

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Working Group Model (WG) Work
Team (WT)
TRANSCRIPTION
19 May 2010 at 18:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee Working Group Model (WG) Work Team (WT) meeting on Wednesday 19 May 2010 at 18:00 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-wg-20100519.mp3>

On page:
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>

(All MP3's and transcriptions can be found on the calendar page).

Present:
J. Scott Evans - IPC Work Team Chair
Avri Doria - NCSG
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC chair
S Subbiah –individual

Staff:
Liz Gasster
Marika Konings
Gisella Gruber-White
Glen de Saint Gery

Absent apologies:
Iliya Bazlyankov
Caroline Greer

Coordinator: Excuse me. This call is now being recorded.

Gisella Gruber-White: Just a quick update on who we have on the PPSC Workgroup today on Wednesday the 19th of May. We have Avri Doria, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Subbiah. From staff, Marika Konings, Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from Iliya Bazlyankov. And if I could please just remind you to state your names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks very much. Marika you've to pull up - this is Cheryl speaking.

You've managed to pull up the first question I believe or will be soon that Subbiah wanted to raise on the discussion point about examples that Subbiah perhaps over to you so you can share with Avri and I your particular question.

S. Subbiah: Yeah. I just wanted to - under the translation there was a second point that (entered) me regarding, you know, soliciting I guess more widely making sure that relevant areas are covered, you know, when you acquire people, trademark area, legal area and so on.

And I didn't see how that related to the actual section they were making the points to. Does that make sense or did any of it? Maybe they were talking about another section when they - that comment down there.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I just read through it as well and my - I suspect as well that it relates to another section but I can't quickly figure out either where it should belong. (Unintelligible).

S. Subbiah: Yeah. So my only thought there was - yeah. My only thought I mean it didn't - first it didn't and secondly then, you know, it's a matter of I mean - and clearly I should be on top of this and be able to go find it but obviously I'm not.

So somewhere else we talked about it I guess and I guess just making the point regarding that. And I mean since you're on this point, it seems to me not unreasonable that you're going to be - you know, if we're asking, you know, generally soliciting for everybody then we should, you know, try to make - try our best to also solicit for people in areas that might be of particular relevance with that working group committee.

For example, you know, (unintelligible) expertise or legal or whatever - just that was my thought for that. Even though it wasn't - and since we are on that

point anyway that email, there's only one other point about the languages.
I've made all my points now through emails (unintelligible).

And it seems reasonable; suggest this set of languages (unintelligible).
Suggestion only, so.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri. Any points on that?

Avri Doria: On the languages?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Avri Doria: No. I thought it was a big set but, you know, they're all reasonable. So, it's, you know, I tend to be, you know, sort of - funny for me to refer to myself this way but conservative in that and always strike out for the U.N. six. But I understand, you know, the reasonableness of adding the others.

I think when I look at things like, and, you know, I hope I can say this without being insulting. When I look at things like Japanese and Korean being on the list and I know that their English, (and) written English is often better than mine. I don't know how necessary it is but certainly, you know, there's no reason to say no to those languages. I do think it's a lot but I think it's a reasonable set.

S. Subbiah: But I don't think they're requiring them are we. They're just simply saying this is the suggested list based on, you know, your ability to, you know, the cost and ability to do this right.

Avri Doria: The problem comes for the staff is then they have to make a decision. Now perhaps they can make a decision based on some statistical basis as a - listen, nobody ever, you know - we've been putting out the Japanese and the Korean for a year and nobody ever does those.

Or they can put out an analysis that says, you know, to translate it into those - these nine --- I didn't count them --- these nine as opposed to six at X amount plus doing these is far more expensive therefore. But it forces the staff to basically have to give reason for constraining the suggested set. And so that would be my only reason for saying maybe we should have a minimal set that of course they could go beyond. But that would be my only reason.

S. Subbiah: I guess - we have a minimal set that we agreed to on a sort of a UN basis, haven't we? I mean we have set of four, five or six that ICANN's already been doing.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Ah, but Subbiah many workgroups are very clear. They will work in English currently.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...and that is a disadvantage for an internationalizing organization.

S. Subbiah: Yeah. No, my point is that - I think we agreed that English would be the working language. It's only the question of, you know, translations being provided.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

S. Subbiah: And right now we've already - ICANN over the last few years has committed to a set of - a small set of languages that are U.N. based, right. I mean the five or six or whatever. And while we were - if Avri's looking for minimally requiring something (kinder) then well that would be the set for focus on and all these other languages are good choices for depending on cost or whatever issues that ICANN (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I think perhaps some languages, and I just recognized (unintelligible) for a moment, some language we could look towards is seeks a purpose. There are clearly times when particular topics will have a greater requirement for certain languages.

If you're, for example, doing a workgroup that happens to be specifically of interest to the brushstroke scripts, then (CPK) is going to be, you know, what you need to add in there. And I think that comes to what Avri was speaking about in terms of the metrics. You know, we need to test the need and have some sort of decision.

S. Subbiah: Okay. Yeah. My take on it is, you know, I mean I'm agreeable with all this I mean as far as the decision-making. But my own kind of, you know - if I could, you know - I understand the limitations that we're doing this.

But my own take in it is a difference perspective, which is, you know, we're talking about Internet for everybody in the world, every language in the world. And there's a lot of money being spent. Trillions of dollars on this thing. Okay. And ICANN and everybody is making tons of money. Okay. And domain names are very small cost relatively speaking.

So it is not that nobody reads it or - it's true, most of these things that we put out probably be put in (unintelligible) and nobody reads it. But that's not why we do a lot of things. You know, we don't do things because they're practical. We do things because it's the right thing to do. You know.

So we do as much as we can. We do that, right. It's to send a message that we - and that's what you're countering. It's not just simply we translated it and, you know, we wanted you to know. It's more that, you know, we've understood you needs. We're a cooperative organization.

And as, you know, I mean if I was practical, you know, I'd be doing a lot more things for my kids than, (sounded great) I mean right. So the reality is, you

know, yeah it's a lot of cost but how much is this added cost, you know? And it's (set) to be inclusive. And that's the logic.

