

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC)
TRANSCRIPTION**

Wednesday, 7 January 2009 20:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee meeting on Wednesday, 7 January 2009, at 20:00 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-policy-process-20090107.mp3>

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

Participants present:

Jeff Neuman - (Registry constituency) elected chair

Avri Doria - NCA - GNSO Council chair

Mike Rodenbaugh - (CBUC)

J. Scott Evans - (IPC)

Konstantinos Komaitis - (NCUC)

Alan Greenberg - (ALAC)

Greg Ruth - (ISP)

Tim Ruiz - (Registrar)

Bertrand de la Chapelle - (GAC)

Staff:

Liz Gasster

Ken Bour

Marika Konings

Glen de Saint G ery

Coordinator: Excuse me, this is the conference coordinator, I'd like to inform all participants this conference is being recorded. Thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay, I'll do the role call quickly Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: We have Alan Greenberg, ALAC, Avri Doria, GNSO Council Chair, Jeff Neuman, Registry Constituency, Greg Ruth, ISP on the Council, Bertrand de la Chapelle, GAC, Konstantinos Komaitis, non-commercial constituency, Mike Rodenbaugh, business constituency council, J.

Scott Evans, IPC, Tim Ruiz, registrar and for staff we have Marika Konings, Liz Gasster, Ken Bour, Glen - and myself, Glen.

Jeff Neuman: Great. So happy new year everyone and welcome back. I know towards the end of the year a lot of people were on vacation and so there was not that much flurry of activity going on.

But now we're back for a brand new year and I'm sure everyone's just excited to get back in it, right? Woo hoo.

Woman: That's what I was going to say.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So Liz sent out an agenda for today. It went on the list, I'm assuming everybody got it. Bertrand, are you on the mailing list?

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Yes I am.

Jeff Neuman: Okay great. In fact is everybody on this call on the mailing list? I just want to make sure everyone got a copy of it.

Man: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: And Tim, you had sent an email, is everything okay with - on your side? Tim Ruiz?

Tim Ruiz: Oh, yes, yes. I had something happened while I was gone and all kinds of things are starting to get sent into my spam folder.

So at any rate, but I got all the information.

Jeff Neuman: Okay great. So the agenda has got seven items and I'll ask if anyone has anything additional. We're going to review the PPSC, the main charter, and I believe J. Scott had sent around the last version of that.

Then there is the charter for the two work teams that we'll talk about the announcement and solicitation for not just our two work teams but also there's three other work teams with the OSC.

We'll talk a little bit about the working team rules that we'll need to work out over the next couple weeks or so and statement of interest template and appointing chairs for the work teams and discussing or beginning the discussion on timelines and high priority issues so that we can make sure that we meet some of the goals of having some of the stuff done at least by June if not sooner.

So does anyone have anything else to add to the agenda? Okay. Hearing silence, I will - let's go to the PPSC charter. Now just as a background, this is the charter that was initially approved by the GNSO council.

And any changes to that charter will need to be reviewed by the GNSO council, I guess their next meeting is tomorrow. We won't obviously have everything to them by tomorrow to review and vote on, so it will probably be looked at at the February meeting.

That said, once we come to an agreement with the charter, we're going to proceed under that unless the council tells us otherwise at the February meeting.

Avri Doria: I have a tentative slot for this on the 29th of January meeting.

Jeff Neuman: Oh okay, I didn't realize there were two in January.

Avri Doria: Every three weeks.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Or maybe not so great.

Avri Doria: Not so great, but every three weeks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so hopefully this will get out on the 29th conference call. J. Scott, you're on the line, correct?

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Do you want to - I believe this is from your email from Monday, does that contain the last one?

J. Scott Evans: No, my email from Monday only had to do with the working group, so if we're talking about the general PPSC charter that I sent around earlier on, that was not sent around yesterday, that was sent around some time ago.

And I think Liz if I'm not correct that's what appears on the Wiki now?

Liz Gasster: Yeah, right.

Jeff Neuman: Great.

J. Scott Evans: So if you don't have my email if you go to the Wiki and you look at the proposed charter, that's the language that I sent around.

It would be under the first bolded language, it says proposed charter for policy process steering committee.

Jeff Neuman: Okay were there - hopefully most people are in front of a computer now. That actually was sent around by email in December, I think it was either the 10th or the 17th or it was one of those, I think you reposted it.

So...

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, I did repost it because I had cute little graphics in my email and Glen told me that's a no-no. So I resent it around. But basically it's just sort of a cleaning op and a rearranging of the wording that the GNSO had put out.

It is not substantively a variance if you compare the two and I had sent around a - originally sent around a redline version so people could see, it's just really shifting things around.

And I thought making it a little bit more clear.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, and I think you did that, it was well done. We actually talked about those changes on the December 10th call as well so I'd like to ask for a, you know people's thoughts and we operate by consensus here, not by voting.

So I want to know if there's rough consensus on this new charter.

Liz Gasster: Jeff it may be useful to note that I did suggest one additional language change from what J. Scott had put forward on the 10th which just very quickly what he had written was the immediate goal of the immediate goal of the PPSC is to develop recommendations for all process changes needed to meet the requirement of the GNSO improvements report, etcetera.

And what I was suggesting was a slight change to say that the immediate goal to PPSC would be to coordinate and oversee the process for developing recommendations for all process changes.

The point being that the work teams would actually develop the recommendations for the process changes and that the role of the PPSC would be one of coordination and oversight of those teams.

J. Scott Evans: And this is J. Scott and I agree that that language specifically clarifies and I don't have a problem with it.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Mike Rodenbaugh, if J. Scott has a suggestion then it's not a problem with it. Bottom line, this group is responsible for developing it and we're doing that by delegating the recommendations to two other teams.

But in the event that those teams come back that we on the PPSC don't agree with, then we would be able to overrule and change those recommendations in the way that we agreed, by consensus.

Is that what everyone's understanding is?

Avri Doria: This is Avri, can I comment?

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

Avri Doria: I would think that it wouldn't be so much, I mean going with bottom up processing that it wouldn't be so much that we could change it, but that we could certainly send back questions, clarifications, ask if they had considered this that and the other thing.

And ask them to rework it. In terms of changing it, I'm not sure. You know that all comes out in sort of understanding of bottom up.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well okay, but the council and I guess well not - well the council at least has initiated this steering committee with the responsibility here. And then we're further delegating that down.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Correct?

Avri Doria: Yeah, if I understand it from the way the org (unintelligible) up, then it basically gets to us, we get the question, we go back and forth make sure all issues are answered.

And then you know we pass it on either with our consensus recommendation or with our comments and criticisms. But I don't know that we actually get (unintelligible).

But as I say I don't know, this is just my thoughts.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well I think that's for us to decide.

J. Scott Evans: Well I will say this, this is J. Scott, that that language to develop recommendations was identical to the language that was proposed by the GNSO in their proposed charter.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Exactly.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, just to put that forward to let you know that that's what they conceptualized at least when they put out this charter and that's the reason I kept that wording, although I am not offended by Liz's suggestion that perhaps there needs to be some wordsmithing in this area.

Jeff Neuman: So what are some other thoughts on this? Is anyone opposed to the language that - I mean Liz had suggested alternate language but does anyone think that the original language that's' in there the immediate goal of the PPSC is to develop recommendations or does anyone have an issue with that?

Ken Bour: This is Ken Bour speaking, I have a suggestion. One way that you might approach it is to say the immediate goal is to ensure that recommendations are developed for all process changes.

Or you could even say the immediate goal of PPSC is WHOIS oversight and coordination to ensure that recommendations for all process are developed and that leaves you with the option of developing yourself or using the workings.

