Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Policy Development Process (PDP) Work Team (WT)
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 23 July 2009 14:00 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 23 July 2009, at 14:00 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-20090723.mp3

On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#july
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
Jeff Neuman - Registry c. - Work Team Chair
Paul Diaz - Registrar c.
James Bladel – Registrar c.
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISP
Marilyn Cade – Individual (joined after roll call)
Bertrand de la Chapelle – French Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Avri Doria – GNSO Chair - NCA

ICANN Staff:
Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent apologies:
Gabriel Pineiro - Non Commercial Users Constituency
Brian Winterfeldt – IPC
Margie Milam – Policy Staff
Liz Gasster – Policy Staff

Coordinator: Thank you please go ahead.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thank you very much. Welcome everyone to the PDP Work Team call

                   on today is July - Thursday, July 23, 2009 and I'm going to turn it over to Glen

                   to take a role of who's on the call.

Glen DeSaintgery:Thank you Jeff. On the call we have Jeff Neuman; Paul Diaz from the

                   Registrar Constituency; Avri Doria, GNSO chair on the NTA; James Bladel,

Registrar; Bertrand de La Chappelle, GAC; Wolf-Ulrich Knoben from the ISP and I don't think anybody - has anybody else joined -- and I can't see anybody else having joined on the Abode Connect and for staff we have Margie Milam, Glen DeSaintgery, and we have apologies from Marika who is traveling, Margie who is traveling and we have apologies from the NCUC member who is Gabrielle Pineiro.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Glen this is Bertrand. One remark - a factor remark. When you list me in the - in any written document mention French Ministry of Foreign Affairs rather than GAC because I'm participating but not representing GAC as a whole.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay thank you very much for that detail Bertrand.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so thank you Bertrand, thank you Glen. If I'm re - if I wrote this down correctly so we don't have anyone from the BC, the non-commercial, the IP or the ALAC. Is that...

Glen DeSaintgery: (Pac Rac).

Jeff Neuman: Okay so we have representatives from...

Glen DeSaintgery: Registry.

Jeff Neuman: Well actually I'm a chair so we don't have our Registry rep either.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay well.

Jeff Neuman: But all we have is our Registrar reps and ISP and Avri in her personal or GNSO chair capacity either one, either or both. Okay that's a little...

Glen DeSaintgery: She's on mute.

Jeff Neuman: She's on mute?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so it's a little disappointing but and maybe Avri maybe if you're listening.

Avri Doria: Yes I am listening sorry...

Jeff Neuman: Okay if you could, I know you have a council call later on. If there's anything you could do, I mean this is our regularly scheduled time so it's not like we've moved anything around. If you could maybe help us on the council call to make a plea for people to show up and participate.

Avri Doria: Certainly although I haven't been historically good about showing up for these particular meetings myself but certainly I'll be slightly hypocritical and suggest that other people should.

Jeff Neuman: We would appreciate it. I mean it's understandable for you. You have a lot of stuff going on all at the same time. It looks like Paul you have something to add?

Paul Diaz: Yes Jeff I was just going to ask I mean as you were discussing earlier with the schedule. I don't have a quorum today. Do you want to try and maybe shift the schedule while we have it every other Thursday push it to next week and then every week after that? Because that could get us avoiding that third week in August which is problematic.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I mean I - we could try to schedule something for next week and see if people show up. I'm not sure if a week notice is good but why don't we try to do that anyway. I think that's a good idea. Then we could make this call a little bit short and maybe make a plea for you guys to help out answer or start discussion on some of these questions that were raised the last time. For the

people that are on this is next Thursday at this time something that's doable for you all?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf Knoben speaking, for me the next two weeks are not doable for me personally. While I could try to get somebody from some of (ISPCP) else but I don't know. I know I personally can't participate the next two weeks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. How about Paul you'd be available and what about James?

Paul Diaz: Yes I think I will be.

James Bladel: Yes should be.

Jeff Neuman: Okay and Bertrand?

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Marilyn next week is going to be hard.

Avri Doria: That's right you're going to be in the same place I am Bertrand right?

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Yes.

Avri Doria: Yes so it will be hard for me too next week.

Jeff Neuman: Is that a (ITF)...

Avri Doria: Actually I'm not going to be at the (ITF). It was going to be teaching on his article.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: (Unintelligible)

Jeff Neuman: All right well let's - why don't we do that because we really don't have many people here on this call and I feel horrible. Why don't we try to - we'll schedule for next week and I'll send emails personally to ask each of the members to see if they could actually make it. We're keeping - we're definitely keeping the next call on the 6th so we're not going to move that one. And also for the people on this call there were four questions that were submitted and you guys were all, I think well Bertrand you may not have been on the last call I can't remember.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: No I was not, no.

Jeff Neuman: There were four questions that came up really from the survey. We went over the last results of the survey that was done and there were four new questions that kind of came of that we all agreed were important for us to help Marika who's actually writing the - writing up all of the Phase One questions - the answers to the questions with recommendations on changing bylaws or keeping them the same or what we need to do to implement what we've come up with.

So if you all can weigh in on those four questions and the other thing that she posted was the timelines for some of the recent PDPs that have gone on I guess in the last couple of years. Just so when we discuss timelines on the next call we can have some base to look at that and come up - try to come up with some realistic high marks for the steps that we've discussed.

And I think what came up on the last call was that we were not necessarily going to mandate okay things - this must be done within 15 days but provide ranges of time so that, you know, it's much more it allows some flexibility in the schedule.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn sorry I was late. Would you repeat that last statement about 15 days?

Jeff Neuman: Oh hi Marilyn you didn't sign into Adobe huh?

Marilyn Cade: You know we have a choice I can either be on the phone with you or not able to participate as much as I love Adobe.

Jeff Neuman: Oh I'm glad you made the right choice. So Marilyn unfortunately we don't have that many people on the call.

Marilyn Cade: So it's really good I showed up?

Jeff Neuman: Exactly so what we're discussing is...

Bertrand de La Chappelle: ...(just starting the) day.

Jeff Neuman: ...the possibility of having - trying to do another call next Thursday at this scheduled time.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry Thursday will not work for me that's the 30th right?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: I'm unfortunately on a plane so that - I could do it on Friday but I can't do this time because I'm actually on the plane right at this time.