And that's how unfortunately people who come from the third world think. You got so much money to do all these things. How come you can't look after us? You know, it's - whereas we think it's the money that - oh it's we've already spent a million dollars. How - you know, it's going to cost another \$100,000. Does that make sense? I mean anyway it's...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: From an ALAC point of view Subbiah I hear what you're saying and we agree and it's also a matter of there is a difference between the hard cost and the perceived benefits. And if we did a cost benefit analysis on...

S. Subbiah: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...some of these things, we'd come out with very, very different metrics.

S. Subbiah: Correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But what I'm hearing on this point is a general acceptance for the common with some language that says you don't necessarily need to have all languages for all things at all time obviously and that the workgroup needs some flexibility and ability to work with staff to ensure that the right choices are made. Does that sound about right?

Marika Konings: Cheryl, can I make a comment?

Woman: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Please go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: The comment I want to make is the language that is here doesn't talk about any specific languages. It just talks about, you know, providing arrangements if a language is...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...solved the translation principles. So if we would suddenly go and put in certain languages or recommendations, I think we're moving into a different direction than providing general guidelines.

So I'm wondering if that is a proposal that we're suddenly now going to suggest the languages that need to be translated and if it doesn't get us into a situation where, you know, this groups is trying to make choices of one language over the other and whether that's not better dealt with.

Because I know that they're working in - I think they're working on new translation policy I've been told because the issue has rather been discussed in the PDP Work Team. So I'm just wondering if we're not, you know, up a can of worms that maybe at this stage is not a...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I thought I was hearing more things should be suits the purpose than it was so whilst Avri was saying she tends to go for the six U.N.'s that - but there are others. I thought we weren't being trying to be at all specific...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Marika Konings: Okay. So are there any changes you want us to make to the language that's there. I'm just, you know, pointing out that this is language that's already been taken from the translation principles that were adopted Avri I guess by the Board and through, you know, proper processes. So that's a question.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

S. Subbiah: Here's something. We can put language in there to say there's another committee deciding what the translation languages are. Why don't we just say look, the translation that, you know, we'll look to that, you know, whatever the translation policy in those languages which right now seems to include the six U.N. languages.

And we suggest that additional languages, right, may be - may have to be selected depending on the working group and what they're trying to do. Fair enough?

Avri Doria: I actually I think it would probably just be sufficient -- this is Avri -- to say in accordance with the translation policy as defined by ICANN and leave it at that and make (unintelligible)...

S. Subbiah: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...languages. And if we have a list of languages, we better include Swahili. But anyway, I agree with not putting in a list of languages, not even my U.N. basic six.

If there is a translation policy being driven, then that's where we should go, you know, and perhaps a list of appropriate languages, you know, as opposed to fit for purpose. But, you know, as defined or in accordance with the ICANN (unintelligible) process would be a way to do it. Yes.

Marika Konings: Just to point out, there is an editorial note at the end that basically says that additional recommendations made by other teams or committees such as the OST or the Public Participation Committee may be added ones available as appropriate.

So we can add there as well others or maybe other teams, committees or the ICANN Board or who would be the - what would be the body adopting to

cover - basically saying like if anything else gets adopted, this will be updated accordingly. Would that address the comments that have been raised?

Woman: Yeah.

Avri Doria: And I mean we'd have to -- it's Avri again -- have to address INTA's comment of, you know, and the answers I'm seeing it's difficult, you know. Because we'd have to add a bunch of those because why is my language not on the list and we have decided to, you know, stick with Board approved recommendations for translation policy.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. That's the best way forward as far as I'm concerned. Yeah.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just to satisfy - do we want to add anything or as it is now it's basically covered that, you know, if anything new gets adopted this will be updated and for now just follow it - follow the translation principle as adopted by ICANN.

S. Subbiah: Yeah, does this actually say that clearly right now, the transition policy as adopted by ICANN? I think it does.

Marika Konings: Yeah. ICANN using the following translation principles.

S. Subbiah: Oh, I see. Perhaps we can be, you know, more specific and say, you know, in any general policy that ICANN adopts or whatever, you know, I don't know. Right. I mean basically we're saying...

Marika Konings: I mean...

S. Subbiah: No. No. What I'm trying to say is that when I read that, I don't come away with a sense that there is a specific policy for translation that ICANN has somewhere else actively on any (common rule).

Marika Konings: And I can look at that as I think this was taken from - I don't know where - I think this is part of a document. So I can provide the link to that so people can go and look for it (unintelligible).

S. Subbiah: Yeah. And then that would be a way out. Yeah. Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's a good way out. Avri, you're happy with that?

Avri Doria: Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. All right. Well Subbiah you've had one and I know (we don't) have much time but let's bat the ball across to Avri and take the first on her list of questions or comments more to the point.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And can we move back up to the top of the session then to general meeting logistics and beyond.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I have fairly quick answers on 4.1. I think they're more answers for how to respond to INTA than changes in some of them. But the one was saying we need a toll free number for everywhere in the world. Well, I think that becomes impossible and that's being taken care of by anybody that wants to call about getting one. And so I think that that is to respond and no change needed.

The one that sort of...

S. Subbiah: Or...

Avri Doria: Sorry. Go ahead.

S. Subbiah: Or is it possible - is it possible to just weave in your point into the text itself, you know, of what you want to say that isn't covered. I don't know. That's another possible (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: In other words, I think if I understand Subbiah's point is as opposed to saying that is taken care of by the Secretariat in the answer to INTA to basically make sure that that point - but it already says that GNSO will also be able to assist with providing dialog if required by working group members.

S. Subbiah: Okay. Perhaps we can be...

Avri Doria: So that's already there.

S. Subbiah: Okay. Yeah. But I was just thinking that since the question is - the driving force of the question is no one should be barred from (unintelligible), right.

Avri Doria: Yeah. If...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think a way to clarify this and maybe they think that for most countries maybe they assume that, you know, we made some kind of selection for which countries we provide...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: ...for countries that where available toll free numbers will be provided.

