

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Policy Development Process (PDP)
Work Team (WT)
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 21 January 2010 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee Policy Development Process (PDP) Work Team (WT) meeting on Thursday 21 January 2010 at 15:00 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-20100121.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Jeff Neuman - Registry Stakeholder Group - Work Team Chair
James Bladel – Registrar Stakeholder Group
Paul Diaz - Registrar Stakeholder Group
Wolf Knoben – ISPC
Alan Greenberg - ALAC
Marilyn Cade – Individual

ICANN Staff:

Margie Milam
Gisella Gruber-White
Marika Konings

Absent apologies:

Tatiana Khramtsova – Registrar Stakeholder Group
Alex Gakuru - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group
Avri Doria - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group
David Maher – Registry Stakeholder Group

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Welcome everyone. I will have before we start Gisella call the roll.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. One today's call we have Jeff Neuman, James Bladel, Marilyn Cade, Wolf Knoblen, Paul Diaz. From staff we have Margie Milam, Marika Konings and myself, Gisella Gruber-White.

We have apologies from Avri Doria, Alex Gakuru, Tatiana Khramtsova. And if I can also just remind everyone please to state their names when speaking. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Good morning and good afternoon everyone. It is January 21. I hope I have that right. It is Thursday and it is our normal regularly scheduled meeting of the PDP Work Team of the PPSC. And this has been our first meeting in probably close to a month given the holiday season and some other things that had come in the way.

So with that started, I think the first agenda item we should kind of look at which is up on Adobe, so if everyone that's around a computer that could get on Adobe could get on. We have up right now is a new timeline that takes the old one and just revises a bunch of the dates given the month that we have in between and the fact that obviously we didn't have a face to face meeting.

So it's now drawing the timeline out to Brussels, the Brussels meeting, to hopefully complete work by then. And I sent it around on the mailing list. I'm not sure if it's made it its way around yet or not. Sent it a few minutes before the meeting.

And so why don't we - why don't we go through that timeline? Then we'll talk about status of where we are on the current documents and where we'd like to be in the next few weeks. And then we'll do some logistics on future meetings and for Nairobi.

I will say that I have a - I have to step away in an hour and so if the meeting is going on I will ask someone on policy staff to continue the meeting if there's

still good discussion or we can decide at that point to close the meeting and just hold off until the following one.

And with that said, also one more housekeeping item. Given that things are busy for all of us, if anyone is interested in having a Vice Chair of this group, I know I'm certainly interested in that or an Alternate Chair or whatever we want to call that person to kind of help out a little bit if I have to be away or if for whatever reason.

I would greatly appreciate it if anyone wanted to volunteer. I will not put anyone on the spot on this call. So if you do have an interest and want to let me know off list or on the list that would be - that would be great.

Any questions about today's agenda? Okay. So the timeline that's up on the screen now it incorporates what we've done already since November, which was when we first put out this last version of this timeline. And as you can see, we do have this - the draft reports that are out for Stages 1, 2 and 3.

We are in the midst of discussing Stage 4 and we have questions out there for Stage 5, which we should hopefully turn to fairly soon. And we've only gotten comments on Stages 1, 2 and 3 now from Avri and from James.

James sent his around early today, or - well actually probably late last night for some of us. And so I don't think most of us have read that yet. But what we're doing is compiling all the comments and hopefully we'll submit a revised report incorporating those comments within the next couple of weeks.

I strongly encourage everyone to read those because after all the reports are really what's going to be the output of this group. So the discussions have been great. The surveys have been great. We're including those discussions and surveys into the report but, you know, really what most of the people in the end are going to see are those - the draft report.

So the goal for this meeting is to talk about after we get through with the timeline is to talk about - is to continue on with Stage 4 and review the questions for Stage 5. Hopefully finishing Stage 4 if by the end of the next meeting and then having a report on Stage 4 by the first week of February.

With that, is there any questions? We're going to - I'm sorry, I missed the - hopefully by January 26 which is next week we'll have a survey on the questions for Stage 5 so we can begin those discussions. Marika, you have a hand up.

Wolf Knoben: Jeff, Wolf speaking.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I'm going to go to Marika and then I'll go to you Wolf.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Just to continue on the timeline and there's also to explain because there's some changes in the timeline compared to the previous version that relates to the approach we would like to take in reviewing and editing the report.

Because initially we were talking about maybe, you know, running through the report altogether and then, you know, making edits and, you know, we're looking at tools that would enable us to do so.

But we thought as well like in addition to that something that other working groups are doing as, you know, probably the most important part of the report and probably as well where most discussion is required are the recommendations.

And one suggestion there that we've included in the timeline is to develop a polling system on the recommendations which, you know, shouldn't be seen as a voting mechanism but more as a way to see how people view the recommendations. How close we are to reaching consensus and also allow

for people to specifically focus on those recommendations and be able to provide edits or to submit alternate views.

