Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Work Team (WT) TRANSCRIPTION Wednesday 14 July 2009 18:30 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the

Policy Process Steering Committee Policy Development Process (PDP) meeting on Wednesday 14 July 2009, at 18:30 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-20100714.mp3

On page:

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Jeff Neuman - Registry Stakeholder Group - Work Team Chair Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC Tony Harris -Tim Ruiz J.Scott Evans

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings Gisella Gruber-White

Absent apologies:

Alan Greenberg – ALAC

Absent:

Mike Rodenbaugh – BC Gabriel Pineiro – NCSG Olga Cavalli – NCA Chuck Gomes – GNSO Council

Coordinator: Thank you. The call is now being recorded.

Jeff Neuman: Great, Gisella do you want to start to introduce the call and get us started?

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's PPSC call on Wednesday the 14th of July. We have Jeff Neuman, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tony Harris, Tim Ruiz, J. Scott Evans.

Page 2

From Staff we have Marika Konings, myself Gisella Gruber-White and we've got apologies from Alan Greenberg, and if I can please remind everyone to state their names and speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Jeff.

Jeff Neuman:

Thank you very much. This is as was said a meeting of the Policy Process Steering Committee on July 14. What we have now posted - sorry this is Jeff Neuman. I'm the Chair of this little group.

And so what we have posted now on Adobe for those of you that are on there are a list of the current members. And it seems like we have the IPC rep which is J. Scott Evans on the call.

We have the ISP rep, Tony Harris, who's on the call but on mute for the moment. We have the Registry Stakeholder Group rep which is myself, the Registrar Stakeholder Group which is Tim Ruiz, and although not on the chart we also have the ALAC representative or at least the alternate representative, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr who's also on.

So it seems like we're missing the BC reps and the Non-Commercial Stakeholder rep and there is a NomCom - Nominating Committee appointee that's on as well that's on the stake - that's on - sorry, that's on the Steering Committee, and Chuck Gomes or Stephane van Gelder are the GNSO Council and Vice Chair that are able to attend these meetings.

So with that said I think we do have enough people to get this meeting started. We are fortunate enough to have on this call not only the IPC rep but he's also - he was also or still is the Chair of the Working Group for our work team as well.

So any questions we certainly can turn over to J. Scott if we have any. So what I wanted to do on this call was to just do a recap of what we discussed

ICANN Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White 07-14-10/1:30 pm CT

Confirmation # 3229250

Page 3

as our approach in Brussels for those of you that were there, and then just

kind of do a deep dive into the Working Group guidelines and kind of the

approach of how we're going to do that.

And then go through a timeline of when we think we can meet or how often

we need to meet and when we think we can get this done. Now if you

remember our role essentially is as we discussed in Brussels is to oversee

the two work teams, the Policy Development Process work team and the

Working Group work team to charter which is for the PPSC is found on the

Wiki, basically says that we're responsible for reviewing and recommending

processes used within the GNSO for developing policy and recommending

any changes.

And so our working method was that we were to create these two work teams

which we've done, and then we would be responsible for combining the

results into a - one proposal that goes to the Council.

In Brussels one of the first things we talked about was the reality of the

situation, which was that the Working Group work team was able to complete

its work in a much faster timeframe than the Policy Development Process

work team.

And that those recommendations of the Working Group work team were

separable from those in the Policy Process, although there may be a couple

recommendations that interrelate to each other.

We decided in Brussels that once the work of the Working Group work team

is done and we are satisfied with that work that we could indeed forward that

work separately to the Council, as opposed to doing what it says here in the

charter as doing one report with both sets of recommendations.

So that was the first thing we discussed in Brussels, and then essentially

what we want to do with this Steering Committee as opposed to the work of

ICANN Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White

> 07-14-10/1:30 pm CT Confirmation # 3229250

> > Page 4

the Working Group work team is similar to what was done with the OSC and

overseeing the work of its five or so work teams.

It's not really our job to go over each and every recommendation and do the

work all over again. I think the Working Group work team did an excellent job

in the work that they did.

They took comments, they - after their initial report they came out with their

follow up report. It's really our job to make sure number one, that the Working

Group work team took into consideration all the comments that they

considered and make sure that we're satisfied that they addressed all of

those comments.

And number two is to identify any areas in the Working Group work team

report which we may feel are - that we may feel need more information or

were not adequately addressed, whether or not there are comments on them.

And if we do find there are areas that we do not believe were adequately

addressed, again it's what we talked about before creating the work teams, is

that we would send those questions back to the work team itself rather than

doing the work ourselves.