S. Subbiah: Yeah.

Marika Konings: For countries where available, would that solve the issue and make sure that (unintelligible).

S. Subbiah: I think that it might be a little bit proactive that ICANN intent here or the WG intent here is not to - that no one should be barred from participating because of (competition). (Unintelligible) the intent, you know.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...just recognize - if I can just recognize myself for a moment. My concern on this sentence actually was the use of GNSO specific to Secretariat when we have been trying very hard...

Avri Doria: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...to be general. So the whole of the Section 4.1...

S. Subbiah: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...in my totally humble and very biased opinion when you have the word - the letters GNSO removed from in front of Secretariat everywhere. And then to your particular point, it might just need to be a re-jigging of the sentences to say that for - or let - either dial in or dial out support or toll free number where available...

S. Subbiah: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...will be used to facilitation workgroup members involvement and engagement. Sometime along those lines rather than sort of make it possible to read oh, well I have a toll free - I have a toll-free number in Australia but I get a dial out because...

S. Subbiah: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...it works better.

S. Subbiah: Oh, I see actually. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If we just re-jig that sentence to say...

S. Subbiah: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...yeah, that we'll provide...

S. Subbiah: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...dial out support and/or toll free numbers where they are available to facilitate...

S. Subbiah: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...workgroup interaction...

S. Subbiah: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...or something.

S. Subbiah: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri, you're better at wordsmithing than I am.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I thought your first try was fine.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Well listen to the tape and write it down Marika. Next one on that.

Avri Doria: Okay. The next one - this one repeats once again later when they talk about that.

S. Subbiah: Yeah.

Avri Doria: But the other point was talking about the pure sensitive nature of some working group activities. Personally I didn't think we were supposed to have many of those. So I would tend to sort of say - I think everything's supposed to be transparent.

Now in my I guess almost six years participation, there has been - sorry, forgot. There has been one case where the working group felt that some information need to be confidential because it would have told fishers too much about how to fish successfully or some such thing.

So, you know, so there might be a reason to add a sentence in extraordinary circumstances where a certain amount of confidentiality and the materials of the working group is required, you know, that will be dealt with.

S. Subbiah: I'm totally agreeable to that.

Avri Doria: But for the most part I think everything has to be open. Okay.

S. Subbiah: Yeah. I'm totally - yeah - I'm totally agreeable to that. But the one thing I want to point out that the fact that - the fact that the whole thing is transparent doesn't necessarily conflict with saying, you know, the system should be secure and, you know, outside should be (half right) I mean in that sense of security, right. I mean, you know.

And I think - I'm not sure whether (interest) comment was meant from the point of just a particular confidential document or something. I think they just felt that the thing should be, you know, secure, you know. And I think maybe that, you know - but besides that I think I was also for a carve out sentence which said that if there's cases of it, not extraordinary cases but confidential that have to be kept, then, you know, the system should be secure enough to be able to handle that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So Subbiah just to be clear, you're calling for a strengthening of the sentence that indicates that things that are meant to be secure are secured properly.

S. Subbiah: In extraordinary circumstances we have that. I mean if - I'm just thinking of (wild) situation tomorrow, okay. There is something going on and we are at war, right, or something, some dramatic thing that's going on, okay, terrorist - I mean it's not inconceivable. It's happened already a couple of times I think (and you figure) in a wartime and other things.

I could be, you know, and we find ourselves, believe it or not, in the U.S. or something like that, you know, because (miracle) oppression or whatever. You know, if somebody says they should act, whatever, and somebody's, you know, something - we're in the middle of a meeting and some WG's working and that WG's now presented with some confidential information that you need (so you can at least act) on something, you know, terrorism, something or other.

And some set of controlling people who happen to control ICANN at the time whether you like it or not are saying look, do this from the top, right. Now will at that time, at the time you need to act, is your system going to be secure enough in the software and so on and so forth, right, that it's protected?

I mean it was built to be secure so that when you had to discuss something securely it was available rather than in general you didn't care and we didn't invest in firewalls, you know what I mean, you know. So that's the (leak).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Every...

S. Subbiah: That's what (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I ask you to respond to that remembering that we would be talking about in the rare and exceptional circumstances where material is either sensitive or confidential nature?

Avri Doria: I'm not sure what you're asking me. Yeah, I agree with that phrase.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well we don't have sentencing in there that indicates that the look on the doors on those things have to be held. So I was just thinking as Subbiah was thinking the matters of some workgroups or committees, which do act and have access to material of a sensitive nature. For example, work under strict confidentiality so the equivalent of the workgroup members are requested to sign and to be bound by confidentiality agreements.

We haven't ventured into this at all in this document but Subbiah's question sort of raised that in my mind. In the very rare and exceptional circumstances where materials of sensitive or confidential nature is being discussed under Section 4.1 Paragraph 2...

Avri Doria: (Is that what)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...do we need to put any language in there?

Avri Doria: If we do, we could put in something like, you know, using that whole phrase that you just had. In those cases a separate procedure will need to be drawn out and agreed to for that.

And basically sort of saying - so for example, you guys in AOC if you were following these - the AOC letter of the alphabet (of the) review team were, you know, deciding to use the working group stuff because it had worked so well. But because some of your stuff was confidential, you would have to establish a process for yourself at the beginning of the working group for...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...any such materials. And not leave it an open thing, not spend a lot of time now trying to define what one would be but just sort of say in those rare circumstances where it may be required. So a working group is responsible for defining appropriate processes and procedures at the beginning of the working group and just (leave it).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Which then it's fit in just before such services much be secure, et cetera, et cetera. So such services and processes, workgroup processes.

Avri Doria: Well would we need anything there? Basically then they figure out what they need.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott. I'm sorry guys.

Avri Doria: Hi J. How's the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh hi J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: She's doing okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's all yours and we're part way through 4.1.

J. Scott Evans: She's losing her back hip function, so.

Avri Doria: Oh dear.

J. Scott Evans: And we live in a four story home, so we had to go have an emergency but they seem to think she's just getting old.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I've got (unintelligible)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: An old...

Avri Doria: ...animals. That's what we're seeing.

