help particularly at the delivery end of the process. That there be specific participation limits.

So I will try to - except for the examples we've used of Cross Community Working Groups I will try not to rely too much on history. But does anybody here, Chuck, remember vertical integration which essentially was open to everybody but was very heavily weighted in some particular ways?

So if a group has 20 represents, another group has one, it becomes difficult to get a sense of whether or not that work product is really the result of a collaboration or not.

And so the notion of specific participation, specific limits and understanding that if you're not participating it's a delivered decision, they're all important parts of a Cross Community Working Group.

The notion of members versus observers, I'm not - it's not to say that there will be votes in a Cross Community Working Group. But if there were a vote it really should be a member who votes. If we limit the number of members but we can have as many observers as possible we still get the input, the intelligence from the broader community but the decision making is put into a funnel that allows us to have a more sharply focus fire edge decision.

One of the - at this point the co-Chairs of this - the interim co-Chairs, the original - originating co-Chair of this working group come from the ccNSO Council and the GNSO Council.

The notion of consensus in those two bodies is very different. In the ccNSO consensus is or is not, okay.

In the GNSO it's not just consensus but we might have full consensus. If it's - if we don't have consensus we might have...

Man: Partial.

John Berard: ...a partial consensus or actually or complete non-consensus, right. And there's a wider range.

And as an example of how I think we can come to grips with these things is Becky at one of our forming meetings says, you know, the way we decide if it's not consensus is would you be willing to drive into a ditch to prevent it from happening. I mean so...

Becky Burr: It's somebody who's willing to die in a ditch.

John Berard: Die in a ditch, right. Well...

Becky Burr: It beats consensus.

John Berard: Yes. I softened it a little bit. I didn't think death was really the right (thing).

((Crosstalk))

Becky Burr: Well yes, dying in a ditch. It's a...

John Berard: Okay, so...

Becky Burr: ...(just a) phrase.

John Berard: And a very practical approach to things. And so we have already begun to come to grips with how we can reach consensus on some of these ones.

But even though the world seems to be moving in a direction that would over time create the opportunity for Cross Community Working Groups to be effectively conducted, it's not going to happen fast enough. And even when it does if there are not rules governing or can be wrapped around it there's no guarantee that it will hold.

And so that's what we're here to do, to create those rules.

And there are some other information I want to get into that speak to the history.

And Edmon had already mentioned. Edmon you are on the (JIG), yes. And somebody was on the (JAZZ). Alan was on (JAZZ) and...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

John Berard: And Jim you're on DSSA so...

Jim Galvin: And DSSA and IRD.

John Berard: And IRD. So what we have here is a good base of knowledge. And I wonder if we might be begin with a little bit of a taste of what that is all about. If I characterize it I would say that Alan has a story that indicates the shortcomings of groups working together. Edmon has a story of how well they can work together. And Jim has a story about how well it can work together and be undone in the acceptance and implementation of its findings.

So if I could impose upon the three of you. Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Could I make one comment before we start that?

John Berard: Of course.

Alan Greenberg: You gave the - you said a little bit about the different definitions of consensus and, you know, that are you willing to die in a ditch for it or not. The ccNSO makes relatively few rules so you don't have - the question doesn't come up very often.

The GNSO on the other hand given that we have a somewhat more complex environment and ICANN makes the rules we make a lot more rules.

Moreover we tend to on occasion make rules which affect contracted parties, registrars or registries which are a part of the GNSO.

Therefore the rules are carefully constructed so that even without the working group consensus rules, the voting rules in the GNSO do not allow a single contracted party group to veto.

So in other words if we're doing something that registry hate, we may decide it's for good of the - the common good for the, you know, public interest that they have to do it anyway so they can vote against and still can't defeat it which explain - goes back to explain some of the more subtleties of why our - why we have a range of levels of consensus and why we can approve things still with - what, you know, the ICANN terminology, a supermajority with a single group still completely vetoing so that's just a bit of history.

Woman: So let me just respond. I mean I totally understand that. The way that came up in our discussions was what are the rules? What is the definition of consensus for this group?

And so I think it's an interesting - I mean obviously what you're talking about, what you're - what decisions you're making, how it affects people, all of that makes sense in terms of where you establish what consensus means.

