Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Working Group Model (WG) Work Team (WT)
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday, 10 June 2009 17:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the
Policy Process Steering Committee Working Group Model (WG) Work Team (WT)
meeting on Wednesday 10 June 2009, at 17:00 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-ppsc-20090610.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#june
(All MP3's and transcriptions can be found on the calendar page).

Present:
Avri Doria - NCA GNSO Council chair
S. Subbiah - Individual
Konstantinos Komaitis – NCUC (joined after roll call)
Alexei Sozonov
Graham Chynoweth (joined after roll call)
Greg Ruth
Alexey Mykhaylov (joined after roll call)
Cheryl Langdon-Orr (joined after roll call)

Absent apologies:
J. Scott Evans - IPC Work Team Chair
Iliya Bazlyankov
Jonne Soininen
Caroline Greer - Registry c.
Nacho Amadoz - Registry c.

Staff:
Ken Bour
Liz Gasster
Glen de Saint Gery
Gisella Gruber-White

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much. Good afternoon everyone. On today's

call we have Alexei Sozonov. We have Ken Bour, Avri Doria, Greg

Ruth and we have myself Gisella Gruber-White. And I believe...

Subbiah: Subbiah's here.

Gisella Gruber-White: Subbiah just joined.

Subbiah: Just joined.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Apologies we have (India), (Buzz), sorry (Buzz Yenkle), J. Scott Evans and (Yonis Finninen). Thank you. Roll call finished.

Ken Bour: I'm sorry. Those were apologies right?

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes. Apologies.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Gisella Gruber-White: And Liz Gasster has just joined as well.

Liz Gasster: Hello.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Liz Gasster: (A little wait) dialing in.

Man: Yeah. I had the same thing as well. Five to six minute wait.

Liz Gasster: Yeah.

Ken Bour: Maybe there's a half a dozen more that'll be joining us shortly.

Liz Gasster: Yeah.

Ken Bour: All right. Well this is Ken. I guess I'll just substitute a little bit here for J. Scott who is not going to join us today.

                Let's see. I sent a couple of emails off to the list basically summarizing the activities since our last call which - actually it was back in early May.

Man: Yes.

Ken Bour: And the idea was that we were supposed to have had a consensus call after working on the outlines that week follow the last conference call. And of course that didn't happen. And then in the intervening period I think folks just sort of lost track of where we were and what we were supposed to do and all of us were I'm sure busy doing other things.

                And as a result the sub teams didn't have calls. And things got organized about the third week of that interlude. And the, as I mentioned in an email, the charter sub team had a session and Avri, (Graham), Cheryl Langdon and I actually made a tremendous amount of progress going through the outline and cleaning up all of the comments, making decisions about what was in, what was out, restructuring the outline and so forth.

                And I'm happy to or maybe Avri would be amenable to going through that and telling the group where that document now stands and what our next steps are. The operating model team I don't believe has had any further meetings and I haven't seen any activity on the list. So probably need to figure out how to juice that back up.

Subbiah: I sent an email out - remember, this is (Tobia), on the 13th there was a cutoff date asking for consensus if there are going to be any changes in the document of the original thing. I sent an email out and I made some changes but I had no responses from anybody else and the call also didn't happen. So that's where it's sitting.

Ken Bour: Okay. Well what do folks want to do?

Subbiah: I mean what we're talking about now just so that I get this right is on the operating model to clean it up so that's it's a higher level draft than it is right now. Is that correct?

Ken Bour: Let me - you know what. Let me take a shot at describing what happened with the charter sub team Subbiah:and others and maybe that will...

Gisella Gruber-White: Perfect. Somebody's not muted.

Ken Bour: That's all right. Let me - let me just give you a sense of what took place with the charter sub team and that might be an indication. Because candidly just before that call with Avri, (Graham) and myself, you know, I was really in my own mind quite unclear as to how we were going to reconcile all the many comments some of which seemed like they were in the 180 degree, you know, variance of each other and all that.

And I thought wow, this is going to be really hard. But as it turned out, you know, we started at the very top, you know, looked at each element of the outline. Had some preliminary discussions around, you know, again looking at what was the mission, who was the audience,

what was the essential purpose and as a result of some dialog we were able to break the outline into two big pieces.

Actually I ended up making three sections out of it, one that was sort of an implementation set of guidelines that would be for sponsoring or chartering organizations, guidelines around implementing the working teams. And then the second section, which was the meat of the templates for the actual draft charter guidelines, these would be the set of instructions if you will that guide anybody who wants to build a real charter.

And that activity is out on the Wiki if you - if you go to the - this is the working group team page right at the very front of it. I put the new charter out line at the top. Does anybody not know where that is? I think I put it in the last email. I put all the links...

Subbiah: Yeah. I (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: So I could just sort of walk through this generally and then (Tobia) you were the last Chair so to speak quote unquote, of the operating model team and maybe this will be a (luster) too.

So what I did was all the stuff that was on this page before is now parked in another page and you'll see that in the first participant note. So anybody who wants to go back and look at...

Subbiah: Okay.

Ken Bour: ...what was done prior to that, you can simply click on that link, take you right back to the other page. And I really didn't do any substantive

editing at all to that page. I took everything and rebuilt it all new under this page based on the suggestion that Avri made which made all the - made great sense to me.

So on the 9th or so, that's five days after we met, I was able to get all the notes that I had taken from the call and created a synthesized outline that's essentially reconstituted and so I'm calling this Version 1 of the working group's implementation and charter drafting guidelines which indeed a mouthful.

Eventually we'll put a table of contents in but for now there'd be an introductory section, which you'll see. And then the document is broken up into three sections. Section 1 contains background information and material that relates. We were calling it on our call Meta information. It's information about working groups, not specifically related to the building of a real charter with real sections in it. So all of that generic material is now in Section 1.

Section 2 though is precisely the template material that - so every section there is intended to be a potential section in a real charter that would be given to a particular working group.

And the Section 3 I just tucked in there as an amendments or a revisions table for the purposes of keeping track of document control and versioning.

And then what I did - what we did in addition is we went through the outline. Okay. Once we figured out that as we went to a certain section we (decided) that's a meta issue, right, and we popped that up into a

different section and so we were doing a little of that kind of crafting work as we went through.

The second think we did with each element of the outline is we asked ourselves does this need to be in there. And if it does, we said a few words about what we thought it should be and I took the note. So what you see now here starting with Section 1.0 general, there would be a background section in the outline, a section that deals with the revisions that, you know, making the document a living guideline.