J. Scott Evans: Again that sounds like it is one of the things I find that we have to do in drafting these things is make them broad enough that we can take care

of contingencies so that we're not having to redraft or face arguments outside of our charter because of contingencies that occurred.

Man: Exactly.

J. Scott Evans: Or unforeseen at the time that the thing is drafted. So Ken I am fine with that language. I think Mike since you were the one that brought up a concern, it seems to me that that would handle your concern, but I will leave that to speak for yourself.

Mike Rodenbaugh: It sounded right to me the first time I heard it, of course I'd like to hear it again or see it in text ideally.

Jeff Neuman: So Ken, just to repeat it, you said something like the immediate goal of the PPSC is to ensure recommendations are developed for all process changes...

Ken Bour: Needed to meet the requirements of the PPSC, yes, you could just follow along the rest of that sentence I think.

Jeff Neuman: So it's taking out the words is to develop recommendations and substituting ensure recommendations are developed. That's it.

Ken Bour: That's what I had in mind.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Frankly I like the original text better, because I think it is our job to get the recommendations that the council chartered us to do. And we're just delegating that down.

But if what we get back from one of the work groups is unacceptable to any of us, then we have an obligation I think to get it to a state where it's got the consensus of this committee.

Alan Greenberg: This is Alan Green...

Tim Ruiz: Can I get in with you?

Jeff Neuman: Sure, Tim and then Alan. Okay.

Tim Ruiz: Thank you. Yeah, I think I agree with Mike, I would prefer to leave it as J. Scott first had it, especially because it's based on the actual working from the...

Mike Rodenbaugh: Tim, I'm sorry, could you repeat that (unintelligible).

Tim Ruiz: I said that I agree with Mike on the original wording.

Mike Rodenbaugh: That's what I thought, thanks. It just surprised me.

Tim Ruiz: At any rate, yeah. The way it was originally worded and I think we should leave it.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: This is Bertrand, can I get in the queue?

Jeff Neuman: Sure, I've got Alan then Bertrand.

Alan Greenberg: I tend to agree, I was looking at the draft work team rules which have an awful lot of words in them about what happens if you cannot get a

good consensus within the work teams and how reports may be produced by the work team with minority view and things like that.

Which means it bounces up to the PPSC to address. So we have to make sure that our - the charter for the PPSC itself is consistent with what we're going to do for the next stages down.

And we haven't done that yet, but in light of the draft I would tend to keep the words as they are right now.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Bertrand?

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Yeah, just one comment that the question that we're discussing right now is actually related to one underlying question which is what is the role of a steering committee in a process that is initiated by the board, sent to the council.

Then talk to a steering committee that decides to do working teams. It is not exactly something that would be really called bottom up, because it is not something that is starting from the bottom, but is something that is being delegated at lower and lower levels in order to broaden the participation.

So the question that is being discussed here is whether the steering committee which is a limited group is tasked with establishing the proposals and decides to do this to establish working groups in order to involve a broader range of people.

Or if the steering committee is basically just establishing the groups and waits until the groups brings the information back. I think in this

case, even more so than in the OSC which has on its side established ratings, here the interaction between the PDP team and the working group team will be very important.

So there is a balance to be found, maybe between the notion that the PPSC as a sort of coordination and supervisory role. But also probably a more active role than the OSC is doing.

The OSC has basically decided that it will not meet on a teleconference call regularly unless it's needed. I wonder whether in the case of the PPSC there will be a little more hands on approach on out.

I think that's the question that we're addressing behind this.

Jeff Neuman: Okay is - so just to - you know we planned to meet every couple weeks at least initially until the work teams are formed. You know at some later point we might decide to have less frequent meetings or maybe alternatively more frequent.

I don't think we've fully decided how active we're going to be at this point. But I do think that it was initially set up to be more of a coordination role. But Mike and some others that have talked already, do you guys agree, or...

Mike Rodenbaugh: I do, I think Bertrand raises a great point though that two work teams really are going to have to be coordinated very well. If one of them starts going off on a tangent the other one's not aware of, this thing just ends up a big mess at the end.

Jeff Neuman: Right. It's not as discreet as some of the items that the OSC is working on.

Man: Right.

Jeff Neuman: It sounds like someone's got in the background....

Avri Doria: Yeah, someone's conversation.

Jeff Neuman: So if that person can mute their line.

J. Scott Evans: How do you mute, it may be me, J. Scott.

Man: Star 6.

J. Scott Evans: Press 6?

Man: Star 6.

J. Scott Evans: Star 6.

Avri Doria: I think I was making the comment it was most out of line with what other people were saying about needing to sort of respect what comes up from the working team.

Yet I do agree with leaving the wording as it is, and I agree that it is the responsibility of this group to come with the recommendations that it sends to the council.

I guess I'm thinking more in terms of the practice that of what we do and this doesn't change the wording that we have to seriously take into account for work done by the working teams that we create and build.

And that we can't just sort of reject it out of hand, but that we really have to use it and work with them to reach the consensus point. But I don't think we need to change the wording.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so what I'm hearing from at least the people that have spoken is that everyone seems okay with the current wording as J. Scott has submitted around which is also reflected in the GNSO original GNSO language.

But as Avri said we just need to keep in mind as we go further that our role is more of a coordination role and we just need to keep all this in mind.

Is there anyone that disagrees with keeping the language as J. Scott has recommended? Okay. Sounds like from everyone's silence that we have a consensus on keeping the language the way it is on the Wiki.

And I guess that means we would just cross out the parenthetical.

Liz Gasster: Yep, I'll take care of that.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Does anyone else have any comments on the proposed charter?

Avri Doria: I have one.

Jeff Neuman: Okay Avri.

Avri Doria: Under goals and milestones, and this kind of fits in with the SO's comments that we just went through, it says to be determined by the PPSC and approved by the council which is true.

But one of the reasons that we're not including milestones now is because they want to be determined by the PPSC in cooperation, coordination, what have you with the work teams that we're putting together because otherwise we could just do them now.

So I'm wondering whether we want to amplify that wording at all, otherwise why aren't we just hey, let's just sit down and set down the milestones.

But when we talked about that, we said no, no, no, we should work those out in cooperation with the team.

J. Scott Evans: I have no problem I think that that's an excellent suggestions, this is J. Scott, in just formulating that out so that third parties would understand what the process is as we're going through it.

Jeff Neuman: So your suggestion would be to be determined by the work teams?

Avri Doria: No, to be determined by the PPSC team in cooperation with the work team and approved by the council.

Jeff Neuman: Gotcha. How does everyone feel on that, on the addition of that language?

Konstantinos Komaitis: I agree, this is Konstantinos.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Man: I'd say it's work teams just to make sure we don't have confused with the other work teams.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, Liz do you got that?

Liz Gasster: Yep, sure do.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Just one question, this is Bertrand, is the approval by the council necessary or could it be a lighter formulation that it is communicated to the council?

Avri Doria: I think that the way it was set up is that charter changes and milestones were approved by the council.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Yeah, but I mean it's a pretty strong relation with the council in terms of the rules that will be potentially scalable.

It means that any modification of the milestones at one moment or the other has to be fundamentally approved by the council.

Avri Doria: Yep, but that's milestones, that's not detailed scheduled, you know that you have a few things that are milestones, like complete this document.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Okay, good.

Avri Doria: Complete this work, because it's the milestone, it's the council that has to agree to the schedule to the board and all that stuff and is kind of responsible for that managerial when is work getting done and trying to be intentional about dates and stuff.

So it's not internal detailed schedule I don't think.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I mean the council is answerable, therefore it has to you know have the clout to make sure it can do what it's promising.