Man: No. I was just giving - you know, when John was introducing different definitions, for this particular group I think the ccNSO definition is the right one. Because if we cannot come to agreement that something should be a rule for all future Cross Community Working Groups then it shouldn't be a rigid rule and it should be one of the variables which they can set on their own.

Man: Just a few comments and say I think that being staff support for some of these groups and probably for one of the most controversial ones in CC land, that is the Framework of (Implementation) Working Group, this is about delegation or re-delegations of ccTLDs. This is about the existence of ccTLDs themselves.

So it is controversial especially in that group. That's where the whole criteria around die in the ditch was evolved and where the rule was evolved where we have now in the charter or second readings, etcetera.

So it is possible even where if you would look and then would look over the transcripts of some of these sessions (albeit FYI), you see there is great, sometimes great disagreement on some of, you know, substantial matters.

And just through a rule like this it's able. One reason why you can do it and I think that its core to the Cross Community Working Groups is this is the internal mechanism of the working group.

But if you always have with Cross Community Working Groups even with this one and even the one you referred to in the Internet Governance, you always have the backstop rule that the supporting organizations at the end of the day need to support it.

So it's first of all, it's the governance of the working group and then it goes out again for a sanity check. However depends on how the - how people feel engaged in that group.

So that's probably - that's why we were so successful with the ccNSO Working Groups. We've always had this type of backstop mechanism built in.

Man: And of course the dynamics are different on a (NETA) group like this setting rules for some future process and on the framework ones than deciding the actual outcome that's going to live or die.

John Berard: Well I want to - oh yes, Chuck, you next.

Chuck Gomes: Yes thanks. I want to complement what Alan said a little bit about the GNSO side because first of all what Alan was referring to with regard to voting really applies to the Council, not the working groups.

And it's not only true that one contracted party like the registries cannot veto a decision. Same thing applies to the non-contracted parties and the stakeholder groups there. No one stakeholder group can block a process.

Now with working groups and the GNSO voting is really discouraged. We take polls. We're really - we find out our differences and then we try to find decisions that all of us can support. Not that we all love but that we can all support.

And I think we're probably not too much different from the ccNSO in that regard.

Man: I know that this sounds like it's a ccNSO and GNSO partnership in this. But our goal here is to create a set of rules that would allow for every part of the community to participate even those that like the GAC that are often difficult to find outside their own deliberations.

So that will - the ccNSO and the GNSO of course will be providing a lot of the raw material for our deliberations. But we should not be bound by - should not limit our thinking to just what has come before for those two SOs.

Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Actually Edmon Chung here. But this is probably not a good time to bring up - I want to bring up with what you just said. But I did want to mention but anyway, the - Alan mentioned something that, you know, the ccNSO will probably have less rules.

But there is one particular rule, that it's very big rule that is very different which is that some of the policies. They don't really set so much policies for the registries.

And a lot of times from the experience from the (JIG) is that once we touch onto any type of policy recommendation or implementation recommendation we would even have to, you know, stay away completely from it or have talk about potential directions for each of the supporting organizations. And they

may have to be different because simply because for gTLDs it is possible to think about something that's cross-cutting and a lot of times with ccTLDs that's - that cannot be the case.

So I think that's - although, you know, that's a pretty big rule, once we get into kind of a joint situation.

The other thing, I think what you mentioned is quite right. But one thing that to remember is also that the ccNSO and the GNSO are the only two, well I kind of don't count ASO because the actual policy is not quite done by the ASO. ccNSO and the GNSO is the only two organizations that create these policies.

So not saying that they should have heavy weight but that particular background needs to be considered when I guess a Cross Community Working Group is being conceptualized.

And that has some implications on the other parts where ALAC and GAC especially as Advisory Committees, their role sometimes, you know, as the policy or whatever, output any group comes out of, their roles independently might be a little bit different.

So agree that we need to look at the others obviously. But there are certain special reasons why more in-depth considerations and especially when we talk about anything that touches on policy has to do with GNSO and ccNSO.

John Berard: I wanted to ask Jim to - did you want to respond to that directly? Okay, go ahead. Yes.

Man: What Edmon says is completely right. The saving grace however is in many Cross Community Working Groups that we have held and are likely to hold, they're not actually establishing policy.

Man: Right.

Man: For the TLDs that are under the - they're making a statement to ICANN on something or other but not establishing a policy.

John Berard: Jim.