And Avri I see has already added some notes here, that's good, which weren't there the last time I looked. And on it goes. And then we have Section 2 that deals with the working group implementation and then Section 2 which is the working group charter template. Another introduction starting then with Section 1 working group identification.

And these would now be sections of the real charter. You know, there'd be - first is, you know, what is the name of the working group and who's the appointed chair and so forth and so on, all that kind of information.

Then Section 2 deals with mission purpose and deliverables. Section 3 information staffing, organization and - the outline is now all cleaned up. And what we - what I've tried to do is to put at least a paragraph underneath each one that says what that section will actually look like when it's fully drafted.

So I'm going to stop instead of going through all this. You can read through this outline and I'll - when I get a chance I'll look at Avri's latest set of notes to see if they change anything.

Subbiah: Okay. Can I say something? This is (Tobia) here.

Ken Bour: Absolutely.

Subbiah: Okay. So I mean I'm just trying to get this down to a task that's completable. Okay. So I'm just trying to hone down on that without worrying about, you know, opinions or anything here. Okay.

                So I see that what you have produced is in substance about 2-1/2 pages of text, correct, I mean roughly for the charter group. Right. I'm now taking a look at what I have on the - on the working group side, our last pass on it. Okay.

                I look at it. It's probably about two, three, maybe four pages long. Possibly maybe a bit longer even. You know, it might even be five including our comments and stuff. Okay. So it's a little bit longer than this one.

                Now from my understanding Scott Evans's point on by giving that 15th deadline was some kind of, you know, deadline whereby that point if anybody wanted to introduce new points in or take points out or make suggestions they ought to have done so by then. Is that my understanding?

                I mean (they'll have) a chance to object later on as to one but for now this is what's on the page is what needs to be drafted up. Is that a fair statement Ken? Is that how we were proceeding with this?

Ken Bour: Yeah. I mean - with your disclaimer that those...

((Crosstalk))

Subbiah: Yeah, because you see...

Ken Bour: ...haven't commented may have a right to do so later. I...

((Crosstalk))

Subbiah: I mean I - there are two ways to proceed with this. I actually, you know, I still think there's, you know - personally I think that the discussion wasn't finished as far as, you know, getting this together. But, you know, the Chair said look, this is a hard deadline, get your points in and then that's what we're going to work with for now, right.

                  And so if that's the view we're going for and also we are also looking at a point of getting something done then the easier task would be if we agree to do this is to say hey, let's take these four or five pages. Everything here for now is cast in stone. Everything in is in and everything out is out. Okay. All right.

                  Then it's just a matter of, you know, sitting down and cleaning this up so that maybe, you know, page out of the five pages would be taken out, be cleaned up and put in some format like what you've done for the charters would pretty much reorganize it and everything.

                  But nothing in substance being changed, anything. Every point being in there or a point that wasn't in there, not in there still, you know. And just recreating it to get something done, you know, that's an easier task. Right. I mean that's a - that's a finite task that can be done, you

know, potentially not with- you know, there's no (unintelligible). It'd be nice if all of us were on the call to be able to do it. But it looks clearly like we're not.

So if that's the task that we need to do then that's a task that, you know, in a way could probably be done because on your charter call there's just a few of you, right.

Ken Bour: Well that's right.

Subbiah: Yeah. So my suggestion is, you know, I'm committed, you know, we can try to do it now. We can try to go through some of this. But I do know that if the few people who are in a room together and tasked to do this face to face, just sit there and do it in an hour or two, you know, we could probably get it done. I mean - so I'm thinking, you know, I mean that's okay if we want to get it done on this call, that's perfectly fine. We can try.

But I'm thinking if on that Sunday I'm going to be there but if enough of us are there, a few of us at least, then we can commit that Sunday afternoon or whatever it is a couple of hours to sit there in Sydney and get it just done. You know.

And then - and then put it - serve it up to everybody - ask hey, this is the - nothing changed but this is just a (reentered) version of what everybody kind of finalized on before. Then let's open it up for more discussion.

I don't know. That's a choice but I'm also open to getting it done now but, you know. But for me personally after I - after I kind of turn, you

know, in the next two days, day and a half I'm off to two or three countries and then I end up in Sydney.

So it's going to be very difficult for me to work online during the next several days but I can more than willing to do whatever is necessary today. Any thoughts anyone?

(Constantine):   Yes (Tobia), it's (Constantine). Hello. (Unintelligible.) I think that it would be better to go for the second suggesting sitting right now and going through everything...

((Crosstalk))

(Constantine):   ...(if you decide) Ken. We can circulate an email to the operator's team saying that for the people who are not going to be in Sydney they have the last chance to make any additions that they want and then we can task whoever it is in Sydney. I won't be for example but I've made my insertions to summarize it and produce it to the rest of the team.

Subbiah: Do we have - do we have any idea who's going to be in Sydney? I mean even if we wrap this up now...

(Constantine):   I know that (Caroline) is going to be there from the operating...

Subbiah: Right.

(Constantine):   ...the operations team.

Subbiah: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

(Constantine): ...is going to be there.

Subbiah: Yeah. Even if (we) manage to wrap it up as a polished document right now, probably it's worthwhile for the rest of us who'll still be in Sydney to get together again and offer, you know, and talk anyway. So to meet is probably for those who are in Sydney is a given. The only question is what we do there.

So (Caroline) is going to be there. I'm going to be there. Anyone else on this call that's going to be there? I mea, you know, Ken is there obviously and Liz probably.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Ruth: ...I'm going to be there.

Subbiah: Who's that?

Greg Ruth: Greg.

Subbiah: Oh Greg. Yeah Greg's going to be there. And I guess Avri will be there, right.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yeah. (I plan to).

(Grey Graham): This is (Gray) - this is (Grey Graham). I'll be there as well.

(Tobia):   Okay. Oh, hi (Gray).

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...going to be there. (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Yeah. I mean most of the Council members will be there. I expect J. Scott will be there although I haven't heard for sure. I expect most people will be there. When exactly they're all free...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...is another issue.

Subbiah: People are aware of that time slot, right. That evening of the Sunday I guess from 4:00 to 5:00 or something, is that Ken?

Ken Bour: Yeah. So in fact I was going to bring this up a little later on the call.

Subbiah: Okay.

Ken Bour: Liz and I and Marika and a few others were actually talking a little bit from a staff point of view as to how we might use the time in Sydney productively. And it was my suggestion that in fact for the working group team it might be useful for us to work in sub teams rather than as a larger team, right.

Subbiah: Right. Right.

Ken Bour: And that's essentially (Tobia) what you're advocating...

Subbiah: Yes.