Jeff Neuman: That was Alan, right?

Alan Greenberg: Yep.

Jeff Neuman: Okay yeah. I think since this is being recorded if people could even if you've spoken many times just make sure you at least say your first name.

Avri Doria: Sorry.

Jeff Neuman: So it sounds like Bertrand are you okay then with leaving that.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Yeah, sure. It was more a question - in all those things, just as a comment in general, we must understand or I see very clearly that everything we do in establishing the PPSC, the work team the (unintelligible) and the three work teams is actually addressing in a certain way the substance of our work.

Because what we are doing here is what we are trying to conceive as procedures. So every time I raise a question is more to understand

what is the current procedure and why for instance something has to be approved as opposed to being transmitted or notified or unless somebody opposes.

These are question that we will find again every time we discuss the various steps in the PDP or in the working group methodology. So this is the only reason why - I have no problem with the way it is going to run for the PPSC itself.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Anybody else have any comments on the charter?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Mike Rodenbaugh.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, is there someone else in the queue as well?

Tim Ruiz: Tim.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so Mike then Tim.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Maybe it's just part of the charter here, but the current members list, I guess it lists Avri twice on bullets, there's no alternate (unintelligible) or ITC, I'm not sure whether that's important or not.

J. Scott Evans: Mike, this is J. Scott. I have confirmed and this is just to let while it's up that Ute Decker will be our alternate for IPC so Liz, you can have that information.

Konstantinos Komaitis: And this is Konstantinos, and I can confirm that Gabriel Pineiro is going to be the alternate for NSUC participating in the PDP team.

Avri Doria: And I think the reason I'm mentioned twice is because I'm filling the role both of the NCA slot and the formal definitions, there's a slot for the chair and/or vice chair.

So basically because I'm filling those two, but notice there's two different alternatives.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay, my question or concern is a little bit broader on those details. I remember we had an issue about what is the role of alternates in you know the consensus calls basically.

And I guess I have the same question about the role of the other participants, they are liaisons in particular, Alan and Bertrand, what is their role in consensus calls as well?

Should those issues be addressed in our charter or should those be addressed in a different document with our working rules or something like that?

Avri Doria: I think as it was conceived by the (unintelligible) they weren't a necessary part of a consensus.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: That's my understanding as well.

Jeff Neuman: Right, and I think we addressed this in our - we certainly addressed this in our first meeting and I know that we from my notes in the first meeting which I can't remember where they are posted.

They are posted, that we had discussed the role of alternates.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, I think we did not come to a conclusion, we agreed to talk about it later if I recall.

Jeff Neuman: No, I thought we did, I thought what we...

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott, I thought we came to some sort of general understanding of the role of alternates. And as I sort of recall it is that on consensus calls they can attend and if they are - if both parties are not there, they will voice their, when the consensus is called forth they would voice.

If both parties are there, the alternate does not voice whether they believed it, they would not give a voice into the consensus decision, is their consensus a rough consensus.

Jeff Neuman: Here's from my notes and again they're not formal and it's not any kind of meeting minutes, but my notes from the November 24th said that there's general consensus was that we encourage as much participation as possible.

And therefore alternates may be selected from any constituency, supporting organization or advisory committee. Where there's a quote consensus call if both the primary and alternate reps are on the call or present at a meeting only the primary may cast their response to the consensus call.

If only one rep is on the call where there is a consensus call then that rep may cast a response to the consensus call. And then I said please

note the absence of the word vote as we are trying to move away from using that term.

Mike Rodenbaugh: That makes sense. And what about Alan and Bertrand then?

Bertrand de la Chapelle: That was the question I was going to raise, because the formulation that you just made puts in the same category the members and the liaison, the so called liaison.

Jeff Neuman: I mean we've worked in different ways on different groups. In general the advisory committee liaisons or their whoever is representing them are non-voting members of council and are non-voting members of other organizations.

On the other hand the group that was put together by the board on GNSO restructure made that person a full fledged member.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: And the case that we had on the IDN CCTLD group was putting everybody as well on the same level.

Avri Doria: Not really, but that's a discussion for another day. I do believe that it was quite specific in the council that the consensus were from among the members and that's why that was a specific listing of members and other participants.

Now obviously on a consensus thing you know if we have very strong opposition from other participants, we need to take that into account. But I know that in creating the initial charter, the councils did quite specifically - and this was also discussed in the planning team, quite

specifically the difference between the members and consensus of members.

And that's why there's a category called other participants.

Man: Correct. Even with that distinction I'd like to see the other participants sub divided, because I don't think we're in the same category as staff.

Avri Doria: In other words...

Jeff Neuman: Move staff down to...

Man: Should we just break it out and have...

Avri Doria: Well but I'm not sure I agree.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, and if I could jump in Avri, I'm now thinking about it as well. I think because policy staff is going to have to implement a lot - at least with respect to the PDP team, I think policy is an instrumental - I'm sorry the policy staff is an instrumental component that I would like to see included in the same category.

Alan Greenberg: I can live with that.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Now wait a minute, in what category?

Jeff Neuman: With the other participants.

Mike Rodenbaugh: With the working teams, you're not thinking about in the consensus of the committee.

Jeff Neuman: No, not on the work teams, on the PPSC. So it's the PPSC members which are listed really as just the constituencies and the...

Mike Rodenbaugh: And Avri.

Man: I'd say we don't agree that staff would be included as part of the full consensus of the committee, I don't know where that would.

Jeff Neuman: Right, no that would...

Man: No, we've already excluded the group of others from the consensus.

Jeff Neuman: Right, they're already excluded.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well that's - I mean Avri says that was her view of the consensus of council, I don't recall that personally myself.

But I think Avri went on to make it seem like it probably doesn't really matter because then I agree with her completely.

I think Alan or Bertrand or Liz have a concern then we all ought to have a concern and try to address it. I just you know I'm concerned at how we're going to make consensus calls.

You know what if people aren't on the call when a consensus call is made, are they going to have an opportunity to object afterwards?

Man: That was my question Mike as well, I mean I had the same questions that you did, most have been answered. I think there are still a few that are out there and that's one of them that I think is important.

Jeff Neuman: I think we might be interpreting consensus call literally as a phone call as opposed to a call for consensus which could be done via email as well, right?

So I don't want to get caught up in that. Someone will be present whether it's on email or - it can't be present on email and/or a teleconference then I mean I'm...

Liz Gasster: This is Liz, I have a...

Man: I think this needs to be defined so that everyone's on the same page. Because clearly and I guess this is another case where I'm with Mike on not understanding that we had come to some agreement in that first meeting.

I don't - I didn't quite grasp that either and don't recall that there was a consensus call on that. Of course we were trying to define what that means, that (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: So in the charter and then I'll let Liz - it sounds like she wants to say something. In the charter it doesn't say anything about a consensus call.

It says unless otherwise determined by the PPSC members, committee decisions will be made using a quote full consensus end quote process.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right, and that's just completely undefined.

Avri Doria: I don't....

Man: But evidently some of us think that we came to agreement in the first meeting on some of it and others of us clearly didn't have that understanding, so...

J. Scott Evans: Well this is J. Scott and I think Jeff and I have both said that we came to agreement with regards to the role of an alternate versus a member.

I don't believe that we said that there was an agreement with regards to other participants which Bertrand I think was the one that brought up that question or something.

That's been raised in this - I do not think that was discussed on our December call.

Jeff Neuman: So Liz, you wanted to say something.

Liz Gasster: I actually just wanted to draw people's attention to the fact that we do have the - some draft work team rules that the OSC has adopted that I think there's some edits to from this group, you know the idea that we might adopt something like that.