Jim Galvin: So thank you. I guess as I think about the problem space and, you know, what it is we need to accomplish, the thing that occurs to me and now maybe I'm just in some sense I'm going to repeat what's already been said but I want to phrase it in a particular way.

Cross Community Working Groups are created with different purposes in mind. Because I think the issue that they're addressing originates from different places.

And so they will have different requirements. I mean we've already observed the differences between the way the existing groups work. GNSO and ccNSO appear to be the economical example at the moment. You know very different ways in which they operate.

And what that tells me and even based on the experience that I've had and the groups that I've been in is there probably is no one size fits all solution here. And, you know, we have to find a way to describe. There's probably a core set of rules and principles that are appropriate.

And we very much have to allow for some options that are going to depend very heavily on the origin of the issue for - that's being addressed. You know things that come out of policy development that might end up being obligations probably have a slightly different set of rules than Advisory Groups. You know, like the original IRD Group and even the DSSA Group are more of Advisory Groups.

So the rules that one might apply there are very different so that's my comment for now.

Woman: And I think in many ways what we can be thinking about this is developing tools to help people decide what the right set of rules are in any particular situation or what the things that you need to be thinking about when you're picking the rules.

But clearly there is no one size fits all on this.

John Berard: Anyone else? If not Bart I - is it possible to pull up the lifecycle because I think the lifecycle elements of a working group might be a good way to organize our thinking especially because my feeling is that if we - if it can't be gotten right at the start it's only going to go more crazily wrong as it proceeds and so getting it right at the start seems to be a good place for us to begin our discussion.

Okay, so you recall this. So those of you who were on our call recall the phases, the lifecycle of a working group that it gets initiated. And it's then formed. It operates. It closes. And closure I think also includes uptake of its findings. And then there's follow-up to the success or not - success or less of its work.

And so what I'd like to do is to begin thinking about initiating a Cross Community Working Group. How does that happen?

When should a Cross Community Working Group be formed?

What is - what are the reasons why it makes sense? And then what are the ways in which we think it might best be done?

So who wants to start with that? Becky, if nobody else raises their hand, then I'm going to ask you to start -- of course.

Avri Doria: Sorry, Avri Doria speaking.

I wanted to ask a sort of (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: Award winning regarding. I think you guys should say that.

Avri Doria: I've got to say that? No, no, there was no stipulation that just because I get the award I have to attend.

John Berard: But we get the (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: One of the things about looking at that list - now I don't know who else has done it other than the GNSO, but we've also paused and restarted working groups. So I don't know whether you want to have that in there as something else then needs to be considered.

John Berard: It certainly is a part of initiation, right. I mean - yes, right. (Krista)?

(Krista Hillar): Yes, just a comment about that (unintelligible) time need for cross-communication working group or cross-(unintelligible).

I've been commenting here earlier also that the idea of stakeholder should be considered more of us and not just a static instance. So in the case where you have communities which are not so easily defined or the initiated communities changing by its nature, or although you find the different communities (unintelligible) somewhat. So I would maybe suggest that that would be a good initiation point for the cross-community working group.

To put it also that way, that if you think about cross-community, the cross-community, the (unintelligible) is not something which is they can't fix, but changing fundamental. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: It's probably helpful to clarify that when we say cross-community, we mean across the ICANN different SOs and ACs.

Each of us, like the ccNSO and the GNSO, do policy work just among the GNSO or just among the ccNSO now like Alan I think said. It's always open to anybody in the community. It looks to this in the GNSO, I suspect this for the ccNSO too.

So when we say cross-community, it means it's not just a gTLD issue, it's one that affects the broader ICANN community. And it varies sometimes; sometimes it may just be two or three groups. I know the ccNSO does that with the GAC and you do other things. In the case of the (Jig), I think it definitely involves CC's and G's, and then of course ALAC and others.

So in the GNSO, almost every working group we do is really cross-community because we have all kinds of different communities within the GNSO. So I just wanted to clarify what is meant by cross-community within ICANN.

John Berard: Okay. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: This is Alan.

That list is fine as long as - but occasionally, we have certainly on various occasions we have loops. That is we go back and modify the charter or recharter the group or add a line as appropriate.

You don't want to have to force a group to close and restart from the very beginning because of some minor changes and that, so.

John Berard: I think we can agree that these represent the elements and sequence, but that it's not confined to - once you've formed, you cannot make any changes to it.

Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Location pool for this model. If you would drill down in some of the aspects, you will see what you just said; that's fine.

The reason - let me rephrase it. More or less in my mind, I always use this model in drafting charters. So if you look at - this is almost from an outsider looking into, say, how can you define the works etcetera over working group? You should treat it that way. This is from the start what you need to consider drafting a charter.

So taking it from a step back, is it a tool to consider, what should the guidelines look into? That was it; it was to assist the discussion. This is not that something that needs to be done if you can do it from the start. It's a mental exercise.

John Berard: Adam, you want to speak to this issue?

Adam: So I don't know whether - I think what Bart says is quite right. Is when you drill down some of this, maybe under operation, there are, you know, that's the way the loop happens a little bit.

But I do think however that maybe one more item as in how it checks back with the chartering organizations, that's probably big enough to be an item here. Although you can argue that it's part of operation, but that's such an important part of it for what we're talking about that I think it probably serves at this level, which is how the group takes back with the various chartering organizations.

John Berard: Alan, I know you have a point. You want to make some - I might just follow it up.

So when you say, "checks back," what leads a working group to check back with its organizing community?

Adam: I would guess there are multiple possibilities. One is the changes to the charter is one possible (oration). You know, there are certain out-of-scope/in-scope things, you know, different organizations or SO ACs might have different perspectives.

There are situations where there are interim reports and then final reports. You know, there are multiple phases of a particular project. So all this might require a kind of check-back to the various organizations.

And because the timing may be different, you're under one particular chartering organization, then the decision comes back right away, right. But if you have multiple, then you might have a staggering timeline in terms of how everyone comes back. And you might have inconsistent answers.

And you know, that's why I think this is such, I guess, a big item under cross-community working groups.

John Berard: Jim, you had a point on this? All right, why don't we go to Alan and then we'll come over here to Cintra, and then we'll come back to you.

Alan Greenberg: Actually, something Jim said earlier just made me think about it for a minute about the comment about one-size-fits-all, and I think this relates to what we're talking about. Is where's the definition of success for us as a group? And I think - I mean so for me, I don't come here thinking that we will have a template or set of rules or whatever, but rather from the opposite; if we can just do one thing to help these groups get going more quickly.

So I think if we - I don't know what everyone's expectations are, but I think it's important to make the measure into have an appropriate sense of what success is.

So ironically, I was back looking at the objective in our charter, and I find it - I can understand why it was written the way it was written. But I think it's much more ambitious than what we perhaps may accomplish, so I just wanted to mention that and maybe we could think a little (unintelligible).

Cintra Sooknanan: (Unintelligible). Edmon alluded today a little bit but he didn't quite get there. In addition to check back, it's also important to note the final report and reporting to the community as a whole as part of the working group's operation.

John Berard: I think that particular aspect is one of the primary motivations for us being in this room. Because that - the inability to have the acceptance of a final report is a driver of this working group.

Jim?

Jim Galvin: So thank you. Should we be saying Jim Galvin for the transcript I suppose? I don't know, maybe not.

John Berard: I think only you can say Jim Galvin. Well, that's not true. I'm Avri Doria for the transcript - the award winning Avri Doria for the transcript.

Jim Galvin: I take Edmon's point and I'd like to suggest reshaping it a little bit. Rather than calling it checking back with other working groups, I think the important point is there is an interaction between a cross-community working group and the other groups for which the issue matters.

So I would suggest that that interaction also goes through the entire working group life cycle - if you go back to your life cycle slide. If those are just the life cycle events, I think that interaction with the other groups to which the issue is important, happens at every step; it's a sub-item in every place; as part of the charter development, as part of the formation, because you're looking for volunteers in that group if you want.

As part of the operation, you're dealing with interim reports, and then you get to ask the question, do we require explicitly support, a formal acknowledgement that the work is on track or not from those subgroups?

You have the same question in closure. Are those other groups required or obligated to respond in some formal way during closure that the report is accepted, or is the report's final work product supposed to be something that's standalone? And once the group has created, you know, you operate independently of these other groups.

I mean I think these are sort of the perimeters. So what I'm suggesting is taking his point, but it's actually a sub-bullet in every step, and I think that's what's important. And that's what we have to consider is what it means in each step. Thank you.