Jeff Neuman: All right.

Marilyn Cade: I could do it later in the day but that may not be convenient for others.

Jeff Neuman: Well what I'm going to do is - we're keeping our call definitely on the 6th right because that's our normal time every other week?

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: So we're definitely keeping that call. I will email everyone to try to get everyone in the group to try to figure out if having a call next Thursday is something that's doable or not.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: It may or may not be.

Marilyn Cade: Sure.

Jeff Neuman: But what I was saying is that there were four questions and I know Marilyn you were on the call a lot.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Jeff Neuman: So is James and Paul. There were four questions that came out that we thought were kind of important in drafting up recommendations on what we're calling Phase One which is the planning and initiation phase.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Jeff Neuman: So these four questions we thought would help us. We discussed it on the call but because there weren't that many on that call either, we wanted to put it out to the full group. And the second thing I said which is probably when you joined and heard the 15 days is ultimately once Marika comes back with a report on Phase One we need to discuss timelines. It's hard to discuss timelines before you see that report and all the different steps and recommended steps that we've kind of come up with.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Jeff Neuman: And then what we had discussed on the last call was not necessarily tying it down so like right now it says that an issues report must be provided within

15 days. What we were saying on the call in the last few calls was that we thought it would be better to provide ranges of days as guidelines as opposed to a mandatory inflexible drop dead date.

Marilyn Cade: Exactly, right, right, right, with you okay thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes right so that's kind of where it came up with. But it's hard to have the discussion without seeing all the steps in front of you and so hopefully by the next call we'll have something there.

So it's the timeline that we would start the call with next time. Hopefully we'll have answers to these four questions and then we would start on Page 2 which is the - which was sent by Marika to the list on, I'll get the exact day here. It was on Tuesday, June 30, 10:57 my time. But that was sent and I think Margie's putting it up if I see that correctly. Anyway that document basically talks about Phase Two which is the - which is coming up right now. Well anyway.

Margie Milam: I'm trying to find it sorry.

Jeff Neuman: That's okay I have it pulled up in front of me so it's the proposal review and voting threshold is Stage Two. That contains questions like how to - is there an appeals mechanism in case the GNSO votes against initiating a PDP requested by - let's say it's requested by an advisory committee or supporting organization so to consider where there should be some appeals mechanism. You know, the answer may be no but, you know, we need to consider that question.

Should the approved voting thresholds that, you know, the thresholds about initiating a PDP that have already been approved is that - does that apply to the entire GNSO council or just members present which is the current practice. The current wording is not very clear on that. And what I mean

current wording, I mean the wording that was approved last year by the Board.

And then where in the process is a charter for the working group done. How is that done? But also - so I need to also and Glen if we can or Margie if we could take note we should coordinate on that question with Jay Scott's group.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Make sure that they have not discussed that yet or if they have to get feedback on that.

Margie Milam: On the chartering Number 4?

Jeff Neuman: Yes on Number 4. Question 5 it should expedite be available in case there's some emergency and if or urgency and how do we define when that happens and how is that done.

How do we involve advice from other advisor committees or supporting organizations and obtain consistent input from the Board in the process? And this Item 7 was evaluate the ICANN staff costs and resources needed to conduct PDP and prioritize existing policy work and revisit their existing deadlines and deliverables. So those are the overall categories. I think Margie the other thing that we'll do, you and I, is fill in the current practice of the rules if there are any.

Margie Milam: Okay fill in current practice?

Jeff Neuman: Yes that second column.

Margie Milam: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: And then we'll redistribute the chart.

Margie Milam: Sure.

Jeff Neuman: Okay I wish we had more people so we could actually answer some of these questions but it just seems like with the few amount of people it might not - it might be difficult.

Avri Doria: Hi.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Why?

Jeff Neuman: Well we could discuss it I guess then...

Avri Doria: Hi can I add one piece of content.

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

Avri Doria: On four since that group I have been participating in more actively than I have this one. While certainly you should go talk to it to Jay Scott but by and large that group has not been looking at when that process -- other than the fact that of course its -- the working group charter is there before the working group - but where and who does it and necessarily how a organization starts a working group has not been a focal point.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Avri Doria: So, you know, so I think you need to attach it where you think it needs to be attached and then see how they fit but...

Jeff Neuman: Okay that's good to know. I think that it's an interesting - so today when a charter is developed it's really been well from the last few PDPs -- well at least the ones that well working groups have been initiating.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: What has been the...

Avri Doria: There it's an evolving process because we're still trying to figure out what
                   work. What we started with at one point - and also because we're trying to
                   operate within the current bylaws at least their spirit if not, you know, because
                   but and so all processing gets check with legal to see if this works.

                   So one of the things - the character of a working group now is the way in
                   which the committee of the whole does it. So their was originally this notion
                   that said first you had to vote on PDP then you have to do the vote on
                   taskforce. Once you've done the vote negative on taskforce you can,
                   committee of the whole can say we want a working group let's do a charter.

                   Now more recently -- and this is again in consultation with legal -- is that if
                   you - and because you both have a different threshold it's difficult. But
                   basically we've been trying to combine having the charter at the point at
                   which the decision is made to the PDP. But that's not working quite right
                   either because we still have the taskforce or not and we're trying to combine
                   the taskforce decision in the PDP decision but that only works if thresholds
                   working out correctly so.

Jeff Neuman: Well me ask a different way then. If the so let - so you have the issues report
                   council and say it's the new voting thresholds. They vote yes this is worth
                   initiating a PDP on. At that point in theory after that is when a charter will be
                   created but would the charter go back to the council to vote on that or...?

Avri Doria: I would think it would have to. I think that and that's why the charter can be
                   part of the PDP process and that's really a decision that the - when you vote
                   on yes let's do a PDP you can say and you vote on the charter too at that
                   point or you can say -- and this is a decision I don't think that they've made--
                   is that then you vote on the charter.

Now theoretically and under the rules because only a committee as a whole can do the working group as we've done it we do it after. But there's no real reason I think why the charter can't be part of the PDP if that's what people want to do.

Jeff Neuman: So in essence when it goes to the council your theory what could be required as both the issues report and the proposed charter. And then the council would have two different votes, first whether to initiate the PDP and the second one is whether this is the appropriate charter for the group.