And there is a section there for decision making that elaborates on actually rough consensus, the term it uses so we have to do some work to make sure our terminology is consistent.

But one possibility is to add language to that decision making section that essentially provides for an actual process to determine consensus like Avri for example in the fast flux working group where you know you had the - on the first call there would be okay here's new language.

And it would be highlighted in one way and there would be the opportunity on the next call for people to voice concerns and then on the third call there would be - it would then revert to you know fully - it would revert out of the draft text or you could set a series of steps to be sure that each area that's at issue is out of the - what everyone has heard from on each issue.

Or has the opportunity to be heard from on the issue. I didn't express that very well, but.

Avri Doria: And if I can comment, and that was a rough consensus model because at that point you ended up with you know agreement support and alternative views and obviously when you're in that kind of statement, you're in rough consensus, not full consensus.

Full consensus which I thought was fairly well defined which is everyone that - everyone is in agreement and there is no one voicing opposition. Now whether they're not voicing opposition because they've given up or because they truly agree is beside the point.

But no one is voicing opposition. That's the full consensus model as I understand it and as I understand it's applied in perhaps the GAC, though Bertrand could tell me better.

And it was quite specific when it said full consensus of members. Now we can change that, but that was what it was - you know the default was full consensus of members and the original proposals were quite specific of there being full members and other participants.

Mike Rodenbaugh: So I have a suggestion, this is Mike so that hopefully we can do something today and approve this charter. Maybe we just put in some placeholder language here and decision making that says that the PPSC will devise rules to define full consensus and how that will be determined.

J. Scott Evans: Well this is J. Scott, I don't think the question as I understood it was necessarily that, I thought the question was who among those groups listed on this TWiki when we say okay we want to know if we have reached consensus, which parties in that list are entitled to give an opinion.

And as I understood Avri's position is that historically and what she just supports is that is members which mean that those that are listed as other participants would not be included and would not voice anything when we took a temperature of the group to see if consensus whether it be rough, whether it be full, whether - had be reached.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan, that doesn't make any sense though if you include the last line, that is the representative of the council itself.

J. Scott Evans: I'm just saying I think that...

Alan Greenberg: Are you saying the chair of the council can override consensus?

J. Scott Evans: No, what I'm saying is that I'm not looking at the working team rules because - that the OSC has put out. I thought the issue we were discussing was whatever, however you define consensus who gets to participate in defining to default into whatever definition you give it.

And as I understood, Avri's position was that was the people who are listed on the TWiki as members.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan, that's the question I'm asking about.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, all right so Alan's in the queue and then who else after Alan?

Avri Doria: Avri.

Jeff Neuman: Alan then Avri and then Tim, okay so Alan, Avri, I'm sorry, I'm just getting - Bertrand and Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Tim, yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I was raising the point that if full consensus means everyone has to agree, the last line in the member's list is the council chair or alternate. And I'm not sure if that's what - we really want that to have a vote on the consensus or is consensus the vote of the constituency of the GNSO council?

I'm just pointing out that maybe that last person does not participate - have to participate in the full consensus. I'm not sure I know what the

answer is but I'm raising the point that it's - that member is in a somewhat different category.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, then Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, a couple things. One is in the original definition, that person whether it was the chair or vice chair was indeed a member and was undistinguished as being a lesser member but was a member.

So therefore like anyone else, participated in the consensus. Now there was also though a strong recommendation that for some reason is not written, but it's what both Chuck and I are fulfilling is that you know you are there as the chair but you're also there in you're whatever other role you've got.

So in other words, in this one I'm also the NCA rep and on that one he's also the registry member. So that's the one thing.

Now the other thing is on consensus if the members as they now stand want to say that consensus is all inclusive and includes the other members which is not an unreasonable thing to do, we can certainly do it and I would go along with it.

It's just that because it's up to the members to make that kind of decision and if we want to we certainly can. It's just that the default condition as defined was this set of members.

It was the listed set of members and full consensus which means all those members agreed. There was no notion about who could speak and who couldn't when we were asking for it.

I don't think anybody ever thought of so and so doesn't get to speak when you're doing a consensus check. But when you looked around and said okay do all the members agree, all the members did not include the other representative.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, Bertrand?

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Well first of all I think that this issue Avri was right in saying that a full consensus is probably the objective. The second thing is that the expression unless otherwise determined by the PPSC members committee decisions will be made using full consensus is imprecise because we don't know how the decision is being made by the PPSC members.

It's a sentence that I saw in the USC document as well. Does that mean that the decision to not use a full consensus should be done by full consensus or is there another way?

Avri Doria: No, exactly.

Jeff Neuman: No, I think that was - no, you're right, it is - was intended that a full consensus of PPSC members had to decide otherwise.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Okay. So there's a full consensus needed to decide that we don't use full consensus. Okay. The second thing is regarding the participations of the other members.

I think there is a distinction in any case between the liaisons and the secretariat and policy staff represented, not in the discussion but it is not exactly the same kind of participation.

I think the secretariat and the staff are there to support the activities but it is not the same category as other members of the community.

Now as far as the question as whether the liaisons both from ALAC and the GAC whether they should participate or not in the vote or in the consensus call, the two options are possible.

I believe that in any case this is typically a question that we should address at one moment in the working group team discussion.

Because this is a question that will be recurring every time we will want to make a working group that is transversal.

Whether we choose right now to make it a full participation is a question that is open. I'm not making it an absolute condition. It may be a little bit early to discuss that or to decide it.

And I would have no problem if there is a decision by the whole group not to include the liaisons in the consensus call. But I think it is a very important question that will have to be addressed in any case.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan, could you put me back in the queue?

Jeff Neuman: Sure, I've got Tim and then Alan. Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Oh. I think first of all if we're going to consider other than the members as currently defined in the consensus process, I don't think that's a decision that the steering committee can make.

We might have an opinion, we might express the opinion back to the full council, but that would be in my opinion a decision that the full council would ultimately have to make.

Because we're really not given that flexibility within currently approved implementation documents. The other thing is that I think that for the purposes of getting this charter approved, I think Mike had a good suggestion.

That we simply - I don't think we need to define full consensus. In fact I would like to see that just slightly modified so it actually mirrors the actual verbiage in the actual implementation plan.

Where it doesn't just say using the full consensus, it says using the full consensus of the members and that's in quotes, process. I don't think full consensus of the members needs to be defined, I think that's pretty clear.

But we might note that the process that we will use to determine the full consensus of the members is yet to be defined. So we have to put a place holder for that, we can approve this charter.

But I think full consensus is pretty clear, the intent was pretty clear when this document was put together. And to prevent a change, who the members are or who participates in this process, it should go back to the council.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so Tim, just to reiterate and then I'll go to Alan, your recommendation is that we keep the same wording except we add the words in the quotes, it says full consensus of its members?

Tim Ruiz: Of the members.

Jeff Neuman: Of the members, you'd add those three words and then we could pretty much leave that as is and work on that in the future. And if we want to revise it your position is that we need to go to the council anyway.

Tim Ruiz: If we want to revise what the full consensus, who participates in full consensus then yes, because - yeah, but we've been given to work from is very clear about who the members are.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, two comments. First just with respect to what Avri said, I wasn't targeting my comment at Avri in particular. Avri currently is sitting on this PPSC as an NCA member in addition to being here as a chair.

And I was looking at it you know if the chair is not on the committee representing the constituency which is really the issue. With regard to what Bertrand said, I think the issue is quite different on the PPSC and on the working teams.