Ken Bour: ...as well is that use the time to clean up the outline and then after Sydney we can begin drafting work. Now on the charter side, you know, we will have already started draft or already have started drafting work. But it won't be finished I don't think by Sydney.

((Crosstalk))

Subbiah: Yeah.

Ken Bour: Unless we get a huge block of time.

Avri Doria: And in terms of scheduling, I don't know if this has gotten through to everyone. Because of the way the schedule worked out, on Saturday in terms of basically being in gTLD discussions almost all day, we're only using one out of two rooms. So if there are groups of people that aren't totally smitten with the subject of new gTLDs, there is actually a room that can be used and space that can be arranged.

I know most people are smitten with gTLDs. So it's hard to get together. But there is space, room and time.

Ken Bour: Thanks.

Subbiah: So maybe what we should try to then - try to do is take the two suggestions that were just made right now which is one, you know, we should make it very clear that between now and Sydney if anybody else, you know, by email to whoever is not here and anyone here too,

to get in there - their comments if they want to, you know, in this moving document. And that's the last - you know, because in Sydney we're going to finalize at least this version of it.

So now having - so we need to take care of sending that email out and, you know, Ken or someone. Okay. So we'll do that. Now I suppose. The other thin then is I guess with the few of us here there's a commitment of at least a few of us joining up in Sydney.

I mean I'd imagine there's four or five people at least that we know will turn up because, you know, I don't think we want to be in the position of getting Sydney and finding that it's, you know, just two of us, Ken and someone else, two people (planning) it, right. We want to make sure there's a group of us who can stand by it.

So we need to make sure that - I believe right now it looks like that's going to happen.

Now the third thing is that maybe then what to do with this current call - perhaps what we can do at least is make a pass on the working group document and try to organize it at least by bullet points into the three sections that Ken was suggesting so it makes it similar to the charter one.

Is at least get that step of overall, you know, parsing it so that we can shove it into different sections and maybe even go through it and clean up a few things that we may think are inappropriate or whatever. Is that a thing to try to do Ken?

Ken Bour: Well, I don't know that the sectioning idea necessarily applies in the operating model guidebook.

Subbiah: Okay.

Ken Bour: We actually had two logical types that were built...

((Crosstalk))

Subbiah: Okay. Over there.

Ken Bour: ...to the original outline. And what we did, and this was a kind of an odd moment for me, through the discussion we discovered that we really had two types, to logical types of information in the outline. And it made sense to put them into Section 1 for one type and Section 2 for the other.

              In the operating model I'm not sure that you have - we have that same kind of circumstance. But if we did then yeah, that would make sense to do.

Subbiah: Okay. So I'm just trying to see how we can be productive with the current time we have. So one thing is to, you know, try to overview it and try, you know, (positive) session.

              If that is not a reasonable thing to try to do, at least then we can try to take at least one of the sections here, I know there are several sections here, five or six sections, five sections. At least pick one and try to structure in a way towards what we want it to look like post

Sydney, you know, right now and see, you know, sort of a model of what we want to do. Is that a fair thing to try to do?

Ken Bour: Not sure.

(Constantine): The idea on this (Tobia) (unintelligible).

Subbiah: No, I'm just saying that I'm not sure whether we'll have the time in this call to go through the whole thing and, you know, rewrite the whole thing the way we want it to be. The way that, you know, Ken's got his charter stuff, Ken and Avri and all the others that have got the charter stuff to. Okay.

So I'm thinking that if there's no need to reorganize the whole thing in different overview sections because as Ken points out, then perhaps what we can do as a model, as a template, pick one of the sections here, there's a general, there's roles and responsibilities and so on.

Just pick one right now and start working on it at least as a sort of a model or a template, you know, so we can have something done now and then we'll continue with the other sections in Sydney. Any idea? At least we'll have some kind of template form so we'll know what to think about when we get into Sydney.

Avri Doria: Sounds like a good idea.

Ken Bour: Sure, you want to lead us through it (Tobia)?

Subbiah: Yeah, I don't know. Are you going to help me here? So let's go.

Ken Bour: Sure.

Subbiah: Let's start with the - any pot luck. Should we just go with general or just jump into one of the more meaty ones? I mean I don't know. Any ideas?

Ken Bour: I think we can probably skip the general stuff. I mean...

Subbiah: Okay.

Ken Bour: ...both documents will have a section that discusses...

Subbiah: Okay.

Ken Bour: ...the background and the purpose, the (aviants) and that sort of thing.

Subbiah: Okay. You know what...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: In fact I can probably even pull from material that...

Subbiah: Okay.

Ken Bour: ...if we get ahead - if one document gets ahead of the other we can share and share alike.

Subbiah: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes. I can imagine there'd be two paragraphs of blah, blah where one would be almost identical and one would be specific to each of the docs.

Ken Bour: Yeah. I think that's right.

Subbiah: Okay. To me it seems that the easy ones to pull out, the most straightforward things here might be either the roles and responsibilities or the (norms). Is that a - is that a fair statement that we could work on? Either one of those two I think be it simpler in terms of thinking about - maybe not (norms). Probably roles and responsibilities might be - might be - the (norms) has all kinds of voting issues and stuff, right.

                So roles and responsibilities?

Ken Bour: Sure.

Subbiah: Okay. So let's start. And I guess we have let's see - (unintelligible) about two pages worth. We have altogether two point - two point - four points. Actually two points. Okay. So the first one seems to be introduction and team formation. Okay.

                Can everyone - I mean I guess everyone - is there anyone who doesn't have it in front of them?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I don't.

Subbiah: I can, you know, I can give - I can send the link or one of us can - everybody's got it?

Avri Doria: Which way do you find it in the tree? Can somebody quickly tell me where the tree (hop) is and...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...improvements to where?

Ken Bour: CPSC then to work team...

Avri Doria: Okay. I'll find it.

Ken Bour: ...working group team.

Avri Doria: Okay. Cool.

Ken Bour: In fact on the - on the master GNSO site, gnsoicann.org Glen has now created on the left side actually a spot for each of the teams, all five. You can get to it that was also.

Subbiah: Yeah. I have it here as a link. If anybody wants I can...

((Crosstalk))

Alexei Sozonov: Subbiah:if you could send it to me at (unintelligible).

Subbiah: Okay. All right. Yes. Okay Alex, here it is.

Alexei Sozonov: Thank you.

Subbiah: Okay and the others who have it in front of them maybe you want to scan and start reading the 2.1 I guess.

Ken Bour: It might help just to take a moment and just recalibrate ourselves on what the general purpose or intent was of these two different documents, right. One of them is intend - the audience was intended to be a sponsor or chartering organization that is going to charter a working group, right.

