

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Policy Development Process (PDP)  
Operating Model  
Sub-Team  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Monday 06 July at 1400 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee Policy Development Process (PDP) Operating Model Sub-Team meeting on Monday 06 July 2009 at 1400 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-omg-20090706.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#july>

(All MP3's and transcriptions can be found on the calendar page).

**Present:**

J. Scott Evans - PPSC WG chair  
S Subbiah - Individual  
Jonne Soininen - Individual  
Alexei Sozonov  
Alexey Mykhaylov  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO) - ALAC chair

**Absent apologies:**

Caroline Greer - Registry c.  
Thomas Roessler

**Staff:**

Ken Bour – Policy consultant  
Liz Gasster – Senior Policy Counselor  
Glen de Saint Gery – GNSO Secretariat

J. Scott Evans: I guess you're going to have to, because I think she's dropped off.

Ken Bour: Okay. No problem. So on the call we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jonne Soininen, and...

Coordinator: Please pardon interruption, Mr. Subbiah now joins.

Ken Bour: Okay, great. Thank you. And J. Scott Evans, our Chair. Subbiah has just joined us. And for staff we have Ken Bour and Liz Gasster. Am I missing anybody? All right, it's all yours J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Well I mean I think we just need to start - let's bring everybody up to date Ken of where we were.

Ken Bour: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: And I'm just going to leave it to you because you were driving the (pen). The last meeting we had was an in-person meeting. It was myself, Ken, Graham Chynoweth, and I'm sorry I cannot remember (Johann)'s last name, but we were all - we all met in person. We worked through I think the first three paragraphs?

Ken Bour: Well we went through all of Sections 2 and 3.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. So now we're on Section 4.

Ken Bour: Right. So what I would suggest just to do real - I'm not sure if everybody noticed, but the wiki has been updated based on the work that was done in Sydney. And so all of Section 2 now is completed. I think we had actually done Section 2.1 on a prior call, but all there estimated of the 2.2 team member roles and responsibilities, 2.3 use of subteams, and the whole section on 3.0, which had to do with norms -- 3.1, 3.2, all of that material has been gone over again.

All of the notes have been eliminated, and just outline sections now remain. I think we don't have maybe just one remaining note that I stuck in there when I was going through it. I was unsure about something. In fact, that might be a good place to start. If you look at Section 3/4 consensus, what we have left in the outline - there was an item that I wasn't sure what to do with folks, and you'll notice the note there.

It says I'm not sure about recording of consensus calls. The original subteam -- the one that worked on this particular outline -- included the following

instruction. Quote, at the chair's direction, working group participants must be explicitly associated with each view/position, end quote. And I'm not really sure of what happened during our Sydney discussion, but somehow I didn't have a note attached to that item.

Is it common in working groups for recording of positions? I understand minority positions, but if there's a consensus call does everybody say, you know, I'm in, I'm not in, or I agree, I don't agree? If somebody could clarify that, then I can fix that particular item in the notes.

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott. In my experience, it really depends on how the chair calls for consensus. I've seen a chair call for consensus where everybody's is (opt) in, and then I've seen call for consensus where it's - we're making a call from consensus only those people who were going to opt out reply.

Ken Bour: But what recording - what would the minute taker record as it was - for example if you call for a consensus and you had a listening of ayes or a show of hands or whatever it was that allowed you to conclude that you had consensus, what gets recorded?

J. Scott Evans: Again, it was always at the chair's discretion. Either it was, you know, our call for consensus were (say) having no objections there was - consensus was deemed reached, or it was, you know, x, y, z, or I've seen them poll the group.

Ken Bour: Right, but what...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: ...maybe I'm still not being clear. Would each working group's participant's name be associated with their position? That's the question.

J. Scott Evans: Well again it depends on what the chair asks for. If they ask for the group to be polled, yes.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Subbiah Can I - I - remember - this is Subbiah here. I recall that, I mean the guideline that was given to us in the - from the board's direction mentioned basically only two instances where working groups have been attempted more or less in this style at ICANN. One was the (IDN) policy group and there was another one.

I remember that on the other one in the (IDN) policy group we went, you know, absolutely systematic where on every (weeks) we had everyone positioned. We had the minority views all duly reported, but we didn't have this breakdown. But there was another - at the same time there's this other - at the other kind of associated working group that was going on where they actually (did this) systemically.

At the end of it - at the end of the working group and on the - and the - maybe there were ten calls or whatever, at the end of it, they posted on every single issue that they had a big matrix with who attended as well as who took what position in each, you know, (position that was) required. It was like a big complicated matrix. But the - somebody had bothered to do that. You know, it's just...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: Right. So would it be okay guys if we did this on that subject? I'll remove the note and simply change this language to say that at the Chair's direction, working group participants may be associated explicitly with each view position since it sounds like the chair gets to decide, right?

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: Yes.

Liz Gasster: I'd be inclined to, you know, think of it as something that the group could decide. The chair may have to ultimately call the question if people view it differently. I think it makes sense to have the flexibility to record individuals if needed, or if the issues are sufficiently complex or nuanced where you'd want to differentiate where people stood. But I think it's also okay in the spirit of consensus not to push that in the absence of a need, because I think it could potentially polarize viewpoints where that's not necessary.

I do want to point out that we've been using working groups quite a bit. It's not just the two that (Tobiah) mentioned. Those were probably the first instances of it.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Liz Gasster: But they're very frequently used today, and, you know, at - typically it's not an issue. And if there is consensus, it's just, you know, it's the consensus in that - or if there is a minority they record the minority. I don't think typically in working groups it's found to be necessary.

But they're - I agree that there could be instances where it would be more than, you know, very useful to do. So I do kind of think it should be optional and not required, and that there could be instances where it's actually not a good idea.

Jonne Yes, this is (Johann). I do agree with that. I think that we should avoid too much process and not at least having every instance that has to be recorded. I think most of the times just the - that consensus was there (is enough). So the matter of fact that there was decision is enough. And this (in) very rare occasions where (unintelligible) explicit the kind of (sanding) should be recorded. But maybe the - having that possibility is useful.

Ken Bour: Okay I think I've captured some notes here. I'm actually editing the wiki as we go along here, so I'll capture it. Good. That helped me with that one, and so I would suggest that we slide on down to Section 4, logistics and requirements.

((Crosstalk))

CLO: (Unintelligible) just before you do, I think it's important when you're rewording -- I haven't refreshed; perhaps you've already done it -- to just to capture that it is as much (once) the chair goes through the process an individual or a subset of individuals in a working team needs to be able to have their name recorded against something.

Even though hey may not be putting up a main - a minority view per se, their minority view may not be a formed document. That's simply a statement that says we or me want, my name or our names, recorded against these outcome.

Subbiah Okay. I also wanted to add something (Tobiah). I have no issue with the notion of the, you know, when needed, having it explicit, and more explicit and when not so needed. That's fine; just leave it as consensus. But my concern is that (while) - what - just - can anyone point out what would happen if that is in conjunction - that happens in conjunction with 3.5, minimum representation at a meeting?

The first point (unintelligible) working groups are intended to operate on a consensus model versus voting, then generally no circumstances (unintelligible) quorum should be defined and imposed.

So if there is no quorum and there's just, you know, no defined or imposed in the circumstances -- they just one or two people out of a very large group of a people who are on the - nominally on the committee of the working group, if there's very few people at the meeting and also we are not reporting, you

know, we've chosen to not record explicitly on what everyone says, then the - is it possible that my understanding that the current document allows an instance where there could be maybe 15 people on the committee. Or - and then at some meeting, there's two people or three people there, make a decision and it's called a consensus and it just moves on without a revisitation?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. We included something at the bottom in the next paragraph of 3.5 called minimum representation at a meeting.

Man: Yes, that's what I'm reading from the...

Ken Bour: Yes.

Man: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Generally a call for consensus should be to the whole group...

Man: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...not to any subgroup that shows up at a call.

Man: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: So if a group got together at a call and they worked on this document, and this group came to an agreement on what this document should be, then it would have to go out to the whole group for a call (unintelligible) for consensus.

Man: Okay. All right. I mean it's - I mean that was certainly very reasonable, but I'm just hoping that the document itself, you know, I mean the - right now this section captures that idea (unintelligible). You know, I haven't...

Jonne 11:00 Yes, I think - I agree. I don't know if we had it somewhere, but maybe that - on the decision making we should just say where the decision making should take place.

So for instance in (unintelligible) it's only the working group mailing list that's allowed to do (decisions) because that's seen as the representation of the whole group, whereas in some other organizations like (unintelligible) the meeting that just can do the decisions, and the mailing list is something extraordinary.

So we should (unintelligible) where we - where do we want to do the decisions. And from J. Scott's comment that we should do the decisions with all group and not for a subset of group that happens to be in the meeting, that would indicate to the direction of having the (decisions) done on the mailing list.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: ...trying to capture that. Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, and Liz correct me if I'm wrong. That's how we've done the (PPSC). I mean even when we've had a call where the majority of the people on the call are of like mind, we still send it out to the group.

Liz Gasster: Right. And there's - at the council level took they tend to - they'll hold something over if there isn't a big - at another working group if there isn't large representation. Or even if there is, just to allow sort of type it in, put it in quotes or in the highlights and then give it another session at least for everyone to have a chance to review at the next meeting.

Jonne The other thing is that we might want to write down what is the time given to - the general time given to our decisions so if that would be a week or something like that.



But one thing that just to keep in mind we don't want to cripple the process by saying that every decision have to be made to mailing list. So (maybe) - because that is also a thing kind of like that if everything that even resembles a decision can only be done on the mailing list you would have after ever meeting about what 20 decisions to be...

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Jonne ...done during the next week.

Ken Bour: Okay this is Ken. I've recorded a couple of notes, one in the consensus section that says consensus calls should always involve the entire working group. And then in 3.5 I added another bullet, which I thought we did have it. I must have missed it somehow. But the idea is decisions made by subgroups should always be shared with a larger team. Yes, I seem to recall that being discussed in Sydney, but I - it doesn't appear here so I added it.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Jonne Yes, but I think that this (unintelligible) is now not about that. The decision should be shared but that the kind of - or the information should be shared, but the decision should be made always by the bigger team. I think that was what J. Scott said. But maybe J. Scott can speak for himself.