The working teams are going to have members who don't necessarily represent any constituency and I think our rules are going to be somewhat different and be more lenient in allowing lack of full consensus.

Because we're going to have free agents there who can do whatever they want.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so your position...

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry, I'm saying the rules we use in this case to determine consensus I think will be different from those that we use in the working teams.

Jeff Neuman: So would you be okay though with adding the couple words that Tim had recommended?

Alan Greenberg: In terms of the members?

Jeff Neuman: right.

Alan Greenberg: I - with having pointed out the caveat that maybe we want the council representative to not be required for full consensus but that's just pointing it out. But yes, I'm happy with it.

Avri Doria: Can I make a comment in response?

J. Scott Evans: I'd like to get in the queue as well.

Jeff Neuman: I've got Avri and J. Scott, anyone else? Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay. Certainly if we want to remove the chair as a duplicate from another member that's certainly something we'd need to get approved

by the council because it was included in the council's list of memberships.

The other thing I'd like to point out and this is semi-(guess) but not really, any chair of anything in the GNSO council or whoever who tried to veto something, that would not last very long.

Man: Probably true.

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott, in that regard I think the implementation plan actually might allow for it, because it says that the members are the GNSO council and/or vice chairs, a representative from each constituency and then the nominating committee appointee.

So in the situation we're in, you might fill the role of the nominating committee appointee for consensus purposes and Chuck may fill the role of the GNSO council and/or vice chair.

Not that I think it matters but I mean that is technically I don't think we really have a problem there.

Man: Well just have to give you two hats.

Jeff Neuman: J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I guess my first question is when we're talking about the wording, where is this wording we're speaking of? Is it on the TWiki? Is it on the working group, the working team rules that have been - where is this wording that we keep talking about members and the chair.

Jeff Neuman: My understanding and I'm trying to remember, correct me if I'm wrong, is on the Wiki, TWiki, in the part that says decision making for the PPSC, it's right before - or right after golden milestones but before initial PPSC teams.

Unless otherwise determined by PPSC members, committee decisions will be made using a full consensus process.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: That's where you - full consensus of the members. What we need to do also is to make sure that since we have some new people on the call is to make sure that the PPSC teams are at least that the current members are updated.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Now my next question is that we've seem to have come to at least a point with that and the - I thought what lead us to this whole discussion, I want to make sure we've handled that point, this is J. Scott again.

Is it says members and there are members listed and there are participants listed, correct? So I assume that if we change that that it means that whenever there is a call for a group to discuss whether consensus has been reached, that participants aren't considered quote unquote members.

Is that my understanding?

Jeff Neuman: The people listed in other participants are not members for the full consensus process.

J. Scott Evans: All right.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan, my understanding of what we were saying is their input would be listened to but they could not break consensus.

Jeff Neuman: Correct.

J. Scott Evans: All right, and I - that's where I want to make, that's the page I'm on as well, I just wanted to make sure that I was understanding because we seem to have floated a bit around.

I just wanted to make sure I understood that, thank you Alan, thank you Jeff.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, but it perhaps needs to be said for the next people who aren't on this call.

Avri Doria: Actually I need to point out something else and we may just want to, and this is (unintelligible) wording as I can.

Man: Sure.

Avri Doria: We should be careful and with liaison and actually go - and liaison, and what we already say our other appointed representative/observer.

There's a possibility that a specific AC may have trouble calling someone a liaison or calling someone a representative but could appoint a single person as an observer.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Yeah, I would support that, this is Bertrand.

Konstantinos Komaitis: I would support that as well, this is Konstantinos.

Jeff Neuman: Representative/observer?

Avri Doria: Right, appoint it so it's still - but just so it's open so we're not just saying that person has to be considered a representative by a group that it's unable to pick representatives.

Jeff Neuman: Does anyone object to that? I'll do it the opposite way, does anyone object to that? Okay Liz, we're going to - we'll make that change.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, I've got it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, with all of those, I wanted to ask if there's any other issues, making the couple changes that we discussed with the addition of the words, well it says now full consensus, say full consensus of the members.

And adding the word observer, is everyone good with the charter?

Man: I think so, if Liz could do a save so we could all see it, that would help.

Liz Gasster: I'm editing, sorry.

Man: Sorry, I thought you had been editing all along.

Liz Gasster: I have but I've been saving frequently, so...

Jeff Neuman: Let me - so Avri, a question. If this is to be ready for your June 29th council meeting, when does it have to be...

Avri Doria: It has to be a week ahead.

Jeff Neuman: I said June 29th, I meant January 29th.

Avri Doria: Right, January 29th, so at least a week ahead the motion needs to be there and the motion should be made by two of us you know who are on this group and council members.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so why don't we do this. Why don't we have Liz make the updates and we will do a consensus call via email over the next week, so that by the 15th, or the 14th if we don't hear any objections, and we'll specify this in the consensus call, then we will ask the council members to make a motion to accept this as our charter.

Anyone disagree with that approach?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I just ask that you use the phrase consensus call in the subject of your email along with PPSC so it doesn't get lost.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I think that's good.

Liz Gasster: So it just saved so if you refresh hopefully you'll see all my changes and you can correct me if I've missed anything.

Jeff Neuman: Okay well we'll - I still like the idea of sending out an email so people have a little bit of time to think about it. Bertrand, you had a comment?

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Yeah, I just had a small comment, in the working methods for the PPSC it says the PPSC will be comprised of a minimum of two separate teams, is it comprised or will establish a minimum of two separate teams?

Jeff Neuman: Where are you?

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Because the committee itself is not comprised of two teams.

Jeff Neuman: I think that is a good observation. So that is on the paragraph under working methods for the PPSC, Bertrand your recommendation is that we change it to PPSC...

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Will establish a minimum of two separate teams.

Jeff Neuman: I'm good with that change. Does anybody have any thoughts on that?

J. Scott Evans: We need a Frenchman to correct our English, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: J. Scott, that's a great point. So Liz can you make that change as well.

Liz Gasster: Yes, it's done.

Jeff Neuman: And then after that, after the consensus call is over what Liz and I will do is do a redline so that the council can see the changes that we've made from the original version.

Okay, I think we're ready for agenda item two. I thank everyone for their patience, and actually this one might take up a little bit more, I hope not as much time but it's a little bit more dense.

Mike Rodenbaugh: How long have we - how long do you allot for these calls? We're at about an hour now.

Jeff Neuman: Glen did you set it up for two hours, or...

Glen DeSaintgery: This one is actually set up for 1 1/2 hours Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: One and a half. Okay, so we need to move a little bit quicker and there's - because there's a couple key things that I think we need to do and I'd really like to leave here with - leave this call with you know comfort that the solicitation, the announcement for the work teams is going to go out in the next couple days.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Why don't we move to that one instead of the (CB) charters?

Jeff Neuman: Right, so the one thing in that is I think the solicitations are going to point to the charters, so yes, let's go to that one now but then we do need to get back to the charters.

So I believe it was distributed on the mailing list some time ago, the announcement, the proposed announcement that would go out.

Liz, correct me if I'm wrong, I believe that was sent out?

Liz Gasster: Yeah, in fact you sent out the most recent version I think. Sorry, I just have to grab the date.

Jeff Neuman: I see something on December 22nd.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, but subsequently you sent one, the more final one that Chuck sent you on the 30th of December.

Jeff Neuman: I'm not sure that went, did that go to the whole group?

Liz Gasster: You're talking about the invitation right?

Jeff Neuman: Oh, correct, you're right, December 30th at 2:10 pm.

Liz Gasster: Jeff, you're better than you even know you are.