So there's a set of things that they need to think about. And this whole project, this whole working group team project that we're on is essentially to take what the BGC said in it's report back in 2008 and try to help the entire GNSO move toward a working group model in most or if not all of its endeavors where community needs to participate.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Can I make two comments on that?

Ken Bour: Yeah. Before you do - up until now the GNSO certainly has adopted working groups and there have been many that have already been chartered and worked but there hasn't been any formality yet around that. It's been - and that's I think the intent of this team was to create the formality around it. Yeah, go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. I have two things. One was I'm always a little cautious when we talk about the audience for these because I think there's quite a diverse audience from people participating, people chartering, people

who are saying how do these things work anyway. So I think there's a very large audience and we need to keep that in mind.

The other thing I'm hoping is that we don't assume that the working group model that we've currently got albeit informal that it's sort of been evolving in a nature way. It's something to just be oh okay, that was just temporary and now we're going to do this whole new thing.

So I worry a little when we think about there being a large division between the fact that the GNSO is already doing working groups and the fact that we want to formalize what they're doing and maybe add a few more constraints. But I really hope we're not, you know, coming up with something out of the blue when we obviously have some notion of working group that's working.

Subbiah: Okay. So is there - I mean is a definitive document besides the general statements that the Board gave us to go do this, a definitive statement of how the working groups work today and something we can actually physically...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: The template stuff - the template stuff that's in the charter...

Subbiah: Okay. The...

Avri Doria: ...that gives some few clues. And then note there's just looking at how they're working.

Subbiah: Okay. And maybe...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: And then...

Subbiah: Maybe the way - my suggestion is this. That perhaps what we do is we work with this the way we are going forward but then we appoint a member of us, one of us, who's job is just specifically to compare that with what we're doing to keep us in line. Does that make sense? And maybe the natural suggestion is Avri. You know.

Avri Doria: Oh yeah. I always comment.

((Crosstalk))

Subbiah: Yeah. Formalize that process so that we all understand that hey Avri's job is to let us know whenever we have - deviating so much and then we have to assess whether we want to deviate that much or not.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Subbiah: That way it wouldn't just seem as, you know, Avri can (unintelligible) that opinion but rather hey, the formal role is to make sure these two things are - and then she can flag it. Seems fine. I mean I think that's okay.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yeah I would name it as perhaps I'll try just continuities.

Subbiah: Okay. All right. Okay. And then we know whenever you mention that word then we know that's what we are referring to. Okay. All right. So now I have a question regarding one of your comments here. We really to get the depth of (unintelligible) people. I didn't quite understand what you meant by that. Can you comment on the...

Avri Doria: Okay. Which, which, which, which, which?

Subbiah: Above the word introduction.

Avri Doria: Above the word introduction.

Subbiah: Under 2.1.

Avri Doria: Under 2.1. Okay.

Subbiah: Sorry. Yeah. If anyone else understands what that means, please let me know.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I have to understand what I wrote while I was sitting in an airport reading these things. And also put that okay explanation point at the end.

Subbiah: Oh so there's two culprits.

Avri Doria: Oh I think I was asking do we really need to get to this depth of...

Subbiah: Oh, I see.

Avri Doria: ...(specificity) where the Chair starts out by introducing people. And perhaps we do I guess and maybe I did put the okay - it just seems like, you know, I will introduce people and you will do this and - and so I was just asking do we really need to get to this level of detail. And if so, fine. You know.

Subbiah: Okay. Is the - here's the - I'm okay with either but just as a sort of a compromise in case that, you know, we want to take Avri's point and include it. A compromise could be the Chair simply makes sure at the first meeting that, you know, formally ask and takes a vote almost, make sure that all the team members have not only provided the material but the rest of the people have, you know, read the other team members views or whatever.

The purpose of the introductions is to share it, right. So then one way of getting around that is to simply for the Chair to simply say look have you all read each others, you know, stuff and please, you know, confirm that you have before we move on. I don't know. That's a compromise.

Anyway, open to discussion.

Avri Doria: The other question I had is under the second bullet, two and three, where, you know, the team members have to give, have to apply and have to give a resume and show what they've done. And then the third point to actually have to show how they have benefited and organization in the past. That's - I thought these things kind of like open and now we're sort of saying people have to prove themselves to be in a working group. I question that.

Man: (What are you trying to say again Avri?)

Subbiah: Two entries.

Avri Doria: I'm questioning the second bullet under introductions. I mean certainly the first bullet seems fine. Yeah. Everyone has to sign a declaration of interest, the disclosures and that everybody's read and seen and all that stuff. That was...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...but the second part where we - where we do, you know, it's almost like the beginning of an Alcoholic Anonymous meeting.

((Crosstalk))

Subbiah: There's a distinction between two and three. Two is only coaxing you because it should be encouraged. Three is more, you know, demanding. It says demonstrate there. I think at the very least three needs to be torn down to be like two.

Ken Bour: Let me just add. Again I think it's always helpful to understand the purpose of our document, who its intended audience is and so forth. You know, the charter guidelines, the charter document is going to have in it the...

Subbiah: Okay.

Ken Bour: ...membership criteria that the sponsor or chartering organization has stipulated if there is any, right. And if there isn't and it's open, it's open.

So we're talking now to the Chair and working group members of - that's already been chartered, right.

Subbiah: Okay.

Ken Bour: So we're trying to find what are the guidelines - what are the things that this working group needs in order to...

Subbiah: Okay.

Ken Bour: ...form itself and organize itself to accomplish its task that would not otherwise be provided in the charter. I'm sort of agreeing here with Avri here I think and others that we probably don't want much material in this section...

Subbiah: Okay.

Ken Bour: ...that qualifies members.

Subbiah: Okay.

Ken Bour: That would have already been taken into account.

Subbiah: Maybe I have a suggestion. I mean I don't know who introduced the two and three but in support of whoever did, you know, I'm suggesting we could change these around a little bit to satisfy both ends.

Just to say that to re-craft two and three, to sue some of the same language, right, the same points but to combine them together and say

with the purpose of making sure - I mean the general or the (unintelligible) should be the purpose.

The reason you encourage to talk about this and tell us about what you know and what have I demonstrate - you know, so in order that we can assign, you know, we can learn more about you and be able to assign you to the right tasks. You know, to select the right tasks within the committee or the group to go forward if that - I mean it's more learning about someone else...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: A team - a team building sort of comment that...

((Crosstalk))

Subbiah: Yes. Right.

Ken Bour: ...is a qualifying thing. Yeah.