Avri Doria: Yes or you may want to continue doing it after and then yet the decision one would have is depends on what the issues reports recommends. If the issues reports recommends that working groups be done then a charter's put together. But it may be presumptuous to set up a working group before there's been a PDP vote. So it really can go either way.

And one way to strength is when you vote for the PDP you know what you're voting for in terms of working groups because you're doing the charter at the same time. What goes against it is you've put a lot of work into something that people then say I don't care that you've worked out a charter, you know, we don't want to do this PDP. So you really have a cost on either side.

Jeff Neuman: And then of course if it's decided, so let's say you do have the PDP vote first and then you do a charter you're going to assign people and figure out who serves on that drafting team to come up with the charter. You know, all those kind of logistics and then how long it's going to take to get on the council agenda for the next meeting. So you could talk about an extra month delay in the process which...

Avri Doria: Oh it's definitely with meeting twice a week, I mean time times, every three weeks whatever the right word for that is. And, you know, just the amount of stuff. It basically takes one to two meeting cycles because for it you have to

be ready in two weeks to be able to get it on the agenda for the meeting in three weeks and that's rare. So it's usually a six week cycle before it gets voted on.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes?

Bertrand de La Chappelle: May I ask a question also to Avri. I may have missed a step in some previous call but Avri should you explain a little bit more this comment you made regarding the vote on a taskforce or working group? I was left with the impression that actually the reform was replacing the taskforce model.

Avri Doria: Oh yes no I was talking about what I do now...

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Okay, okay, okay, fine.

Avri Doria: Because I'm still working under the old bylaws.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Okay, okay, okay, fine. Just another point regarding the question that was mentioned on urgency as an insert. I wonder whether a specific simplified procedure that is separate shouldn't be developed for cases of urgency under a specific criteria rather than trying to stick within the general process the case for urgency. You see what I mean?

It's one thing to try to design something that covers absolutely everything be it a very simple development of guidelines or a very complex policy development and at the same time accommodate things that are urgent, things that can take several years, maybe we should distinguish a little bit more. And if we want to address the notion of urgency maybe it requires being set on the side as a specific procedure.

Avri Doria: Actually, you know, that if you - one natural dividing space could be you'll have - and one hopes it will be a strategic plan -- and, you know, that the council needs and the GNSO, you know, needs to get into it having a prioritized strategic plan. Those things since it will be planned into the future and taking six weeks wouldn't be a big bother. Whereas if you plan it in the schedule.

Whereas as anything that rises ad hoc, you know, basically, you know, something that jumps to the front of the burner because it's hot could have a different procedure and then there's the natural dividing line without having to decide is this an emergency. It's not because that has a qualitative aspect.

Jeff Neuman: So before we get to the emergency aspect I mean I want to know if there's comments like James have called and others on your thoughts on the whole development of a charter for the working group and what we've been talking about as far as timing.

You know, another so I guess, you know, what Avri was saying was present - maybe presumptuous for an issues report to continue a proposed charter because the issues report may actually recommend or not recommend creating a working group. But could we say if the issues report recommend the working group that they should include a proposed charter or leave that because the issues report is really under staff control or is that something that should be more under council control.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: May I chime in on that?

Jeff Neuman: Absolutely sure.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Following the discussions that took place particularly in Sidney on the working group model I think there is a distinction we can make regarding the working group (unintelligible). The distinction is as follows, there is a basic template with - there are a certain number of guidelines that will be applicable probably to all or almost all working groups.

The second element is for each working group filling the elements of this template. For instance the template charter may have something that says the chair is column and then you fill the name of the chair. Or the subject and the purpose of this group is and you fill that. So these are two elements. One element is permanent, it's a template and this doesn't have to be drafted each time and what has to be drafted is basically filling the blanks.

And then there's a third dimension which is additional modules that do not - are not put within each and every single charter but that can be picked according to the issue in for instance requesting additional research or things that are optional. Would that distinction be workable because the more standard the working group charter is, apart from the options and filling in the blanks, the less the question of whether the charter is being prepared in the issues report or not is important. If it's a template and relatively standard then it is available as soon as the seat of the council decides to set up the group.

Jeff Neuman: Well James you wrote a comment on the (unintelligible) you said it depends if there's a drafting team. Do you want to elaborate on that?

James Bladel: Well yes just and you kind of caught me multi-tasking with the last question but if I'm understanding correctly with sequence of whether a charter or template is included in the issues report developed by staff or whether that's developed on the table at a council meeting.

A couple of working groups successfully have a pre-PDP drafting team. It's relatively small and short-lived but presents at least an outline to council that can be readily transformed into a charter so I just I think that that's a - I don't

know if that's the norm or the exception it's certainly is common in the ones that I've participated in and think that that's pretty - that's one pretty effective approach there.

Jeff Neuman: Okay Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yes just to follow with what James has said. I would consider or suggest that we be careful about essentially giving staff even more responsibility, you know, we've already heard in our previous discussions some very strong differences of opinion about what staff whether it's general council or the professional staff sort of what the limits on their roles should be and I think that some folks will probably feel quite uncomfortable as staff is now asked to provide the charter up front.

I'm just kind of thinking on a more controversial issue that maybe before the council that you - in the interest of time I can see wanting to try and roll it all in and get it done quicker but a, I think the community's probably better served having the sort of transparent process of going through the extra step, having council deliberate, having the counselors think through and then making decision rather than having everything presented to them what some might see as a fate of complete by staff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay James?

James Bladel: I agree with Paul completely. We've had a lot of recent working groups where the charter has been put under a microscope after the (unintelligible) of various issues and I think that if the genesis of that were staff that that would just - that any time saved by having staff put that in an issues report will be burned up in a working group just going over and over those issues that probably apply to the charter so I agree with Paul I think it's best that comes from (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

James Bladel: If that's what you were saying Paul and I think it was.

Jeff Neuman: Yes that sounds like you and Paul agree?

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Yes actually I was - I wanted to make a precision on what I said earlier. When I was talking about a template or something I didn't have in mind at all something that would be prepared by the staff.

What I was thinking is that and I was supposing that actually the work team's own working groups has one of its goal - of it's goals, sorry, to elaborate something that is a typical working group mechanism that basically functions in almost all cases. Like it says basically and the process and the bylaws would say this is how a process is initiated and issues report what we've been discussing one.