Jeff Neuman: I'm just getting forgetful. So on December 30th, at least on Eastern time so I guess that might have been for some of you the 31st, I - we sent the...

Man: The 2:07 pm?

Jeff Neuman: Right, Eastern time, Eastern US time. That was the latest draft that I believe the council has a copy of as well.

But this is the latest draft that the OSC has approved to go out to solicit people for the five work teams, the two work teams that we have plus the three work teams that the OSC had.

It's been on our list, I haven't seen any comments against it. And I know that the - wow, hope everyone's okay. It sounds like and Avri correct me if I'm wrong, I think I talked to Chuck this morning on it.

He said he was pushing for this to be sent around shortly after the council meeting. Is that your understanding?

Avri Doria: I guess, I don't think we've talked about it, but I know that it's - but yeah, I think so.

Jeff Neuman: Has everyone had a chance to read it? It's pretty generic and a lot of the language was taken from...

Man: The guide, the housekeeping (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: So does anyone have any comments on this solicitation?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, I've got a comment on it. Who are we trying to solicit? You know I know we're in here to say that we're looking for people with specific expertise in certain areas.

It just kind of says what the teams are and then basically is an open invitation for anybody to join. Is that really what we want here?

Liz Gasster: Actually Mike it does say in the first paragraph that each work team will be made up of community volunteers who have interest in an expertise in one of the five main focus areas.

And then provides the details so that - it may not be sufficient but I think it was an attempt to solicit expertise in the areas.

Jeff Neuman: So what are you worried about Mike? I mean let's get that on the...

Mike Rodenbaugh: I'm worried that we're going to have work teams that - folks that - the work teams are going to get too big conceivably, but that's probably not really going to happen.

But maybe one or two of them will get out of control because you've got people joining these things who have no idea what they're doing.

Man: Well what lists are these being sent to Liz?

Liz Gasster: This actually is for very wide distribution including an announcement on the ICANN page I believe because when you look at the recommendations in the totality and the multiple tasks that are being asked of all five of the work teams, there's quite a lot of work involved in a variety of different areas including for example communications and document management potentially and website, improving the website and some communications aspects.

So there are differing types of expertise that are being sought in the different work teams and there's also been a lot of concern which I know is very much on the minds of the council initially that because of the amount of work that would be entailed to develop the recommendations in each of these areas that it's just going to take more people.

That people are spread too thin trying to cover the various work teams if we don't solicit a lot of participation beyond the usual participants.

Jeff Neuman: So Mike do you have any comments on that?

Mike Rodenbaugh: No, not really. I mean I certainly agree that there's a lot of work and there's not a lot of people to do it. I guess I still like (unintelligible) to anybody is maybe not exactly what we want to do.

I prefer to have a different approach where each of the work teams went out and found specific expertise if they needed it. But you know I'm sure that my fear is probably not well founded, that we'll get too many volunteers.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, I have a comment.

Tim Ruiz: I'd like in the queue.

Jeff Neuman: Sure, Avri, Tim, anybody else? Okay, Avri?

Avri Doria: I think that we need to do just for the sake of openness a wide outreach. I also think we have to make sure that we do the particular outreach that you're talking about in terms of for example on working groups.

You know we specifically mention that we're going to look at the working group processes from other organizations that do working groups.

You know we should do some outreach either to their liaisons within the technical advisory committee you know that the board has or directly through WCT and IATS and other groups like that.

And the last thing is within any working group if we can get enough people, that's one thing.

And then even then only 10 to 20% maximum will be the ones actually doing most of the work if things follow any normal pattern I've ever seen.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, Tim?

Tim Ruiz: The one - probably the big issue but I certainly think it would help to frame this work more appropriately if for example in bullet - in item four in the background information it was clear that the GNSO through two steering committees is creating these five special work teams.

And perhaps in that - the end paragraph of that section make it clear that these - who these steering committees are and that there will be coordinating and overseeing the work of the work teams.

Because this makes it sounds like these are five teams being formed directly by the GNSO and reporting directly to the GNSO and it might be beneficial to make it clearer as to the structure that we're going to be working under.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I agree with that.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, Liz, how difficult would it be to make that change?

Liz Gasster: Well it's easy enough to draft it, I think it's just you know going back through the OSC folks to give them a chance to comment. I know they were trying to kind of simplify a little bit just for the invitation, the background information that was provided.

I do agree that for new people joining the work teams who express interest based on the solicitation, a further overview might be called for including an explanation of the role of the steering committees.

So one possibility is to consider that something that's done after people express interest to just get everyone on board and give additional information there.

But I'd be glad to draft additional phrase here and refer it back to the OSC. I know that we're anxious to get this out.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yeah, I don't know that we need to delay, from my perspective anyway I don't know that we need to delay for that.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: This is Bertrand, can I get in the queue?

Jeff Neuman: So I've got Bertrand and Tim, if you want to respond as well. So Bertrand?

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Yeah, just very quickly first it will be the responsibility for each of the representatives of the different constituencies and the liaisons to not only spread the document but explain to their respective constituencies what this is about and encourage them to identify within their own membership the appropriate people that might be interested in each of the sub groups.

Because explaining this relatively complex structure of two steering committees and five sub groups requires additional comments in addition to the document that will be circulated.

The second thing is I wonder what kind of plans are underway for addressing this issue in any public manner during the Mexico meeting and what it would articulate for the timeline.

Because I think the consultation will come to that later, I know, but the consultation with the rest of the community will be an important element to engage factors and maybe have less people in the work teams and more interaction in physical meetings.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, and Tim and then I'll step in a little bit too. Tim?

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, I think what Liz suggested is fine, that the volunteers that we follow up in some fashion with the volunteers in more detail so that they understand fully what they're getting into as well as the structure is going to be.

And then in regards you know with Mike's concerns about this is going to anybody and everybody and we're going to be requiring a statement of interest with some additional information as the details where - I think that will help.

And then are we necessarily bound to accept every volunteer, or if there's some extreme case we are you know the steering committee has issues, I mean do we have a veto on - potentially?

Jeff Neuman: As it's worded it says the work teams are open to all interested volunteers.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Right, so what happens if one of them is obstructionist or otherwise a problem. Is that built in to the work team rules, I have not reviewed those yet.

J. Scott Evans: I believe if you look at the work team rules that have been put together by the OSC, this is J. Scott speaking, they have something in there about managing that particular problem Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Yep, I confirm.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, right, okay.

J. Scott Evans: And I think that's the reason you're getting statements of interest from people is because that would serve as a basis for understanding where it's coming from, it looks like an obstruction is because it's a particular point of view or political process.

It's sort of not bringing it forward, it would give you grounds to raise something under that section.

Jeff Neuman: Correct. And I think Bertrand's points as well are important in that yeah, I believe we should in Mexico City talk about the groups and I don't think this - these work teams have a definite date of when you have to join by, so I do think that if people want to join or contribute after the Mexico City meeting I think that's okay.

I just don't want - none of us want work to wait until after the Mexico City.

J. Scott Evans: Correct.

Jeff Neuman: So I think J. Scott's point about the work team rules try to address that and we will be talking about that as well. I think we're going to be posting as soon as we approve work team rules those will be posted,

so these are going to be things that will remain known to people as they are finished.

So all of that said, I want to ask the same question I guess I started with on this is that Liz is going to propose an extra phrase in there to clarify that there are steering committees.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I thought we decided she would not because we didn't want to delay because she'd have to go back to the OSC.

Jeff Neuman: Well I think it's just the addition of a couple words, correct Liz?

Liz Gasster: Well yeah, but we would still have to go back to them. So you know honestly I'd recommend candidly although I'd do as you like of course not doing it. You know I think there's this element of not wanting to sound too complicated you know when it is going to be new to a lot of people.