Right, our task is more from a management and coordination as opposed to

doing the actual Policy Development itself. So that's what we talked about in

Brussels.

Are there any questions on that as far as, you know, kind of the methodology

and the approach that we talked about?

Tim Ruiz:

Jeff, this is Tim. Just about the Adobe Connect link, when I click on it from the

email it's - it comes up and says, "Working Group model, working team call,

this meeting has not yet started."

J. Scott Evans: That's what I've got too.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes that's what happened to me originally. You'll need to send the new link that Gisella sent to me via Scott, or she sent it to me via Scott but that's exactly what happened to me.

Marika Konings: I'll send a new link through the mailing list so it'll come through shortly so everyone should have it, okay?

Jeff Neuman: Okay. All right, so I'll give a minute for people to join. What we have now displaying is really just the same thing that's on the Wiki Web - the Wiki site right now.

It's again just kind of the charter of the PPSC. But - so hopefully we'll resolve that in a minute or so. Is there any other questions on the approach that we'd like to take?

I know and unfortunately Mike is not here, but during the Brussels meeting I had a feeling that Mike Rodenbaugh disagreed with the approach. But I want to make sure that everyone else is on line - in line with the fact that we really don't want to, A, replicate the work of the Working Group work team; and B, to the extent that there are outstanding questions that it's the intention to forward those or revert those back to the Working Group work team as opposed to doing the work ourselves.

Does anyone disagree with that approach or -- okay, hearing no disagreement I think you got to see the approach that - and seeing agreement from at least Cheryl. Thank you for indicating that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: He completely has biases Jeff of course, coming from one of the work teams but I don't think Alan would disagree.

Jeff Neuman:

And actually - this is a question maybe I'll just throw out to J. Scott. J., do you want, you know, Steve Metalitz is listed as the alternate member. Are you comfortable being both the Working Group Work Chair and serving as the IPC rep on the PPSC when discussing these items, or would you rather invite Steve to future meetings just in case?

J. Scott Evans:

No I'm, I mean, I served as a neutral Chair so, I mean, I think Cheryl will say I basically just made sure the planes arrived on time. It was...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely.

J. Scott Evans:

...members that did all the work. I just coordinated everything so I am not emotionally tied to this in any way.

Jeff Neuman:

Okay, that's fine. And just - so then just make sure if you're making a comment, just make sure that we understand whether that's in your role as the Chair answering a question or whether you're going to make a comment in your role as the IPC rep.

J. Scott Evans:

Okay.

Jeff Neuman:

Because I - because they may diverge at some point. They may not but they may. So, you know, for example I don't know if this happened but I can foresee if the IPC had submitted a comment that maybe the Working Group work team did not fully address, I can see that maybe your comment as an IPC rep may be, "Look, we don't think this was adequately addressed."

So I can definitely see something like that happening. So as long as we understand I think we're fine. I see that Tim and Tony have now joined the Adobe room so I think we have everybody on that needs to be on.

J. Scott Evans:

I'm not there yet but you all go ahead. It just - she just came through. I should be there in a minute.

Jeff Neuman:

Okay good. Okay so with that said, you know, let me first start out with the general question. I'm hoping everybody by now other than Cheryl and J. Scott who I know have read this - I'm hoping by now that the others have had a chance to read this and have some at least general impressions.

I do have a couple of comments that were submitted to me from the Registrys on some issues that they either through lateness of time or for whatever reason may not have been addressed by the Working Group work team.

So I could certainly throw those out, but what I wanted to do is before we kind of do a deep dive into the comments that were received, Tim, you have a question? I don't...

Tim Ruiz:

Did you say Tim? Oh, okay. I'm sorry I didn't hear you. Yes, well I just wanted to - I was just going to add that I - the Registrar constituency or stakeholder group, I don't have any comments from them. I do have, you know, there's a few things I noticed when I went through it and I don't know if -- are you suggesting we try to throw those out to the list?

Jeff Neuman:

Well yes, otherwise I think we - what I wanted to do is start today with kind of a general brainstorming, so if you have those issues you have to kind of bring them up now.

We can document them. We don't have to solve them or even, you know, we don't have to solve them now but just get the issues out in the open if we could do that. Yes, I think that would be a good idea.

Tim Ruiz:

Are you trying to queue on that now or-

Jeff Neuman:

Sure, I mean, if you're ready to talk about some things that'd be great. If not I can jump to my - the issues I got from the Registrys but I'd rather start with you first if you have a moment.