J. Scott Evans: No, I think that it should be shared Ken. And on that bullet - and I would just, you know, you can make a cross reference back up, and any consensus call should, you know, just reiterate it again.

Ken Bour: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: But you say any subgroup decision needs to be shared with a larger group, and any call for consensus on any decision made by a subgroup needs to be made to the larger group or - and then refer it back up.

Ken Bour: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Okay we're at 4.0?

Ken Bour: Yes sir. So this first bullet was to deal with session - just session planning. General meeting logistics was the first bullet. And then we had some comments. And so the general idea here is to - and - is to decide what stays in the outline and what comments we want to keep and what comments we want to delete.

J. Scott Evans: Who's (TR)?

Ken Bour: (Thomas Russler) I believe. Well would it be helpful for me to read these comments or something?

J. Scott Evans: I'm reading them as - is everybody on the wiki?

CLO Yes.

Man: I even printed myself (unintelligible) (wiki text).

Liz Gasster: (It)'s printed the wiki.

Man: It's possible.

CLO I understand it's possible. I'm just wondering how you're doing the (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Well I've got the pen out.

- Jonne Ken has the pen. I'm - I don't want to mix up the system.
- J. Scott Evans: I mean some of the comments, you know, seem to be (so) - I'm not so sure (unintelligible). I mean I guess (Thomas') point on teleconference medium and, (you know) personally I think Adobe's Connect is the better environment, but I don't think we should, you know, hoop anybody in. I think we should...
- CLO (Unintelligible) (handle this).
- Ken Bour: Well my recommendation would be to delete the first comment, which (is)...
- CLO (Unintelligible) I don't know what's happened.
- Ken Bour: Okay. Just sort of following our general plan in Sydney, I recommend that we delete the first comment unless anybody has an objection or thinks that there's some point there that we need to capture.
- J. Scott Evans: No. I do think that maybe you can take that comment and somehow get it into medium of teleconference service -- that thing -- and say that, you know, once you select one for the group, it should remain (consistent).
- Subbiah Or another question is, do we have kind of a standardized ICANN working environment, which means basically this -- the ICANN - whatever teleconference need - operator they use and whatever online meeting tool they use and just refer that - well those are used unless explicitly kind of otherwise decided.
- J. Scott Evans: Yes, I think that's probably the best way to go. Liz - because you all do sort of have a standardized...
- Liz Gasster: Well let me say this -- I would not name a brand of products, because that can always change. But I do think that it - useful for this group that is looking

at, you know, standards and consistencies across working groups and what works to describe what you think it optimal or beneficial, because what we've been doing to date is more experimental than defined. And it's grown up in an ad hoc way based on people's experiences and what works.

For example the Adobe Connect was something that I believe the (ALAC) really embraced first, and, you know, we found it useful too. Which isn't to say that, you know - I guess the point is it's the job of this group to help define what's really useful. And I wouldn't worry about the names of tools, but I would think it's appropriate to describe the kinds of tools that should be used consistently or optionally at the direction of the group.

You know, if you're at a (unintelligible) stage where you're not looking at a document, it may be premature to use Adobe, but if people find it useful because there's so many participants and you want to manage the call using the tool, I think that that kind of discretion should be available. So I wouldn't worry about what's been done in the past or defining something that has to always be used, but I do think it's appropriate to mention and categorize the things that you think should be institutionalized or at least available as a menu for the team to select from.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Subbiah Yes, so (unintelligible) I would like to say that for instance we could put something there that they - kind of like that we use the ICANN provided teleconference. And kind of like electronic meeting service as defined, or something similar.

But then as requirements there should be that it's available for the - that it's generally available without a license for the user. And kind of like works most operating systems, if we want -- that we don't have situations like somebody wants to use HP Halo, which one of those rooms costs \$1 million or something like that or \$500,000 -- and not everybody has one -- so that the

cool (unintelligible) don't become kind of the deciding factor of who can join the meeting.

But I agree that we shouldn't name any names of - because those can change. But I think that is this the right assumption that ICANN is working towards having a staff supported kind of standardized quote/unquote so an ICANN prepared online meeting system, so the teleconference plus something like Adobe Connect.

Liz Gasster: It's the intent to offer it like we are today and to enhance tools as they become available. But specific guidance on what would work best is welcome.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, so I think what we need to do is we - rather than name systems talk about characteristics.

Liz Gasster: Oh.

J. Scott Evans: So one of the things we know is the preferred teleconference service is ICANN, and...

Jonne Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...it needs to have the ability to record the call, correct, in the mp3 format...

Liz Gasster: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...it - also it needs to be of no additional cost to participants...

Liz Gasster: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...you, you know, also there - so that's - I think for the teleconference that's about the minimums, right? It needs to be - well I guess we would say

generally available of little or no - of no cost to participants and ability to record mp3 format of the call. So those are three minimums.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: And we would say additionally the, you know, there needs to be the availability of an online tool such as Adobe Connect, you know, for example. And then just - let's give the qualities about an online tool we want -- the ability to post and edit documents in real time, the ability to communicate and chat in real time...

Man: Oh.

J. Scott Evans: ...the ability to manage the call, vote, and discussion queues, because those are all things about Adobe that I found extremely valuable.

Liz Gasster: Yes, yes.

J. Scott Evans: And I - I'm just saying, you know, do you see what I'm saying, Ken? Just...

Ken Bour: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...broad minimum qualities that any tool should have.

Ken Bour: Yes, I've been jotting notes in this section as you've been talking through them, and I'll reorganize them after I get...

J. Scott Evans: What you're just doing is saying, you know, to somebody - when you look at a tool or something, if you're not going to use ICANN (as such) you've got to at least have this...

Man: Oh.

J. Scott Evans: ...if it makes it more manageable for the group.

Ken Bour: Right. Yes.

J. Scott Evans: And I think you need to add again in the online tool that it's no cost to the participant...

Ken Bour: Right.

J. Scott Evans: ...and it is easily available, and easily - I don't know (unintelligible) to say interoperable or, you know, it works on most standard computers, something to that extent...

Ken Bour: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...you know. So you're basically saying you can't pick something that people have to go and download \$10,000 worth of software on a computer.

Jonne Yes, and it works only on some special configuration or something like that. So...

Woman: Yes.

Jonne ...basically it has to support most of - most modern operating systems in the balance of reason and kind of like...

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Jonne ...the useful tool and stuff like that.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. And I - and then the next bullet - so I think those are - with respect to the technology Ken, do you think you've got enough there to sort of...

Ken Bour: I do. Yes, I think we're good there on the medium.

CLO (Unintelligible) (Sheryl) here. Just on the tool, if it may not be an essential, but some tools have easier archive and replay or record. Others don't. If you're doing a lot of work using these online tools, it really is handy particularly if you've got subgroups working. If - at people's own leisure you can log in and look at what's happened during a - that subteam's activity. I would think that's a fairly desirable trait.

Ken Bour: Yes I'll slash recording with archiving so we'll have both of those slots there.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Now we've got Avri's comment. I (agree) that innovation should be allowed, and I think that can come out because...

CLO Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...we've done that by just saying you've got to have these minimums.

Man: Oh.

J. Scott Evans: And so it's got more than that - more bells and whistles, that's fine.

Man: Oh.

Ken Bour: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: All right? Times -- I think reasonable selection. I think (ETC) is good, but I think there needs to be a comment there about rotation.

CLO Oh...

((Crosstalk))



J. Scott Evans: ...Time Zone.

((Crosstalk))

CLO ... (feel) that's useful.

J. Scott Evans: No there should be an effort to make a fair and balanced rotation of times.  
(Unintelligible) would disagree, but I mean I know - I mean...

Man: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: ...it needs to sort of - the pain needs to be even.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...happy (vote) to that.

Ken Bour: Yes I've added that.

J. Scott Evans: I think the thing on length and duration is two hours maximum. I think it's pretty reasonable. What do other people think? As a suggestion, you know, I think two hours is pretty much at the...

Subbiah I think that maybe this is the way we could (unintelligible). If you say two hours is the default unless that - itself, you know, no one objects and people decide it's important and go longer or something.

J. Scott Evans: I mean it would be a suggestion best practice that no more than two hours...

Man: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...unless the entire - unless there's a consensus that the call needs to be longer.

Ken Bour: Okay. I think we, you know, again I'll - when I write this section I'll flush that out. But I think it's okay as - for now. Yes the idea here is just to make - we just want the working group to think a little bit about the kinds of calls it's going to have and what lengths and durations are typically going to work for the group.

And so, you know, this expectation of no more than two hours might be what they would choose, but they might say no more than one hour. I mean that's also possible, right?

J. Scott Evans: That's true.

Ken Bour: Yes, okay. And the same thing on frequency. I mean they should pick a frequency or variable however they want to do it.

J. Scott Evans: That's correct.

CLO Yes. And it's more a matter - I think there's two points where these are extremely important pieces of data that these sorts of metrics. One is when people are in fact deciding to join, not to join, or to commit or not to commit, how much of a commitment they're going to be making.

But you do need to leave the group plenty of I guess individual group choice, because there'll be times where you will want to meet several times a week to finish something important off, but underneath a shorter box of time.

Ken Bour: Sure.

J. Scott Evans: And again, with all these there's - maybe we should be some sort of chapeau language that just says, you know, flexibility...

Woman: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...innovation is, you know, is encouraged, However at a minimum - these are the minimums and then do this stuff.

Ken Bour: Yes, we'll have something at the very top in both of the documents that says, you know, nothing in any of this material should be considered hard and fast rule unless it's really stated that way. And...

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Ken Bour: ...otherwise it's all - yes, it's just guideline.