And that the orientation might be the more appropriate place to do it. But I'd be glad to draft it and I'd be glad to send it over to the OSC right away, so as you like.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so Mike, are you fine with leaving it as is?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes as I said before.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. All right, so everyone - is there anyone against sending out the solicitations as soon as possible with the words that are currently in there?

Mike Rodenbaugh: The only concern I would have remaining is that there's links and charters which aren't resolved yet.

Jeff Neuman: Right. So that's what we're going to talk about next. But I think even if the charters are works in progress, I've - well we'll discuss the charters but I'm assuming that they're - well maybe I shouldn't assume.

My assumption was that they're - even if they're not final they're pretty close. So let's table that and actually go to the charters themselves.

The latest version of the work team charters were sent around by J. Scott and that was Tuesday...

J. Scott Evans: Monday.

Jeff Neuman: Monday. What was Tuesday? Today. You sent something this morning, didn't you?

J. Scott Evans: No.

Jeff Neuman: No yesterday, you sent something yesterday. You sent revision to mine, is that...

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, maybe it was yesterday, I can't remember if it was yesterday or Monday. I'm out of the office so my head is sort of bizarre. But I sent something recently and I posted it on the TWiki as well.

Jeff Neuman: Right. So those work team documents are up there. They're...

Man: They're on the Wiki?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I'm looking right now, I believe they are, let's see, working groups...

J. Scott Evans: They're on the work team, I couldn't post them to the work team TWiki so they're on the main TWiki. And they're over there where it says attach documents.

And I think even at the very top because they were just added they were the three things I sent out are the very - there are links at the very top under policy process steering committee.

Avri Doria: They're also in line there you see them, it's the work group team and then the other following charter reflect that some (unintelligible) December, etcetera. But yeah, they're there in line as well as attached documents.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so there's three documents at the top, one says working group section two compare with new and dot doc, so that is - I'm just trying to figure out which one that is.

J. Scott Evans: All that is is section two of the proposed working group charter compared to the section two of the PDP charter that you sent out recently. Then the next document is a comparison between the working group charter section two with what was originally on the TWiki.

Jeff Neuman: So the PDP team charter's not up there?

J. Scott Evans: No.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. That one...

Avri Doria: What's the useful, under useful internal Wiki links down at the bottom, there's policy development process piece. What's that?

J. Scott Evans: Where is this now?

Man: Bottom of the page.

Avri Doria: The whole internal Wiki link. Or are these the old things?

Jeff Neuman: That's the old one.

Avri Doria: Oh, that's the old stuff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so there's two - so my document, okay. You need to look at the one that's Monday email, sent around Monday at 9:54 am, we will post that document as well, 9:54 my time, eastern time.

That was the document for the PDP team that I posted.

Alan Greenberg: I have a comment on that one.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, and then just hold on one second. Then the J. Scott posted the working group team one plus a comparison of section two of mine to his one.

Man: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So that's what's up there, we'll make sure they're all posted correctly. So let's go to the - and I think it was Alan, let's go to the PDP team.

Tim Ruiz: And Jeff this is Tim, I sent some revisions to the revisions.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, the two that I have so far, this is J. Scott were from Tim Ruiz and from Avri.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so that was...

J. Scott Evans: They both had comments.

Jeff Neuman: Right, so Tim yours is on the OSC? I'm sorry, your one was on....

Tim Ruiz: Yeah, I had that one too but I sent one - minor changes to the section two document.

Jeff Neuman: Right, so all the comments were on section two, correct? There were no comments on section one of either of them?

Tim Ruiz: Right, for me.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, and that was Mike, you said you had some questions?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, let's go to the PDP one first that was sent around and we'll start with section one.

Avri Doria: Can I make a general comment before you start?

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

Avri Doria: I have to leave to get ready for another meeting. I just wanted to comment that I'm fine with whatever you all decide to put out there as draft charters that are available when people do the sign up and I'm going to hang up now.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thanks Avri.

Avri Doria: Thanks, bye.

Jeff Neuman: So Mike, you said you had some questions on - for the PDP team one or the working?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I'm looking at your document Jeff, PDP.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: That's the same one for me, it's Alan.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so Mike and then Alan.

Mike Rodenbaugh: So if there's more specifically the report recommended that a new PDP, blah, blah, blah and then there's A through F. Is this verbatim from the report?

Jeff Neuman: No.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I did not think so.

Jeff Neuman: It's not because it would have been - it would not have made sense if it was verbatim. It's pretty - I mean read it and double check it. I don't think I interpreted anything.

Mike Rodenbaugh: But I've read it and there's certainly some typos as you say, a few of them. But one subsequent question I think I have and I can rattle off the typos after that, but a subsequent question I guess I have is in A.

First of all there's some bad grammar at the end, and I'm just not sure what you actually intended by A.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so let me see, let me go back to - so where that was taken from initially is if you go to the let's see, where is it. The PDP team one that was posted earlier.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think am I correct that you're synthesizing Liz's (unintelligible) of the BGC report?

Liz Gasster: Right, this is - you all should feel free to take license with these.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay. Well I at least want to get my questions answered, that's all. But I mean I don't know that the board, I don't know what it means by the last part and maybe just because it's bad grammar.

But are you suggesting that we need to devise process - basically pre-PDP processes for fact finding?

Jeff Neuman: I believe one of the recommendations of the board governance committee was that there were steps to be taken including fact finding prior to the initiation of a PDP.

I believe that was one of the recommendations and Liz can correct me if I'm wrong. I may not have a worded that the best, again I might have done it really quick after some spiked egg nog.

But yeah, I believe that was something that they did say. If you want, I tried to make it easier by rewording certain things. I could try to go back and quote them.

Liz Gasster: Jeff, I can help with this. I know where the references are and Mike if you go to the PDP team...

Mike Rodenbaugh: I don't care what was said before, I guess I just care what we're trying to say now and I want to try to understand what we're tasking ourselves to do because I'm on that group.

So...

Alan Greenberg: Jeff can I get in here, it's Alan.

Jeff Neuman: Sure Alan.

Alan Greenberg: When I've been doing these request for issues reports through the ALAC, I've read the words of the current bylaws very carefully many times. And one of the current problems is the term policy development process is used for a variety of different things.

It's used for the thing that the council votes on to start a PDP. It's also used as an umbrella for the whole thing that includes the request for an issues report.

If you look at the current bylaws, a PDP is initiated or started about 3 different times in the process.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Or in three different ways.

Alan Greenberg: Well no, but they start - you initiate the PDP by requesting an issues report, then the GNSO council gets it and it decides to do an initiated PDP.

It's conflicting as it is right now.

Liz Gasster: Alan this is Liz....

Alan Greenberg: And the problem is - yeah, the problem is we're still using the terms in this confusing manner. So when we talk about the whole envelope of a development policy lower case, it may well include investigation before deciding to start it.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Well as a matter - sorry, this is Bertrand, can I get in queue?

Alan Greenberg: And I just think we need to clarify exactly what we mean because otherwise we get into these circular discussions continually.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, Bertrand, anyone else in the queue?

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Yeah, actually I should have sent it to the list but I had a side discussion with Chuck Gomes on the - when I joined the OSC because what Alan is mentioning is exactly one of the discussions that we will have to have or that they will have to have in the PDP team.

As a matter of fact the current mechanism for the PDP is not distinguishing the three stages which are one, how it is initiated, all the preliminary work, issue identification, issue scoping, issue framing and the general framework background documents and so on.