Tim Ruiz:

Okay, yes I don't have anything prepared to shoot right out right now but I can just talk about it. What, you know, I think the work done here was great. It's an amazing amount of work that these guys did and very well done too.

The only questions that I have were just in some specific areas where I think it is too general, and I know the purpose of this was that it wasn't going to be just GNSO Working Group guidelines that, you know, they might be used elsewhere as well.

And I can understand that, but I think there's a few areas where it's too general that I'm concerned won't be specific enough for GNSO use within a Working Group developing policy.

And one of those is in regards to the development of consensus or the determining of consensus and I can get more into it later when we have more time to discuss it, but I think that there needs to be at least in my opinion a little bit more meat for the Chairs or tools or direction for the Chairs to help them determine consensus.

And then - and a little bit more substance in - that the Chair would put together in any follow up report to help the Council be able to see that they're, you know, what that determination of consensus was based on so that, you know, there isn't questions raised at Council level about whether there was really consensus or not or blah, blah, blah and then no way for them to go back and kind of determine that for themselves to some extent without having to, you know, dig way back into archives, et cetera to try to determine that.

So some of the things I'd be looking at would be better documentation of who the Working Group members were, how they participated and what their, you know, what their opinion or view of the various recommendations were, so if those things were actually documented.

Page 9

The other area that I am concerned about just after having been participating in several different Working Groups like this now, that it's kind of analogous,

this sort of paradigm that we would be trying to move to.

And that's the - being careful about not allowing these Working Groups to get

gamed and I don't know exactly how - what the answer completely is but I

can see a situation where, you know, it would be very easy for several so-

called identities to participate in these Working Groups that, you know, no

one would be able to verify right now beyond an email address.

I'm not sure that's the best way to continue and that some thought should

maybe be given to how we actually verify the - who's participating in these

Working Groups beyond just, you know, an email address and some

statement that we have to rely on.

That may be some due diligence of the specific nature might need to be done

in order to be sure that we know who's participating and that we're not, you

know, someone isn't creating multiple identities or something of that nature.

So those are a couple of thoughts that I had at least initially about some of

the things in the report that I think could be expanded on.

Jeff Neuman:

Okay, so let me just make sure if I could just do a recap of what I got from

you. One is you think the report needs a little bit more meat or - as to how the

Chairs go about in determining the level of consensus, or whatever level

attributed to different recommendations, right, so that's in Section - shit I got

to make this bigger here on my screen here.

Someone has it on the tip of their tongue here. What Section is this that they

talk about-

J. Scott Evans:

I'm trying to find it Jeff.

Jeff Neuman:

Yes.

J. Scott Evans:

Probably either in 2 or 3. I can't...

Marika Konings: I think it's Section 3.6, Standard Methodology for Making Decisions.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: 3.6. Yes.

Jeff Neuman:

Yes. Okay, and then what you also wanted as part of that was - so that's one, is just a little bit more meat and guidance for Chairs and how to determine the appropriate level.

Second one was a little bit more substance in the report that's actually delivered to the Council to help the Council understand how the Chair or provide documentation on how the Chair determines these levels so that the Council wouldn't have to go back into its full archives to try to figure out after the fact how that happened.

And then the third is what we can do to ensure Working Groups or people participating in Working Groups, that that whole process isn't gamed in the context of verifying contacts and how do you - or how do you verify due diligence on - to know who's participating in the groups.

Tim Ruiz:

Right, right.

Jeff Neuman:

So the case you said about creating multiple identities, what I've noticed has happened is that also on certain Working Groups that people will hire other people and in the - in one case they'll hire an attorney.

The attorney in their statement of interest will basically not disclose to their client is - as kind of a this is attorney-client privilege, and you get the sneaking suspicion that, you know, that both attorney and client are on the group. So J. Scott...

Tim Ruiz:

Can I raise one other thing that I just about forgot about? And I'm not sure it's
- I guess I need to give more thought and maybe the group can give their
opinion too about it.

But one of the things I've noticed happened in some of the Working Groups and I'm not sure there's - I just want to make sure there's adequate protection from that or whether that should be a part of this report or not.

And that's that it seems that we spend, you know, months on the Working Group. It gets close to conclusion and for the most part it looks like there's some consensus around certain recommendations or conclusions that are going to be going into a report.

And then certain members who haven't been participating for weeks if not months, or maybe they were on the first couple calls and then we didn't hear anything from them till the very end and then bang, they jump in or maybe it's a new member that jumps in.

And all of a sudden all these other - all these issues they want to reopen and rehash and it - sometimes it's taking weeks and months more for these Working Groups to get through that in order to get back to where they were before this member or new member jumped in and kind of stirred everything up.