CLO (Unintelligible) sharing of the pain, whilst believe me I understand the principle, certainly the experience in the at large advisory committee, not so much the work groups, is that they require to agree on a single point and time so that their volunteers can better manage their lives. They all know that at a given day at a given time and a given amount of time is going to be a commitment problem for the overall meeting. So sometimes the group itself might prefer not to share the pain around, but say this is a time there's going to be.

J. Scott Evans: Well and I think that that can be stated. It can be...

CLO Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...you know, again. I mean...

CLO It's to meet the needs of the group that's meeting.

J. Scott Evans: Right. Ken I see you have a comment here, and I agree. It would seem to me that that should be in the charter -- duration of the work team?

Ken Bour: Right.

Woman: Oh.

Ken Bour: Yes, and the - so the - yes, I was making that comment because in fact I know that it is over there in charter guidelines. But if for some reason it wasn't in the charter...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: I think you should address it and I think you should also address it...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: ...they can meet that timeline. Right? There are two situations. One, it's not addressed and it should've been. And two is, when they get into the work they realize they're not going to meet the deadline.

Man: Oh.

J. Scott Evans: In both of those situations they need to go back to their sponsoring organization, correct?

Ken Bour: Right. Yes.

J. Scott Evans: So I just think we should cover both of those situations.

Ken Bour: Okay. And I'm trying to think how here. So in the duration schedule, what we - yes, what I should probably just write there is this will normally be...

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Ken Bour: ...covered in the charter, right?

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Ken Bour: So we won't - I'll take the six months, twelve months out and say...

Woman: Yes.

Ken Bour: Yes, this normally expect - normally the duration will be contained in the charter; however, it is not an expense - then if not, then the working group should...

J. Scott Evans: (Unintelligible) first orders of business.

Ken Bour: Yes, it should communicate with the sponsor.

J. Scott Evans: Likewise in the - likewise if the working group should determine it will be unable to meet the timeline set forth in the charter, blah, blah, blah.

Ken Bour: Yes, I'm wondering if that's covered somewhere down...

J. Scott Evans: Can we just note it? And if it is we'll let...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: Yes, okay we'll do. That's a good idea. Hang on, let me just flip back to where I was. Yes, okay. And...

CLO Because I'm thinking of a couple of experiences here in the Australian telco industry where the regulator in government have required a particularly desired end point or timeline. And when, you know, the working groups have got right down to it, it's simply unable to be done.

What's important is early in a timely manner getting back to, in this case the regulator. But in the model we're looking at, the sponsoring organization

(detach) (unintelligible) some trigger points where a report back at various milestone or phases is - I'll use the term mandatory, but desirable even if the report back is, "We're on track, thank you very much." Just so things don't become a surprise at the end.

Jonne Yes, so is the kind of like idea basically that every working group have - should have a kind of like up to date work plan with clear milestones when they report back? And that's of course true.

Ken Bour: Okay I've captured that - both those points.

CLO

And occasionally what we've done in the (unintelligible) environment here in Australia where all policy in fact is formulated by policy workgroups, which then come back up to the board for the board to either accept or say, "Can you go back and try that again," the workgroups themselves need to know that occasionally -- in this case, the sponsoring organization -- is the equivalent to the board of our (EDA) can say, "No you're going to have to put another two or three months on that, because you're still not meeting the needs as we envisaged."

So even though there's a clear separation from where the policy is developed as such, it can be sent back to the workgroup, and some cases even double the original timeline.

J. Scott Evans: Okay Ken what is your comment with regards to agenda?

Ken Bour: You know, I don't remember what I was thinking at that time. I'm prepared to delete that comment quickly. You know, I think it's sufficient here under session planning that we just deal with the subject or topic of agenda.

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Ken Bour: I think some of the comment came from Thomas. It's somewhere in an email I think he wrote some information about the - what - that may be where I came from, but - and then I guess Avri's comment was dealing with mine, right?

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Ken Bour: And I think we're fine on that, right -- we're going to provide some comments at the very outset of the document that says keep in mind that flexibility and good judgment will always be preferable to anything written in these guidelines. All right and so we can take that out. And so we're down to...

J. Scott Evans: Minutes.

Ken Bour: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Well we know of course - we've already suggested that they use the teleconference services that has the ability to record mp3 recording, right?

Man: Oh.

J. Scott Evans: So this would have to do with in-person meetings where they're not - there's not an ICANN assigned transcriber, correct?

Ken Bour: Yes, or it's - I think even when we had - when we had recordings but not transcriptions, it was either me or - and one of the staff members, you know, would try to summarize. So I always called mine - what did I call them -- summarize and action meeting, you know...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Ken Bour: ...summary and meeting notes and action items, that kind of thing, right?

Man: Oh.

Jonne Yes, so - this is (Johann). I think the - also that we need some sort of meeting minutes, not only transcriptions or mp3s, because those are like - going through mp3s that will take you quite some time, but really something that summarizes -- excuse me -- what was decided what will be the - done next, who was present in the meeting, and things like that. Just as kind of a meeting report -- so what was done in the meeting rather than...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: It's Liz. Can I jump in on that?

J. Scott Evans: Yes, Liz.

Liz Gasster: One thing I want the group to think about is - so one challenge that we're having in working groups right now is that we have many more working groups running at the moment than we've typically had let's just say in the (GNSO) related work historically.

So right now (GNSO) related working groups -- I think we had close to 13 different working groups -- maybe 15. And so my point is really that staff is pretty burdened by trying to do - well first of all the transcripts and the reportings, those are kind of standardized today. And there is staff work associated with arranging for the recording, posting the recording, and on the transcript - reviewing the transcript and posting it, but they are less burdensome than - and we tend to do action items...

Man: Oh.

Liz Gasster: ...the most minimal action items anyway.



But I am concerned about stealing written minutes across 13 or 15 working groups. And I believe that we need to think about this a little bit holistically, because there is quite a burden here that typically - like when I use transcripts I find it very quick actually to run through a transcript as long as it's written, and find what I need.

I think we need to really be sure about what we're asking for here and what kind of staff requirements then have to get...

J. Scott Evans: I, you know, I think that what we should say is that, you know, I think that what Ken has pointed out and everyone's pointed out a -- a summary and actions items is the level of detail that needs to be provided. I think that, you know, we need to put down a guideline that you shouldn't assume that staff is going to be responsible, and that (unintelligible) appoint a scribe for each call that will be, you know - and then what do you think, others? I mean...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: ...(INCA) we appoint a script and it kind of rotates around.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...I think that maybe the more - maybe the bigger, more important working groups going to have staff support as a scribe, but in general I think that a volunteer scribe or an appointed scribe, whichever - or somehow somebody made to write down the action items and decisions, that's just fine. It doesn't have to be staff support always.

I would imagine that maybe the more important things or bigger working groups could have even bigger staff support or kind of quote/unquote professional secretary or scribe for the meeting. But most of them most probably have just somebody from the group who's writing down that - what was decided.

J. Scott Evans: And I think Ken one of the things we need to do is put a guide that, you know, it should be circulated to the broader group that was in attendance for approval prior to being posted to the public. That's typically what we do. Does that seem problematic?

Jonne I think that's the right approach. I'm like - the minutes have to be kind of a week time or two days or some time basically that the group will silently consent to the contents of those minutes. If there is no objection then they're approved to kind of implicitly.

Liz Gasster: This is Liz. I think that's a good thought. And, you know, we might want to try it in this group a little bit and see how it works and see what kinds of contours we might want to apply.

I think also we might want to talk a little bit about how you would differentiate - I know you were using shorthand to say, you know, one working group's more important than another, but, you know, what the characteristics should be to help differentiate when a participant might be named versus when staff support is requested.

Jonne So I think that should come from the sponsoring organization, that if they kind of like the resources that during the chartering of the working group, it - there is something that is fairly small and maybe not so long in duration, it doesn't necessarily need staff support - that much staff support than something that is more let's say difficult. Or as you really need a impartial scribe there, and so on, or people are not willing for some other reason to take that role, because they need - they are needed in the discussion more.

I think that comes a little bit - depends on case by case. I don't think that there's a general rule. I just use this kind of like saying more important, but it depends on kind of like what is seen as the need of the group or resources from the staff in general.

Liz Gasster: Yes, so that would make senses maybe to add to the charter - have it be specific to a working group that the - that is addressed in the charter. And there might even be other elements that would make it more relevant to have a scribe.

For example if a group divided into three smaller groups let's just say, or two smaller groups it might be useful, because they'll be important to having that detail available for the three subgroups or, you know, there might be additional rationale for when that makes sense.

Jonne Yes, or (unintelligible) but I know like I understand your point totally that well, there's just - there are so many scribes (unintelligible) staff support that the staff can get. I - we end up having 60 working groups. Not everybody is going to have a scribe, and especially if they have sub-working groups and stuff like that. Just going like extreme here.

So I think that should be understandable for everybody, that there are groups that are going to get the support and there are groups that are not.

CLO But if you've got two, depending on the two you're using, you can have some standardization or some templating -- (in inverted commas) -- of how things are recorded. My concern about a scribe being allocated from the group in rotation is the variety of capture with more or less detail, and it's usually the more detail that I find problematic rather than the less detail in these circumstances.

If we're using tools like wikis where a scribe for a, you know, a subgroup of a workgroup can look at what is expected, then they're more likely to say first of all, "Yes I can do that job of scribing to this subgroup, and secondly do it in a way that fits with what is currently best practice."

Occasionally when you switch secretariats for example, you've got to retrain the minute-taker, because the minutes, you know, resemble some sort of major piece of novel work as opposed to what the group has been working with -- just conventions such as using initials or not. You can waste an awful lot of time retraining the scribes to get them back to a standardized convention if we're using templates that makes it a lot easier as well.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Just a comment. (Subnet) - I've been trying to capture ideas that they could mention here. Just once again, I - we - my sense of this document is what we're trying to do it to get the working group to consider a number of things. So I've retitled this section - I took the word minutes out and called it meeting notes.