Subbiah: It's worth knowing these things if you're good at Excel, you know, you'll be the one that's doing the spreadsheets, right. So we can, you know, change the two so that way it's, you know, there's no - there's no emphasis and the people - I mean there is some relevance for people.

In a functioning committee I think it's - even if it's not stipulated, it's - I mean if we know nothing about everybody else then it's kind of not that efficient to work together.

Knowing somebody - people's backgrounds helps you work better. I think we know all that. The question is, you know, should we stipulate it in, you know, in very strong ways. That's - so this could be a sort of a reminder maybe to the extent that, hey, if you know something else they'll let us know as opposed to any kind of qualification.

I don't know. Any thoughts on that if it's reclassed or something like that?

Man: Just one thought. I mean, to me it's relevant because the Chair for the head of the working group is going to be - going to need to know whether or not they have everyone on board that they need to get on board. That's one of these things.

So and this also allows everyone else to know that the Chair has gotten everyone - all the skill sets on board that they need to get on board. So to me it really is only relevant - it's only necessary to the extent that we - that the charter outlines specific (unintelligible) that must be a part of the working group because that way it allows them kind of accountability, where the charter says, "Hey, you've got to have x, y and z skills." Now we have people who are stepping up and saying, "I have x, y and z skills."

So to me it's - it really has - of greatest importance when there is a charter reference to a skill set. Once you get beyond the charter reference to the skill set then I think it may be helpful and may not be helpful.

So to me it's that kind of threshold where if there is something in the charter which says certain skill sets are required, if you have one of

those skill sets we are asking you so make it known so that we can know whether or not we have all the people on the team that we need. Because if we don't get the people on the team that we need then we may not be able to move forward with it. Does that make sense?

Woman: Yeah, so you're kind of saying that there should be a self-introduction with reference to interest and skill sets?

Man: Exactly. And that references like it - that try to - the most relevant portion of that information is going to be information that's tied to the charter for the working group.

Man: So how about these clauses - self-introduction, basic skill sets tied to any specific skills outlined in the original charter and the information of this group, refer to so and so, and some examples of what you might want to share are, you know, blank, blank.

It could involve some definitive versions of two and three.

Man: Yeah, exactly, and I think that those should be - that's the reasoning behind why we have that in there.

Man: Is that satisfactory, Avri? Something like that.

Avri Doria: I was, you know, I'm only one opinion. I was comfortable until you got to the examples would include, you know, how you did a good job at your company. You know, so I thought the first part was really cool.

The second part seemed like it was going - and that was kind of what I meant by my introductory (unintelligible) - my introductory question is how deep do we need to go in this?

Man: Okay, anyone else...

Man: It should be pretty shallow, right? I mean, it's like we don't need to require people to write a full biography, you know.

((Crosstalk)

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) seems biographical to me.

Man: You know, it's like, "Hey look, on the charter it says they need someone with experience in, you know, networking, right? Oh, I have experience in networking." Boom. You know, and since no one's going to actually check on these things. So if you put that you're an awesome person, you know, like, "Hey, I built the Eiffel Tower. I'm really good at constructing things."

Like no one's going to go out and verify whether or not you've built the Eiffel Tower. Right? So it's really, you know, I think the burden of describing it, you know, is going to be - the veracity of whether or not someone has the skills that they say they have is going to borne out by their participation and not by any analysis of that statement.

Avri Doria: Well, yeah, and there's always the giggle test.

Man: Prior to your joining the working group.

Man: Yep. So anyone else, any comments, I think with some kind of middle line approach that we just talked about?

                Okay, if none then I guess Ken, if we can note that down and then we'll work on it (unintelligible). I don't think we should get in the nitty gritty of rewriting it right now on the spot, but I think we know what we need to do. Fair enough Ken?

Ken Bour: I agree.

Man: Okay, and then we can move forward. I think that the - there's a comment after that. I think we should also add demonstrate how the activities will facilitate policymaking and contributing to the overall development of the Internet.

                Now the person who made that comment - would that be - (Constantine), would that be okay that we - would you consider that being rolled into what we've already discussed?

(Constantine): Yes.

Man: Okay. Then we can move on to the next bullet point which is the self-selection application might require to have evidence of their representation and performance in their particular self-selected field.

                Yeah, I guess that also has to be - do we want to leave it the way it is or tone it down slightly, in view of what we've just discussed?

Avri Doria: Evidence is such a hard word.

Man: Yeah.

Man: So any suggestions here?

Avri Doria: Maybe - if we want to have anything, you know, self - it might require a statement, you know.

Man: Okay.

Avri Doria: I guess. As I say...

Man: The (unintelligible) charter guidelines will establish the statements of interest are required.

Avri Doria: You know, and this skill set thing is such a cultural thing. I mean, you know, being in Sweden, you know, you look at resumes from a Swede, you look at resumes from an American. And any time you compare them, well the Swede has never done anything because they don't boast.

                Whereas in the U.S. we boast so when you're looking at this kind of criteria in a cross-cultural perspective, it really becomes problematic because, you know, if you come from a non-boastable culture you're always going to say, "Well, you know, I played with protocols a little bit."

                Even though you may have written 17 of them, whereas a U.S. person might say, you know, "And I created, you know, the greatest protocol in the world." Well, even though they were a co-author with four other authors of one nonsuccessful protocol.

So it's one of those things that you really have to be very careful with in this, you know, part of statement of your skill level in terms of trying to make something that is weighable because that becomes problematic and - on a cross-cultural level.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I think if we just keep the understanding of the title here, which is Introduction. The purpose of this section would be really just to - so that the team and the Chair and all the members understand what resources and capabilities that they have.

So it's - if we keep the idea of introduction in mind and not qualification. No one's trying to do an interview to see whether they get accepted onto the team, right? Then maybe we'll stay clear of language that makes it sound like we're - somebody has to prove something.

Avri Doria: Yes, that's kind of my point, yeah.

Ken Bour: Yeah.

Man: Can we, can we...Go ahead. Anyone else?

Ken Bour: I was just going - it's really like the application may, you know, just to - maybe even - may really even get rid of this bullet and make it a number four. And then it says something like, you know, and also list any other relevant experiences you have that may be relevant in the context of ICANN or something like that.

Man: Are you going to - so that the Chair and the team could channel your resources in the right whatever direction. I mean, your abilities in the right direction in terms of the team.

Ken Bour: Yeah, yeah.

Man: You know, sort of again saying that this information is needed to appoint you to a specific task sort of. Okay. I think that - to me it seems like rolling it two points forward off of the, I mean, (unintelligible), you know, considering that we're amalgamating all this, that might also make it cleaner, simpler and neater unless someone has a - any objection to that. Anyone?