J. Scott Evans: So I guess I'll just be grateful I can still make it up the stairs with her in my arms, so.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just both of you be careful and just deal with the quality of life (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Yeah. So here we are with 4.1. I take it - who's comments were you just dealing with of the comments listed on these.

Avri Doria: We were dealing I think with mine - my very, very late comments.

J. Scott Evans: Oh yours? (You give) a solution to the comment. My question was who's comment were we addressing? GoDaddy, Chuck Gomes or INTA.

Avri Doria: INTA I believe.

S. Subbiah: INTA.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: INTA.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: INTA.

J. Scott Evans: All right. And everyone's satisfied with where you left off? The solution - I saw - I heard some language being added.

Avri Doria: I think we were getting there. Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Avri Doria: The balance we had was between trying to describe how in those rare occasions where there would need to be sensitive material kept confidential. And the general case whether we wanted to define a process now or what I was suggesting was saying in those rare circumstances it will be up to the working group at the beginning of its tenure to decide on processes and procedures...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...for maintaining that sensitive material.

J. Scott Evans: Should they need to - I'll just throw this out to the group. Should there be something that says that the confidentiality needs to be approved by the chartering organization?

Avri Doria: I think that's a good idea.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: Because you come up with or we think this needs to be and then you go back to the chartering organization and say we think certain things need to be confidential. Here's what they are and here's our process. And the chartering organization...

S. Subbiah: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: ...can say yah or nay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

S. Subbiah: J. Scott, I think you can make it...

J. Scott Evans: Subbiah.

S. Subbiah: You can make that more general by saying just working in conjunction with the COE or CO approval. Because sometimes the CO that asks you to do it rather than the WG asking us, it could be (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: All right. So where do we want to put that? I'm just - we need to throw that...

S. Subbiah: Working - a clause to say that, you know, working in conjunction with the CO.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: But could someone tell me please where we're wanting to put language...

J. Scott Evans: Yeah I'm saying in the language itself, where...

Marika Konings: ...the (new) language?

S. Subbiah: Oh, in the language, yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...are we going to put it?

S. Subbiah: (Unintelligible). I see.

J. Scott Evans: Do we have anything about confidential information? Where is that Marika in here?

Marika Konings: I don't think there is anything in here. It's just saying all meetings are...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Marika Konings: ...normally decided (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Where are we? Start over again Marika. All meetings are where? Where are we?

Marika Konings: In the second paragraph where we talk about meetings are normally recorded and transcribed. I don't think we actually talk here specifically about - just strictly looking through it and, you know, just to comment as well, I think I agree with Avri. I mean if a working group would see the need for having that kind of information secured, they can set it up and...

J. Scott Evans: Well here's one of the things...

Marika Konings: ...(unintelligible) with their charter.

J. Scott Evans: ...I would do is I would move to facilitate remote participation sentence and put it after to facilitate participation period in addition to facilitate remote participation and sharing the documents blah, blah, blah. Move that sentence after the word participation in that second paragraph.

Avri Doria: I'm sorry. I'm confused.

J. Scott Evans: I would move the last sentence in the paragraph that begins to facilitate remote participation. I would move that up so it's now the second to last sentence in the paragraph. Okay. All right. And then because it says to facilitate after to facilitate, I think I would put in addition or additionally comma to facilitate.

And then the last sentence talks about as described above, right. Now. Is that correct? That's how it'll read. The last sentence will be as described above, these things are normally...

Marika Konings: Meetings are normally recorded.

J. Scott Evans: ...meetings are normally recorded and transcribed. Then I think that's where I would put Avri's sentence about in the rare...

Avri Doria: Actually can I make a further recommendation on that?

J. Scott Evans: Sure.

Avri Doria: Actually we might actually be starting another paragraph. I have no problem with your rearranging. And basically a paragraph says there is a presumption of full transparency in all working groups period. And then the other one.

Now in the extraordinary event that a working group may feel the need for confidentiality, you know, it is the responsibility of that working group to propose a set of processes and procedures for such confidentiality in cooperation with the chartering organization. That's quote.

I realize that I was getting to Subbiah there because it would be not the workgroup would feel but in the rare extraordinary event that the working group should need - should require confidentiality, something like that. And leave it up to where that requirement for the coming - requirements coming from the chartering organization or the workgroup.

Marika Konings: Avri, just to clarify, the last bit. It would mean is it up to that working to propose a set of rules and procedures that will need to be approved by the chartering organization?

((Crosstalk))

S. Subbiah: Say in collaboration with CO.

Avri Doria: I was going to Subbiah's recommendation. The working group propose a set of rules and procedures in collaboration with the - yeah. Okay. That's it.

J. Scott Evans: That looks good.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. That does look good.

S. Subbiah: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: All right.

S. Subbiah: Right.

J. Scott Evans: Is everybody comfortable with that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Avri Doria: The only thing I might suggest is presumption of full transparency. So nobody says well...

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I don't have a problem with the disclaimer.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. It could - yeah.

Avri Doria: Okay.

S. Subbiah: We live in a time and age when you have to qualify in that one as well, right.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Believe it or not, yes, right, right, right now and I'm putting on my IOC hat.

S. Subbiah: Yes. Yes. There's lawyers on the call - we have lawyers on the call.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. No. It's got - it hasn't got to do with the lawyers. You will hear language about how...

((Crosstalk))

S. Subbiah: You actually call it - you actually call it read my lips and the question is when.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Right.

J. Scott Evans: We've got that. Okay. Now what was the comment you were working on?

Avri Doria: Okay. That was actually a duplicate - there's two comments. This was in 4.1.

J. Scott Evans: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: They had two comments for INTA. They had it for...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The confidentiality.

Avri Doria: Right. Confidential - we covered that one.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Avri Doria: Then there was the one about...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Timing.

Avri Doria: ...timing. That one day for an agenda wasn't enough.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah.

Avri Doria: You know, and yeah.

S. Subbiah: And my point was that I also actually said two days. I said kind of two or three days is recommended. No later than 24 hours. I think that was the way I (wrote that part).

Avri Doria: Yeah. I think that would be cool.