So they - those can then be used to update the report and guide further discussions on those recommendations.

On reviewing the actual report, and we've just been discussing a bit before this call, we have been looking into other tools that we might be able to use online to allow for a live editing of documents. But, you know, there are tools out there but, you know, each of them come with their own challenges and difficulties of course will require, you know, additional learning from everyone to use those.

So as a, you know, maybe a second best option what we're considering doing is trying to use Adobe Connect allowing the share screen function so that we can - at the stage where we have and need edits from everyone and suggestions from everyone, have feedback on the recommendations.

Basically then have one document where we can run through looking at the changes proposed and run through with the group basically looking at, you know, which changes do we want to accept. Which changes, you know, should be rejected? Where do we still need to refine the report and use it in a way for people to still see, you know, live on screen what's happening and use that as a tool hopefully to facilitate, you know, the group participation in getting this document in to a final state, so.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thank you. Yes. Thank you Marika. I think all of those are very important and the recommendations are key obviously. So that's a lot of attention is going to be drawn on the recommendations. I also think the discussion - I mean please don't let that substitute for a review on the discussion because ultimately when people look at the recommendations, they want to know the rationale as to how we got there.

Obviously the discussion in the background is really should lay the stage. It shouldn't be a surprise in reading the report; what the recommendations are by looking at the discussion. And how we got to where we got to. There have been a lot of really great discussions that have gone on within the work team and in the document that really set the stage as to why we got to where we are.

Man: Communication (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: So I want to - Wolf I know you had a question or a comment.

Wolf Knoblen: Yes. So I have two questions or clarifications. The one is so I understood that for Stages 1 to 3 I comments - it's still open for comments. So that's what I got right now.

And for me it's important to know what is the really (hard) deadline for that. So that means because - and I would like to incorporate the (consistency) for example. So I don't like now to engage them repeatedly. So really I need the very last deadline in order well to - to incorporate them. So that's the first one, my first question how to do this.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Why don't we - why don't we take that one and then we'll go on to your second question?

Wolf Knoblen: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: So on that one it's kind of interesting because, you know, I'm not sure this is going to be the most satisfying answer but my opinion is that there's no hard deadlines on these Stages 1, 2, 3, 4, or even 5 until we actually have a kind of unified report because I think there are items in every stage that effect other stages.

So, you know, at least the way we've been operating until now has been that the only hard deadline will be once we complete, there'll be Stage 5 and then there's this topic of overarching issues which include things like foreign translations and timelines and kind of issues that are in every single stage that we have to sort of address as an overarching issue.

Once we have that Stages 1 through 5 and those overarching issues, at that point we'll have the hard deadline so that we can go out and get kind of more constituency views on these and community views on the whole unified report. That's the way we've been operating until now, which is a little bit different than many of the other groups that have been operating just because there's so much material in this overall topic of policy development.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: So that's just my view. I want to - I want to hear from others to make sure they share that same view or if they differ.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Because indeed Jeff, you describe it well. It's basically up to people, you know, we'll of course encourage them to already review it, you know, ongoing and as well making comments because it will be easier to integrate everything instead of, you know, waiting for everyone until the last, you know, bit and then having to put everything together.

And, you know, will give maybe less time to people to actually review the changes made. So, you know, I would like to encourage people to, you know, do look at the different stages as they come out.

But I cannot understand as well that some people might prefer to see everything together and then spend a chunk of time really going through the report in detail and, you know, making comments, you know, over the whole report. So it's a bit of, you know individual choice as well how you would like to handle it.

Jeff Neuman: Right. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I think one of the problems is we've identified a number of overarching issues and put them off to the end which are the ones that we have not been able to grapple with well.

But in fact we've addressed many overarching issues and handled them one by one as we went along and made decisions. And one of the problems of waiting until the very end to make any comments whatsoever is a small change somewhere may in fact have ripple effects in a lot of other places.

So I think we almost need at least two passes that we - we've done a very substantive amount of work and I think that comments and review is warranted now even though it's not a complete document that stands on, you know, on its own.

Jeff Neuman: Oh absolutely. And I hope I didn't - I didn't mean to imply that people shouldn't be commenting all along. I guess my comment was that we're not really - we don't really have a hard deadline for people to, you know, we're saying okay we're accepting comments on Stage 3 up until now and then that's it.

I think your point of people should get comments in now because they do affect other stages not just in the past but going forward. And it obviously help us on an ongoing basis.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I wasn't meaning to disagree at all with you. Just pointing out that we didn't hold all overarching issues. We made an awful lot of recommendations along the way. And they're implicitly relied on in other parts of the document. So the earlier we can get tacit an approval on what we have said so far, the better off we're likely to be without having to make massive changes later.