So, you know, while I think we need to be careful and make sure we give adequate opportunity for everyone to voice their views and make sure that, you know, their Stakeholder Group's concerns are being addressed, et cetera, on the other hand, you know, at some point things need to be considered closed.

And I don't know how we get there but I know that's just something I've seen happen in a number of Work Groups and something we might want to give

some thought to. I don't know what the answer is completely but I think something we got to think about.

J. Scott Evans:

Well as a Chair a couple of things. One, with regards to the last concern raised by Tim that is addressed in here. It talks about the ability to reopen issues and it says that they - that shouldn't be done unless there's new information that's been provided.

So, I mean, we have tried to address that. We also have addressed it by putting in some ways for you to - as a Working Group Team Member to appeal to the Chair and/or the liaison with regards to persons that are coming up and becoming problematic because they keep trying to pull that kind of stuff.

So I - we tried to address, I mean, it - there are some - you may not feel like it's adequate or robust enough, but those issues were highlighted and discussed and we tried to deal with them.

Tim Ruiz:

So Jeff, do you recall seeing those or-

Jeff Neuman:

Yes, yes, it's in 3.3 and I guess I'm just - and that's fine. I - I'll look at that again and I guess I wasn't - I was at the time feeling like maybe it didn't - it could maybe go a little farther but maybe not. I don't know. So let me look at that again. It's 3.3.

J. Scott Evans:

...the ability to contact these people and tell them to, I mean, we've done some methodologies in here but it's a spin - it's a, you know, it's a - there was a lot of belief - Cheryl can address this.

I'm not wrong that being too draconian would give the Chair power to discourage dissident voices and that's not what's intended. It's intended to give the Chair tools and methodologies to prevent abuses in the process.

Page 13

And so that's the delicate balance that we were trying to meet. Cheryl if you

disagree, please speak up but I believe that's where it came and that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, J. Scott, Cheryl here. If I may, Jeff?

Jeff Neuman:

Absolutely, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Tim, as a team member here, not as Alan's alternate, we indeed went into extraordinary details and over many, many - can I say it again, many meetings on in fact just about every one of the points you raised.

> We as a work team went through all sorts of permutations and possibilities and the balance that J. Scott is referring to is what is reflected in this document, empowering and indeed mandating methods where the concerns that some improprietary or some high-jacking or gaming is going on, because in the document very much because of the fears that - but then people's experiences in other Work Groups in the past and not wanting to have that old baggage dragged into this new if.

> In terms of the due diligence I also - I'll talk back to J. Scott again for this. But that was another matter that we went through in agonizing detail and in fact ended up being quite set aside that with the mechanisms in play for disputes or concerns to be dealt with, and in fact with a degree of due diligence it's actually done by Staff and with the necessity of having not only your statements put in and published, but an ongoing commitment to continuous disclosure.

> So one could call out and question someone to say, you know, "We think or I think the status on your - in your statement is perhaps missing something or has something changed as mechanisms to deal with it."

> If you send these points back to the work team I'm fairly confident that where more robustness is desired certainly in outlining the specifics as to how the

ICANN Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White 07-14-10/1:30 pm CT

Confirmation # 3229250

Page 14

Chair needs to report back to the GNSO, and in some way some assistance

for how they can really establish and indeed report levels of consensus will

be able to be done because we have got alternates that we - and done

promptly.

We have got alternates and more day shops that we work through in our first

exercises.

J. Scott Evans: Yes and Tim that - the area that I think handles the abuse of player is 3.5. I

believe somewhere there is also a discussion and I can't point to it, but there

is also a discussion about reopening issues at some point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes there is.

Tim Ruiz:

Yes in 3.3.

J. Scott Evans:

And 3.5 is where the Chair has the power to take on somebody who's coming

in at the last minute, who's being disruptive so I would just ask you to look at

both of those sections in tandem.

With regards to the due diligence, I'm not so sure that's the right - this is the

right document for that because all this document is - tells the Working Group

Chair is you make sure that the Secretariat has done due diligence.

If the verification you're wanting is something beyond what they're currently

doing, then that's a best practice or direction that Staff needs to come up with

for how the Secretariat's going to verify.

And I don't think that that's the Working Group, you know, Chair's position to

do. All they do is say that the Secretariat has verified in accordance with the

ICANN practices, well whatever those are.