J. Scott Evans: That's fine.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I'm comfortable with that.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I mean I agree it's nice to put it in there but, you know, reality is it's not (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Well it says the same thing. We say...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Woman: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...at least 24 hours. So I think we just leave it alone.

Avri Doria: Right.

J. Scott Evans: The reality is if you make it any more than 24 hours, they're never going to do it. It's constantly going to be violated, so.

Marika Konings: Yeah. But the problem is as well with weekly calls, you know...

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Marika Konings: ...just cropping up and getting the action points out and document before, you know, and weekends that are in between and...

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Marika Konings: ...the chairs that are in different time zones. I mean 24 hours is already really difficult and not often met.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Avri Doria: And I'm not sure the person writing this was paying attention to what seems to happen. For example, they say it should be possible to send in amendments to the agenda by email as opposed to just the beginning of the meeting. And it was like yeah, of course.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Do we need to...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So some people do actually work and live in a parallel universe I've decided Avri.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. At start of meeting the chair should review the agenda and working members may propose items to be added to the - or changed. We could put a sentence that says likewise the chair will - should acknowledge any additional agenda items that have been submitted via email.

S. Subbiah: (Okay).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Actually if I may J. Scott. I have a little bit of a problem if we change that language to be too prescriptive.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Working on what actually happens as opposed to what might be nice to happen in a democratized globalized world, notice they're two different things. And I come from a space where one is more (clear) than the other. The practice where one calls for an amendment to an agenda at the beginning of a meeting is a good one because it allows the workgroup to interact.

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And if things have come in by email, fine. But you can get some annoying little people, bit people perhaps, some annoying individuals who will just pre-flood via email. And if we set things that says, you know, if it's coming via email, then we have to have some formal process. Ooh...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm not too comfortable with that.

J. Scott Evans: Well and they can acknowledge - if they do that then the email submitter can say I've submitted something by email.

Avri Doria: I can recommend perhaps two wording changes that might...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...be easier and aren't totally...

J. Scott Evans: All right.

Avri Doria: ...prescriptive. Could circulate a draft agenda so that in the case that it's open for discussion, it's a draft agenda.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Avri Doria: And then at the start of the meeting the chair should review the agenda and working group and oh, okay. And...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Call for any proposed amendments.

Avri Doria: ...if it's more than one word - review the agenda and any proposed changes to that agenda.

S. Subbiah: Yes. I mean the standard process in our meetings is right in the beginning the first call is this is the agenda, do you have any items you want to add at the beginning. All right.

J. Scott Evans: And then yeah, just take the rest of that out. Okay. That works.

Avri Doria: So whether it happens in email before or during...

S. Subbiah: Yeah. It's irrelevant.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It doesn't - yeah.

J. Scott Evans: That's correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Flexibility there is important.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right. What other things do we want to cover in this session?

S. Subbiah: I have to run but I think on all the other points I've made my (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

S. Subbiah: I think. Okay. Thanks. Bye.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thanks Subbiah. Okay. There's one recommendation by CG, which says remote participation facilities might be available and change that to best efforts should be made to provide remote facilitation facilities.

Avri Doria: Yeah. That seems like a nice change.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. I'm comfortable with that.

J. Scott Evans: That's what happens anyway.

Avri Doria: That's what happens.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. It was just the wording.

J. Scott Evans: I mean we've gotten a lot better in my view. It's not perfect but it's a lot better than it was when we first started this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's improving yes.

J. Scott Evans: This (wall). Okay. So where are you going to add the best efforts language.

Avri Doria: That was in the - replacing the sentence in the third paragraph.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Third paragraph.

Avri Doria: Last sentence in the third paragraph.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'll keep (that).

J. Scott Evans: Oh I see. Best effort should be made.

Avri Doria: Yeah. That's a nice change.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. We should probably capitalize that if it's new.

Marika Konings: Yeah. The problem is I'm going to have to retype the whole sentence. It doesn't go that easy.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Okay. Okay.

Marika Konings: It will come up in the document of course...

J. Scott Evans: All right. All right.

Marika Konings: ...when I make a change. If I want this quickly, I'm afraid that doesn't work here.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: Copy and paste (does not).

J. Scott Evans: Have we worked through all of these?

Avri Doria: There was one other comment we had about...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The face-to-face meeting one.

Avri Doria: ...and basically...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It was a question on face-to-face meetings and the urgency and the situations where they may or may not be and how you kind of get geographic balance and blah, blah, blah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Have I dropped out?

J. Scott Evans: No.

Avri Doria: Oh.

J. Scott Evans: I heard you. I'm just reading. Did anybody address that in their...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. (GED)...

J. Scott Evans: ...(unintelligible) folks?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Marika Konings: Avri actually dropped off. Her battery died.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Ah, that's who dropped off.

Marika Konings: And she's saying the word - the word vital in the sentence should already cover it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Marika Konings: You're just talking about the vital in the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. If it's vital for...

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...deliberations and/or reaching consensus, blah, blah, blah. And because that follows the best efforts to provide remote participation, I think some of the other points that was being made in that comment we can respond to it by saying exactly that that we've recognized best efforts must need to be made to facilitate remote participation.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, you know, I mean as far as GoDaddy is concerned, their comments seem to me to be something the chartering organization would decide. I mean that's not for the working group to decide. Working group can ask. The chartering organization can come back and say well exactly why do you need this? You need to show us X, Y and Z. But that's for - I mean that's for them to do.

So I, you know, there are innumerable situations that might not fall into that list so I think we're fine the way it is.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I agree. And I believe Avri does as well with the word vital in the sentence cover it - oh good, she dialing back in. In responses though in our little call out boxes to respond to the various comments, Marika can we address that last sentence with a - I suggest, you know, we ask the work team to consider the experiences of other working groups to have blah, blah, blah.

Shouldn't we just back that back and say it's the CO responsibility, not a workgroup or ours?

Marika Konings: Yeah. I'll add that.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah we felt like the chartering organization...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: That there are a myriad of unique...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: ...situations that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: They can't...