John Berard: (Unintelligible), I don't know if I exactly understand what you're talking about because if a group has - so let's say that the ccNSO, the GNSO, ALAC, have decided to collectively pursue some issue via cross-community working group. But the SSAC has decided not to participate.

Are you suggesting then that the work of that group should be - if we think it affects the SSAC, should be played to you during the course of (redeliberations)? Or you should we just be paying attention to the ccNSO, GNSO and ALAC?

Jim Galvin: So I'm actually saying that's a question that needs to be asked. And you know, some decision has to be made, and observing that that question, probably not phrased exactly that way, but yes, that question has to be asked at every step in the life cycle of the working group.

You know, what is the responsibility that the cross-community working group has to each of the other groups in that relationship?

John Berard: You want to use the mic?

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. May I suggest we run through, say, the underlying bullets because some of the points from Edmon and Jim are addressed say like in the initiation phase. This is where you see that you have consultation with other SOs and ACs, etcetera. The formation, that's just more a critical point in (ACLs).

But if you would look at it and say, first of all around this problem space, etcetera, the question comes is there a need for cross-community working groups or are there alternatives. So that's more a list for somebody who initiates it. It could be one or two. Or if it's problem space conceived by two SOs or ACs, then it's natural to have a cross-community working group.

An underlying question becomes this is what Edmon alluded too, is the cross-community working group the only way or should we check other things? In some instances, you need to go through a PDP because it's a policy to (everything), and then the cross-community working group is clearly not the most appropriate means to do it.

Then you have the invitation to other SOs and ACs. Again, and this is probably the point you made, this is the communication you have when you think about creation of an SO AC, this is how the (DSSA) was created. This is how- at least that was probably the best how this one was created and how the cross-community working groups are created.

And then (unintelligible), the drafting process. At that stage, you start launching the drafting process. And (unintelligible), the drafting process is looking into these different bullets.

So then you have the formation - and again, this is a matter of communication. You send out the draft charter to all the SOs and ACs to seek their participation, going back to your point, also probably an explicit note that they do not want to participate. It's a note of non-participation and then you start the call of volunteers. Again, this goes out to everybody.

So, but that's another way of framing. There is, in that sense, along all these lines, there is constant lines of communication with say the broader community and between the SOs and ACs, but they're very specific.

And if you would run through - I will not run through it again. But you will see in every phase, you will see that they are more specific in say the life cycle model, that say the lines of communication are really important. And as soon as you hit the operations - so that's the life of the working group itself when it really starts working, then it's the communication from inside the working group to the broader community and the feedback into it. But that's a specific kind of communication.

So I will not go into - yes, I think. Otherwise I would take up all the time.

John Berard: No, and very helpful.

We have distributed the slides to the list, have we not?

Mary Wong: No - Mary speaking for the transcript. Congratulations Avri, well deserved.

But these slides are posted to the working group Wiki, and I will put into the Adobe Connect room the link to that and it's open to everybody to check and to download.

John Berard: Great, thank you Mary.

Well why don't we, as suggested, begin at the beginning which is with the initiation, the chartering, of a working group.

What are the ways in which, other than a smart person who's got the idea to instigate a working group, are we only to rely on that person to know which other groups to alert or is there some methodology that we can deploy? Yes?

(Krista Hillar): (Krista Hillar) for the record.

Sorry for my ignorance but I just wanted to clarify. Is it like an extended requirement that you have ten (unintelligible) working from (unintelligible), have you considered the possibility of having a fixed or long living working group which would be able to handle all or most of the issues coming between the stakeholders? Thank you.

John Berard: Chuck, you're much more practiced at working groups than almost anybody here at the table. My feeling (Kris) is that the working groups are specifically defined, and while they seem to be interminable, are really - their work is set out within a timeframe and then move on to the next issue as it arises.

But no, there are no standing working groups.

(Krista Hillar): But maybe those that have a fixed working group, inside of that you have an approach or issue or something like that.

John Berard: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck.

The only standing group I think is the improvements - what do we call it? The SCI...

John Berard: The structural improvements committee.

Chuck Gomes: That's a committee though, not a working group. But yes, I'm not aware of any standing working groups.

Now in cases where a working group has a lot of issues pretty challenging to tackle at once, we have broken them down into segments. But it's not really a standing working group.

Now it so happens with the registrar transfer working group, it was really good continuity from one PDP to the next of the people involved because they had the right expertise and so forth.