ICANN Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White 07-14-10/1:30 pm CT

Confirmation # 3229250

Page 15

So if there's a problem in the fact that we feel like the verification or due

diligence on behalf of verifying Working Group members is inadequate, I think

that's something that needs to be put into sort of a - and I think this came up

during our call, maybe best practices manual or a operations manual for the

Secretariat...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes that definitely did.

J. Scott Evans: ...different than this document.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But if you know it was an error then it comes back into the - raise it as a

dispute, call it out and it has to be dealt with pause.

J. Scott Evans:

So that's why it's not drilled down in that excruciating detail here. Also one

more thing - with regards to the disclosures of interest and statements of

interest, again you realize we have only supplanted into this document those

requirements that have been developed by...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The other work teams.

J. Scott Evans: ...other work teams.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Tim Ruiz:

But that's the one in the OSC work team.

J. Scott Evans:

That's right so if there are concerns with regards to those, you need to go

back to those Working Groups because we're - they're developing, all we're

doing is plopping it in here as a form of...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, but strengthening those other matters because we've gone through

them by my guess ad nauseum, we would have materials to work with and I

think J. Scott I'm fairly confident that the work team could react.

J. Scott Evans: I agree, I just was - my point was just to sort of...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What we did and what we didn't do, yes.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. Tim, no, from my understanding of where we - there was a huge

concern by particular person in the group of over-empowering a Chair with

the concern that it could become abusive. That's my...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Clearly that wasn't me.

Tim Ruiz: Right, right.

J. Scott Evans: But I - let you know that there was a - that's the reason it's a little - it's not so

very direct and strong. It's more fluid.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But the homework's done and kind of the question if it was bounced back

to us, it would not be difficult to react to.

Jeff Neuman: Okay Tim, do you have any thoughts on that as far as - so what I - sounds

like I'm hearing are that the first two issues that you brought up with respect

to the determination of consensus or whatever level that is that the Chair has

done with respect to determining, you know, putting a little bit more meat on

the - on how a Chair goes to determine those levels.

And a little bit more substance in the report to help the Council understand

how that, you know, basically to document it. That sounds like something that

the Working Group work team could certainly provide more information.

It sounds like with the other two issues about the gaming and the abusive

member or ensuring issues aren't reopened, it sounds like at least J. Scott

and Cheryl believe the Working Group addressed.

So with those last few if you wanted to just, you know, go back, read those sections again and let us know if you're - if you are comfortable with that. If you're not then, you know, let's talk about that at that point in time to make sure that you're comfortable.

Tim Ruiz: That sounds good.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Tim Ruiz: And thank you Scott and Cheryl for your explanations. That was helpful.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, and if you'll notice in the - and I - Marika you correct me if I'm wrong, but

the version you see up here and I believe it's on the (tweaky) as well, if you will use that when you go through that, I think it addresses where we did or

didn't do something that their comment was made about.

Tim Ruiz: Right, right.

J. Scott Evans: So if you want to look at that when you are reading through so you can see if

we've received the comment and we addressed or changed or didn't change

something, so it'll just more robustly inform your understanding.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The green bits literally direct feedback from our going over every

comment received, and the outcomes of why we did or did not respond

specifically to each and every one of the comments received.

J. Scott Evans: I just...

Tim Ruiz: Which by the way I think is - the way you guys dealt with this is a model for

others by the way. I think you did a great job.

J. Scott Evans: Well you have to thank our Staff liaison who is very good at her job.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Marika's worth her weight in gold. We need to clone her.

Marika Konings: Thank you for that.

J. Scott Evans: But that's because she made sure that we was transparent, open as possible

as did all of the team members, but Marika carried the heavy ore on that so...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: I'm just saying this will inform so you can say, "Well I noticed that they did this

but I still think more," that kind of stuff.

Tim Ruiz: Got it. All right, thanks Scott.

J. Scott Evans: No problem.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so the comments I got from the Registry team - Marika, you have a

comment?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just a suggestion because maybe it might be a similar

way of working if there are certain areas that the PPSC would like to hand back to the Working Group work team we might do in a similar way where, you know, the individual or the group as a whole writes in in that specific section what they see lacking or what issues they would like to - the work team to consider so that that can be handed back in relation to the relevant section, so that then the Working Group work team can look at it and then again comment on why they did or didn't make any changes in relating - in relation to the comments raised by the PPSC. So the group might consider

using a similar kind of model going forward.

Jeff Neuman: Okay I actually - I think that's a good suggestion. If - so the two comments I

got from the Registry - from a couple of the Registrys on this report, one

Page 19

relates to something that I believe - let's see in this version I think it might be

in the red line.