J. Scott Evans: ...could make a workgroup believe that they need to have a meeting face-to-face.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: But the chartering organization depending on whatever that myriad is, that particular recipe that calls the working group to do that may have - may want to put some structure around that and say okay, we hear you but here's what we need; A, B and C. But that's not for us to do.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Because it could be different in every situation.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Well I think we've reacted to GoDaddy's comments and is that it for Section 4.1?

J. Scott Evans: Is Avri back?

Avri Doria: Yeah, I'm back.

J. Scott Evans: We basically think you're right. That vital works.

Avri Doria: Good.

J. Scott Evans: And that we're just going to say what we just said to GoDaddy in a call out that just says, you know, we think it's covered. Okay. Let's go. Let's rock.

Avri Doria: Okay. Translation we covered. So we covered 4.3 right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah we did. J. Scott we've already done 4.3.

J. Scott Evans: Oh, okay. I trust.

Avri Doria: Not quite as bad as you thought.

J. Scott Evans: Remember I'm not - I don't have a vote. I just sort of try to move things forward.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We're just telling you where we're up to. Like you try to control a runaway train here today, remember.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Here we are on...

Avri Doria: So did Subbiah have comments - Subbiah may have had comments - my last minute comment was on CG's - oh wait a second. We're on five? Oh, okay we're on five. Yeah. That was a reasonable thought. Their comment is won't these get - links get stale? And yeah, links will get stale.

There'll be updates to the constituency statement or ever. So I'm not sure what the right way to refer to it. Refer to it by name, refer to it by something but or, you know, does the staff just have to make sure that when the link gets stale they go back and update it. I don't know.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. So you're suggesting general links and I'm not really sure where those general links would be because it's not a page that we have templates or anything like that. And at least, you know, I think that the Wikis,

those might indeed be linked that, you know, might get outdated with changes.

But I would hope that a GNSO Web site would, you know, that that would remain for a while. But maybe this is indeed an issue just to review over time. Or if someone knows, you know, what are considered general links, I'm happy to look there and include others.

Avri Doria: Well I mean one way to do it and the ITF had the same problem was they referred to things as RFCs and those numbers changed as the policies changed over the years. Eventually they came up with a numbering system which was they called it their BCP, best current practices, where, you know, public comment review sheet would always be BCP 1.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Avri Doria: And it would always contain the latest. And so basically if ICANN wanted to do such a thing, having a strictly numbered set of policies and that policy always was the latest approved one and that would be one way to do it. But that's a whole structure you'd have to think about.

J. Scott Evans: Well I mean...

Avri Doria: Otherwise I think just go with the name.

J. Scott Evans: Is he talking about the fact of a link that we've given above...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: ...will eventually become stale.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: Well then I would just suggest that, you know, we put a call out that says it's recognizable that that could occur therefore the GNSO should update this section during it's yearly review and insert relevant links.

Avri Doria: Yeah. The other way to do it would be that there is some space that always says summary puts those recommended implementation guidelines. And it's guaranteed to always be the latest. That's the other thing. But yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. I would like to come down on my preference to that because I think naming conventions and tracking of document conventions go to ongoing accountability.

J. Scott Evans: But these - all these are is examples, right. These are just examples to say...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: ...he's talking about the links in our report could go stable because we could develop a whole new system. Well it seems to me that if one of the things of the GNSO is they're supposed to look at this yearly, correct, and make any adjustments that might be necessary.

Avri Doria: Yeah. You're right.

J. Scott Evans: Then the one thing we just say is this should be handled by the GNSO during its annual review and...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: ...and you know, the best examples should be inserted in the appropriate links accordingly there too or something to that extent. The acknowledgement...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think I again ask that we don't specify just to the GNSO that we use the term chartering organization and...

J. Scott Evans: Well the GNSO is going to review this, these working group guidelines.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: True.

J. Scott Evans: So you could say the GNSO...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: On the annual, yeah.

J. Scott Evans: ...or any other organization that adopts this model.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: You know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just to - you know how...

J. Scott Evans: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...people can get.

J. Scott Evans: But at the GNSO we've recommended to look at this yearly and I'm just saying that what they would do...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's when they'd...

J. Scott Evans: ...they would know - one of their checklist things is okay, on five, do we need to update these links? Yes. We think X, Y, Z is a better work product example. We think this is a better comment review sheet. We think this is a better, you know, example. Is that okay?

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Let's move.

Avri Doria: Okay. I think I had a comment in six and then I think I was almost done after that. Yeah. Because I did get more done and that was a simple one. But we're at the end of there. The INTA was recommending that we be stronger in our adherence to the key guidelines including certain ones. And, you know, I have my comments. I have absolutely no objection with saying, you know, these are strongly recommended guidelines.

But - and I think this goes along well with what Cheryl's been saying that at all times we have to remember that these are guidelines and each, you know, each group is going to decide and their chartering organization is going to accept or not accept if they want to deviate from them.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: And so, you know, that was my only point. I don't mind making the language stronger as long as it's...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Still flexible.

Avri Doria: Yeah. That one.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And Subbiah's comment was cannot harm to take up what they suggest.

Avri Doria: Yeah. Well he usually wants a stronger - and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...that's been one of the push pulls in our comments all the way through. You know, the word now is that it may consider or utilize and here they're saying can consider, can and may are - of course they can. They always can. May is actually stronger than can.

But, you know, go to should.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah. I would go to should.

Avri Doria: I mean it's okay to say they should consider them, you know. Whether I would go so far as to say should utilize, that gets strong. But they should certainly consider them.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So should consider.

J. Scott Evans: Should consider and/or utilize. We're not saying that - you were saying...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: ...at a minimum you have to consider them.

Avri Doria: And there's - and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...as appropriate is a get out of jail free card anyway, so.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. With the charter guidelines again do we actually need the word GNSO in that first sentence or can we say this section is just intended to fit any chartering organization and it's protected implementation...

J. Scott Evans: I would just - I don't think we need to say anything. I'd just say take out within the GNSO.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Really I tend to make these generally used.

J. Scott Evans: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Yeah. No I think that's great. Okay. That was it for any comments I had. Subbiah went further than I did but then again we're four minutes after the hour and I'll...