If they want to do minutes I suppose they could, but what we would be suggesting in the guidelines is that they - that the working group should define what level of notes it needs. How detailed or verbose they should be, how often they should be posted or when they, you know, and that sort of - all - it's - all we want to do I think in our book is to give them all of the questions that they need to think about and decide on rather than tell them that, you know, they should only appoint scribes that are staffed or not staff. I mean they can figure all that out, right?

J. Scott Evans: I think they're going to have to.

Ken Bour: Yes, but I - we don't - our guide book isn't trying to prescribe answers to those questions right? Just to raise the questions.

J. Scott Evans: Right, I think it should - it somehow point out they shouldn't assume that they're going to have staff.

Man: Oh.

J. Scott Evans: In the event they don't have staff to do that role, how are they going to handle it?

Ken Bour: Right.

J. Scott Evans: And that at a minimum, you know, I think in a - at - we need to say the minimum they need to have meeting summaries...

Woman: Oh.

J. Scott Evans: ...and action items.

Ken Bour: Okay so a little - on Subpoint 1, the (comma) centered, I will add - I left the first point in and changed the second one. So the first one says action items. Why don't we say summary and action items slash resolutions, I guess...

Woman: Yes.

Ken Bour: ...should be available within one to two days...

Woman: Yes.

Ken Bour: Do we need (however rough the form)?

J. Scott Evans: No.

Ken Bour: Okay. And then the second one I put meeting notes should be circulated to the entire group within XX period after the session. And again, are we going to recommend how frequently or that they should make that decision when they're - after they've convened?

J. Scott Evans: Well can we set a minimum or, you know, say within...

Ken Bour: No later than one week after the session?

J. Scott Evans: In one week or ten days or something like that?

Jonne Yes I think that there should be some kind of timeline that says that when they are delivered and what time you have to...

J. Scott Evans: I mean it should be (unintelligible) that they can be (quick)...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: ...(an outside date).

Ken Bour: We could say something like meeting notes should be circulated to the entire group on a timely basis, but no later than, one or two days before the next session. See if you're - if the group's meeting weekly, then to say no later than one week after the session isn't...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: ...isn't very helpful, right?

CLO Oh.

Ken Bour: So maybe just to say on a timely basis, but no later - but before the next meeting. So I wrote is meeting notes should be circulated to the entire group on a timely basis, but at least one day before its next session.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Ken Bour: I think we can wordsmith that later. Is that okay?

CLO Yes.

Ken Bour: All right then (Thomas) has a note. The documentation stuff in my mind goes to the same category setting of communication staff responsibility. Does anybody have any comments on that? Should I just delete that comment?

J. Scott Evans: Again it's not staff's responsibility, it's the working group's responsibility, so yes.

Ken Bour: Yes I think (Thomas) has a different point of view...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: ...on that, but we've discussed it and...

J. Scott Evans: Well it's not going to scale if we throw everything on staff unless (we're going to) hire 200 people in the next week, so we just need to take it out.

Ken Bour: Okay, done.

J. Scott Evans: Hey I thought I heard somebody speaking up. (Sheryl) or Liz -- it sounded like a female voice.

CLO Not guilty for once.

Liz Gasster: And me either, but I will comment, which is only to say that I think it would be a good idea to just - because (Thomas) isn't on the call, we can delete it but also perhaps make a note in the minutes or in the wiki that we discussed it and...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Liz Gasster: ...so he can follow the bouncing ball.

Ken Bour: Well just a point of order there. We did a lot of that sort of thing on the - in Sydney, and I did not make an attempt to try to say whose not it was, who got - why it got clobbered or any of that. I - you...

Liz Gasster: Well it's just that...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: It's - (Thomas) wrote the - he (unintelligible) the comment. He can compare version if he wants (unintelligible) we'll have kept the information. You know, we sort of discussed in Sydney that if you're not on the call, those that are on the call can sort of make the decision. And we will resubmit of course the new outline, right, with those comments we'll be out.

Jonne Yes, so I think Ken is right. Let's just go ahead and Thomas will take care of his own comments. This is nothing against Thomas, this just point of order in the kind of like - when we are drafting something, yes we will most probably throw couple of babies with the bath water, but people hopefully take care of their own babies and bring them back if they were important.

Woman: Oh.

Man: So maybe the way to compromise on this Ken is just to put out an email in the next summary or whatever that you'd be putting out. Just to say that, you know, points were considered in general and things we removed and things were added if that people will just go through their own versions to make sure that their points got addressed.

Ken Bour: Yes, that sounds great. I'd be happy to do that. Okay let's see, the next one's draft schedule for whole working group duration post (unintelligible). What does that mean?



J. Scott Evans: It looks like it's some sort of draft timeline for the entire working group duration.

CLO Charter again.

Ken Bour: Yes, I think so. I don't know where that item came from, so I'd be inclined to delete that.

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Ken Bour: Okay. The next note was a note from the assist (unintelligible) subchapter. All right, well we probably don't need a subchapter because we just discussed it. That stuff's going in the charter. All right, so we're down to 42.

J. Scott Evans: Communication.

Ken Bour: I'm going to hit the save button real quick just so I don't...

CLO Oh good we'll all reload now to see what (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Well that's right you can do that. That's a good point. All right, so we're down to 4.2. Okay, this has to do with working group communications.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Mailing lists should all be public. I mean I don't - I - there're always going to be private communications between parties on a group, but the mailing list...

Jonne The mailing list should be public and they should be archived. I agree.

Woman: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: All right, let me take private out. Public and archived. See what's - I think the - some of these rules got added by some members of the subteam, like limits around page and attachment sizes, define stuff lead time...

CLO Well if - again, I think we should look at the three points and not see them as separate items. The mailing list to me is simply another form of collaboration tool. There's been some God-given ranking to it, at least in the group within ICANN that I have most exposures to, that a mailing list is somehow a prioritized decision making tool.

It is a collaboration tool, nothing more, nothing less. And not all cultures are comfortable using all collaboration tools equally, and not one should be a higher priority over the other.

Ken Bour: I'm happy to pick up mailing lists and drop it underneath collaboration tools.

CLO Because then if you're using wikis and those types of other collaboration tools, I'd be worrying about why people are putting huge attachments onto mailing lists at all. They should be being attached to one of the other, you know, the mailing list should not, you know, have large size and download requirements.

You know, there's some places for example where people are - into Africa, you know, they're relying on mobile communication requirements and, you know, just getting the (heather) of the mailing list is all they're going to be doing. And then going to the wiki and not downloading anything but simply accessing it remotely.

J. Scott Evans: Well I think that that's all well and good, but I got to tell you that somewhere in here we need to have some sort of educational time for folks during the establishment of a working group where they get some training on how to use these tools.

CLO Including the mailing lists, which seems like how not to attach huge files.

J. Scott Evans: I mean maybe that's one of the - I don't know (unintelligible). You know, that...

CLO That's...

J. Scott Evans: ...I mean people say, "Well we have a wiki," and blah, blah, blah, and use it, enjoy.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: And it's not that easy. If you're not...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: ...familiar with the (technology).

CLO I couldn't agree with you more. I think that's hugely important.

J. Scott Evans: So I mean communications - maybe we just need to say, you know, there are a variety...

CLO Oh.

J. Scott Evans: ...communications and list them, and then put down, you know, if you're going to use a mailing list, it needs to be public, and it needs...

CLO Oh.

J. Scott Evans: ...to be archived.

CLO Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Collaboration tools such as wikis, you know, blah, blah - and just put some general guidelines.

CLO Well (unintelligible) what we did earlier with the forms of collaboration tools (unintelligible) put in some, you know, some minimum requirements, some best practice. The same thing should go to the mailing list.

Ken Bour: Okay. I'll just make a note to myself there.

CLO): And again, we don't need to be using (proprietary) names.

Ken Bour: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: And I do believe that we do need to say that somewhere that - make (Sheryl)'s point that, you know, if you're using a variety of methods, then any notice needs to go to all those methods. So if you're using a mailing list and a wiki and you're noticing something or - it should go to both places.

CLO Yes.

Ken Bour: All right, so I'm going to - I am going to - my comment there right below the first bullet, which is now not the first bullet, suggests a change in the title -- the communication tools -- to differentiate it from behavior. Anybody object o that.

J. Scott Evans: No.

CLO (Unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Okay.

CLO I think that...

Ken Bour: That's what we're looking for here, right? So...

CLO Yes.

Ken Bour: So I'm going to...

J. Scott Evans: Well I think 4.3 (in the handle) my point.

CLO Yes.

Ken Bour: Yes. Yes I just noticed that...

Man: Yes.

Ken Bour: ...looking ahead.

CLO But that dry run, that ability to have an upfront training, I discovered for example when I first started with a particularly new group, well new to me, not new to Australia. And they are a passionate following of the Open Source world, I could not use the (moodle) tool because my laptop did not have Open Office on it. So it basically forced me to go and download Open Office before I could use the collaboration tool.

Now, I do not have a problem doing that, but it needs to be something that you know about before you do your first work meeting. It is something that you can discover during a training opportunity.

Man: Yes. And I think also that there should be and so I mean like a practical point there. There should not be like a huge list of different tools used in different places because those of us who have to live in a corporate environment some of us have issues of installing stuff on our laptops...

CLO Exactly.

Man: ...because we have to go through our IT people and stuff like that.

CLO Yes.

Man: And when you want something exotic they just going to say no.

CLO Hmm.

CLO Yes. Well, I mean, that is a perfect example, you know. If I had to go and ask someone's permission to download Open Office...

J. Scott Evans: Well then I think that should be a point under communications tools that we reiterate that, you know, we try to use things...

CLO And this way, yes. And that is very much where the whole working in the cloud is better, because it, you know, puts the pressure away from the edges. You just need to access.

And again I keep thinking about the need for people to often be using mobile communications, not even a laptop in some of the regions.

Man: Okay. I tried to capture that under what I have now got as a fourth bullet which I sort of called rules or guidelines associated with communications, for example, email page limits or attachment sizes defines sufficient lead time for people to re-respond, utilize common software applications, avoid requiring any downloadable applets to client computers, that sort of thing.

CLO Hmm.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Man: So when that gets written up, that will just...