                Okay, no? Then I guess the words like require probably will have to go. I mean, the whole point is not to say require, right? Unless it is in connection with a specific instruction already in the charter (unintelligible), right. I mean, if it's an instruction the charter says, "Look, you know, we need somebody with a Bachelor's Degree in this, right, from an Ivy League institution." Okay, if it says that has to be, you know, a requirement, right, I mean, as to the level.

Ken Bour: Well, I don't even think that needs to be a requirement because that's like a polling, so if no one wants to elect to say that they have an Ivy League degree...

Man: Yeah. What I meant is this - if it was a requirement in the charter then, you know, if the charter above it had already been a requirement for the selection process, then it's something that you may ask to see here, but not if for any other interest, right. Unless it's not specifically required in the overriding charter.

Avri Doria: I guess that kind of criteria is - obviously you were doing in an ad sertum. One place where you may have criteria, and I don't know if it comes later, is certainly if there are some invited experts.

In other words if we say, "This team needs an expert in how IETF working groups work." Then it certainly makes sense to ask the invited expert, you know, "Please tell us why you're an expert."

But I think it comes - a normal participant, that becomes much less relevant.

Ken Bour: Yeah, because, I mean, I don't think you'd ever have a situation where you would require anyone to say anything. Basically it's like, you know, because this is all volunteer stuff, so if someone wants to participate then they can, I mean, I wouldn't require them to say anything.

Man: Right.

Ken Bour: As long as we're on the same page it doesn't matter.

Man: Yeah, we're on the same page. I'm just leaving a legal clause in case it's overriding charter that we have no control of says do something, right? Then, you know, (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Yeah, exactly.

Man: But other than that there's no reason to put the words like require and the stronger terms there. So are we in some kind of consensus on that now, to put that into a four and roll it down and kind of make it simpler

along those lines and tie it back to specific tasks and remove the require and stuff like that?

Okay, I guess...I'm sorry, go ahead. Anyone? Okay, if everyone's agreed then I guess Ken, are we okay with that one? We can work on that either now or in Sydney, you know, to clean that up to make it like that? Okay.

So, okay, I'm just serially reading this. I'm reading Ken's comment here. The next one that says KB.

Ken Bour: You can skip that.

Man: Oh, I can skip that. Okay.

Ken Bour: Because that was all the discussion we just had.

Man: Okay, good. Great.

Ken Bour: I was just making the same observations that this material doesn't belong in this section.

Man: Okay, good, good, good.

Ken Bour: Yeah, okay.

Man: So I'm just in operational mode here. We should have an appeals process for issues of openness and transparency. Okay, I guess that's really quite reasonable.

The question is, should we put it as part of this section or something as an overriding thing for the whole document, you know, that's the question, right? (Constantine).

(Constantine):   Yes, well it was more of a comment of Ken's previous. It was the last sentence so Ken's comment, should there be an appeals process for a candidate that is not extending the working group and there are these things that we need to include in an appeals process for those situations whereby a candidate is not accepted. But it seems like CACs have been treated unfairly.

Ken Bour: Yeah, this is Ken. I just want to make it clear, my comment was rhetorical; my question was rhetorical. I wasn't advocating that there should be a non-acceptance option. I was just asking the team and the people who prescribe that, you know.

If you're going to have somebody who doesn't get accepted, which I'm not advocating, then you need an appeals process if they don't get accepted, right? But if we don't even go there we can skip all that.

Man: Yes. But we do - but we have covered somewhere in this document or in the charter document an appeals process for each and every thing, right? Correct? We have something like that, correct?

I mean, we did discuss that I know. I just don't know where that there's a de facto appeals process, right?

Avri Doria: I don't know if it's in this document. We certainly have one in the template that we're using now and in my semi-literate comment here I

really did a terrible job but I guess people are fairly used to my semi-literacy.

That what I'm basically arguing is that I don't know that we need lots of different appeals mechanisms. I think it's very important for the GNSO to develop one for all working groups and all (unintelligible). It pretty much works the same and gets documented in one place and it's standardized, and that's what this was referring to.

Man: Okay, I think, you know, personally I think that's a fair thing to try to do. So the only thing we need - if everybody is in agreement with that with me, then the only thing we need to do is make a reference here somewhere in this document saying that everything in this document is subject to that link that Avri is talking about which is, you know, a GNSO-wide appeals mechanism.

Avri Doria: And I think that that appeals process may indeed be the task of this particular team.

Man: Oh, okay.

Ken Bour: Yeah.

Avri Doria: And now there's already one written that people can take, look at and say, "Yeah, that's adequate." "No it's not adequate and it needs to be fleshed out." But I think this team that's working on the modalities for a working group is a great place to have developed that.

Man: So if we were to put an appeals process item into our document where do we all think logically it should go in? Under one, two, three, four, five

or a sixth? Where does anybody think because we need to assign it somewhere right now so it's a placeholder, right?

Ken Bour: Yeah.

Man: I'm trying to figure this out.

Avri Doria: You know, personally think appeals processes are probably the most important things we can do.

((Crosstalk))

(Constantine):   (Unintelligible) section, number seven, appeals process.

Man: Yeah, I think it might be important enough to address it up front and call it a seven. What do you think?

Ken Bour: Well, I do want to make it clear that there - I think we had identified that as a charter element.

Man: Oh, you did? Okay.

Ken Bour: Yeah.

Man: And that's fine. If it's, I mean, it's - the question is, it should go somewhere, right? I mean.

Avri Doria: In the charter itself?

Ken Bour: Well, it would be boilerplate. In other words we would pull out, yeah, we would say, you know, "As a working group your charter says to you that there is an appeals process and here's where you find out what - where it is and or it's in the boilerplate or it's in the charter itself."

And so this operating model - the team already has from the charter, it already has an appeals process. We can assume that that will have already been delivered to the working group.

(Constantine):   (Unintelligible). Are we sure that was delivered to the working group?

Ken Bour: Yeah, I'm saying that from having worked now on the other side on the charter, sort of thing cascades down, the working group will have been given an appeals process.

Avri Doria: But if there's a single process for all working groups which I think there needs to be because I think - this is personal opinion - I think that needs to be sort of simple, direct and that's one of the few things so I think there's a one size fits all.

While I do agree that every charter needs to include a boilerplate statement that says, you know, "You must adhere. You know, there is this appeals process and you must adhere to it."

Whether it's defined by the modalities group, essentially this group, or whether it's defined by the charter group I think is somewhat immaterial. I felt my first instinct was, you know, it is a modality. It's how things work. It has to do with methods and procedures. And so, I mean, it really doesn't matter to me where it gets done but I think naturally sought itself here.