Jeff Neuman: Agreed. Okay. Anyone else's comments on Wolf's first question? Okay. Wolf, you had a second comment or question?

Wolf Knoblen: Yes. The second question is regard to the timeline. The question is it - is there something kind of meeting incorporated which means an extended meeting so in replacement of the face-to-face meeting or did we leave that?

Jeff Neuman: That's a very good question. You know, I - part of it's going to depend on what's going on which was going to be my next question before we actually got into - back to Stage 4, which was going to be about the Nairobi meeting and who is - assuming that that's going on, who is going to - who is going and whether we could have some sort of - if it was going on and there was enough attendance there of this work team whether we could have an extended meeting at that point in time.

So I think we've kind of been silent on it in this - in this document at this point in time. But I do think, and that's another topic I wanted to talk about. I still do think an extended meeting whether in person or more likely over the phone or through some of these conference tools is a good idea. Alan do you have a...

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Regardless of who goes to Nairobi and that's an interesting question, I think the ship has - the time has passed for setting up an extended meeting there. It's certainly not going to be possible to schedule during the week and because of travel arrangements it's getting a bit too - it's probably a lot too late to do it before or after the meeting. So as much as I regret that, I don't think that's a - that's a non-starter.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I mean of course we're already working on the schedule and (it depends on) we have set aside some time over the weekend. I mean of course we'll need to see I mean who's available or not. But in the schedule we've tried to make some time. I mean not, you know, not hours, hours at a time but at least, you know, to allow for an hour and a half, two hours hopefully a discussion. But again, the schedule is tentative and...

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Alan Greenberg: I'd like to hope we will meet for that kind of time but allocating a half day, a day, two days is just not going to be possible.

Marika Konings: No. Agreed.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I agree with that. So in this timeline we did not build in a meeting for that or an extended one. I think I would still like to do that. But let's see what progress we can make at this point and but this timeline does not build that in there.

Alan Greenberg: But you did at one point say that without the face to face and without an extended teleconference, you don't think we can come anywhere near meeting the deadlines that we set.

Jeff Neuman: Well that was the deadlines that we had set for Nairobi.

Alan Greenberg: Right. Right.

Jeff Neuman: I think these deadlines now are pushed out more towards having everything done by Brussels. So hopefully a little bit more realistic without that extended meeting. And if we can get something for an extended meeting, that would be fantastic. And I'm sure we would use that time wisely. And I'm not sure whether that would or would not push the timeline in a little bit because dates tend to slip, not intentionally but they sometimes tend to slip just because of the nature of things.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So actually I would like to take a informal poll of people on this call as to who will - who is planning on being in Nairobi at this point. Obviously things

can change. And I will tell you at this point in time, just for my own company's standpoint is that - at this point I may not be going.

I'm still fighting that internal battle here. And, you know, with security and other things that are going on in the world, at this point in time, my company's telling me that I'm not able to go. But that may change. So other than me, you know, Alan, do you have - are you able to attend?

Alan Greenberg: I have a travel request in. Haven't heard back on it yet but I'm assuming I'm going to be there.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Let's see. James.

James Bladel: Yes. We're planning to go. Our concern at this point as I mentioned to you offline is will enough people show up for it be productive. But we're monitoring the situation; but so far no changes to our plans.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: People who are planning to go should pre-register. That low number of pre-registrations right now is causing problems.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Paul.

Paul Diaz: Yes. Just like James. We're planning to go. We're monitoring. We'll be there and we'll be there early. So if we do something on the weekend as we were just discussing, be available for that as well.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

James Bladel: I'm sorry. This is James. I should mention we're also arriving on the Thursday prior to the weekend.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Alan, I'm assuming you have a request in and if you - if that gets granted, you'll be there on the weekend.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I'm planning - my request is to arrive late Friday night. Means I may not be very awake on Saturday, but I may - I should - I should physically be there.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Wolf.

Wolf Knoben: Yes. I've also filed a request but not yet have got approval. So my plan is also to arrive Friday night so to stay there over the weekend before the ICANN meeting starts as well.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Marilyn, you already said you would be there. I'm assuming on the weekend as well.

Marilyn Cade: Hold on. I'll tell you. I am arriving Friday at 8:25, yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Assuming the policy staff will be there. Is that a safe assumption?

Marika Konings: Normally yes.

Jeff Neuman: Is there anyone on this call that I missed? Okay. Well I mean that - at least for the people on this call, that sounds pretty encouraging for the most part; obviously myself being excluded. I'd like to - if we can - if we can do a poll on the list as well. Marika if we can send something around.