CLO Yes.

Man: ...that will be a, yes, a category that says when you are looking at communication and collaboration tools, these are some things to think about.

J. Scott Evans: Right.

CLO Yes.

Man: Okay?

((Crosstalk))

CLO And on that...

Man: Are we okay to move to 4.3?

CLO Yes.

Man: All right.

J. Scott Evans: I am going to have to step away for a minute. I will be right back.

Man: Okay. Upfront determined training needs and modify by first - I am not sure whose note this is. Let's see.

Man: (Ian)?

Jonne: Yes.

Man: I am looking at the three points (today) of (Thomas) and then you and then (Thomas), right. It boils down to basically the comments seem to be, you know, that the training process, whatever has been set up, what has been decided, the issue of who decides it, should it be the group or should it be something higher up, the charter sponsoring association of the group?

You know, that is one of the two things that - and the second thing is there should be a clear cut off timeline. That once you have set up some training, a week or two weeks or whatever it is, you set up, it should be held accountable and that people should not just keep asking for more training and training as a way of stalling everything.

I think - am I right? Those are basically the two points here, right?

Jonne: Right.

Man: Okay. So I think one natural suggestion that was already implicit in the comments here is that, you know, that the charter - that the group that is sponsoring the charter should be the first person who should make up what training is needed and what is not.

Now in the event that they do not do it or if the working group itself decides there is some additional training they need of something, then they may have the opportunity to discuss what they need.

So that solves part of the problem already because you have shifted it up to the level above that they have to decide if you need something. And then only if you need something more then you start talking about it potentially. (See.)

I think clearly that is probably fine. Now then if that is the case, then all we need to deal with here is in the event that the (top) decides they need additional training, then how to get it done, how to get it decided and how to get it accountable so it is finished in a certain amount of time.



Is that pretty much it? If we took care of that then (we) take care of...

Jonne: Well except for Avri's point which is...

((Crosstalk))

Jonne: ...that it is a third concept which says, and I think (Tom) says the same thing. Somebody has to be in a position to say no. And they come from - and each one of them makes a point slightly differently.

Man: Okay. Okay.

Jonne: Avri from the point of view that...

Man: I see.

Jonne: ...yes, people want. She says a huge political component in training.

Man: Okay. Okay.

Jonne: I am not really sure what she is referring to there.

Man: Where there - but there is two ways to stop it, okay. One would be to say well you may have to ask your higher body whether that is allowable or secondly you could stop it by simply putting language in here as minimum guideline things where you say look, no matter how much training you need, it has to be done by X period of time, you know. You know, it (shan't) take longer than that, you know, so that the only way that the time factor can be the falling issue. It is a minimum guideline put in here, right.

Those are the only two ways of - I cannot see of anything else that could, you know, other than saying the (change aside) or something.

((Crosstalk))

CLO            You see, I would like to think that what is standard is the opportunity for training on the tools the group is going to use before the group starts its actual work. Now, that may not be a mandatory requirement for all the work group members because some of those work group members might be highly experienced users of those tools.

But it allows the novice or the new work group member to have an ability to hit the ground running I suppose.

Man:            And I think that one thing that should be kind of like also kind of focus here on the training that the training should be focused on something that is related to the worker (approach). It is not maybe the technical or political or law related knowledge that is needed...

CLO            Hmm. Okay.

Man:            ...to participate in the working group. That is something that people are expected to acquire themselves or use some other...

CLO            Or (op) bringing to the work group because that is a particular reason for being there.

Man:            Yes. But I mean like things like that there is some kind of like - maybe training is too the big of word, but there is some kind of like learning resources whereas to learn to use the tools.

CLO            Hmm.

Man:            And perhaps some training or resources to understand how a working group works which might be just these two documents.

CLO            Hmm.

Man:            But I think that training on anything else beyond that is like Avri says becomes political. And I think what Avri is basically pointing here to is that if you have for instance of you have technical training or training about a subject matter, there is always about the subject matter more kind of opinions.

And one opinions might be very important for somebody and their business and their politics and whatever...

Man:            Yes.

Man:            ...and some other opinion for somebody else. So which is - what are you going to teach there and that would become too difficult I think.

Man:            May I - I understand where that is coming from. I understand that it is a problem. I mean clearly it is a - that could be a huge political component to it.

But here is the other side of the story. I do not know what the answer is but the other side of the story is we - ICANN is a very complicated place. And so if a lot of these things tend to be technical, you know, and so we have a committee on technical stuff and then you have people, I mean that is one of the reasons why I think we are shifting to a working group. Because I think previously the model is below where the GNSO council elected members decided things.

But often on things that they did not really have that much expertise on because you are selected to be in these committees for a variety of reasons - business reasons, political reasons and so on and so forth, not necessarily technical reasons.

So anyway you have a working - it is possible that in the working group level which I have experienced where people are making decisions on the outcome of some technology ultimately, and many people are there to make voice their business opinions, their political views, their moral ideas, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...whatever different aspects of that technology.

However, lots of - many times technology decisions are then made where, you know, there is not even a minimum level of technological understanding but it is making the - some members making that decision.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Later on you talk to them and say well we did not know. I mean, they have, you know, in the basics of that piece of technology, what does one do there? What is the solution?

One solution might be to say look, there could be a presentation or something by an SME, a Subject Matter Expert, who would, you know, you could call that training if you like. But it is more just explaining the basics or at least going through the basics or putting up some documents to make sure that the people what - making decisions are at least minimally aware of the technology...

CLO Hmm.

Man: ...side of things...

CLO Yes.

Man: ...for instance.

CLO Yes, that is briefing opportunities are often a good place for people to work out whether or not they are bringing a particular agenda into the work group that might be best left outside the work group door as well. Because you are not necessarily making any form of furthering of the work group activity in such a briefing or listening to the subject...

Man: Um-hmm.

CLO ...matter expert, but you do get the temperature of everybody else's views. And that can be a very useful exercise in itself.

J. Scott Evans: So where did we end up? This is Jay.

Jonne: Okay. I am trying to...

((Crosstalk))

CLO ...these at the moment, but of course to an (SME) and anybody from China for example and SME is a small to micro enterprise. So...

Jonne: All right. What I have got here so far under training is to the extent that the charter does not identify and/or prescribe, we will wordsmith it later, specific training. And the working group determines that it needs additional education, for example, tools processes, it should identify specific needs, objectives and costs. Is that reasonable?

Man: Um-hmm.

CLO Um-hmm.

Man: Yes.

Jonne: And costs.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Well I think that maybe it should be kind of like rather that there should be a kind of the minimum training material to use and operate the tools of ICANN and understand the processes of ICANN should be provided by the ICANN staff for everybody.

And if people are expected to take the advantage of these kind of this information or resources before joining a working group so that they understand how working groups work and are able to master those tools.

What I am worried about when we say training, that sounds like formal classroom...

CLO Yes.

Man: ...type of training or something formal like that. And I am worried that people start to say well I do not know enough about some - about the DNS. And I want a training solution for myself to learn about DNS and that the - and ICANN should provide that to me.

Well there are multiple free and also for pay solutions for that and people can take those outside of ICANN.

Man: Hmm.

Man: And those are what people are expected to do by themselves. And it is hard for ICANN as an organization the staff, or even (more) to the staff to provide those kind of tools I think.

Jonne:

Okay.

CLO

Getting back to those words of usage that you were just pointing out, with the words like training, scheduling and training wrapped in with the subject matter expertise being shared, you know, for the picking and choosing from, I would prefer terminology that is more talking about awareness raising and briefing rather than the formality of training.

Even when it is coming from things like subject matter experts which for example if you need to know about the ramifications in terms of security and stability that your decisions might be making, then, you know, Lesson Number 1, first work group would be a good idea to have available, whatever briefings are archived that people could take themselves through, or have a what is a DNS five minute promo that everyone gets to the same exposure to.

Man:

May I give an example of what I thought in terms of (greeting). I think we did an excellent, a very good job as far as this committee itself is concerned, how it came about.

Before we - because when we started, one of the things we were all told is these are documents you have to read which is the ICANN Board, you know...

CLO

Yes.

Man:

...policy of what they wanted out of this committee, right, some documents, (unintelligible) many pages. And then there was also PowerPoint presentations, I think something, you know, at one of the meetings, going through the background of why this committee decreed it and some, you know, explanation of background history and, you know, just some information and some documents (I have) yet to read.

And in that process itself, I think that even if it is not, you know, complete or, you know, full blown, that the people want to be part of this committee, intend to be (unintelligible) business or whatever reason are aware of what's there to be learned. At least so that once they are finished with that at least they realize that some parts they do not know they can talk to other people on the committee and learn it along the way.

I mean, and that would be helpful, huh? We did a reasonably good job on that. And that is what I have in mind when I think...

CLO            Hmm.

Man:            ...in terms of - so that people coming in before they get into decision making have some knowledge of what they need to know and more importantly maybe know what they do not know. They have some idea of what, you know...

CLO            Yes.

Man:            ...the stuff out there they do not know.

J. Scott Evans:    Why don't we just not call it training, call it informational briefing?

CLO            Yes. I am much more comfortable with that.

J. Scott Evans:    And then just - (just) a variety of subject matters can they - you might cover such as historical background, operations of work groups, technological tools, those kinds of things and just give, you know, you need to (decide) what you are going to do, but these are some suggestions.

Jonne:           Um...

J. Scott Evans:    Types of information briefing...



((Crosstalk))

Jonne: Well um...

J. Scott Evans: ...to consider.

Jonne: So you want to re-title it - so I am trying - I am trying to make sure that we include - I understand that we do not want working groups to be asking for lots of training, right, and that is (Thomas') point that I have not...

Man: Yes.

Jonne: ...deleted yet, but we have kind of captured.

What I did was I changed that second, or that first bullet to training/education/briefings. I do not know whether - the - and then the first bullet says to (except) that the charter does not specify and so forth, then it needs - okay, then identify specific needs, objectives and I added in parens how it will impact the working group's objectives and costs if applicable.

