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

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks and start immediately with the next which follows neatly on in some ways as (Steve) and others have probably recognized.

So we'll welcome, thank you, welcome Chuck Gomes to who's going to lead us through the next session which is on the work of the Policy and Implementation Working Group. Over to you Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. And let me start by also thanking my co-chair Jay Scott Evans and the two co-chairs of this working group, Michael Graham and all of the (Gaume). It's been a great leadership team to work with.

In fact let me complement the whole Working group because I think it's just a great group of people that have been very productive. So I thank all of them for that.

Notice in contrast to what Steve DelBianco said this working group is called Policy and Implementation not policy versus implementation.

And that was a decision that came out of the - out of the GNSO actually. We talked - it was talked about on the council and so forth. It originally was versus instead of and but it was intentionally changed.

And I think so far at least the direction we're going we really believe it should be that way and that'll come out in some of the principles that we'll talk about in the working group if you go to the session later this week.

Okay next slide please, recent developments. We have in fact we did several months ago request input from all SOs, ACs, SGs and constituencies. And thank - I want to complement two groups that did provide feedback, the ALAC and the registries. I hope that others still will. We'd still like to have that.

Most recently we had - we formed two sub teams to develop working definitions and principles upon which the working group's efforts would be based.

The Working Group has adopted the proposed working definitions. Some of you were probably in our session in Buenos Aires when we had community discussion on that.

And if you're anxious to see the, how the working group handled that the working group definitions are available. And it includes a commentary on why we did or did not take some of the recommendations that were given from the public input there.

A copy, a printed copy if you don't have access otherwise to the working definitions that we've adopted is available. You can see (Mary) has them over there. If you'd like one of those please come up and pick one.

And there's also a copy of the principles that aren't quite yet finished and but are pretty close at least from a working group point of view.

Understand that in both cases those are subject to change as we continue our work so that as we discover things maybe we didn't get quite right there or we received input from any of you or anybody in the community we can - we can refine those and make them better. Next slide please.

The - I guess I just said the first bullet there so I don't need to repeat that. There is a link that probably not very many of us can read on the screen there. But the - Marika maybe you can just tell them how to find the links to those since that's almost illegible at least for me.

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks. Thanks okay. Next slide please.

Next steps, we are going to review the input that we receive here in Singapore on the working definitions and principles.

We have a Working Group meeting that's open to everyone that's scheduled for 3:30 on Wednesday for 90 minutes.

We hope to see some of you there and receive feedback back like we did in Buenos Ares.

Another thing that we're doing is we're getting ready to do the jump in to the meat of our work, the main tasks of what we are charged with doing.

And so we're in the process right now of forming three sub teams that we'll be working we hope simultaneously on those main tasks.

We're tentatively setting a target day of before the Los Angeles meeting in June to have an initial report. And so we throw that out there at least as a tentative date that we've got in mind. Next slide please.

Here you can see the three sub teams that are just in formation now. And by the way if you're not a part of the Working Group right now and like to join that's still a possibility.

And if any one of these three sub teams particularly interest you that may be a motivation to join with us and as we do the main part of our work.

I'm not going to read through each one of those but I'll - we'll leave it up there just for a minute or two if you want to skim through those and in case you have any questions about those teams.

By the way just a little historical point one of the first things we did as a working group is we had a sub team that developed a work plan. And these three sub teams came out of that work plan that was developed as our first main task.

Okay next slide. Any questions or comments?

Again I encourage you if you can, I know there are lots of conflicts in the schedule but if you can join us on Wednesday at 3:30 we'd welcome you. And there will be opportunity for lots of input there.

We will probably primarily talk about the principles because we've spent quite a bit of a time talking about the definitions in Buenos Ares. But you're - it - we will talk a little bit about the definitions as well because both of these documents are foundations to the main work that we're just getting ready to do. Thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. Just a quick - one quick comment and a question it was a very small point. You said LA in June. I'm sure you mean LA in November.

Chuck Gomes: No I should have said London in June, my mistake. Oh it is LA?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Oh that's a much more realistic date. As co-chair I really appreciate that correction.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. And then the second is this was one - a group that was uniquely kind of oversubscribed or I mean that's probably not correct, over-subscribed. But there was a lot of interest in the group. Has that been retained?

Chuck Gomes: There are probably about half of I think in the neighborhood of 35 people that are very active. A portion of the remaining are still participating sporadically.

There are a few that haven't been able to participate at all. But I would say overall considering other working groups that I've been involved with, the percentage of people actively participating is quite strong.

And again the caliber of the work from my opinion has been very good. And that includes several people on this council right now.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. John?

John Berard: John Berard. Chuck is there a seat - a council liaison to this Working Group?

Chuck Gomes: Yes there is.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: (Unintelligible) right here.