Second, if a PDP is being launched it will use a working group model and apart from the bylaws there's a document that says this is the way a working group model works and this is how a charter should be drafted. So I think the less filling in the blanks or sorry the more the format of the working group model is predetermined the more (previsible) is the overall process.

I was very, very surprised for instance when I began to get involved in this PPSC and OSC process and with all the sub-working groups to see how long it took to draft a specific charter for each of the subgroups whereas in fact when you compared them they were very, very, very similar because they were naturally reusing the same kind of procedures more or less. And I was basically listening to exactly the same discussions in the OSC and in the PPSC and any of the subgroups.

So the more standard the working group model and charters are I think the best will have worked. So it was not about the staff including a charter in the

issues report. It was more having a procedure that says working groups work this way. Maybe I was not clear.

Jeff Neuman: Okay Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay yes, I have two things. One I had missed the - I fell off the line for a bit so I had missed any - whether anyone had actually suggested that staff write charters. I would personally think that that was a really, really, really bad idea and would be one of those that was really, really, really uncomfortable with it.

On what Bertrand was saying I think yes, I think that what the working team has been doing is eventually creating the template for charters with questions and guidance on, you know, what goes into and doesn't go into various parts of it.

I think when Bertrand talks about it taking a long time to do a charter even though they all look similar is in essence yes people are already using a template but really what takes time in doing any charter and, you know, and this has not just been in ICANN is really trying to nail down what the work items are what the work items found and what milestones need to be there. And so I'm not assuming it'll get shorter simply because it's a template because in essence at the moment there already is an implicit template that evolves with each use but an implicit template.

Jeff Neuman: Okay Bertrand?

Marilyn Cade: And can I get in the queue as well?

Jeff Neuman: All right after Bertrand.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Yes actually I want to follow on what Avri said. I think she's absolutely right. One of the concerns I have or I raise a flag is that sometimes it is not necessary to put in the charter itself the whole gambit of the work

plan and the objectives and that sort of thing because I agree with her it takes a lot of time but surprisingly enough it is already beginning to address the substance when you discuss those elements and the best example was in the setting up of those works regarding the PDP or the working team model is that a lot of discussions went on the question of consensus.

And guess what the finding consensus or rough consensus is a huge part of how you define the new working group model. So strangely enough we were discussing for the charter one of the very subjects that we were suppose to discuss as a group. So I would favor in general terms something that is more iterative like having a process whereby you don't allow just the working group and it's going on with the whole period. It is launched for a short period for instance with a first part of the group that will be defining some of the milestones, some of the priorities or that sort of stuff.

The faster you can make the charter the quicker you probably can get into the working group actual discussion. I know it's a balance but I agree with Avri that what takes time is to put in the charter all those elements regarding the milestones and the objectives but in some cases the tendencies to get into too much detail and then making the process longer whereas it is already part of the discussion. It's a balance issue.

Jeff Neuman: Okay Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to repeat part of what I said on the last call. You know I must say that I both respect and understand the caution that is being expressed by counselors about not being captured by staff. But I'm as worried as a member of the community -- and remember I'm on this group in my individual capacity -- I am as worried as a member of the community about having counselors who think that they are and in fact are elected to represent different parties, different interests or who are appointed by the nominating committee.

I feel there needs to be a real openness to hear expert reports so I just want to be sure we're capturing the idea that, you know, and I appreciate the fact that people have the sense that I'm elected to do so, so, so right? I've been in that role before. I fully understand it but I also want to be sure that we are in a position to ask for expert input from staff and to really hear expert reports or experts that are brought in or other kinds of useful fact backed information. So just want to keep that back on the burner because I know some of you who are on the call today did not hear me say that on our last call.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thank you Marilyn. Let me go back and try to summarize a couple of things. What I'm hearing strong support for and this at least with the people that are on the phone is that a charter would need to be developed. Well let me ask a question does everyone feel that a charter needs to be developed prior to the actual working group being constituted? Avri has responded that she does. Anybody disagree with that notion?

James Bladel: Can you repeat that Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Okay the question is so the council has decided to initiate a PDP. The question I'm asking is does the charter for the working group need to be finalized. Well not finalized but does there need to be a charter prior to as a creation of the working group?

Now remember the working - at least what we've done in the past is that the working group agreed to recommend changes to the charter and that would go up to the council to vote on that. But there would have to be some sort of stable charter in place before the working group. Look's like a few people are putting check marks. Avri and Bertrand have raised their hands so Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes I mean I believe their has to be a charter and I believe once a working group starts working then if they feel that the charter is inappropriate then they need to renegotiate it with the council. So I don't believe that they're

stuck with a charter but I believe that they have to have a starting charter that lays out the scope. But then they renegotiate.

Jeff Neuman: Okay and then Bertrand.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Quickly I support the distinction potentially between the starting charter and the interactive modification of the charter this goes into the interactive mode. I think the quicker people can begin discussing the issue and shaping the work of the working group the better. But I'm not familiar enough as to the current work of the working group team to see whether the charter is or not a condition for starting the discussion in the working group model (unintelligible) better.

Jeff Neuman: Okay and James.

James Bladel: You know and I'm going to try and say this as quickly as possible. I agree with what Avri mentioned as far as the working group needs a charter to begin and begin its work and that it's open to renegotiation. But I wonder if it's relevant to discuss any sort of guidelines on that renegotiation process and maybe we can defer this for later in the document. But seems like I've been on a couple of working groups where the charter would be in a continuous state of renegotiation.

You know maybe not by the balance of the working group but by, you know, a fraction or something like that. So I don't know if there's anything that we can do put some structure around that renegotiation process so that its' not necessarily a ongoing perpetual sort of free for all, thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay thanks James. My view on that question is that I think that question actually involves both work that we're doing and work that the working group is doing.

In other words the working group work team can discuss their process on how to bring up changes but I think we're at hands off to us is what if we recommend that the council does or what is the process once it comes out of the working group and say the chair of the working groups presents changes to the council then what's the process that the council follows after receiving that? I think it's where we would kind of jump back in. So I think that's Margie something we should probably write down for coordination with Jay Scott with the working group the 14th.

Margie Milam: Yes, yes and I had a comment too whenever you have a moment.