J. Scott Evans: Yeah. We have - we're supposed to be 90 minutes today.

Avri Doria: Oh, we're supposed to be 90 minutes. Okay. Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, so.

Avri Doria: Well then I didn't get - I didn't get any further with Subbiah's comments.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But if we can react to them as we go through me.

J. Scott Evans: Sure. Okay. ITA while there's language in (unintelligible) realize the importance of circulating the call for volunteers is why that's possible. It goes on to state that the publications in GNSO on the ICANN side and that (distributed) stakeholder groups should be explored depending upon the scope of the working group and its intended subject matter.

The committee recommends that publication (distribution) be required as the default subject to exceptions only in extraordinary circumstances.

Avri Doria: Okay. It probably has to do -- this is Avri -- with definition of the word should. Should to me, and this is perhaps again, IETF training, but should to me means it would be must except that there may be exceptions. So that's what they're asking for. And so I don't know if it needs to be worded to, you know.

J. Scott Evans: We could always say that. The following avenues must be explored - must be explored...

Avri Doria: Subject to expression only in extraordinary circumstances.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Or actually there are sentences to that too. Publication distribution be required in the default rule subject to expectance.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. But I think...

Avri Doria: It's always nice to give a comment to their sentence.

J. Scott Evans: Depending upon...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I always like - I actually like the sentence, yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...(unintelligible) intended subject matter, comma, publication is the following avenues are required as the default rule - okay.

Marika Konings: So just (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: I'm with you Marika. Follow me. Okay.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: The sentence that reads depending the scope of the working group's intended subject matter, comma, the following avenues are required as the default rule, comma, subject to exception only in extraordinary circumstances.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And get rid of must.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah. And get rid of must be explored as a minimum. Ideally complement it as issue with the following (unintelligible).

Marika Konings: Doesn't this verb follow avenues are required to be explored or to be contacted or...

J. Scott Evans: I would say to be utilized. Okay.

Marika Konings: Yeah. We're happy.

J. Scott Evans: I'm thinking.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Looks good to me.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. The only thing I'm thinking of is somewhere do we want to like put a paragraph between the last bullet point that begins circulation of announcement and before ideally. It just states that nothing in the section should limit the working group from wider distribution of the call for volunteers beyond the required minimum listed above.

In other words, if they want to do more than that, we're not saying you can't. Do we want to put something like that in there? We could put that before the additionally sentence and put that and say for example, command, the working group could consider bullet point circulation of announcements to organizations that are extended.

So no, Marika go back. And put that for example where additionally is. Okay. And then delete additionally. And then go back before for example and put nothing in the foregoing is intended to limit wider distribution of the call for volunteers period. For example, the working group could consider blah. Okay.

Do you see what I'm saying? I just want to put in the fact that we're not being so prescriptive to say you only can do the two bullet points. I think we're saying that's required but nothing is - makes you go beyond the requirement. So here's an example. Am I losing people?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. No.

J. Scott Evans: How about you Avri?

Avri Doria: No. I think it's fine.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right. Let's - I'm giving it all she's got, captain. Let's go with the dilithium crystals or draining.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think we're drained, but go on. Let's get (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Some of us are running on empty already.

J. Scott Evans: ...says a chair should not become an advocate.

Avri Doria: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: You know...

Avri Doria: Well who's MO.

J. Scott Evans: Mike O'Connor. Mikey.

Avri Doria: Okay. So Mikey is saying that they should never vote or poll and so he's going to the other extreme from CG. That's Chuck, right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's Chuck, yes.

Avri Doria: And so we're nicely in the middle between the two comments. Basically we're saying it should be avoided but then again, you know, sometimes they would.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: And I think voting or polling if they're members of the group, I don't see the problem and let the group decide...

J. Scott Evans: And that's what I've done. Have you all felt - I've always said well, here's my opinion but I'm - I've never forced anything.

Avri Doria: Right.

J. Scott Evans: I think that we would - that's what we'd point out in our bullet point is we think we have a nice middle ground between the two positions and that there's an appeal process in place if somebody believes this is being abused.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Then the only thing that we might put as a response to those comments but we could consider putting it in as a option which is batting it back to the chartering organization. Is that from time to time the chartering organization may require an independent chair.

Avri Doria: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that should come through a pre-working group formation. So you, you know, the potential working group, here is the person who is your independent chair and they can be even announced by a consultant with particular expertise. Gather yourselves around this individual. But it should be up to the CO.

Avri Doria: And I mean that's one of the reasons why I'm generally an advocate for co-chairs...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Avri Doria: ...is because that also permits having a chair who cares about the subject and basically occasionally say okay listen I'm taking off chair hat, you know, and other person is the arbitrating chair. And, you know, I'm just speaking my mind. I don't think they should ever be strong advocates in a group. But, you know, there are times when they really should be able to state their opinion especially since you want a chair who really understands the subject matter.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Or alternatively Avri if it's going to be a matter of such contentious nature and you're got a through a 50-50 antagonistic split in your potential workgroup members, that's when you put in an experienced third party...

Avri Doria: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...independent chair...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...who has the necessary wrangling and arbitration skills to get the job done.

Avri Doria: You're right. I'm saying it's quite reasonable at the moment in vertical integration that we have neutral chairs.

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Absolutely.

J. Scott Evans: So do we want to put after the chair as well as allowing group leaders to rotate their participation in the discussion period. In addition, comma, the chartering organization...

Avri Doria: I guess this might be another one of those in extraordinary circumstances, you know, the chartering organization may decide that...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...an...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Why don't we do that because again, that's what happens in the IRT.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Does it need to be - does it need to be extraordinary...

J. Scott Evans: The IRTs were given...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...or in particular?

Avri Doria: I don't know. I usually (unintelligible)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well the reason for particular is - yeah.

J. Scott Evans: I think you could say - I wouldn't say particular. I'd say is in certain. And extraordinary looks like an emergency.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. That's...

Avri Doria: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...I wanted to avoid the emergency.