The next bullet would say - sub-bullet, any training must be approved by the sponsoring organization. Then I added a note, this training - training beyond tools or working group processes will generally not be approved, for example, general technical seminars. I know this is not exactly what you guys are saying, but I am trying to capture it.

J. Scott Evans: Well I think that there has been a strong consensus that the term training should come out...

CLO Hmm.

J. Scott Evans: ...and then it should be...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...think so.

J. Scott Evans: ...briefing.

CLO It...

Jonne: Educational briefings, okay.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

CLO Yes.

Jonne: Okay. Done.

CLO Yes.

J. Scott Evans: At - we would then say, you know, I think it should say, you know, you have done two things. You have got one, the considerations you need to consider, but we may want to just give them some things they may want to consider...

CLO Hmm.

J. Scott Evans: ...you know, like historical background, ICANN resources for information.

Jonne: Where would this go? Let me try to find a place to put it so then I can start capturing it. All right, how about here? All right. Go - so once again, historical what?

J. Scott Evans: Historical background of issues.

Jonne: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: ICANN resources for information on issues.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Vacations...

CLO Technology used and technology informa...

J. Scott Evans: Yes. Use of technology or you can just put communications and/or collaboration tools.

Jonne: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: And then working group's structure and operations or something, I do not know...

Jonne: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: ...or protocol or something.

Jonne: Right.

J. Scott Evans: Then you would say when considering what educational briefings would be required, then you put in that what are the costs, what are the objectives.

Jonne: Got it.

((Crosstalk))

Jonne: Okay. All right.

CLO In that last section Jay's got, if I do not have no concept about the words, the wordsmithing is going to have to be up to someone else. But I am just thinking of an example again in the Telco world where we are going down a pathway where we were developing policy and it was becoming very much a privacy issue in terms of the ability to track locations on mobile phones.

And it was interesting to see the difference in the group's views and the way the debate was going before they had had exposure to the negative side of people - in this case it was actual loss of life, you know, disaster situation where emergency services doing the access to those types of tracking abilities.

Just having, you know, a briefing - being able to call for a briefing to explore other options, other perspectives, can also freshen up and I guess give new lease of life to the forward going discussion. As opposed to a head butting debate where you have got particular political or agendas that have become entrenched in the work group, sometimes bringing in an external briefing just to freshen up some thought processes can be a very useful tool.

J. Scott Evans: Well I guess you would then put another bullet to say that briefing should not only be limited to up front issues but can also be...

CLO Emerging.

J. Scott Evans: ...could be emerging issues that come out...

CLO And that allows the technology. So for example, if someone goes whoa, hang on, this might have real affects on stability and security. You can, you know, ask for someone from their sector come and tell you is that the case or not.

J. Scott Evans: So I think all you do is just say, you know, we sort of focused on what you need to do to bring someone up to speed and get them started in a working group...

CLO                    Hmm.

J. Scott Evans:    ...but we can put a bullet in and say that educational briefings are not limited to just that...

CLO                    Yes. Yes.

J. Scott Evans:    ...they should also be considered in exploring issues if appropriate.

CLO                    Yes. Emerging issues during the process. Exactly. That is great. That is - yes.

(Johann):            Okay.

J. Scott Evans:    You kind of grab that - all that?

Jonne:                I grabbed it. I am not sure I put it in the right place, but I will move it to make a bullet out of it. But I have captured the idea that these educational briefings could either be up front or the exploration of emerging issues.

J. Scott Evans:    Okay.

Jonne:                Okay. Let's see.

CLO                    Yes.

Jonne:                Well, we have another bullet on this title of this Section 4.3 was Briefings, Subject Matter Experts and Translation/Interpretation. And I have just noted that - wait a second, yes okay.

Man:                  Well maybe the first thing, maybe you want to kind of like take the translation away from there because that is a little bit different than the other topics.

Jonne:                Okay.

CLO Yes. It really - that almost is, you know, back where, yes you could use your tools. That is just a - translation and interpretation is yet another part of your toolbox as far as I am concerned.

If you are working in a multi-lingual environment, and that is an if, it would be, you know, something that actually could be defined in the charter. Then you use tools which meet those needs.

And in that case, it could be a, you know, a human interpreter in a (phone bridge) or it could be something technologically clever.

Jonne: Okay. I slid it up one - I slid it up to 4.2...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Jonne: ...and re-titled. So it is Briefings, Subject Matter Experts. Okay. So we have a bullet there that says SMEs up front before recruiting. Again I - there will be information in the charter document that discusses...

CLO Hmm.

Jonne: ...whether the sponsoring organization wants to put SMEs into the working group, right. So that it will get considered there first.

CLO Hmm.

Jonne: And then I guess the question is if the working group thinks it needs a subject matter expert like it might need an educational briefing, but somebody may be more semi-permanent on the team...

CLO Yes, I thought that was sort of covered.

J. Scott Evans: Well I do not think there is anything wrong saying that if you believe that you need a subject matter expert as part of your team that you have - but wouldn't you need to go back to the sponsoring organization and ask that or do we want to give them...?

CLO Or can you just (co-opt)?

J. Scott Evans: Can you just go out and ask somebody?

((Crosstalk))

Jonne: Um...

CLO I mean it...

Jonne: ...that is a great question I think.

CLO The ability to (co-opt) would be very useful if that needs to be.

Jonne: What is that? When you say (co-opt), you mean like...?

CLO (Opt) for them - so it is a - they are not necessarily a voting member but they can be, you know, in a meeting to ask - answer questions.

Jonne: All right. So what I can do here again...

CLO I think (sufficient roles) so I guess...

Alexei Sozonov: Excuse me. It is Alexei Sozonov. Can I write small issue regarding translation.

Jonne: Sure.

Alexei Sozonov: We are saying and what we are meaning here that translation that needs to be done (here) from there that - to hear, for people to hear whether - what is said in English and to understand. Do we any - have any thought if the person cannot speak English to translate what he might deliver from himself?

Jonne: Well all I was thinking we would do in Section 4.2 in Guidebook would be to remind the working group that it should consider what translation and interpretation needs and facilities it requires based on the composition of the team.

But we would not prescribe anything, but, you know, even in our group if you or someone else popped up and said, you know, I am having a lot of trouble understanding what is going on with the discussion, then we would have - the team would have to try to figure out how to deal with that.

Man: Okay. Okay. Well, I am fine with the discussion. I am just saying in case there is a work expert from the country and he wants to be heard, not just he want to hear what is just discussed.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I think that if a non-English speaking person wanted to be heard, then it would - that is where that comes into communications. You need to make arrangements for their - to be able to communicate.

Man: Well it is something like that.

CLO): Yes. And for example, in the (ALAC) our regions, at least three of our regions working in at least two languages all the time, and all of my (ALAC) calls are in French, Spanish and English with real-time and real-live interpreters working over the phone bridges.

So we have an English channel, a French channel and a Spanish channel. And all our documents go out in all those languages. And the Adobe rooms



write in those languages. So it is - that is because it meets the makeup and nature of that group.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I think just noting something like that, that is what the communications will be.

CLO Yes, because it is just then a matter of choose your tool.

Man: Yes. I just want to us to be aware of that. This is it.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you.

Jonne: Okay. I think I have captured that.

CLO Yes. I would love it to, you know, eventually us all be working in the six U.N. languages but we are not there yet.

J. Scott Evans: All right. So this...

Jonne: All right. So, you know, as I looked at it, I wonder if - because I am going to end up - education briefings we have made a few points about them, right. You have to - you have to identify the needs and you have to - I wonder if I couldn't just - the same thing would be true of SMEs right. It is all the same point.

CLO Hmm.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Jonne: And so it seems - it does not seem economical here to repeat all of that same stuff so...

((Crosstalk))

Jonne: ...education briefings or SMEs I think I can use...

J. Scott Evans: Yes, the same bullet...

Jonne: Yes. It is all the same stuff right? I am going to say identify the need and...

J. Scott Evans: No all you would do is you would put educational briefings as your first one, SMEs as your second one and then considerations for doing one or the other is your third bullet and just make the considerations applicable to both.

Jonne: Right. Okay. I will fiddle with it.

J. Scott Evans: Does that makes sense?

Man: (Let them transfer me.)

Jonne: Right. So I am going to clobber everything that is under SMEs there.

CLO Um-hmm.

Jonne: All of that is going to be just - that is all repetitive.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Jonne: Now Avri's note, the GNSO has to meet...

((Crosstalk))

CLO Oh that is to do with the interpretation translation.

Jonne: Oh it does, it certainly does. Now what - should I make a note up there to the - under the translate?

CLO Oh I think that needs to go up with it.

Jonne: What is it that we are saying here?

CLO Well...

J. Scott Evans: It is basically saying that at this point, the language that is used by the GNSO, the preferred language is English.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: It seems to me that is what she is saying. (Cheryl) you are more...

((Crosstalk))

CLO Yes. And as I read it, she says at the moment the GNSO works in English. If the GNSO extends beyond English, she would think it should be supporting the six U.N. languages. Anything else would risk discrimination. I couldn't - I couldn't agree with her more.

Jonne: Okay. I will add - well I am just wondering though if a group - if a working group had say six or eight - eight people who spoke English or were fluent in English and one who was not, and that language happened to be Spanish, they would not need translation interpretation in all the U.N. languages would they? If the one person who spoke Spanish just needed...

J. Scott Evans: Yes, I think Avri's point is...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: ...I think it was - each working group is going to have to make a decision based on what its needs and requirements are.

CLO Yes.

J. Scott Evans: I think noting that today they work primarily in English. However, you should have the flexibility to meet the needs of the working group with regards to a translation.

Jonne: Okay yes. I do not think we need - I do not think we need to say anything about the six U.N. languages in this particular guidebook do we?

CLO Not in this document...

Jonne: Okay.

CLO ...but it is something that the GNSO may have to grapple with later.

J. Scott Evans: I think you are right.

Jonne: All right. Good.

J. Scott Evans: This - that - what will happen is that will just - once they make that determination, it will just - again you will - it will be self-evident.