Jeff Neuman: No right now that's good, yes.

Margie Milam: Sure I was just following up with what was said about the renegotiation as in a couple of our groups we've had issues about the charters. I guess my question to Avri would be how formal do you want that process to be or how formal should it be? Is it something that the counsel is putting on every time their needs to be change in the charter or is it more, you know, informal where you just kind of get a feel for the counseling, you'll have to wait until the next council meeting to the get the charter clarified?

Avri Doria: Yes I don't, I mean I don't have a wanting. I think that's something we're still trying to figure out. I have a strong notion I guess of what the liaisons between the council and such can do and I really believe that those changes should be able to go through relatively informally unless somebody raises a flag.

So in other words a liaison bringing to the council the few of the changes that wish to get made are their objections, do we need discussions, wait a certain amount of time and go on. And of course though, you know, needing a formal answer back from the council. But I don't see it needing to make it very formal but of course, you know, it may evolve that way I really don't know. I've tried to make it less formal.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so let me go back to summarizing then because I think I missed a step that may be obvious but I want to state it anyway. So we all think that there should be a charter. There must be a charter prior to the creation of a working group and then that charter is kind of a starting off charter that may be changed by some process, first by approval within the working group and then some process for approval by the council.

The question that's in between is and I think the answer is yes but I want to make sure it is yes that though a charter needs to be drafted there must be a charter. Does it need to be approved by the council prior to the creation of the working group?

Avri Doria: I would think so.

Jeff Neuman: I mean it sounds like a obvious question but...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Paul Diaz: I agree, I think so.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Yes.

James Bladel: I agree.

Jeff Neuman: So it sounds like people - does anyone disagree with that notion that needs to be approved by the council? So the next obvious question is what - how is it approved by the council? What are the thresholds and maybe it's not for this call but it's certainly something that we need to throw out there. What are going to be our recommended thresholds or approval by the council? Is it the same as a PDP which is a fairly low one? Is it or is it something different?

Avri Doria: It - and I think at your base you've got - you don't necessarily need to define something if you're willing to take what's been redefined as the base level approval for the council of majority of both houses and that exact being defined as the base level for anything where we haven't defined previously, etc. and so that's of course is a default if you just want to leave it at default.

Jeff Neuman: Right so it could be - but remember the creation of or voting in, I believe voting in favor of a PDP is that (unintelligible)?

Avri Doria: Yes that's defined but the approval of the working group charter and anything that's done after that is not defined. So certainly yes the starting of a PDP is a defined other threshold but the rest of the stuff isn't and so it can be if you want to in the rules and procedures or it can just go to the default majority of both houses.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Avri Doria: You know, and that, you know.

Jeff Neuman: What you run into difficulty is so if that PDP can be created by -- and I can't remember the exact threshold Margie if you can correct me-- but initiating a PDP could be - let's say its 100% of one house, couldn't it be done by one house alone or...?

Avri Doria: No I think you need to have some or both. I should remember this stuff I should know it by heart.

Jeff Neuman: I know.

Margie Milam: Yes I have, I have it. So you create a issues reports requires more than 25% in vote of both houses or majority of one house and then to initiate a PDP within scope it requires more than 33% of both houses or more than 66% of

one house. And then to initiate a PDP not within scope requires more than 75% at one house and the majority of the other house.

Jeff Neuman: So what you could have with given that -- and I'm not sure we want this or don't it -- is you could have people holding up a - the PDP. You can basically create a higher standard for the approval of a charter than the initiation of the PDP and in one set hold hostage the work of the PDP by not agreeing to the charter, that make sense?

Avri Doria: It's possible.

Jeff Neuman: So I - but we could discuss this issue but maybe say it for the next call or save it for an email discussion. But I think you need to think of the ramifications of just going to the baseline approval and the games that can be played. You know, we have a fairly low threshold for the creation of a PDP because we want policy work to be done but we want to make the charter a higher standard which may, you know, essentially make the initiation of the PDP standard higher too. Anyone have any comments on that? It sounds like someone's driving in the rain or...

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Yes I'm trying to raise my hand but it didn't...

Jeff Neuman: Oh, okay sorry Bertrand.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: No, no, no it's okay. Just one element, this is always the same question I'm coming back again to is the interactive nature of this process. I like Avri's idea of something that is the initiation of the working group work and I could imagine that actually the starting point for the working group is a charter that is very small charter somehow as template as possible that basically one of the elements would be too maybe for the council to designate a convener for the initial work with a short time span that produces the actual more detailed charter.

Isn't that a way to kick start the process because otherwise we will get into this back to the council. You will get one decision by the council to say yes we want a PDP and then their will be something that will require to get a discussion of a charter at the next council meeting and another one and so on. Maybe it's easier to help people kick start the process and have a very limited initial charter and the first task is to basically finalize within a specific timeframe the final charter of the working group on the basis of the general template. Does that make sense?

Jeff Neuman: So I think it makes sense. The problem or the issue not problem, the issue is that there have been a lot of debates recently about the scope of a working group and I really think that the scope needs to be adequately defined in a stable manner prior to people forming this working group.

Because remember in the working group there's not going to be a formal voting structure in the sense of or the sense that each constituency gets one person and then you have some sort of balance between constituency or stakeholder groups. You're basically going to have a bunch of people that may be there in their individual capacity. I just think it's very controversial the actual scope of the working group and it's certainly been debated.

Though I think a formal voting process at the council level with a stable charter one that's open for renegotiation. In other words they can make recommendations. But I think a good head start is something that we really need to have before the working group is created.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: But who will draft the charter itself because we're always in sort of a recursive mechanism whereby we need a working group or at least a group of drafting to produce the charter to be allowed to have a group that is going to do the work but who creates the group that will draft the charter for the group? Is it the council?

Jeff Neuman: So that's my - you've actually jumped to a question I haven't gotten to yet because I was just trying to get to the points of summarizing thing. But we think that there - we've agreed that there must be a starting charter. We need to decide thresholds as to how that - we agreed it needs to be approved by the council, we agree - we need to agree at some point on what those thresholds are.

Is it the base level which is a majority of both houses recognizing that that could actually place a higher burden then actually the initiation of the PDP which may be okay, may not be okay. We need to discuss the ramifications of that and then we agree that once there is a charter...