(John Sommers): (John)…

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

(John Sommers): …(Summers). (Brian) and I are co-liaison with the (unintelligible) thing.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks. (Thomas)?

(Thomas):   Chuck I have one question for you. And that is you know the staff paper that have been produced on policy and implementation or at that time it was still called policy versus implementation, do you see the - this group deviating from the recommendations they're in or is that more or less congruent at least until this point in time?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Thomas, Chuck again. It's too early to tell whether they're - you know, that is one of the key documents that will be used in a sub term team work that I referred to there.

Again all we've done so far is to do the preparatory work, the work plan, the definitions and then the principles. And the principles are really key. That's why it'd be good to have participation from the community on Wednesday because that's the foundation of that work including what we will do with this staff work that was done.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika and then (Alan) and then Avri.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Maybe just to clarify it was actually a staff discussion paper. It was actually more intended to start the conversation and, you know, throw out some ideas and questions. It wasn't necessarily, you know, specific recommendations or staff recommendations as such, so just wanted to clarify that.

Jonathan Robinson: But I thought it was an excellent paper though. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. So in other words if we deviated from it you're going to be on our backs is that right?

Jonathan Robinson: (Alan)?

(Alan):   I'm going to hazard a guess at the outcome. And I think we're going to end up with something quite different from that staff paper.

Because we're taking a very strong position that just because it's in implementation doesn't mean they're all - there aren't policy components. And that's very different from the path being followed till now also something that may be very difficult to implement. But you forget the word implement to build.

But I think the direction we're going right now is quite different with a lot of real serious implications.

So I would suggest people look at our principles and tell us whether we're nuts or not.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Alan), Chuck again. One of the principles that we've I think come to pretty good agreement on right now is that the multi-stakeholder model doesn't stop when you switch from policy and go into implementation.

And that's one of the reasons why the GNSO pretty much and the council as a whole decided to change the name from policy versus implementation to policy and implementation.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm sorry (Alan) I'm not sure, did you get to make your point (Alan)? Yes sorry Avri?

Avri Doria: Basically not that much more to add except that the switch from policy or implementation to policy and implementation means that it's a different - taking a different direction and will come out somewhat different.

Jonathan Robinson: And looks like the last word falls to Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey for the transcript. I just want to raise this one issue. It's related to but not quite exactly the Working Group itself.

But we've got a bit of an implementation backlog right now. We've got IRTPP that isn't fully implemented, IRTPC that isn't implemented at all, Thick Whois that's coming up plus a whole bunch more.

And Marika introduced (Steven Chen) who's a new staff person that's going to be working on that a lot.

But we as the council I think also need to stay focused on this. Because it's all very well and good for, you know, dozens of volunteers to work for a year, an hour, a week, blah, blah, blah, write a big report.

But if the stuff doesn't get implemented then we're not done yet. And so I just want to amplify the need for us as a body to stay focused on that and help it along. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika if I can just clarify one thing because (Steve) is actually not going to be responsible for the implementation of those policies. That's really in the GDD team and I think it's a very good conversation to have tomorrow with (Silas) where (Steve) is going to focus is more implementation related questions as part of policy deliberations and also coordination when it comes to handover or when GDD is implementing if they have, you know, specific questions linking back to the policy development process. So I just wanted to clarify that.

Mikey O'Connor: I was just trying to give the man, you know, a little more to do that's all, just trying to help.

Jonathan Robinson: All right that seems like a natural end to that session. Thank you very much Chuck and members of the Working Group.

(Steve):   Jonathan one more point on that could…

Jonathan Robinson: (Steve)?

(Steve):   In yesterday's session at the NCUC was on a panel where we discussed this notion of principles. And Chuck this is for your group policy implementation.

So the notion of principles are necessary but not really sufficient to say whether we really solved the policy implementation question.

We talked about use cases yesterday. If we come up with several use cases of what happens when the policy coming out of the PDP smashes into the reality of national laws that are in conflict consensus policies, contract provisions that are in conflict and all that was unanticipated as a policy but it happens in implementation I mean I would encourage a dozen or so of these use cases in addition to your principles and make sure that whatever we come up with will survive real world uses cases that we could even model on problems that we've had in the past.

If we just look back to the past five years at every time we had gosh, really troubling implementation problems where it was tough to discern what the original policy coming out of the PDP was those are the use cases we have to solve for and that's even more important than principles.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Steve), Chuck again. And good suggestion. Use cases are a good way to I think strengthen the work that comes out.

One of the principles we have too is that when issues like this whether it be something we didn't anticipate or some new policy issue that comes up, one of the principles that we have in there is that in cases like that even if you're in an implementation phase that should come back to the policy-making body so that that's properly dealt with.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks again Chuck. Thanks (Steve). If we could close the recording on that session and prepare for the next one.