Marika Konings: Gisella, could you send out a note to the group please so we can keep track? I'll check with Gisella that she'll send out a note.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Great. Okay. With that said, that's helpful and we'll be checking in. There is for those of you that have not been on the ICANN Web site or seen the announcement, there's a - an ICANN Board meeting, a special meeting

tomorrow to discuss the Nairobi meeting and the status and whether there are any alternate plans if there's any concerns about security in that region.

So we will see what comes out of that meeting at some point after that. And I'm assuming that Marika or Gisella will send that around for the list so that we know what's going on.

Okay. Any other comments or questions on scheduling or - the last logistical item, I know I keep saying that, is I know ongoing - I have a conflict and standing meeting that is at 11:00 am Eastern Time on this day. And it's - unfortunately it's something that's set by not internally or something I can affect. So we have a couple choices going forward.

We could have these calls and then someone else could take over for me for the last half hour of the calls. We could see if there's - if we could push it - this call up a half hour if that works for people. Or we could see if there's another time. I'm open to any of those suggestions. Anyone of those are fine.

I just wanted to throw that out there and not necessarily decide this minute but just to let you know about my situation and see if there was something we can or should do. Alan do you have a comment on that?

Alan Greenberg: Well, of those - of those options I prefer not to lose you for 2/3 of our - for a third of every meeting. So I prefer making it earlier or changing the time altogether.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thank you. Paul.

Paul Diaz: Yes. Totally agree with Alan and have no problem doing it earlier. If it's another time, just ask that we try and figure that out sooner but early for me is fine.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I want to be sensitive to people on - although I'm not sure...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Diaz: All different time zones.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Exactly. I'm not...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: ...people we have on the West - well, I mean James obviously is the West. Well you're Midwest I guess. But...

James Bladel: Yes. But I still don't like to get up that early Jeff.

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Making a meeting at 10:00 am for me is hard, so.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

James Bladel: Yes. It's fine. If we want to shift it up, that's fine as well. But yes. So that's not an issue. I would eventually more prefer that we change the time plus or minus this time zone or this time slot that we currently have and have been using all along than try to find a different date. Because since this group has kicked off, I've picked up a lot of other commitments and it would be really difficult to find an open spot.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Should we - should we try an experiment then for the next call in two weeks to try it a half hour earlier and see if that works?

Marilyn Cade: Jeff, it's Marilyn.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Sometimes there are benefits to being able to show up on a call and make decisions. I think you ought to implement a decision to move it.

Jeff Neuman: Well okay. So does that - does that work for at least everyone on this call?

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Is there a Council call that happens to conflict with - I don't know when the next Council call is. I think it's actually...

Marika Konings: The next one is on the 28th but it's actually at the - I think - is that 11 UTC?

Marilyn Cade: Correct.

Man: Yes.

Marika Konings: So we should be finished before we start our call. There might be I guess a conflict. So no, I think the times that we have for the Council calls wouldn't conflict with...

Alan Greenberg: No. It's scheduled four hours earlier than our current time.

Marika Konings: Yes. And I think the other times we have for the Council calls also are not conflicting with this specific timeslot. I mean for some it might be very long call although - oh no - I'm sorry. I think we do have one at 1300 UTC.

Marilyn Cade: Thirteen hundred.

Marika Konings: So what that's - I think the next one is again then in a couple of weeks. So we can see that, you know, when that meeting comes up if we can move it to a different time in that week or maybe it's anyway a week where we are not planning to have a call because people are reviewing or working on issues. So I think we should just say that when those meeting come up to see how we address it.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: And for the next one is not a conflict.

Alan Greenberg: We've historically often had to move a meeting or postpone one that's a GNSO meeting anyway.

Jeff Neuman: Right. All right. So then let's - in accordance with Marilyn's recommendation, let's make the decision to start the meetings a half hour early starting on the next meeting in two weeks. And hopefully that will not present a problem to people on the - on the list. And I'm sure we'll hear about it if it does.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Just need to highlight it in the announcement.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Please.

Marika Konings: Jeff you mentioned the next meeting in two weeks. You don't want to have a meeting next week or you want to have it at the old time next week?

Jeff Neuman: Well I think at this point we're still on every other week although I'm looking at your calendar and you actually probably - did you make it for next week on the timeline?

Marika Konings: Yes. I did. The timeline is assuming that we're meeting on a weekly basis I think what we were doing before the Christmas holidays.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. How do people feel about that? I'm good with that. I don't know how everyone else feels.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry. Could you say that again? I kind of...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: So having the call on a weekly basis at nine - sorry, I don't know the UTC time but for me it would be a half hour earlier 9:30 am Eastern Time.

Gisella Gruber-White: 1430 UTC.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: I must say my observation - and so maybe the staff might want to publish the stats again of attendance records. That might be really helpful. The last publication was very helpful.

