

**Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires Meeting
Update on Policy and Implementation WG
Saturday 16 November 2013**

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/#nov>

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

Coordinator: Excuse me. I'd like to inform parties today's conference is being recorded. If anyone has any objections, you may disconnect at this time. Thank you. You may begin.

(Jonathan): Okay. Thanks everyone. Welcome to our next session of the coffee break. This session is an update from the Policy & Implementation Working Group. And the update, I understand, is going to be given by Chuck Gomes, co-chair, and Michael Graham, who's remote participating and one of the vice chairs.

So if I could ask everyone to take their seats and prepare for the update from - I think, Chuck, you'll kick it off, then. Thanks very much.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, (Jonathan). Chuck Gomes, co-chair of the Policy & Implementation Working Group. And as you can see on the intro slide there, J. Scott Evans is co-chair. He happens to be in another meeting in the Bay Area in the US right now. Michael Graham is online, one of our vice chairs. And is (Olivier) here in this week? Or is he online? He is not. Okay.

All right, so we're trying a new concept here in terms of two vice chairs and the co-chairs. The co-chair thing isn't new, but so far I'm really pleased, and this working group is made up of a lot of great people. Are any of the other working group members in the room today? Oh, of course, yes. (Cheryl), I remember you.

(Cheryl): I keep calling you.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that's right. So anyway, but it's like around 35 people, so it's really good. Let's go to the next slide, Lars. Okay, recent developments. Well we convened in August. Like I already mentioned, there are 35-plus participants. And for the most part, they're really active participants. It's been great to see.

We've reached out to all the SOs and ACs for input, and even to the ICANN Board, encouraging them to participate in some capacity. We're very close to finalizing a work plan, and we're going to come back to that in a minute, as I'll turn that over to Michael in that regard.

We've also formed a sub-team for developing some working definitions, because the group felt like there were certain terms that all of us need to be on the same page on as we move forward. So that work is ongoing. And then we're in the process of forming a sub-team to consider some policy and implementation principles.

Next slide, please. With regard to the work plan, I'm going to turn it over. Michael Graham, one of the vice chairs and the person who volunteered to head up this sub-team, is online. And assuming technology works, I would like Michael to take over here.

Michael Graham: Can you hear me through the phone? I'm actually on the phone line. I don't know if that will work.

Chuck Gomes: I hear somebody talking, but it's really low. Can we get any more volume?
They're working on that right now.

Coordinator: I've gained the line. Michael Graham, your line is open.

Michael Graham: Oh, thank you. Yes, this is Michael Graham. Thank you, Chuck.

When we formed the work group, especially with the number of participants and the scope of analysis and reporting that we were called upon to perform by the charter, our first task was to form a sub-team to come up with a working plan that would be manageable and realistic, and also cover all of the ground that we had been asked to, and also be nimble enough to discover further grounds that we may need to deal with.

And what we did within that sub-team was to look at the charter, to look at the various documents within ICANN relating to policy and implementation, and with a fairly small group -- there were five or six of us -- set out to put together both a working plan in terms of subject matter, and also in terms of schedule, which will be obviously very fluid.

We have anticipated -- or I guess it's aspirational -- to be able to present, based on the division of labor in the sub-teams, recommendations, and be ready for a discussion sometime in 2014, hopefully by the first two ICANN meetings. This'll be facilitated by the fact that we have divided up the work of the team into various sub-teams.

Does the next slide cover the (unintelligible) topics, I believe? If it does, if we could move to that - and that's simply because while going through the work plan, we actually have separated into...

Chuck Gomes: Actually I think - excuse me, Michael. This is Chuck again.

Michael Graham: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Can you pull up - Lars, do you have that work plan? Okay, he's going to pull it up. Now understand that the work plan has quite a lot of detail, so we're not going to try, in the short time we have, going through the details, but to give you a concept of what's been done and how it's been mapped out. And I'll let Michael take it from there. It is now up on the screens here in the room, Michael. Go ahead.

Michael Graham: Okay, thank you. Yes, just to go over it just for an understanding, again, how we broke this down and how the work is going to proceed, we've already formed a sub-team to deal within definitions.

In discussing the topics of policy and implementation, we early realized that we were spending a lot of time on the very interesting philosophical discussion of the various concepts, but that in order for us to work, we had to develop definitions that we would be able to use each of the terms that we would be using -- policy, implementation, consensus, and others -- in a way that we would understand and that would not be the basis for debate as to the meaning of the terms.

And that group has already been formed, and some of the draft definitions are being submitted at this meeting.

We then submitted - split it so that we would understand, again going forward to the real work, some of the underlying principles of the GNSO, of PDPs and such, and implementation, and have a starting place for that. And that's a second sub-team.

And then when we get to the meat of the matter, we've divided -- and you can see here in the middle -- the Deliverables 1 and 3, which are together, and 4, to really start working towards what we have been asked to produce in the charter.