Then the proper drafting of a recommendation and then the third stage which is the formal adoption by all the different stages, the council and then the board of the agreed recommendation.

I don't think it is appropriate in that stage of our own - of the charters of the PDP to make that type of distinction, but I think it's one of the elements that we should take into account when we will be discussing the topic in the PDP team to distinguish more clearly those three stages.

The old policy development process is the old umbrella and it has at least three stages. One is the initiation and all the preliminary work up to the decision of launching a drafting process of recommendations and up to the agreement on this by the working group whatever has been tasked with doing this.

And then the final process of complete adoption up to the board. But it's probably early to say that but I fully support what Alan is saying.

Alan Greenberg: I think the substance is that this group is looking at a lower case policy development process which is the full sequence.

Liz Gasster: That's right.

Man: Yeah, the three, absolutely.

Liz Gasster: I agree with that, and I agree with you Bertrand as well and I would offer a fourth phase of the process which is also referenced in E of Jeff's draft, right, which is the post periodic assessment sort of after the fact.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: I fully support that. It's the feedback loop, absolutely.

Liz Gasster: That's right. So I think we want to articulate - the purpose here was just to - and it was based on I think my extraction of the board approved recommendations was to try to encompass the full scope of what they - what the board intended for this group to look at.

And we can do a double check both for grammar and for thoroughness to make sure that those concepts are represented here. But that's the goal.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Okay, may I propose a friendly amendment I hope to section A?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I mean I don't expect us to finalize this on the call, so it's not really a friendly amendment, it's a proposal. I mean....

Mike Rodenbaugh: Sure, I just don't like that it's you know emphasize the importance of the work that must be done before launching the working group.

Because as I've argued before, I think it's perfectly logical for a working group to do fact finding as its first step.

But regardless, I think maybe if we could just water this language down to say something like consider what works might be done before launching.

Jeff Neuman: You know I'm fine with that, I'm also looking at B and thinking do we really need A?

Bertrand de la Chapelle: I'm sorry, I'm not sure that we're talking about the same document. I was looking at the GNSO policy development process team charter that is accessible when you click on the link under initial PPSC team.

Jeff Neuman: No, and that's my problem Bertrand, I sent around to the mailing list but neglected to put it up on the Wiki.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Yeah, because I received two things that I could not open actually, the PDP team and the other one where inform us that it couldn't open for one reason or another.

Man: You sent that as a doc X and if you have an old version of Word or something like that you need a little software to make it work.

Liz Gasster: Jeff can I - it's Liz, can I jump in, is this the appropriate time?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, and if we could post - get this posted up there.

Liz Gasster: Yes, I'll do that right after the call.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so yeah Liz, jump in.

Liz Gasster: I just want to make sure people know this language is directly extracted from the board report, so - and I've got the board report in front of me, it's page 25.

And it specifically says in preparing the new PDP proposal the implementation team should emphasize the importance of the work that must be done before launch of a working group or other activity such as public discussion, fact finding and expert research in order to define properly the scope objective and schedule for a specific policy development goal.

You know so this is really intended to be very you know accurately but succinctly derived from in a sense the charter, the communities being given by the board. And we can double check the language, absolutely and fix any anomalies, but that's the intent behind it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, Mike does that answer your question?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes, not exactly in the way I would have liked it answered.

Jeff Neuman: Right, well I mean the PDP team, that's the board recommendation the PDP team could do whatever it wants with that recommendation and you know make other recommendations.

So this is not meant, if you think this language constrains the PDP team, I think you should let us know that and - because I do

understand your point that it should be flexible enough for the PDP, at least consider the issue.

And just because the board said something doesn't mean that the PDP team has to agree with that and recommend that back.

Mike Rodenbaugh: That's true, but I've already, the wheels are already spinning and I see ways to interpret this that would be all right. So all right, move on.

Liz Gasster: I'm sorry.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: May I make a suggestion, this is Bertrand.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, Bertrand, yes.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: On the document that is currently on the Wiki under team charter goals, it starts with develop and implement a policy for new policy development process for board review and approval.

That column, it could be just saying develop and implement a proposal for a new PDP for board review and approval period and then say in doing so, the team will take into account the board recommendations, the GNSO improvements reports.

And in particular the following elements and quote (unintelligible).

Man: That's essentially what it currently says.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I think Bertrand I think once we actually post the right document up there, I think it follows what you just said.

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Okay good.

Jeff Neuman: and I apologize, I should have gotten it up there and I just didn't think about it, I'm new to the TWiki world as well. So let's - sorry Tim, yes.

Tim Ruiz: Just we're kind of coming to the end here and this really shouldn't hold up this from sending out the invitation, correct? I mean as long as we have at least a draft that's posted on the website, even if it isn't the approved charter.

It could be noted as a draft.

Jeff Neuman: Correct.

Tim Ruiz: And then we could still get that invitation out, right?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, that's my assumption and I think that's right. I also think that we should try to get this done within the next two weeks so that we are final.

Alan Greenberg: Jeff, one substantive comment I have that I'd just like to raise, let's not discuss now, is that at the end of the A through F, the next paragraph it says the PDP team shall be responsible for making recommendations concerning the development implementation of a new PDP for the - for board review, bypassing the PPSC.

I think that needs - the wording there needs to be changed in line with the PPSC charter that we previously approved.

Jeff Neuman: I agree with that.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Liz, do you...

Liz Gasster: I actually didn't catch that Alan, I'm so sorry, can you...

Alan Greenberg: The last sentence on the first page, the last sentence of part one, essentially says the PDP team will make recommendations to the board, bypassing the PPSC.

Jeff Neuman: And bypassing the council.

Alan Greenberg: And the council, yeah.

Liz Gasster: For PPSC...

Jeff Neuman: PPSC review I think is really...

Bertrand de la Chapelle: And it's up to the PPSC to send it to the council.

Jeff Neuman: Right. Then the other issue which has been talked about on the list is in section two which my version is a little bit different than J. Scott's version for the working group team.

Mine says that the chair of the PDP team should be someone from the PPSC whereas J. Scott's - J. Scott you're on the call, right?

J. Scott Evans: Yep.

Jeff Neuman: Your version says, I'm going back between documents here.

J. Scott Evans: I just got bumped out of my screen so I'm going through it now and I'll tell you what difference is....

Liz Gasster: Jeff, I've got to drop off, it's Liz, I'm really sorry.

Man: Liz before you drop off did you want to talk to me about the RA thing?

Jeff Neuman: All right, before that Liz...

Liz Gasster: I would like to talk to you. Can I call you right after?

Man: Call me.

Jeff Neuman: All right guys, just so we do have a call it's every other week. So we are scheduled to have a call, I guess the next one would be the 21st at this time.

So we'll send around the agenda for that call as well and I'm just trying to jump through our agenda to make sure we don't have anything else we really need to address right now.

Interim chairs for work teams, I just want to throw that out there, that's something that we'll need to decide at the next meeting. But we do need to have at least interim chairs until the work teams are fully constituted so that they can pick their own chair once that happens.

But someone needs to get the ball rolling. Okay with that, J. Scott do you have anything to add because I know Liz has to drop off and some of us have to...

J. Scott Evans: No, I mean I just would encourage everyone to review these documents and make it a priority within the next seven days to any comments you have to get them out there on the list so that we can when we come to our discussion in two weeks we are prepared to have a call for consensus.

Jeff Neuman: Correct. All right everyone, thank you for the time I know we went a little bit over. And I will talk to you all in two weeks but please stay on the list and I'm going to issue the consensus call on the PPSC charter today or tomorrow.

Man: Okay. Thank you Jeff.

Man: Bye.

Man: Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks everyone, bye.

END