I must say I'm doubtful that weekly calls - maybe I'm wrong but I'm not sure weekly calls are going to generate more attendance.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I'm not sure about the - I tend to agree with you on attendance. But I think the reason is for pushing the work a little bit. Why don't we...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: I'm not - I'm not objecting. I just...

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Marilyn Cade: I think - I participate in this - in this working group as an individual. I do not represent a constituency. There's no one from the business constituency on this call nor recently on any of the calls.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Marilyn Cade: Publishing statistics are always helpful. So, you know, maybe noting the move to week calls, the workers and the dedicated team on this call who I always find on this call agree I can support and I'll be here when I can. I've got a lot of travel and international meetings but I'll be here when I can.

But I can support that but you might want to - sometimes information is helpful.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I understand that. I think that's a good suggestion. So let me go to Paul and then to Alan.

Paul Diaz: Yes. Thanks Jeff. I totally support everything Marilyn just said. She actually scooped me. I was about to say the same. It would help to have that sort of use your bully pulpit or, you know, shame some folks into getting more involved.

And I'm aware that there are other policy initiatives that are being discussed. And people who are voting for these, agreeing to them aren't even showing up to the ones they previously approved. So I think it's perfectly appropriate to have sort of a notice about what attendance has looked like. And this is supposed to be a very important issue for the - for the Council for ICANN in total.

Each week, you know, we have - each meeting we have the same relatively small handful of participants that said like Marilyn I have no problem going to a weekly meeting. My only question is would it be a one-hour weekly meeting or will we still go for the 90 minutes just for scheduling purposes and need to know.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I think. I think the schedule would start at - I think it would be starting at 9:30 Eastern Time or - and I would suggest next week we would keep it at the hour and a half and then, you know, just see what happens, see if it's productive. All right.

We just have to see the level of productivity on each of the meetings. So I think at this point it would be an hour and a half. But let me go to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. A couple of points. First of all, our attendance is low and I'll make the politically incorrect comment that maybe we should try to remind the people who wanted to go to a face to face meeting, they could attend these meetings as well.

I don't really think that holding a meeting two weeks - every two weeks or every week makes that much of a difference on most of us. It increases the load very significantly for you and for Marika, for Jeff and for Marika.

I'll be honest. Most of the time the work I do is done recognizing there's a meeting tomorrow and I better do something. And that's true whether it's weekly, biweekly or monthly.

So we do need to get attendance up but I don't think how often the meeting is held is a major issue for most of us in terms of our workload.

Jeff Neuman: Well let me see. Does policy staff have a comment on this? I mean policy staff helped put the timeline together. So maybe I could make an assumption but let me talk to Marika or Margie.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I mean I think we'll, you know, by keeping on a weekly basis, I think we keep momentum going. And, you know, my concern is if we do it every two weeks and, you know, sometimes things happen and we need to cancel or there's a Council call that, you know, we might not be meeting for three or four weeks. And it really takes out the pace of the work.

So I think from a staff perspective - and I agree with Alan. I think having weekly or biweekly meetings is not going to change attendance. I don't think that has a real impact. So I think from a policy staff perspective, we're happy to support whatever way the working group wants to go but we would encourage you to maybe do it on a weekly basis to really try as well to wrap up the work in a, you know, timely fashion.

And we're happy to share the attendance records. I mean Jeff we can send them to you and, you know, if you want to send another note out of encouragement to the different constituencies for participation to see if that has any affect.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Please do send that to me. And, you know, I know we did want to - for the presentation we did for the GNSO Council for the in person meeting, so it shouldn't be too much to update that and especially since we didn't have a call in about a month.

So let's - so the executive decision is that we will do weekly basis. We'll start at - Gisella could you repeat the UTC time.

Gisella Gruber-White: 1430 UTC.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you. 1430 UTC time starting next week, hour and a half meetings and we'll see where that takes us. But I - my big interest here is jumping into the substance. As much as I love talking about logistics, I think we should get back into Stage 4.

And just to remind people since it's been a while, we were talking about the Board report, I'm sorry, the Council report to the Board. And what is in the current bylaws we are at Question 3 which is setting forth, if you look at the second column, it's all the, for lack of a better word, stuff that goes to the Board from the GNSO Council that's attached to the actual report itself.

So the report that's produced by the working group or the working group that's sent to the Council and now the Council has voted to send it up to the Board and these are all the items that are to be included with that report. And we had discussed the first two elements - well we discussed the general notion of the Board report and we had a lengthy several discussions on confidentiality and what should go to the Board from staff and versus the Council.

But now we're actually talking about the details of what should be in the Council report to the Board putting aside whether there's any other type of report. And in the current bylaws we had talked about A and B which are the clear statement of the vote of the Council.