It might be Page 20 but I'm - can't verify that. It's a line that starts with - why

can't I scroll? I'm having a tough time scrolling down on this thing. Let me just

see if it's the same Page 20.

J. Scott Evans: The 20 of the version I'm looking at is...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's all comments.

J. Scott Evans: ...and stuff, it's not - well there's one bullet point of text. It begins...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yes, there it is. Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay it's actually on - I downloaded a copy but I'm not sure it's the same one

that's on the...

J. Scott Evans: Section number because we can find it.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, it's Section 2.2 under - I think it's - where it says Chair.

J. Scott Evans: All right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It was close to 20.

J. Scott Evans: Two point two - on the version that's on the - up on the Adobe that's Page 18

is where 2.2 begins.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so let me make sure that that language is actually still there.

Page 20

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And it's probably Page 19. It might be where you're referring to then Jeff

where there's a bullet dot Chair, the purpose of the Chair is.

Jeff Neuman:

Yes, so okay, so here's the comments that I got from one of the Registrys. It says that the sentence that the - that is - the Chair should underscore the importance of achieving representational balance on any subteams that are formed.

This is the comment. It says, "There are times when a subgroup may be formed to develop a draft comment for full group review and editing. In cases like this it is more effective to have just two or three people do this. But obviously such a small group would not be representationally balanced.

Certainly a subgroup should be open to whoever wants to join it, but it usually works just fine if every interest group is not represented, because the goal is simply to create a draft for further discussion by the wider group. Might the following workinstead?

The Chair should make it clear that participation of the subteams is important to all and he/she should encourage representational balance if that is possible and effective.

However it should be understood that there will not always be volunteers from every interest group and that it is often acceptable to have a small subteam that is not totally representational perform an initial role that will later be reviewed by the broader representationally balanced group."

J. Scott Evans:

By? As neutral Chair, it has to - I don't have a problem but that seems like it's more a footnote rather than to be in the main text. So after formed you would put a footnote and then put that language in.

Jeff Neuman:

Okay, I'm just reading to you the comments I got so...

J. Scott Evans:

Yes, I mean, I think it's valuable direction but I think it gets very, very wordy and we might also be able to consider or the Working Group, we might suggest to them Jeff if it does drop in as a footnote, a prefatory phrase, "While not always possible or most effective, the Chair should underscore the blah, blah, blah, blah, blah," footnote.

So, you know, so you might want to go back and see with your folks if something like that might work.

Jeff Neuman:

Yes I think it would. I think the point is rather than the whole rewording, I think the point was just that it's not always possible to have a representation balance and it may not be effective.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jeff If I may?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Jeff, Cheryl here for the record. Is there also - is the difference between the - this being designed as processes for a fully blown Work Group and a work team or subteam of a Work Group, or something that is specific for purpose?

For example if it was a scoping exercise, then the purpose of that Work Group would be specified in its charter, and the desired balance for its particular individual representation that is needed would be established in that charter as well.

So that then also links back into this underscoring of balance because we also discussed there would be times when there would be a necessity for particular talent or individual views to be bought into meet a particular need for a Work Group where for example particular security issues were involved

Page 22

or whatever, that they could be, you know, mandated requirements for some

representation as well as a desire for balance.

But that we just thought would come in more in the chartering and purpose of

whatever the group or team is meant to do. So I think the two things link

together and if we can make that clear about the use of footnotes, it certainly

would be helpful.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, I think that - yes and what I'll do too is I'll forward these comments in

an email to the PPSC just so that we have it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So if we can loop that back I'm comfortable that we could certainly

address that issue.

Jeff Neuman: And then the other comment is, I mean, these are really minor. As Tim said

the report was really well done and I think addresses all the comments. I think

the other point is on the liaison role in 6.1.4.

So let's - let me turn to that. I have it right here. What page is that on in this

version up here?

J. Scott Evans: Four.

Jeff Neuman: 6.1.4.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: It's page...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You went too far.

Jeff Neuman: It's 40...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's in the 40s.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, 43.

Jeff Neuman: Forty-three is...

J. Scott Evans: Other Important Roles.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so in the liaison, so it actually may be on the next page, hold on. Sorry.

No, where's liaison?

J. Scott Evans: Right under 6.1.4 there's a bullet that says, "Chartering Organization Liaison."

Jeff Neuman: There it is. Okay, I think in the added sentence that says that they're

encouraged to remain neutral, I think what the comment is that it should be similar to the Chair, that they should be able to state their opinion as long as,

you know, they indicate it's their opinion and not in their role as liaison.

In other words you should prevent them from advocating a position of the group that he or she represents, so long as it's made clear that they're doing

that separate from their liaison role.