Jonne: Right. Okay.

CLO Because I am already finding it challenging being limited to working in three languages.

J. Scott Evans: All right, 4.4?

Jonne: Yes sir.

J. Scott Evans: Staff support. We want staff to do everything, period. Let's move on.

CLO I was going to say staff support is a good idea.

Jonne: Right yes. And in - just like all the other things that ended up in this early outline, some of this stuff just came from brainstorming activities on the part of myself and (unintelligible) our colleagues.

We just - I think we are - for sure the charter document is going to have...

((Crosstalk))

CLO It has...

Jonne: ...something in it that says, yes...

CLO Yes.

Jonne: ...to the extent that the sponsor identifies the need for staff support...

CLO Right.

Jonne: ...it will be provided for.

So the working group may already have a staff or one or two or more staff people assigned in which case there is not much more for the working group to do unless it thinks it needs additional staff support, right?

J. Scott Evans: You know, you need to say that it should be handled in the charter.

CLO Hmm.

J. Scott Evans: If it is handled in the charter, it needs to be evaluated, see if it is - the working group believes it is sufficient. In the event it isn't handled, that is something that needs to be handled and up front.

CLO Hmm.

Jonne: Right. Or it might be that the staff person assigned is incompetent and needs to be replaced...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: You need to be able to...

Jonne: ...herewith.

CLO Actually that really is important because I have worked with some challenging staff input here in the Telco industry in Australia to the point where you wonder whether or not the work group is little more than lip service.

Jonne: Right. Yes. I mean we could put a - I was being half facetious there but I think that is probably not a bad thing to stick in there right.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Jonne: What a...

CLO The definition of the role.

Jonne: Well I - no I was thinking about, you know, what if the working group does not think its...

CLO Hmm.

Jonne: ...staff support is helping?

Man: Yes.

Jonne: You know, what can they do?

J. Scott Evans: And I think that, you know, one of the early things is the working group and the staff need to come to an understanding about what level of support staff is going to provide the working group...

Man: Yes.

CLO: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Early on.

Man: Yes. Can I suggest something? I think that the - maybe- what I mean, obviously one way of trying to address that was I guess this - the paragraph (certain geon) and the staff support where basically the - all of these issues of estimation, phases and budget and stuff like will be stuff that the working group or maybe the Chair of the working group or some small group of the working group would think about in layers with the staff. Whereas the other way of doing it would be the staff or the chartering organization working together with the staff has already pre-decided what is the support you are going to get.

Are going to get one person for X months, you know, something - but the worry there is that the chartering may not actually think in detail about what the working group has to do to figure out exactly how much resources and so on.

So some rough stab would have been made, and even the chartering group may not really know exactly how much it would be except based on previous experience, you know, roughly what it might require.

It is only that working group or the Chair of the working group sitting down would probably realize exactly how much might be needed early on. So perhaps the different ways of solving this by (meeting) one way as J. Scott and (Evan) says maybe one thing should be very early on maybe a pre-meeting even with the Chair and a couple of people who are already on the committee sit down and have a single session essentially, a pre-session or the first session of the working group.

Be a session dedicated partly to figuring out and talking to staff and figuring out that everybody is on the same page in terms of what they are getting, in terms of staff support and what could be needed. (Unintelligible).

That would hash out the requirement for thinking through very carefully. Because from the part of the working group - because the time where they sit down they will talk to the staff and say okay, staff we know from the charter group that a staff has been assigned for this, this, this and this. Well, we thought about it in the 20, 30 minutes where we talked we will come to some agreement of how we can use that resource.

CLO

It also has ramifications if you are looking at extensions to timelines and shifting milestones. Because it is quite possible picking up on the scalability discussions the (great) staff commitment that we were going on earlier in today's call that if one or more work groups start - for very good reasons - extending their operational time, that is going to have some real effects on staff resourcing.

So I think it is like all other tools and resources. You also need to look at are you going to have - you might even have to switch who your staff support is, not through any complaint or competency issue, but because that person is



being already allocated to another equally demanding task and someone else will be giving whatever level of staff support is deemed appropriate.

Jonne: Right. Well I think I have got the general idea here, right. I think J. Scott kind of summarized it on the beginning here. The question is - well first of all the idea it should be handled in the charter. If however if there is some specific needs that is not handled, then the working group should determine which specific skill sets it needs and estimate how much of that they think they need and then ask permission to get it, right?

CLO Hmm.

Man: Yes. On top of that even, I mean the point that I have been trying to point out is if everybody knew at least the core group who is running the working group and the Chair and a couple of others fully understand it is not so much what resources that they are getting, they understand this is the amount of resources you are going to get, this is the amount of what work we need. And then they could at least figure out how to work within those constraints, right.

I mean at least at the outset before getting started, right. I mean, this is the amount of resources you have gotten. Well, you know, this is how we are going to work within it. At least you know what you are getting before, you know, up front knowing who is going to be taking minutes or whatever, right, so that we can all perform within the constraints we have got.

That is the - I think it is more understanding what you are getting and working within that than actually demanding what you want or anything. That is the way I see it.

Jonne: Yes. These would be requests I would gather, right?

J. Scott Evans: I mean I think that it is an assessment.

Jonne: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Look at...

Man: Right.

Jonne: Right. That is...

J. Scott Evans: ...if you have been given anything, what you have been giving, how operating within that will work in the event you identify that there are any shortcomings - or that is probably not a good word, but, you know, you may need additional resources if those are identified and communicated to the sponsoring organization so that those issues can be worked through and, you know, additional staff can be assigned if appropriate.

Jonne: Right. Okay. I think I can finish (wordsmithing) it. There is some sections - there is some stuff - material in there like budget revisions. I think I just would take that out.

J. Scott Evans: I do not see how that, you know, I do not think that really comes into play.

Jonne: Yes, I do not either. And there is one in here called phases should demand extra (mandating) for initial start up and for - I think that is probably too much detail, hmm?

CLO Um-hmm.

Jonne: I think it is probably just sufficient to say what we already talked about right. Determine what you need. And we can give some examples there, right. I have included - like maybe there is some specific computer expertise or secretariat duties or something like that.

CLO Or that might be where your bilingual person could be really handy.

Jonne: Yes. The translation/interpretation is their staff person. And then the next two bullets could probably just be collapsed. The idea is to try to give some estimation so that the sponsoring organization will know what you are asking for, and then...

CLO Hmm.

Jonne: ...they will check availability and see if it can be done. If it can, it can and if it can't, it can't, right.

CLO Yes.

Jonne: All right. That - oh then let's look at Avri's note real quick. Okay she is asking if this isn't a staff item. And...

J. Scott Evans: I think it has to be collaborative.

Man: That is right. I think it is a staff item to some extent, but the working group needs to understand what they are getting so they can fit within it.

((Crosstalk))

Jonne: Okay.

CLO I - realize what...

Jonne: So I will just - I will just - I will...

CLO ...asking for more does, yes.

Jonne: I will just clobber her note then right?

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Jonne: Okay. We have covered it. All right. That finishes Section 4. How about that?

CLO Woo hoo.

Jonne: It is ten minutes to noon.

CLO Oh no, not where I am darling.

Jonne: No, sorry about that. No. How callous of me not to - I was just there in your lovely part of the world, 14 hours later. So, yes. It is ten minutes to end of two hours. How about...

CLO There it is.

((Crosstalk))

CLO We are on the downhill slide. Look.

((Crosstalk))

(Johann): What do you - you got - do you want to try to jump into five or...

CLO Yes. Yes.

Jonne: Okay. Let's do it - Products and Outputs. All right. So we have two notes before we even get to 5.1 which was to review, response...

Man: Yes.

Jonne: ...timeframes. Products and Outputs, right, so this section was generally going to talk about what the working group team produces...

CLO Yes.

Jonne: ...delivers.

CLO Yes. Some of those - I mean those first two comments, I sort of thought to some extent we were addressing some of these issues earlier on when we were looking at the recording and I did not mean literally recording in mp3 format but that is inclusive of it.

The records of meetings, so meeting summaries and attendance and things I thought would have been dealt with rather than as a product and an output but as an ongoing activity, and I...

((Crosstalk))

Jonne: Yes. We certainly did capture that. Whether, yes, whether we want to make some reference to the fact that - I do not really know. You guys that have all the experience with working groups, does the Chair or the Secretariat of the Working Group frequently produce like a monthly summary report that goes to the sponsoring organization that says something like here are, you know, our attendance records and voting outcomes and stuff like that. Well it will not be voting, right, it is consensus outcomes anyway.

CLO Yes. In answer to your question from my experience in my spaces, (idey) I board the Chair of the work - of our policy work groups comes to every second - possibly not every meeting but every second meeting, Board meeting. Oh yes, he either comes or phones in and does a here is where we are up to, here is our milestones, this is going well, we might need more time on this.

And it is just - we never get a who has been there, what we will know if there is issues coming up, but we do not get the (cerd) detail amount that said because everything is archived and accessible, I can find that out at any time.

Jonne: Okay.

CLO It doesn't need to be part of an output report.

Jonne: Okay. What about Avri's not? What does she say - collecting state as many different ones can be found seems a good idea.

Man: Yes. Yes. Since I, you know, I put up the first comment on the suggest that it is by addition to timeframe and this (would be) identifying product result.

My take is that her view is that knowing some of that detail would tell you how a group functioned basically. You know, where you are basically capturing details at various points, this point being at the end in terms of, you know, the various attendances and along the way how different things when they were voted were voted on, you know, would give you an idea that it functioned.

And I think that is - I might take it that is what she is saying. And to me personally, it - because I monitored a few working groups and a few committee's progress in ICANN over the years, and the ones that were - I cannot actually from the outside take a look at, you know, all the archives and see how it happened and everything.

What I found useful in the cases where it has been very - well it has been done, there has been a couple of cases that I know is done very thoroughly. Where the end of it you just go, you take a look, you can see who was on the committee, who is the - how did people participate. And on the issues they took votes or whatever on in this case, you know, consensus, whatever, you know, on the different issues and the viewpoints, you can look at all the different things that they voted on or thought about. And then whether there

was a, you know, if there was a minority view what the minority views are all on a single page and or on two or three pages, and it is very clear.