And if B was if there's a successful vote was not reached, a clear statement by all of the positions held by the Council members indicating the elements that are in there. So I believe we left off on 3C if we look at the notes that are in there. And C is should this report have an analysis of how the issue would affect each constituency or stakeholder group including financial impact.

We did start on this and actually maybe this is miss-numbered in there - in the report. We did have a discussion on the last call and I remember Robin bringing up some points that it's really not just financial impact. That's a very narrow way of looking at it.

The other point that was brought up was that, you know, this analysis whether financial or otherwise is also or should also be in the Council - in the working group report to the Council. So there was a question as to, and I want to start there again, as to whether we needed a separate element piled on top of the report when in theory this should have been part of the report to the Council in the first place.

Is there any thoughts on that as far as - should it be separately be called out what's in the working group report to the Council or should it be something new that's taken on by policy or the Council putting on top of the report? Any thoughts on that? At this point in time currently it's at least supposed to be in the Council report to the Board.

So seeing no one immediately jumping up, I - you know, some thoughts that I have, you know, are that this really should be what's in the Council report - I'm sorry, what's in the working group report to the Council and I think that is certainly one of the things that should be discussed during the PDP process and should never be a surprise.

You know, it should be something completely new, taking a poll as how this is going to affect anyone. The question I have is whether in the Council report there should be maybe a summary of that or some high level - you know, I guess the summary. Yes, basically bullet point list or something of pointing people to where in the report this is discussed. Alan, you have a comment?

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Well, it's a comment really goes back to a little bit of the previous stuff but it affects this as well. In our early discussions regarding, you know, the staff report and confidentiality and stuff, I think we came to a (cassic) conclusion. I'm not sure it's reflected in the notes. That Council really needs to be told what it is. That needs to be in a concise report to the Board that the Board will actually read so that we can author that document.

Staff can add - any private advice staff can add an opinion on whether it's good or not. But we should have the - we should be able to write that concise report.

Given that, whether that - that's the Board summary let's call it. Given that, I think we're now - we now have two different documents. One is the full Council report to the Board and one is the Board report. I think issues of impact on stakeholders needs to be in the full report. I suspect it won't make

the cut - it may not make the cut unless the issues are crucial in the Board report.

So if we have this Board summary in addition to the full report, I think we need to differentiate which is in what sections as we're having this discussion.

Jeff Neuman: Right. So this is specifically dealing with the Council report to the Board as opposed to any kind of separate staff report or anything.

Alan Greenberg: Well but I'm suggesting there not be a staff report but that, you know, we be told, you know, if the staff reports are limited to three pages, you know, with short sentences because people don't want to read very much, then we should understand what the parameters of that are so Council can write that Board report minus the - and, you know, the opinion of staff and the confidential issues that staff may have to share with the Board.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: And - I'm - the question I'm asking is whether something like financial or rather impact on constituencies is in - I think it has to be in the overall report, the full one. I don't know whether it makes the cut in the short one. We need some input from staff on what are the parameters for the staff report that the write right now on that part.

Jeff Neuman: That's a good question. Marika, you have your hand raised. Do you want to - are you going to answer that question or...

Marika Konings: I'm actually going to make a suggestion because we have been having this discussion for quite some time now. And I would really suggest the work team to ask or write the Board and basically ask them, you know, what is that you would like to see? Why do you have confidential staff report? What's in there? Why can't we see them?

And ask that question directly to the Board and get their input on how they would like to receive information. What information they need to make a decision. How long should such a report be; like how much information can they digest, you know, before a meeting when they have to take a decision? And try to get some direct input there because I think we're, you know, we're being here to intermediary and I think it makes more sense to ask that directly and try to get that information.

And that might be as well a way to start on discussion on, you know, we've had some other debates on. How to facilitate communication between the Council and the Board or the working groups and the Board to try to see as well if there may be a part from a report, you know, should, you know, should the Council set aside some time to brief the Board on its recommendations or for those that want to organize a separate presentation or Webinar or whatever.

So, you know, I would just like to encourage the work team to, you know, direct those questions directly to the Board and get some input in that way directly.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I think that's - I'd like to hear some comments from the work team on that. I would certainly be happy to write to the Board and ask - at least the Board Governance Committee and ask them these questions. I think that's a very good idea. Paul, do you have a comment on that.

Paul Diaz: Yes, specifically. Thanks Jeff. I fully support the idea also from the perspective of greater transparency within ICANN. You know, this question of confidential reports (I want to) - there's so much misunderstanding about what's in those reports and what not. Here's an opportunity. If they get a note, a letter from you serving in your role as Chair of this work team, you know, asking for some clarification and suggestions.

You know, we have some ideas (with the appreciate is there), putting all that on the record so they have to respond on the record would also go a ways to help improve some of the transparency communications (as few) that we have or we think we may have vis a vie the Board. So I fully support the idea.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Anybody else want to comment on this or...