Now do we - what do we say with respect to the - do we say that for Chair?

Do we say that the Chair can express their own opinion as long as they make

it clear it's not their position as the Chair?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't think we were being that generous to the empowered Chair. You

can't have power and opinion.

Jeff Neuman: Well you can have the opinion, you can't just tell it. You can't tell anyone

about it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well that's right, you have to find another way to get it to the table, not out of your own mouth.

Marika Konings:

This is Marika. The bit about the Chair is actually in the page before that section on Page I think 42 where it talks about the Chair is expected to assume a neutral role. That section talks about why he can state an opinion but needs to make clear that it's his personal opinion and not a ruling of the Chair.

Jeff Neuman:

Yes, so that's good. Yes but I think...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We can replicate that into the liaison section.

Jeff Neuman:

Yes I think that's right.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman:

So I'm going to forward those comments to the group. Like I said they're really relatively minor so overall it was really well done. So I'll forward those to the group.

Are there - let me - before - keeping it open-ended at this point are there any other issues that - let me ask Cheryl.

J. Scott Evans:

Here's my suggestion. My suggestion is that Jeff, you hold on to your comment. Have Tim prepare his comments and send them to you. You then add in your comments then send that entire thing to the group with a request for them to review and to add any additional comments.

Then we could come back at our next call hopefully and then put together a list of comments that would be then sent back to the Working Group for consideration. Does that sound - that way we don't get a bunch of piecemeal...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: I think that makes sense to me.

J. Scott Evans: I just think that, you know, that way we could just - everybody is, you know, one or two sheet page they look at rather than trying to do it piecemeal.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, and I think obviously we need to send that out to the people who aren't on the call to ask for their comments as well.

J. Scott Evans: Absolutely.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That would be the most efficient way to do it. It would give Alan the opportunity because whilst I'm happy to represent him, I don't have insight into his pausing and analysis of all the words and he would have paused and analyzed them.

So that would be very useful if the rest of the work team - sorry, Work Group could have that opportunity to add their comments.

Jeff Neuman:

Okay, and another thing I would like each member of the work team to consider as well is to go through this version that's got the comments embedded to make sure that they - that each member of this team, of this committee is satisfied that the comments that were received during the public comment period were adequately addressed, not necessarily that they were - came out in the way that the individual Steering Committee member may have wanted it to come out, but that they were addressed by the work team and to, you know, make sure that it was addressed and it wasn't dismissed or that, you know, the work team just dropped the ball.

And so again - so what I want to do is, and not tie up too much time because I think we're getting kind of close to the end of this call a little bit early, is to

talk about a timeline when we can meet again and then when we realistically think we can get something to the work team, because it sounds like we're going to submit a couple of things to the work team.

And then maybe from J. Scott kind of an indication as to how long he thinks the work team would take if these issues were the only ones that were raised, for the work team to kind of have a meeting or two to get that done.

And then how long we would need afterwards to hopefully get this done and up to the Council, you know, when we could expect to do that. So my guess is if we proceed on the path that we're going, not anticipating any huge other issues in the next few weeks is to hopefully get something to the work team and today, you know, by no later than mid-August and I know it's a terrible time period.

But does it sound like we can do something like that by mid-August to get it to the work team a month from now?

J. Scott Evans:

I see no reason why we can't if we have participation. I mean, it seems to me that, you know, your last request is going to have to go back to the constituency, have them review this version that we're looking at and make sure that those that submitted comments feel like that they were addressed, that we can then come back to you with that answer.

But that'll take a week or so or a week or two probably, and then once we have that and during the same time we have the consolidated list put together and circulated to the wider group, if we have a call of this group in two weeks then hopefully we could finalize it the end of that call or shortly thereafter what goes to the group back to the work team, the Working Group.

But I would say realistically I wouldn't expect the Work Group to be able to have any meetings until September. I could circulate all the materials to them

in preparation for a September call, and depending on what that list has I think we could probably do it in maybe two calls.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Even if they were two-hour calls J. Scott, I'd be confident that that timeline is achievable.

J. Scott Evans: Usually a 90-minute call is about all we can do without killing each other but I think...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You keep us in line.

J. Scott Evans: I think we could do it. The thing you all need to know is we do have one individual that doesn't or hasn't been able to due to scheduling conflicts, been able to attend calls but does review things and reply online.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: We need to give her some additional - once we have a call she has to sort of process it online but...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And it then comes back to us at the next call.