Man: So let me encapsulate there in terms of action items. There's going to
                be at least one or two sections in the charter statement. The first
                section is simply going to say, "Hey, it's going to require that everything
                underneath it, working groups that form, have to follow a set of appeals
                processes, blah, blah, blah, at their location.

                That location of how that appeals process is defined can be either in
                the charter agreement, you know, is this another section within the
                charter document, or it goes into here as Section 7. Okay.

                Now, if we decide to put it into the charter section then my suggestion
                is, unless other people want to volunteer in this group, we'll assign
                maybe (Constantine) because he brought up the issue, you know,
                perhaps - you'll be assigned to make sure that it's addressed in the
                charter thing, you know, right? I mean, to make sure that it is
                addressed, okay.

                If we decide to do it then we will pen it as Number 7 and continue. Now
                if we didn't do it but we didn't include it as Number 7 in our case, we
                would still have to make a point somewhere in this document just to
                remind everyone - just the one line saying that, you know, we will
                follow whatever appeals process that is in the charter above.

Ken Bour: I think - I like that way that you do that. I think there should just be one
                line and this that says, you know, reminds people that they need to
                follow the charter process. And I think that, you know, we're all going to
                get - we're all going to be having a chance to look at all that stuff
                anyway.

But I do think that it makes - for structural reasons, I think that it makes sense to have it in the charter. Because that's - it's kind of comes to the working group and so it has a sense of permanency that is - may not exist in the way that the operating model works if people want to change it around in the working group.

And that gives it like - that gives it more authority to someone who is trying to rely on it.

Man: That's passing the buck. Okay. All right. So is there any further thoughts on that? I mean, is that the way we want to go? I mean, we should just make a decision now, or at least a temporary decision and then maybe when Scott gets us all together he can help us decide which way to put it in.

But the fact is we can make a temporary decision of where we think it should go. Any thoughts?

(Constantine): I think that (unintelligible) it makes, you know, very good sense and my only point was that we really need to include it. Now where it's going to go I don't think it's really that important as long as it is included. Maybe (Pete)'s given us an option to the position.

Man: Okay.

Man: We also have norms section, right, and it could go there.

Ken Bour: Yep.

(Constantine): Even though an appeals process (unintelligible).

Man: Yes. I also - I personally, you know, I mean, I understand that it can go inside the norms in one of these sections but I kind of feel that just for the purposes of not legal, but just for the purposes of showing that we're, you know, reformed GNSO, whatever, right?

It would be good to have a whole bullet point separate, wherever it is, either in the charter document or in the working group document. Somewhere where it's clearly highlighted, "Hey, this is an appeals processes and it exists." Right, and it would just seem natural as part of the reform that - to highlight that.

Ken Bour: Yeah, go ahead. I mean, I don't think it makes a difference, right?

Man: Yeah, I know, but the - and so I don't see any decision yet of which one we should put it in. So Ken, what do you think we should do here? I mean, whether we should put it in here or take it up there or leave it to the next call to decide, you know?

(Constantine): I think there are places to put it in the tasks, no?

Ken Bour: Yeah.

Man: Okay.

Ken Bour: We can get a consensus but put it in the charter and then it's fine to have an additional reference in the modality which says that there should be - the appeals process taken by any, you know, member is consistent with the appeals process in the charter.

Man: Okay. Avri, is that okay with you? I mean you're part of the charter process.

Avri Doria: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. Yeah, you know, in fact I'll even volunteer to work on it in the charter group.

Man: Okay, so then what we will do is a new Section 7.1 and we'll just put a little title and saying - in one sentence saying, "Appeals process is being referred back to charter."

                Okay? All right. So then we can move on with - okay, I guess we're on to - correct me if I'm - not wrong or right, whatever, but I'm just moving on to team formation. If I've skipped anybody or anything let me know quickly.

                Team formation. Review charter mission goals, timeframes, products and deliverables. Others. Any others so far? I assume none have come in so that's really what it is?

Man: Yep.

Man: Okay, maybe we don't just - I would think that if we're going to have a separate bullet point for team - just for one, we might want to just break up this point and make it one and two maybe just to make this look like a section. I don't know, that's just a - rather than just the one point with all those comments there.

                Okay, so let's move on to 2.2 as just a suggestion. Okay, 2.2, specific...

Ken Bour: Quick note. It's 2 o'clock. I'm (unintelligible)...

Man: Oh, okay, sorry. Okay, so is it a good place to stop? Okay. All right. So at least - okay, at least I think what we've tried to do here and demonstrate is at least taking this very long section - 2.1 is almost a whole page of text here. We've kind of - if you stick to something that now is actionable by, you know, a group of very small - you know, just go and re-edit essentially to get it to some kind of a revised interim tract version.

              I guess, is this what - first of all let me just ask the group, is this going to wind up here, is this what - how we want to go through the rest of the document when we get the opportunity to do so?

Ken Bour: I think so.

Man: Okay. Anyone else?

Ken Bour: Yep. This is - that's sort of exactly almost what we did on the other subteam.

Man: All right. Okay. So I think given that in mind if the rest of you can go back and if you have any thoughts, and if - especially if you're not coming to Sydney, you have any thoughts on the rest of the document, how we're going through this and making up our minds, you know, you could send in some email between now and then.

              And the other thing is also we will need to alert the others of what we've done today and the opportunity to first of all get feedback, and secondly if they're able to - there's an mp3 recording today, right?

So if people wanted to know, I mean, you need to tell the others on the team to know that - how we've gone through this template process so if they want to look through that they can listen to the mp3 and then contribute.

And that you know, and that basically after Sydney, you know, after that Sunday or Monday we really are looking at a document that is, you know, it can be modified later but it's getting some structure now and we're reaching, you know, it's going to be harder and harder to really restructure it in completely different ways.

(Constantine):   Exactly. (Unintelligible) everybody who's not on this call, that basically up until Sydney is their last opportunity to make any concessions that they wish to be considered as part of the operations team charter.

Man: Yeah. No, I think that people can still, you know, object a point or two or define later on I believe having - that's what we're talking about further down the road, right? However the real point is that it's going to be very difficult to restructure this document...

(Constantine):   Exactly.

Man: ...taking those all in a form and, yeah, I mean, and changing, you know, changing whole sections or moving things around, you know. That's going to get very difficult.

All right. So we'll just make - between Ken and myself we'll make sure of that. And is there any other thoughts, any other comments to anyone else before we wind up here?

Ken Bour: See you in Sydney.

Man: Okay, see you in Sydney.