Marilyn Cade: I have only one comment. It's Marilyn. I think the - I think it probably should go to the - I think it should probably go to the Board Governance Committee with a -- including Jeff, you know -- an explanation that this is basically a broad area of question within the community. We're asking the question on behalf of this particular working group but I think it's fair to note we don't know if we have a problem or not but there are many people in the community who are concerned that we do.

Jeff Neuman: Right. If - certainly as Paul said, there's certainly a perception.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Jeff Neuman: And, you know, it's almost irrelevant what the reality is. What's more important in this case is perception.

Marilyn Cade: Right. You know, I just want to be really fair to the Board members who have not only any report that we put forward from the GNSO but many, many other work items. And I think if the Board Governance Committee still holds in theory the oversight over the improvements to the GNSO, I think that's the place to start.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Let me also point out I will - so we'll draft that letter. Obviously send it around to the work team. Get lots of input from you guys on the letter. It's going to be objective. I don't - it's not going to offer an opinion one way or the other about whether there should or should not be these types of reports.

I think obviously in our work team report we could certainly opine on that. I think the letter will be more an objective basis about the - in general about the information they get in these reports or information that they would like to see in the Council report. So it'll be on an objective basis.

The one question I have and Marika, Gisella and Margie we need to note is are we allowed to send something - I don't mean allowed. That's kind of not the - obviously we can do whatever we want. How will the Council view a direct communication from a work team to the Board Governance Committee without A, going through the Steering Committee and B, going through the Council is a - I'd like to avoid some of the political issues we got into with the face to face meeting.

So if anyone has any thoughts on that in order to avoid that is to at least let Council - at least let the Steering Committee and the Council know that this is something we are considering doing to make sure that we don't have all of a sudden now the Council debating in a couple weeks whether we did an awful thing by directly communicating outside the appropriate channels to directly to the Board Governance Committee.

Alan Greenberg: I would think you're going to have that discussion whether you like it or not. You may well want to talk to the Chair of the Council.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I want to make a suggestion because you actually have a GNSO Chairs call coming Monday to prepare the meeting. And I'm happy to raise it there and get the input from Chuck, Olga and Stephane to see what they think is the best approach whether, you know, it should be mentioned there and see if anyone has any objections or whether, you know, it's fine, you know, go and send it or, you know, just copying the Council when you send out the note.

I'm happy to check it with them or, you know, Jeff if you want to raise it directly with Chuck, I mean, you know, as you prefer.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I think - I think both. I will - yes Marilyn yes. Sorry. Did not mean to - yes.

Marilyn Cade: Before you make a decision, let me offer a thought.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: So I have no idea, and I understand we're being recorded, I have no idea if the mythical Steering Group is still active since it's hard for me to discern that. I was distressed at the approach that was taken to limit the voice of the interested workers in this group to be able to move forward with the face-to-face meeting by using that as a legal lever. That was quite amazing.

I think that it's really true however that a task force or working group should not send communications to the Board, Governance Committee or Board, without having it I would call forwarded through to whatever the authorizing entity is for the working group or task force.

Now that brings a question of, and it relates to the report as well, does that authorizing entity have the ability to edit or change or refuse to forward such communication? But I think we are actually a working body under a larger organization.

So I really do support the idea that we need to draft the communication and forward it through the appropriate authorizing body to our - to our - I'm not talking authorizing what we decide but the authorizing entity under which we work. I think that's the Council. Is that still the Steering Group?

Jeff Neuman: So excellent question. There is still a Steering Group although it is - has not met and there are a number of members that have since - have since maybe not participated so much in the ICANN arena. Separately, (Rick) and I...

Alan Greenberg: Less (lead Chairs to go around).

Jeff Neuman: Well, Marika and I actually separately had a discussion on this very point yesterday. And a couple things came out of that and we are still researching the - we need to research the charter of the Steering Committee because I think that the names of the people are actually in the charter itself which is probably something that should not be done in the future.

And we are going to have to jump through a couple hoops to actually get the Council to redo the charter even before we can issue a call for the Steering Committee to be reconstituted. Part of the problem on issuing that recall is that in addition to the names being in there, there was also the old structure of constituencies in there.

That said, once that topic goes to the Council, you could imagine the debate that's going to ensue about if we reconstitute the Steering Committee, is it going to have to be on a stakeholder group basis and if so, see there will be people making the same arguments that were raised here about a face to face about the equal representation of stakeholder group.

So, long story short without delving into this, I will have - if the - if the work team feels comfortable, I will have a - I will reach out the Chuck and the GNSO Chair. I'll reach out to them. Marika for whatever reason I'm unsuccessful in reaching Chuck, since you're having a meeting on Monday, if you could bring that up at their - the Chair's meeting.

Marika Konings: Will do.