But it's hard for me to imagine it could happen. We'd need one - it's hard to get people to commit. I mean a working group involving anything with much substance to it takes a long time. And to have a standing group would take even longer. And to get people to commit to that kind of timeframe is really tough because they are time consuming if you're actively involved.

John Berard: Do we want - I mean where do we want to take this at this point?

Becky Burr: I don't know. Where do you want to take it at this point?

I mean I think these are all good ideas. And that it seems to me what we want to do is start sort of breaking down each of the phases and thinking about what are the decisions that need to be made as opposed to what the rules are.

But what are the decisions that you would make and what circumstances would cause you to make one kind of decision versus another?

John Berard: So I guess the first question is, when do you seek to create a cross-community working group? What would cause you to even think that it was a logical solution to the problem? Yes?

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi Vansnick for the transcript.

I would like to come back to your question about is it one person kicking it off. I think that's where it starts and where we have to define what's the minimum requirement to kick off cross-community working group. We need some criteria to define what is needed to be able to start that working group because we have so many other working groups that are active.

And as Chuck has mentioned, I have also a few years experience now in working groups and it really takes a lot of time if you really want to be active, to be valuable in that working group.

And I'm not convinced that a standing working group would ever exist just by the fact that so many things are changing during the phases that you are going through, that at the end you are going to have to redraft the charter and correct the charter. It's something that we are even discussing about in one of our working groups; if we would be able to redraft the charter in the beginning of the process because we discovered that we forgot one issue.

And to bring it back to the question, one person or what is the minimum requirement, I would like to go into the direction of automatically inviting all SOs and ACs, when you think there is an issue where a cross-community working group has to stand, it could sometimes clarify you that the scope of what you're going through or want to go through is wrong. You never know.

And that's where we have seen that some of the PDP working groups and other working groups were failing in delivering what was expected in the beginning because during the course of the working group, things have changed and there is less need for that working group.

So I have some doubts about can we define minimal criteria to initiate a working group?

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again.

Key word with regard to what this working group is developing; flexibility. And I think Becky hit at this earlier. What you design needs to be very flexible.

I think it was Jim that said, "One size does not fit all." If there's anything we've learned in this community, that's the case. And you're not going to be able to give firm timelines for everything.

I'm co-chair of the Policy and Implementation Working Group. Mary helps us on that and I don't know how many times we've changed our work schedule and it will be changed again; that's the reality of the game.

So whatever you do has to have a lot of flexibility built into it just to the circumstances that exist, and there are lots of those.

Becky Burr: (Unintelligible). But I would just would like to put out for questions, part of this depends on how each of the organizations that are participating, you know, how their procedures work. So as we're talking about it, it would be useful to say, you know, I can say from the CC perspective, we kind of talk about it informally, we do some, you know, decide.

Maybe we're going to ask - the Council is going to ask somebody to participate in drafting a charter. The charter then comes back to the Council and then there's a decision about whether it makes sense to participate.

But I do think we need to like understand the ways in which different or parts of this organization kick off the process of a working group. So Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here.

Yes, I guess part of what I wanted to say was exactly what you just mentioned. Part of this working group, we should collect what each SO and AC, how they do it right now, so that we get a sense of how it could start.

I guess the kick off is starting drafting the charter. Once the charter is drafted, it's probably pretty consistent that each particular group would have a more formal resolution on it and then adopt the charter. And then once everybody adopts it, then it becomes formally created. The question is how we get the drafting started really I guess is the part.

Back to the point on whether its standing groups might happen, I get back to the thing about flexibility. It doesn't mean it wouldn't happen.

One particular that is in mind immediately is the potential of having a cross-community working group on universal acceptance, which is kind of standing to see. If you think about it, it's going to take five to ten years, but it should be something that comes from, you know, it should be something that comes from the community as well.

So you know, that's at least one example I can immediately think of that might need a longer horizon. We kind of call standing, although I understand where we're coming from in terms of a standing committee/group, but there might be situations where a group could be formed and have a longer horizon.

Chuck Gomes: Just want to let you know for those that don't know, there's a real live example of what we're talking about going on right now. And that's the

possibility of a cross-community working group with regard to the IANA Transition. And a call has gone out from the Chairs of the ccNSO and GNSO to other SO leaders and AC leaders for volunteers to develop a charter for that; there's a base one that's started.