Jeff Neuman: I don't know if that's someone trying to mute or...that we agree that once the work group is constituted that there should be some mechanism for the working group to recommend changes to the charter that need to be approved by council and again we would need to discuss what those thresholds are.

Assuming all that to be true you've raised another question which I think we all agree on which is it sounds like the drafting of the charter should not be part of issues report sounds like from the people on this call and it should not be something that's drafted by staff. Did I interpret that correctly?

Avri Doria: This is Avri.

Jeff Neuman: Yes Avri.

Avri Doria: I think it's interpreted what I think that doesn't mean that staff shouldn't be strong participants like others in it. I think in answer to the who drafting that Bertrand put out that is one of things that I think the - in sort of its management process. One evolution is that people have been reaching out. Not just the council members when it's come time to write one of these things but reaching into the constituency.

Who is it that's interested in working on this. You know, who puts up their hand to say yes I want to be part of it. You have also one would hope someone within the council or perhaps more than one. Yes I want to be in that liaison role hopefully and that those are the people that go away and create, you know, the first ones that are the first drafts of the charter that are discussed and then approved.

So I think if you can't gather that set of people by doing outreach and the constituency and community liaison to come up with a small number of people that are, you know, actually doing things people that are saying not only do I want to write the charter but I want to work on this thing. I think you've got the group that produces - the drafting team that would create a charter.

Jeff Neuman: And should it be council that creates the rules? In other words should it be the council that says okay where - we've initiated the PDP. Right now we got a - the next step is to get it chartered for the working groups. You know, we direct however it wants to manage. Basically it will send it out, seek volunteers and then say we'd like to see a charter at our next meeting or two meetings from now to vote on.

Avri Doria: It would seem to me that that would be the kind of process that the council, would, you know, manage.

Jeff Neuman: And I don't think we need to - we might maybe put suggested timeframes in our report. I don't think we need to formally recommend exactly how the council does that. Bertrand you have your hand up?

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Yes it's just to follow up on what Avri and you said. I think the best way and the more I listen to the discussion the best way is to make the beginning almost as automatic as possible and then things get refined. I very much like what Avri said regarding very first set in those working group

approach is to make sure people were interested and can contribute or should contribute to work of this particular - on this particular subject are actually part of this.

And so I personally would see something that basically says okay there's the first initial phase. There's a general feeling that the issue must be addressed and the council said yes we will launch a PDP.

Then from now on the initial steps would be almost automatic. For instance the council should maybe have just to say this is - we designate one person to see the initial first steps to establish the charter and to gather the people who are interested in taking part in this group - or in this work.

And so basically all the council would have to do then is to designate someone to do the initiation like a preliminary chair or interim chair and the template for the work of this person would be available.

It is the process that says when somebody's designated the first task is to gather or make a call for comments or to invite people to indicate their interest, get the people to begin a preliminary draft along the template of the charter and try to finalize this charter to be sent to the Board - to the council afterwards. But ideally the council should have probably only to designate one person to kick start this process.

Jeff Neuman: Okay any questions or comments on that? Okay so let me go back and summarize that. I'll keep summarizing to make sure I have it all right and then what we're going to is we'll put this out as a question in email with our - with what we've come up with on this call or agreement points to make sure that people on the email list agree as well.

So we all agree that a working group must have a charter before it's constituted; that that charter needs to be approved by council and we need to determine how that is; we think the charter - the council should manage the

drafting process of that charter including the solicitation of volunteers to create that charter maybe as Bertrand said put one person in charge of that or to oversee that process. That drafting team I guess if you will have milestones created by the council as to when to come back and the council will set a date to approve that charter.

Once the charter is approved and a working group is constituted there needs to be a process by which changes to the charter are approved by the council and that involves work by both the working group work team to come up with that internal process of how the working group does that and then also by us on what happens once the council receives a request by a working group to change the charter and how it votes on that. Did I capture all of that?

Avri Doria: Yes can I add one little thing?

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

Avri Doria: And that's when Bertrand and you mentioned it in your recap was talking about the putting someone in charge. That was what I meant by what's being defined as the liaison role between the person within the council who's taking responsibility for the working group and is acting as the H mediatory, the attachment point, the communications point between a working group and the council and that role is being defined within the working group process so that would be where I think that would be located. Who are the people here that want to be the liaisons and it doesn't necessarily need to be one but it has been.

Jeff Neuman: Okay does anyone have anything else to add on that?

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Yes this is Bertrand just on what Avri was saying she was actually addressing a issue I wanted to raise after you recap. One question is there are two options when I saying the council would designate someone to do this interim chair or kick starting the process.

It could be either somebody outside or potentially somebody within the council in a role of facilitation and I fully take into account Marilyn's concern and so it shouldn't be necessarily one or the other and it's a (unintelligible) role. But one option to make things relatively easy could be that the council designate one person within the council to steer this process in the very early stages or decides to appoint somebody outside.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Avri Doria: Yes well the liaison role is different than the chairing role, very different.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Couldn't it be only one for the very early stage?

Avri Doria: No I don't think so.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: No, oh.

Avri Doria: You have to keep the communications going, I mean obviously my opinion. You have to keep the communications linked between the council meetings and what's going on as opposed to having to throw things over the wall.

So you need go - I mean you need to have many people at the beginning but you need to have the counseling I believe otherwise the process gets lost. It doesn't have a easy way of communicating during the meetings of bringing issues back and forth. It just makes it more difficult. You really need that person who is a member of the council who can act as the in between person. Otherwise I think the system lacks the continuity. I mean its connectivity but that's of course just a personal opinion.

James Bladel: So obviously can I...

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Sorry just on that point maybe I was not clear. What I meant is that the council could choose to have somebody from the council to play this role of interim chair at the very beginning and then this person could act as a liaison afterwards as you described.

Avri Doria: That's - we've had the liaison act as an acting Chair and then the first actor of the first meeting is to pick a real Chair. But, yes, that has happened.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: So, okay, I think I got that. I think I follow that. Any other questions or comments? Do we want to talk a little bit about maybe notes for the email, some of the concerns or talk about voting thresholds of how to approve a charter?

James Bladel: Jeff this is James. I posted something in the chat and again I don't want this to turn into a - or it's not my intention to turn it into a long discussion but I really just had a question about the different thresholds for an in scope PDP versus an out of scope PDP.