Jeff Neuman: And...

Marilyn Cade: Jeff, I just need to ask one more question.

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

Marilyn Cade: How long is the work still expected to continue that a Steering Group would need to in any way be involved in?

Jeff Neuman: So when the Steering Group was originally constituted, it was to develop the new policy development process to oversee the two work teams, right. The Policy Development Work Team and the Working Group Work Team, which actually does have a draft report out now is calling for comments. So the Steering Committee needs to oversee that.

But there was contemplated in the Steering Committee ongoing work as far as, you know, keep doing their reviews on an ongoing basis whether that has to be the same Steering Committee or not was never really set. But there was - there are a couple sentences in the charter talking about the ongoing review and work of the policy development process.

Alan Greenberg: Certainly the process that was outlined for our group presumably the working group, working team, is that our report goes to the PPSC.

Jeff Neuman: Correct.

Marilyn Cade: You know, I'm beginning to think that was another world many eons ago. And that...

((Crosstalk))

Man: It was.

Jeff Neuman: It definitely was. And so brining this up will stir up a lot of the conversations, which are outside of our control.

Woman: (The motion actually)...

Jeff Neuman: So...

((Crosstalk))

Margie Milam: Hey Jeff. It's Margie.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Margie Milam: Can I - can I just comment on this? Yes. We've been talking about this at the policy retreat this week. And one of the reasons we thought there was still usefulness to the Steering Committee was because I think there was this perception that we had the two groups working.

We've got the report from the working team, Working Group Work Team, and there may be some, you know, some need to have the two pieces of work eventually looked at and make sure they're consistent. Because the rules have been developed kind of in a vacuum and not taking into account what changes we come up with on this group.

And so there was this thought that the Steering Committee might have to look at the two pieces that, you know, the two end products and see if they're consistent or if some additional changes might be required.

So I think that was the idea. And as staff, yes, at least, you know, last week we've been talking about, you know, the very issue of, you know, do we reconstitute it? Is there usefulness to having the group, you know, look at the work product, that sort of thing?

Jeff Neuman: Right and whether the Steering Committee can be constituted of all new people or whether it could actually just be a combination of the two work teams to serve or that would be too unruly is another question that's kind of open.

So I think - so the action item, just so I can sum up because we're getting on to the hour, is that the notion we've agreed upon at least within this group to draft a letter to the Board Governance Committee on these questions of the Council report to the Board but also to indirectly ask them if there's any useful information that they're currently getting from the separate staff report that could be incorporated into the Council Report.

But in order to do that, I need to talk to the Chair of the Council and Marika will talk to the Chairs as well of the Council to discuss this whole notion about communications directly to the Board Governance Committee and also about the issues of the Steering Committee and to reconstitute that or to figure out what's going on with that.

And part of the problem with the Steering Committee is that there really hasn't been any work for the Steering Committee to do. So it didn't really - you know, I could have - we could have kept the Steering Committee together and holding monthly meetings.

But there was really nothing for the Steering Committee to discussion. It was all the work was being done by the work teams and the only issues the Steering Committee could have discussed in the last six or eight months was this whole face-to-face meeting. But keeping a Steering Committee around just to - in the eventual - for the eventual - that issue just didn't make sense to keep constant communication.

So I think we've talked about - this probably closes out Item Number 3. Although we didn't talk about some of the sub elements, the basic conclusion is, you know, look, we really should solicit information from the Board on what they want to see. And talking about this in a vacuum is not the most helpful way to come up with any recommendations on this subject. I mean we have our own thoughts obviously.

Any questions or comments on that? Okay. So I'll leave people the choice. I'd like to actually end this meeting, start the next one a week from today. No more spending half-hour on logistics. We'll start it at 1430 UTC time. We'll go directly into - Marika's got a comment already even before I finish. Go directly into the agreement of the Council and the Board vote portion of this voting and implementation in Stage 4.

Please do comment. Get your comments to Stage 1, 2 and 3. We have questions for Stage 5 that I - that I would like to see if anybody - maybe we'll resend it around. I know it's on the - it's definitely on the Wiki. We'll resend it around. Make sure people have any comments or questions or updates to that so we can start a survey for Stage 5, you know, by early next week.

Is that - did I - I saw Marika's hand come down. Is that what you were going to cover.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I just wanted to make sure before everyone probably would hang up, you know, the end of the hour, then that people would look at the questions for Stage 5 and I'll re-circulate them so we can get the survey out as well shortly.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Well I want to thank everyone and thank you for all accommodating me starting next week for an hour and a half or, sorry, a half hour earlier. Thank you very much. I really - I appreciate it.

Man: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Thank you Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks.

Alan Greenberg: Have fun Jeff. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Bye.

Woman: Bye everybody.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you (Natalie).

END