And we divided these up, again because we have such a large group, and the idea being that the sub-groups could work in the trenches on the material, bring it to the work group so that we would be able to discuss and prepare the final deliverables in that way; and then moving to the point where we would actually have final deliverables.

And turning to the concept of the policies and principles underlying the entire policy and implementation process and procedures, come back to those principles and be able to restate those based both on our understanding of what has gone before, and what the work group itself develops as guidelines; criteria to be used for determining when a PDP may be necessary; or guidance; or implementation.

And so we've set up this work plan, and my understanding is we will be discussing it in the work group on Wednesday to finalize it, and also to discuss those first two areas that we're working on -- the definitions and then understanding the principles.

And by dividing it up this way, too, we hope that we're not going to overburden anyone with too much work, understanding that each of these different areas that will be covered by sub-teams requires quite extensive discussion and work.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Michael. Appreciate that. Lars, if you could go back to Slide 4 on the main presentation, please, Michael mentioned the Policy & Implementation working group meeting on Wednesday. That's not just for the working group. In fact, it's actually designed to solicit input from people who are not part of the working group.

So we hope that you will come and help us out on that regard, because we're very early in the process and direction from the broader community is really critical. So we'll look at that work plan again there, and if you want to look at it in more detail, we can do that on Wednesday.

Okay, I think we've basically covered that slide. Let's go to the next one. Again, that's repeating the face-to-face on Wednesday, starting at 4:45 pm. And then what we will do is review the input received, not only in PeerLive and remotely, as people provide input; but we'll also look at any input coming in from the SOs and ACs.

We have - we're awaiting feedback from the GAC. We actually sent a special request to the GAC and asked them to provide us some specific feedback by the end of this month. So we're waiting for that.

And of course we, as a working group, regularly get updates from the sub-teams, and then bring it back together as a whole group in terms of making decisions.

We have a couple background slides. I won't go over those unless somebody wants to. You can go ahead and flip ahead. I'm not going to discuss them in terms of the history of how this was formed. Go ahead and go to the next slide, because I'd rather have some time for questions.

There our charter's detailed there. If anybody has any questions about the charter, of course, it's online on the GNSO site and the working group site. And we'll be glad to talk to you about that, but let me stop there and turn it back to (Jonathan) to see if there are any questions or comments, including if anybody, like (Cheryl) in the working group, would like to add anything.

(Jonathan): Thanks, Chuck, and thanks for the presentation, for the contribution from both of you. Are there any other comments from working group participants, or indeed any questions or comments from those inside the room? This seems to be one of the most popular and well-subscribed working groups in a long while, so it's clearly a significant subject. Any comments or thoughts?

One of the questions I had, Chuck, was when sort of software development process takes place, it typically goes through some form of, I guess, design and then specification, and finally implementation. And sometimes I wonder whether we go through - in our policy-making process, we tend to go from design to implementation, rather than design, specification, implementation.

Has that kind of - how much, if at all, has that sort of software analogy come up in the policy implementation discussion?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. It hasn't come up at all, because we haven't got that far. We're in the preliminary stages of organizing. That's the kind of input, though, that would be very good to document, and now it will be documented in this particular session. So that's what we're looking for.

And once we get past the principles work team that's been established, there are three other sub-teams that are really going to focus on the charter tasks. And that's where that will come in, and that's excellent input. Thanks.

(Jonathan): Thanks, Chuck. I've got, (Alan), your hand up.

(Alan Greenberg): One of the reasons that we're doing definitions is - I must have been - I'm the guilty party that pushed for it. And the reason I pushed for it is just for the reason you mentioned, although worded slightly differently.

We use the term, in ICANN, implementation, just as we do with consensus -- in many different ways. And everyone, when they use the term, in their mind is often thinking of what they mean by implementation. And we need concise definitions that are not used in multiple ways.

And I think (Jeff), in this venue, was the one who introduced the concept of execution and implementation design, or whatever the words we come up with. We need to separate the different tasks that fall under one grab bag of

implementation. If we had ever done that before, we wouldn't be in the problem we're in today, and that's what we're trying to fix.

(Jonathan): That's a good point. I remember. I think the discussion we were having in and around - perhaps at Durban meeting, where we were bringing up this concept of implementation and then execution, and specification, implementation. So there's clearly, as you said, lots of work to flush out the definitions and principles, which is great to see that's going on.

(Alan Greenberg): And just a comment. On good software design, in this case it's almost an iterative process that as you're going along the implementation, you find things - oops, we didn't design it in time to go back and do it. So...

(Jonathan): Yeah, well again, I mean, there's clearly a whole school of software development which nowadays uses iterative design. It's not necessarily exclusive to this (unintelligible) steps as well. Okay, great. Any other comments or questions for the Policy & Implementation Working Group? Not too controversial as yet, then.

All right, so I think that gives us the opportunity to call that session to a close, so we'll close the recording there and pause for a moment.

END