J. Scott Evans: Right, and so I would think that by end of September we could have something to come back to the PPSC.

Jeff Neuman: So with the goal of hopefully getting it to the Council at some point in October.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, I'm sorry, I'm just writing this down.

J. Scott Evans: Marika, what do you think based on your experience?

Marika Konings:

I think that sounds reasonable. It all of course depends on how many comments will come back to the work team, but as it looks now they are limited and the teams have, you know, from the feedback that you and Cheryl have provided are issues that, you know, the group will be able to work with.

So hopefully there won't be not too much back and forth because of course there might be a scenario as well where the work team comes back with answers that the PPSC might not find satisfactory or wants to discuss further where certain things might need to go back and forth again.

Another question of course the PPSC would need to address is whether they want to have another public comment period at the end of their process before handing it to the Council to see, you know, whether there are any further comments on the things that have been changed and whether any further changes need to be made before it's moved up to the Council. That's another question the PPSC would need to address I guess.

Jeff Neuman:

I'm just writing that down. Yes, I think it's hard to answer that question but I think we'll have to - we'll know it when we see it I hope. You know, if really the PPSC is just - or sorry, the working - work team are just addressing questions that were already received in comments, I'm not sure but - well we can't predict that in advance.

So why don't we, you know, with - basically then just a recap, the next two weeks set out to gather the issues together into one list that Marika will help put together.

So I'll send my issues to Marika and Tim will send his issues and everyone else will be encouraged to send it to Marika. I'd like to see the list of issues so if anyone wants to copy me that would be great, but otherwise I'll just get it from Marika. That's fine.

That - we should then probably have a call maybe the first week of August if that works for people.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm probably not going to be around then but I'm sure probably

Liz will be able to cover hopefully.

Jeff Neuman: You Europeans man, you take lots of time off.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But hang on, hang on. When they're working, my heavens, if Marika's the

example boy can they work.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, yes I'd like to see if we could - yes so Liz - what - how long are you out

for Marika?

Marika Konings: I'm just gone the first two weeks of August.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Marika Konings: And actually I am back in the second week so if there will be a call in the

second week I think I'm back from my trip so I should be able to cover that.

Jeff Neuman: All right, so why don't we - I'd rather have you on the call since you're putting

together the list. Why don't we then - what days are you back then like-

Marika Konings: I mean, if we could shoot maybe for the same time, same date it would be

then the 11th of August at this time of day if that works for everyone.

J. Scott Evans: Fine with me I think. Let me check. Yes.

Tim Ruiz: It works for me. This is Tim.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so why don't we schedule that for the 11th of August absent hearing

anyone with huge problems. Then the goal would be to - at that meeting to

finalize that list and at least make sure that list of issues is final, with the goal of empowering J. Scott to send things out to the Working Group work team, you know, at some point the last week of August so that he could then call a meeting or two meetings in the month of September so that hopefully it'll come back to us within - in about a month or so in October.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: J. Scott, just in September and remembering the makeup of the - your work team, remember IGF is on.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You'll probably blow the middle of September away totally, preparatory for the IGF and then the IGF running 14 to 17.

J. Scott Evans: Well it really depends on how big our list is so...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I'm just saying we just need to be aware when we're doing the two calls.

Jeff Neuman: And then yes, hopefully to get it in October and we'll take it from there. Does that sound doable by everyone?

Marika Konings: Jeff this is Marika. Just a question, will you send out a note to the list asking or giving people a deadline by when they need to submit their comments or issues, or would you like me to put together a little note from this meeting and put it in there?

Jeff Neuman: Why don't we - so you're going to send a note on the next meeting of the team the 11th of August?

Marika Konings: Yes, what I can do as well is put a little, you know, where we discussed a little timeline that we went over now, especially for those that weren't on the call.

Jeff Neuman:

Yes, why don't you do that and you can send it out, and what I'm going to do too is I'm going to call Mike and I'm going to call Gabriel or at least drop them a note just making sure that they're non-commercials and the business constituency are aware of the timeline, and to make sure that they get their issues in. I'm assuming Tony's still on mute and is perfectly happy with all of this.

Marika Konings: Tony has actually disconnected according to meeting view.

Jeff Neuman: Then he's really happy with all of it. Okay, so I'll also follow up with Tony as

well. Does anybody else have any comments or questions? Great, I

appreciate everyone coming out and thank you very much, and we'll talk to you in mid-August but please send any comments that you have. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks.

Tim Ruiz: Bye-bye.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you (Shawn).

Coordinator: You're very welcome. Have one of those beers for me would you?

Gisella Gruber-White: I will do so. You enjoy the...

END