So I just throw that out, not that we need to go into that; that's not my purpose. But that it's happening right now and we might be able to learn from that as it's going on as well.

John Berard: And this is John Berard for the record and I guess I should have said that before.

But to my earlier point about good behavior being in the air, right, I mean it's possible that that is exactly the kind of guidance that we would want to certify coming out of our effort here.

You know, you identify an issue that requires/demands/can benefit from cross-community participation, and so you immediately move to create a balanced set of participants to that you ensure, you know, that voices will be heard and not overwhelmed, and charter from that point of strength as opposed to chartering and then trying to append other organizations to it. And that's one of the ways in which these things have gone (array) in the past.

Anyone else?

Becky Burr: So I just want to note that, to our wonderful secretariat, that one of the things we're going to do is try to figure out what the current rules for each of the group areas/groups are.

John Berard: I saw everybody writing that furiously when it was recommended. So I didn't think we needed to repeat it, but it doesn't hurt I suppose.

Look, we are at 15 minutes to go and I promised myself at least that we would finish early. But I don't want to just finish early for the sake of finishing early, right; foolish consistency is the cop-out with a small mind.

But there's one other thing that we need to do which is to vote on the co-chairs before we leave, or do we do that online or what? We're good?

Mary Wong: I thought you said...

John Berard: That was already done; yes.

Mary Wong: Yes.

John Berard: You haven't been paying attention really.

Mary Wong: (Unintelligible).

John Berard: Mary.

Man 3: Put my name say Doria. And I quickly picked the wrong room to catch up on my emails.

John Berard: Mary?

Mary Wong: Actually I was just going to say for the benefit for those who are new to this effort that one of the things that was produced before this meeting was a rather large excel spreadsheet that attempted to map the charters and operations of the groups that are mentioned on this slide including the ones that were discussed briefly today; the joint IDN working group, the Joint Applicant Support Group, JASG, and the RID Internationalized Registration Data and the DSSA. I'm trying really hard to explain all the acronyms as we go along.

And so what we can do is again, I'll put the link in the Adobe Chat transcripts and it will be in the transcript for this meeting. It can be quite informative, for those who are coming new to this, to see some of the diversity in the experiences of the previous groups.

And to the points that were just made in terms of identifying the problem, who identified and how is it identified, one of the things that the group discovered was that - of course the answer is that it varies, but it can come from the Board as well.

And so in that regard, how the problem is identified and by whom, occasionally does determine the direction of the group.

And so I think to conclude, the group I think then decided that rather than come up with a set of fixed rules because flexibility as we said today is probably the key, that to maybe some sort of template for groups to look at, to consult, to fill out in part perhaps, once the problem is identified might be the way to go for this group.

John Berard: I think what we've identified is that there's a little bit of homework for each of us coming out of this meeting.

So we're going to - we will put together a bit more information about how each of the chartering organizations actually get a working group underway. Each of you will make sure that you visit the Wiki and avail yourself of the materials that have already been prepared including the life cycle of a working group with a particular focus on originating, right. So what are some of the factors that we might want to make a part of the guidelines, the checklists that we might be putting together, in terms of originating a cross-community working group.

And if you want to go deeper into it, that's fine because once we've got the first one done, I think the rest will follow fairly quickly.

And our next call, we'll be able to, I think, make some substantive progress in terms of an outline of what our work product will look like.

Becky?

Becky Burr: And just to Chuck's point - this is Becky Burr for the record. No, it's Avri Doria for the record.

To Chuck's point, there are - we are living in a kind of, you know, living experiment in this. And I think we should try to use the Wiki Page to capture everybody's different experiences with all of the work that's going on in the development and discussions about cross-constituency working groups and everything else, whether it's called that or not, that's going on with the transition and accountability.

John Berard: And the other bit that I would ask each of you to engage in is recruiting. So as you look around the table, you can see that there's the ccNSO and GNSO, some of it anyway. And Chuck, you and I will probably will have to do a little more recruiting. There's NPOC, there's ALAC, there's AS, right, SSAC.

But there are some parts of the community that are not represented here. And if you know somebody who you think would be a valuable member from another part of the community, please feel free to recruit so that we can reflect in our work a more complete microcosm of the community.

Anyone else have anything they want to throw on the table? Otherwise, we will call it a day. And I thank you very much for joining us. Thank you.

END