And is it published somewhere or maybe someone can point me in the right direction where I can find out how that determination is made or what criteria are used to decide whether something - whether one voting threshold applies over another?

Jeff Neuman: So I think we talked about this on the last call and the - it's not really - the Council's not defining whether something's in or out of scope. It's really a recommendation by the Staff as to whether they believe it's in or out of scope and the scope is defined as in or out of the scope of the GNSO, not of like the picket fence. That's not what they're looking at.

James Bladel: Okay. I remember that thread last time and I just wasn't sure if that was new material or if we were changing something that was published elsewhere so thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. That's okay. And so that should be being written up by Marika as well. So as far as the voting threshold then which does matter whether it's in or out of scope but let's assume it's in scope just to make an easy case or an easier case.

                  If it's in scope then I think what Margie said is it just requires 33% of both houses. Was that what you said for the PDP?

Margie Milam: Hold on. Okay so if it's within scope it requires more than 33% of both houses or more than 66% vote of one house.

Jeff Neuman: So the question is then if you apply the - we could take that - the same standard or approval of the charter or we could make it the higher standard of a majority of both houses which is the default rule.

                  And there's pros and cons about each one, right. I mean, you can make the argument that okay, the charter is so important because it sets the scope of the PDP that you want the majority of both houses to agree on it to make sure that nobody's going to claim that the work that's being done is out of the scope of the - out of the scope of what was - the process that was initiated.

                  On the other hand the negative, or one negative is that having a higher standard could mean another blocking mechanism by one of the houses if they didn't want to see the PDP done in the first place.

                  So we need to kind of weigh those concerns and discuss them. Can anyone else think of pros and cons about either approach? Does anyone have any thoughts on what I - on that?

Paul Diaz: Jeff it's Paul.

Jeff Neuman: Sure Paul.

Paul Diaz: I would just - I think this is a very important one and obviously there's not enough of us on the call to get all the perspectives. I can imagine some views from some of our colleagues that aren't on the call today and would ask can you simply just be sure to include this - the four questions that are up there if we're going to try and discuss them on the next call.

                  But I also think putting them into an email, you know, reiterating them - add this as a fifth and just lay it out for folks and hopefully those who feel passionately, and I'm sure there's some who will feel very passionately about different threshold standards, you know. Give them an opportunity to communicate that on the list.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I definitely will do that and that's the plan. I was hoping that maybe we can come up with a list of pros and cons of that approach and then put that out like as guidance so people could comment on it.

                  I find that when you put overarching questions that are really general out it doesn't get answered but if you could say, you know, what are the voting thresholds and define it and then say, you know, the group of people on the call found that the positives of having this threshold are these - the negatives are these versus the positives and negatives of having other thresholds it may stimulate more feedback.

Paul Diaz: Yes. And I would just add that using the same threshold or the higher threshold you can make the argument that it's simpler. It's one set of standards to keep in mind and that works both for and against.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Paul Diaz: You know, just make it to the people. You can keep it simple but there may
                 be folks who feel that there's a very valid reason why such a one-size
                 threshold should not apply. So simplicity would be a pro but it can also be a
                 con.

Margie Milam: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: I agree with that.

Avri Doria: Can I add something?

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

Avri Doria: Having just heard that, I mean, one of the problems that we have in the
                 Council this time is if per chance someone did want to include the charter in
                 the PDP vote, because they have different kinds of thresholds that becomes
                 impossible.

                 By making them the same - another advantage of making them the same is it
                 does - while we're not saying there must be a charter in a PDP vote, it allows
                 for that level of flexibility.

                 If there happens to be one ready because people did it, etc. especially on the
                 long planning thing, then, you know, maybe that helps. So that would be an
                 advantage certainly. It would make it possible to put them in a common
                 motion.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: I wouldn't support the argument as well. I think simplicity is better
                 in that respect.

Jeff Neuman: So for simplicity you're saying...

Bertrand de La Chappelle: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: ...that using the same threshold as to initiate the PDP?

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Yes. Knowing that once again in the Council as in the rest voting is the last resort. I mean, I really insist on that because we keep talking about voting but on such a subject there should be an agreement on the topic.

I mean, launching a PDP where there's a strong disagreement within one part of the community on the scope of the discussion is probably a recipe for the working group not to work correctly.

So even if there was a split decision or a situation where one house was really wanting an issue and the other one was not so-so, the objective is that the discussions and the recipe for success is to make sure that the charter will accommodate the views of the other side as well, otherwise it's doomed from the onset. So consensus is the objective and the voting threshold is just the last resort.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Does anyone think that there should be or can anyone think of the pros in favor of having a higher threshold, meaning the default Council threshold which is the majority of both houses?

Avri Doria: I mean, I can think - the only one I can think of is that it would be more of a - more stability. For example if you said perhaps the first charter went at the same threshold but changes went at the other one is basically then you'd be sort of saying that, you know, a charter can't just waver in the wind.

And it - once you've set one in place you need a certain level of consensus and if you can't get consensus at the very least you need the majority vote. So certainly, you know, that would bolster those but say once you start working on something it's - you don't want it to flop without consensus.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, Paul?

Paul Diaz: Yes, just to follow on what Avri's saying I think that's - you can make an
                argument for it when there's a not in scope issue because there may be
                Councilors who disagreed with the Staff recommendation and there may be,
                you know, a big difference of opinion within the Council about whether the
                issue should go forward or not. And I think in such a situation having a higher
                threshold is probably defendable.

Jeff Neuman: So Margie can you review when it's not in scope it's 75% of one house and
                what is it?

Margie Milam: Okay. To initiate a PDP not within scope it requires a vote of more than 75%
                of one house and a majority of the other house.

Jeff Neuman: So that's going to - if you say the default's rule is the same as initiating the
                PDP you actually have a higher standard for improving the charter anyway,
                because that would be higher than the default rule.

Paul Diaz: And I think that works.

Jeff Neuman: What it sounds - I mean, yes. It sounds like what the people at least on this
                call are coming out in discussing the pros and cons obviously this is just
                formal and you could change your mind later, but it sounds like people on this
                call are in favor of just making the approval of the charter the same standard
                as approval of the PDP.