Man: Enjoy Sydney guys.

Man: Okay. Ken, I just wanted to talk to you so we can...

Ken Bour: Yeah, you can - and we'll do -you and I can just hang on for just
                another second and...

Man: All right, thank you everyone.

Man: Bye-bye everybody.

Subbiah: Bye-bye. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Bye. Thanks everybody.

Subbiah: Hi Ken?

Ken Bour: Yeah, we won't stop the recording just yet.

Subbiah: Okay, I just - oh, you want me to wait?

Ken Bour: No, no.

Subbiah: Okay, yeah, so I just want to make sure that - is this what you're looking for at least in template forms to go forward? I mean, everything's covered and...

Ken Bour: Yeah, that worked out pretty well. You can see it - the more people you have on the call, the longer it takes. But the idea is to harmonize the comments, try to figure out - because some people put things in and not all the things they put in necessarily are incorrect and so you have to sort of work your way through - should it belong and if so why and that's what we did.

                And we did I guess Section 2.1, right? 2.0, 2.1.

Subbiah: I think we've got a long way to go but at least...No, but the point also remains that not everybody will be at the next session, whatever, whenever, whatever that is, in Sydney or not.

                But the point is that those who are on this session who will not be on the next one will know how we're proceeding. (Unintelligible).

Ken Bour: If you want I can take a shot at cleaning up Section 2.1, right?

Subbiah: Okay. If you can do that, that'll be great. The other thing is, when you shoot this email, because you'll necessarily have to shoot an email now to everybody, finalizing the Sydney meeting, right? I mean, essentially what we're talking about, right?

                And I would - just - I just wanted to go over the checklist with you to make sure what's there. One is that if you wanted to wait to clean up the 2.1 to show them that this is what we did, you know, maybe - it

may be worth it but it's up to you. If you don't want to do that, that's fine. Just shoot me an email without that.

But the main thing is to point out that, "Hey, we did go through this and we - as a template we went through 2.1 and you can check it on the mp3." Number one. And number two, there's, you know, no, you know, if you really want to make serious changes in the way the structure is and everything you better get it in by Sydney.

Okay, after that it's going to be just a limited kind of changes. Okay, and then number three is turn up in Sydney and, you know, as a - I think it'll be really useful if possible we write - when you say please turn up in Sydney, if you can actually list the names of people who are likely to be there. So that if, you know, so that it makes - the thing that I want to - everybody thinks nobody's coming and then nobody comes, right?

Ken Bour: Well, I think those that are coming have already made their plans.

((Crosstalk))

Subbiah::   And so on myself and Ken and so on, you know. It can be a little wrong but you can say, "Well I think these people are coming." You know, that would be useful.

Ken Bour: What we haven't figured out, I mean, we already have a session set up for the working group team - I forget, it's on Sunday I think. Sunday.

Subbiah: Yeah, but it's two separate rooms I guess for the two people, two separate groups.

Ken Bour: Well, that's the part that hasn't been done yet.

Subbiah: It doesn't matter. I think they're so small you can go into a lobby, I mean...

Ken Bour: Well, yeah, the starter group is just Avri and a couple of us can go off and - or I can stay with you guys and they can work on the other one. But yeah, you're right. Rooms shouldn't be a factor. But I think I have to say Scott's agreement that - my advice was going to be that during that hour and a half that the first hour and fifteen minutes be used in the two subteams to keep working like you just did, right?

Subbiah: Correct, yeah, and I think that...

Ken Bour: But the problem is you - in an hour and fifteen minutes you may get through 2.2 and 2.3.

Subbiah: Correct. I understand. That's why we...

Ken Bour: The process we're using is woefully inefficient and it's going to take a month of Sundays for us to get...

Subbiah: No, no. That's why I'm thinking if there's a smaller group of four or five people in there and then, you know, we get to about, you know, in about two or three hours we could get it done I think.

Ken Bour: But you - oh, well, right. But the allocated time on the agenda for these meetings...

Subbiah: I think what you should - maybe what you can say is you allocate that time and then you could say the locked door is going to take at least an hour or something, you know, possibly double that. And for those who can stay on later we'll continue with it, you know.

I mean, there's no other way, I mean, you know. I mean, you know, I mean, despite the fact that we're taking a inefficient process, you know, this is the only way to go about - I mean, unless, you know, unless we just go, you know, really, you know, just say, "Look, we're going to go through this mess, you know, line by line and just keep moving or we're not going to get there, right?" You know, so...

Ken Bour: Yeah, one of the things that sort of helped with the other group, and this might - there is at least another potential strategy here. And that is to say, "(Tobia) and Ken and (Grey Graham) are going to work in a subteam to clean up this outline. Does anybody object if they do that?"

Subbiah: Yeah, I understand. I just think...

((Crosstalk))

Subbiah: Yeah, but I do know that one or two of these things like the norms section - I think it's going to be - well if you take the view that even with just a few people you can make decisions quicker. But it would also seem that's the kind of place that I think a lot more people want input, you know.

So you have to decide - maybe what we do is in this email here and I'm not compromising it - why don't we just put in this email, look, that, you know, we're going to spend the first half an hour going through,

you know, one and a half hours, whatever we get, one hour, going through these documents, right?

And we may choose not to do it in chronological order. I mean, we don't have to say that part. What we can do is when we get there just pick the ones that are important and get that done first - so important to people.

But the point to make in the email is that we'll go an hour and a half and we'll see what we can get through. We think there's about three hours worth of stuff to do and if we can't - for those things that we cannot meet there'll be a subgroup of two or three people and that includes (Tobia) and, you know, blah, blah, blah.

You know, and anybody else if they care to join to stay on for another hour and a half to finish it. How about that?

Ken Bour: We can try it.

Subbiah: Okay, and then so we upfront say it already right now so that people are aware that's an approach we're going to try to take.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Subbiah: Right? I mean, I could just - I know that if - even if it's just a few or five or six people or we're all in a room together, I think, you know, you - we will tend to get it done fast and, you know, we'll get it done. I mean, I just think that would happen. You know. Right?

Ken Bour: (Unintelligible).

Subbiah: Because you have nowhere else to go unless you have another meeting, right?

Ken Bour: Yeah, that's true. That's true. All right. Very good. Well I'll - yeah, I'll summarize all this and get an email out to everybody and I'll also do some work on 2.1 so you don't have to mess with it. I'll go ahead and clean up the outline and just indicate that when it's completed.

Subbiah: Yes. And then (unintelligible). Okay.

Ken Bour: Very good. All right. Nice to hear your voice again.

Subbiah: Bye-bye.

                        END