And it was done a few times. And in those times it was very helpful. You just went there and you knew exactly what happened. For example, in I think now in the Registry constituency, they have - they are quite transparent about how they make decisions.

When you see a physician paper by the Registry constituency, you go to it, you see what they discussed, what their position is, but at the very bottom there is a page or two that says exactly who their membership is, how they kind of decided, what the voting patterns were - very clear.

So, then it really is helpful seeing that as well as what is on top, you know, the physician...

((Crosstalk))

CLO But when you are trying to build consensus, I would have thought that in a final report or output, much of those metrics would be captured but in a transparency system. A system where things are recorded, archived and accessible, the extent of the details, the actual patents of if there is a vote because it may all be done by consensus...

Man: (Good point).

CLO ...have that vote. When - where discussions resulted in minority views being recorded, and indeed the attendance at each of the meetings should be accessible.

Man: Yes. But I think in my experience in the past, if it is...

CLO We are trying to design something that will be not that was.

Man: Yes. Right.

J. Scott Evans: Well I mean I think that that - it is here that - what we are trying to say is, you know, what is the group responsible for at a minimum level?

CLO Hmm.

J. Scott Evans: And one is we have already decided that they are going to need to have routine meeting summaries with action items. We have already decided that they need to have historical archive of work in progress. We have already decide - and that includes mailing lists...

CLO Um-hmm.

J. Scott Evans: ...(three) recordings, Wiki drafts, you know, those things. I think that they need to have, if required, periodic reports to the sponsoring organization. It...

CLO Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...may not be required or it may be required.

CLO Hmm.

J. Scott Evans: You know. And then I think then we can (pick) up with this, you know, they do need to select a Chair. They do need to look at the charter. They do need to collaborate, if required, collaborate with the sponsoring organization on the charter. They do need to develop a work plan.

CLO Yes.

J. Scott Evans: You know, they do need to identify information. I do not know that identify information needed is necessarily an output.



Man: Yes. I agree.

J. Scott Evans: They need to develop the work plan. They need to execute the work plan. They need to compile the working group report. And they need to do a working group assessment.

Jonne: Yes. I am having a little difficulty here just with the basic structure of this section. I am unclear in my own mind about review response timeframes, and then there is a product...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Take that out.

Jonne: ...list of 5.2 and then a closure.

CLO Yes.

Jonne: I think the original idea was to break the product and outputs into like beginning, middle and end or something like that.

CLO Yes, with milestones and where things have to be done by.

Jonne: Well, or it is like, hmm. Let's do this. We do not have much time left. Let me just get a sense from you guys. Let's look at (Thomas') - let's look at the stuff under 5.2, the bullets...

CLO Hmm.

Jonne: ...that start with public comment. And let's do the same thing (JR), that J. Scott just did on the first group, and just let's see if we like - Avri said she like the list - (AD) good list, right?

CLO            Hmm.

Jonne:        Let's see what we think about it. And then let's do the same thing with 5.3.  
There is only five bullets there.

CLO            Yes...

Jonne:        And then leave it - then turn it back over to me and I will try to synthesize all  
of this stuff into one section that makes sense...

CLO            Um-hmm. Hmm.

Jonne:        ...because I think there is some redundancy between these bullets...

CLO            Yes.

Jonne:        ...and I am not clear in my own mind about review response timeframes,  
products - I think this can be consolidated somehow, as long as we capture  
all the right ideas.

CLO            Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Oh I think we can retire - I am not married to any of these section titles either.

Jonne:        Yes. By the way I did capture your three J. Scott that you just ticked off -  
meeting summaries, historical archives, periodic reports. And I will try to fit  
that in where it belongs. But what do we think about (Thomas') public  
comment from notification of commencement of PDP? Well it might not be a  
PDP right.

CLO            Hmm.

J. Scott Evans: Well, you know, again I do not know if that is a working group problem. That looks to me like that is an ICANN.

((Crosstalk))

CLO ...little (bit).

J. Scott Evans: I mean I certainly do not want to make the working group responsible for the public comment.

Jonne: Yes. That is normally a staff function, right, isn't it?

J. Scott Evans: That is just a huge (bailiwick)...

CLO Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: First of all , it is, you know, that just needs to be - that is part of the ICANN process.

CLO Hmm.

J. Scott Evans: That is ICANN's responsibility. That is not the working group's responsibility.

Jonne: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: I do not know how other people feel, but certainly that is too much to try to manage.

CLO Hmm.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: I mean you just have to assume, given we are transparent and that all work products once it has gone into the council is put out for public comment, that is handled by council and staff.

CLO Hmm.

Jonne: Okay. How about the next one?

Man: Yes.

Jonne: Again, I do not - that is not - that would not be part of the working...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Since that is part of assimilating a final report...

CLO Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...you are going to need to have - you are going to have to have a way to take that in and archive that.

Jonne: Okay. So on the (Adam) note, assimilate into final report.

J. Scott Evans: I would put stakeholder/constituency group statement...

Jonne: I agree.

J. Scott Evans: ...because right now those are so ambig - they can be one in the same, they could be different...

CLO Hmm.

J. Scott Evans: ...but I do not think we should break them out where they look like they are different.

CLO Yes.

Jonne: Okay. All right. Good.

CLO Here here.

Jonne: Well he has constituency statements next.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I would just put those all together...

Jonne: All right.

J. Scott Evans: ...because some groups may want to do constituency statements, some groups may want to stakeholders. But what I do not want the people thinking is that they got to - they have to have two.

Jonne: Got you. Okay.

CLO Yes.

Jonne: Statements of advisors or consultants?

J. Scott Evans: I think that is fine.

Jonne: Advisors, consultants' statements of qualifications and experience, is that an output?

CLO I do not think that is an output. I think that is a conflict of interest of the sorts of things just like the work group members it should all be publicly available up front as you are appointed.

Jonne: Yes. And that - and those would be charter requirements won't they?

CLO Yes.

Jonne: Yes okay. I will take those out. Independent research, new or historical?

J. Scott Evans: Well certainly if there is any independent research...

CLO Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...that the group does, it needs - they are going to be responsible for making sure that it is archived and accessible.

CLO Hmm. And...

J. Scott Evans: So I would not put that on their back.

CLO And there has been some policy work group activities which has done some baseline or had baseline studies on things. They have been incredibly useful for future work to develop from. And, yes, I think as long as they do not just do it and keep it hidden in the tiny report section of the one meeting it goes to, that does need to be flagged as something important.

((Crosstalk))

Jonne: Okay. Surveys, preliminary recommendations, (physicians), it is the same thing, right?

CLO (Exact) thing, yes.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Jonne: Archived accessible.

J. Scott Evans: And minority reports the same thing, draft...

CLO Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...initial report same thing.

Jonne: Okay good.

((Crosstalk))

Jonne: And then real quick on 5.3 closure, initial report...

CLO You started seven minutes over the hour so really you have got another seven minutes. It is all right.

Jonne: Well I have another call I am supposed to be on at noon.

J. Scott Evans: Well then here is what I would say. The initial report by public comment get rid of it.

Jonne: Got it.

CLO Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Final report, Chair's report and assessment of working group are fine.

Man: And may - and just a point regarding 5.2 all those items about various people's statements, you know, advisor consultant statements, constituency statements, stakeholder statements, I guess these all will just be linked at the end of the final report, right. I mean basically as a references or something. They will just say these are the places where these things are at, correct? That is how it will be taken care of...

((Crosstalk))

CLO Well if you use the collaborative tool where they are archived, then you just list to those archived links or the (maninglist) link or the whatever.

Man: Yes, but that is not - the product is for public consumption, right. I mean yes...

CLO Yes.

Man: ...I agree but it is just that this product is what somebody was not being in the committee at all (unintelligible) of ICANN wants to be able to go to in a single document...

CLO Yes.

Man: ...see the summaries of everything plus links to whatever, right.

CLO Yes. Links to the gory details.

Man: Right. Okay good.

J. Scott Evans: All right. Ken do you have enough to sort of...

Ken Bour: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...flush this out...

Ken Bour: Yes.

Jonne: ...and, my, you know, I was just talking to Liz earlier this morning and what I am going to try to do is to grab a significant amount of my July time to devote to the working group team and to the drafting of both the charter and this



operating model. Now that we have a pretty much completed outline since so...

CLO            Hmm.

Jonne:        ...we should start moving into that step and I think that is going to actually work just based on where we are with the restructuring effort and all that, I think I am going to have some time in July to really work on this. So...

CLO            Okay.

Jonne:        ...the ball is going to - I mean the, you know, the work task next is going to fall over to staff for a while.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. What I would like to do is can we do a doodle but have a call in two weeks?

Jonne:        Sure.

J. Scott Evans: And just do that whole week for the two weeks and pick - I guess this - all right?

Jonne:        Right. I am sorry. So we want to do a doodle in two weeks and like the norm - our normal Wednesday time?

J. Scott Evans: Yes. That is fine with me.

Man:           Yes. It sounds good.

Jonne:        Okay. I will try to - I will try to get that set up...

J. Scott Evans: All right.

Jonne: ...and we will do that for two weeks from to - well from this...

J. Scott Evans: Wednesday.

Jonne: ...this week. Yes. Right. And then I will try to get some stuff done so that we have something to talk about.

J. Scott Evans: That is going to be the 23rd for everybody who sort of has time to think about their calendar. That will be July 23.

Jonne: Okay. Great.

CLO Got it.

J. Scott Evans: All right?

Jonne: Well listen thanks everybody. That was great. I had no clue we would get through it. We did. Two hours was right, J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: All right.

((Crosstalk))

Jonne: Nice guess.

J. Scott Evans: ...and let's keep it up okay.

Jonne: All right guys. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: All right. Bye-bye.

Jonne: Bye-bye everybody. Okay bye.

CLO           Bye.

Man:           Bye.

END