                So if it was in scope it would be the 33% of both houses or 60% of one house
                and if it was the - if it was not within scope it would be either - it would be - it
                would have to be - sorry, 75% of one house and 25% of the other.

Margie Milam: Majority of the other house.

Jeff Neuman: I'm sorry, and a majority of the other house. Yes.

So one house could never initiate a PDP that's out of scope alone. Is that correct Margie?

Margie Milam: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So, I mean, it sounds like informally this group kind of - sounds like this group is at least in sort of some agreement and we could put that Margie in the email that, you know, just an informal discussions this is what the group had come up with.

But we obviously want feedback from anyone that wasn't on the call or if anyone on the call has kind of a change of heart they obviously could comment on that as well.

So let me ask a follow up question then. If the working group comes back with changes to the charter should that be the same - should that require a Council vote is question one. And two, should that be the same threshold as we just talked about?

Let me start with question one. If the working group comes back and says that there should be - recommends changes for whatever process they have, does that require a vote of the Council to change it?

Avri Doria: I don't have the screen in front of me. Can I put my hand up? This is Avri.

Jeff Neuman: Sure, yes. Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay, I think that again if we can get consensus and that's why within the informal process, you know, that generally I've been using and something that works is basically you ask if you need a vote on something. Is there agreement on this? Do we need a vote?

And if you don't then you've got consensus. But otherwise yes, there does need to be a vote because as a management body it says if it has consensus, but if someone believes that the issue is touchy enough, controversial enough, or whatever that it needs to go to a vote, that then it does.

And then I would argue for the stronger threshold simply because you don't want it to be trivially easy to change charters. You want people to look at it and think about it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Does anyone else have any - that makes sense. Anyone else have comments on that? So what Avri is saying is yes, it should require a vote of the Council and - but it should be the default standard which is a majority of...Well actually Avri it's not a higher standard...

Avri Doria: Well it's - yes, for the out of scope.

Jeff Neuman: But, I mean, in either case for simplicity's sake would everyone support the majority of both houses' default rule?

Avri Doria: I think of it as a standard administrative action at that point, you know.

Jeff Neuman: All for Bertrand, James, any...?

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Jeff if I may say it's all right for the general nature of the comment. I think as a general rule it is important to try to make as little as possible or as little as necessary obstacles to beginning to address an issue and to put interactive steps to check whether there's agreement on the way it is going.

The reason why I'm saying that is because there might be cases where one particular group or subgroup has a real deep concern with one issue and another group for either very valid reason or self-interest reason is strongly opposed to the issue being addressed.

I think it is dangerous for the organization that the mechanisms are being used to not address the issue if it is a real concern to one group because the longer you wait the more protracted and the more tense the issue can become.

So my natural tendency as a general rule is to keep in mind that not only the goal is to have consensus but on the other hand the goal is also to allow issues to emerge as quickly as possible and to be discussed as broadly as possible in a less formal way at first and to progressively rolled into something that is really making and taking decisions.

Because I - the three year experience that I have with ICANN show that sometimes it takes a long time to put an issue on the agenda because one actor or a group of actor is not really keen on that and there's only one pushing.

And sometimes when the issue finally arrives on the plate it becomes harder to solve because the period where you need to address it is becoming shorter.

So if we can keep in mind that the lower the threshold for starting to explore an issue in a very informal way and formalizing it along the way is more important than having a very high level range of principles that guarantee that only issues perfectly framed get into a very formal process.

I think the first method is better so it's a general guiding principle I would say, lowering the threshold and the barrier to entry for an issue to emerge.

Jeff Neuman: Well let me ask a question of Avri. If a working group comes forward and recommends changes I'm assuming it's a pretty low threshold for them to get it on the agenda for the Council.

Avri Doria: Oh, yes. Those things come on the agenda as soon as they're ready. I mean, in fact, you know, one part of - and of course agendas probably change but the way I've been doing the agenda is one part of agenda we cycle through the status of all the groups and if the liaison has any issues that need to be dealt with they get dealt with.

And, you know, they'll be sent out on email on the list hopefully as soon as the request is made formal and on most of them I've been being let know in advance that it's coming.

So, I mean, there's no walls. Obviously keep walking, keep talking and working with each other and it works. But, yes, those tend to get there quickly and so...

One thing I think I did since I started talking, one thing I think I disagree with (Bert) on perhaps is that I think that things have to be fairly strict and have to be fairly formal and milestones set and work items set with a real threshold for changing them. Otherwise no work ever gets done.

There's really a balance in working groups between them lasting into infinity versus the precision with which their goals and deliverables and milestones are defined. And so yes, you have to be able to change them when they're not right, when new ones are needed and stuff. But if it's trivially easy to change them it will never get done.

Bertrand de La Chappelle: Actually for Jeff, I understand what Avri's saying. I just want to make clear and sometimes it's my English that is failing me. What I meant was not so much the process for changing the charter or the scope or the subject of a working group.

It was more the early stages so that the issues first emerge and I do believe indeed in the progressive refinement of work rather than setting up frameworks that are usually not followed afterwards, because people set very

ambitious timelines for instance or deliverables and then it doesn't really produce it in the right time.

So I'm very much more into a progressive methodology. But it's probably again a question of balance what Avri was saying, which I don't object to in general.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Does anyone else have any comments on the charter or just the issues that we've discussed? Because I think we're coming across the hour and a half mark and I think we have enough to put some more questions on the - on email and I think we actually had a really good discussion on probably one of the more important parts of this Phase II document, our Phase II document.

So I just saw an invite go out for next week on the 30th so I still if people can make it we should have that call and maybe we'll have a different mix of - or an additional - additional people that can make that call so we could talk more about the timelines from - the planning initiation phase and then address these questions and then continue on with Phase II.

Avri Doria: Well one last thing. If you send me a quick summary I can read it out and if you want anything reported at today's meeting I can read it out when we get to that point and I will include the plead for more participation.

But if there's anything you want me to say to the group just send it to me in the next half hour or so and I'll try to make sure to look for it and if Glen is listening she'll remind me to look for it when I forget.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, I will try to...

Avri Doria: Okay thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you guys. Thank you everyone for coming and it's a good discussion. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thanks Jeff.

James Bladel: Thanks Jeff.

Man: Bye Jeff.

Glen DeSaintgery:Avri?

                         END