J. Scott Evans: Rather than it may not be an emergency. It may be that it's just the subject matter. So in certain...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: ...in addition in certain circumstances CO may decide that it must appoint a completely neutral chair.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Did we use neutral or the term independent in your world?

J. Scott Evans: Independent is fine.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Or we may say both, neutral and independent chair.

Avri Doria: Yeah. We use, yeah, neutral and independent chair who would not participate in the substance of the discussions.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: So in under such circumstances, comma, the chair will be appointed by the CO.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. That's a good point just to make really clear. Yeah. I'm happy with that.

J. Scott Evans: So in other words, you come with your chair as opposed to having that election process.

Avri Doria: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And in the case of for example our at large solution for a Board member, we have a regionally balanced workgroup which - who's job it is to reduce the site of interest down to a slate of candidates.

J. Scott Evans: One of the things I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Like the ALAC appoints a chair that has no voting ability. That's what I think.

J. Scott Evans: Marika, we need to go back up to the first meeting provisions - I'm just telling you this for editorial. And where it says elect a chair, you need to put subject to the exception or stated in 6.13 or...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: ...something to that effect so that they know that you normally elect a chair but if you've been given a chair under 6.1 - something like that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good catch.

J. Scott Evans: And we probably need to put something in the chartering organization document section that says in circumstances you may want to choose a chair. So we may want to add something to that template.

I'm just trying to get it all to click so we cover all the bases. We tell them that the people when they read this most normally you're going to do this. We tell them as part of the chair they're normally going to be thing but in those situations where it's got to be completely independent, you'll be given a chair.

And we need to tell the chartering organization in that section that if it's a particularly, you know, under certain circumstances they may wish to appoint a chair. And we just need to make sure we tell them that in the particular section that applies to them.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I can try to find the appropriate (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I'm not - but it's somewhere in that other section.

Marika Konings: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Let's move on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Didn't we do it?

J. Scott Evans: In the first replacing should...

Avri Doria: I got 6.1. Other...

J. Scott Evans: I don't have - you know, that is so miniscule, fine. And that's my...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What are the (roles).

J. Scott Evans: ...that's my group. I mean should consider is just as the suggestion. These are best practices anyway. That's the reason we put them down. We've identified as the group that there are other important roles. I don't think it's beyond our experience...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: ...given what we have to say, you know, in our experience you really should do this, fine. I think that's true.

Avri Doria: And should consider versus could consider is - yeah. I guess in could consider you could say no, I don't want to think about it.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Should consider unless you've got a really good reason you have to think about it.

J. Scott Evans: Right. Move on. Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible). Those are his needs. Could you meet them? (Voter perspective as opposed to)...

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Again, it should say all working groups, not GNSO working groups.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Yeah. And they're right about prospective. Chuck is right. It is prospective, not perspective.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The question of the example, right, by INTA.

Avri Doria: I forget what the examples are.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So do I.

J. Scott Evans: Mailing lists, public - our meetings are normally recorded and transcribed...

Avri Doria: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: ...and otherwise required from...

Avri Doria: Oh that's what 's in the second sentence there. I thought they were further - well inter alia it doesn't mean examples. It means includes but is not limited to. Maybe they just didn't now what inter alia meant. They're not meant to be examples. They're saying that, you know, including but not limited to mailing lists, publicly archived (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Well, you know, that's a judgment call. They're saying well they (on their face) don't necessarily mean it's open and, you know, these are the normal processes that are publicly available.

Avri Doria: Yeah. They're getting into that space between transparency and clarity.

J. Scott Evans: Only thing that I would change is I would say and SOIs are required to working group participants and will be publicly available. Right. Because we have...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: ...that we went through that whole thing about...

Avri Doria: Yeah. Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: ...telling them that they're going to be publicly...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...available.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. So I think we just stick that there and, you know, that's a - personally I think, you know, that's a judgment call. And these are the things where - you know, if we're talking about - what we're talking about is - I just think that's the best we can do. And that's how we've always done transparency and openness.

Now there are those people who would say that we have failed miserably. But that's a judgment call.

Avri Doria: As I say, that usually boils down to the clarity argument, which we've had to get into in various places. You know, you give me- you give me a data dump. That's not transparent because I have to think.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And should I just say that's actually the work of a larger issue and that is being dealt within an IOC environments.

J. Scott Evans: So let's just move on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Unless you want to put in the callout n response the meaning of inter alia.

J. Scott Evans: No.

Avri Doria: I don't think so.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, 6.2.3 is if the (unintelligible) (is going to blame).

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think the first comment of CJ has already been addressed.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: I think I already changed that because I know that there was a reference to the...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...small guidebook that (unintelligible) have been there.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Again, statement of interest, disclosure of interest, we have to wait for those to be defined by the other group, correct?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Marika Konings: What is in there...

J. Scott Evans: So once they're...

Marika Konings: ...now in the document is already an updated version. And I think the OIC is going to consider - is considering that shortly. So I'll check back...

J. Scott Evans: Okay. We just want to insert whatever they decide.

Marika Konings: Yeah. What is there now is the latest version. So I'll check back with...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...(Judy) and staff for...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...to see whether it's still going to change or whether that's it.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So they're using disclosure anyway I guess.

J. Scott Evans: All right. I do see that the last sentence under disclosure (enter subject)
GNSO working group guidelines.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: GNSO policy development process and outcomes also higher up. But
because that's coming from the other group...

J. Scott Evans: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...I'm not sure we can do much about it.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah. I don't think we can either. Okay. Let's move on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Doesn't Subbiah's proposed...

Avri Doria: Yeah. Sort of works.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...changes...

J. Scott Evans: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...will it work. Works for me and...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...deals with INTA's issues.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Next.

J. Scott Evans: So we just put in...

Avri Doria: Subbiah's change.

J. Scott Evans: Oh.

Avri Doria: You may want to wordsmith it a little but...

Marika Konings: So wait. Where do you want to put that in?

J. Scott Evans: So it would say - but should feel unconstrained and skipping any sections that are not relative or adding...

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: ...any sections...

Marika Konings: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: ...that are specific to a particular working group. However...

Avri Doria: The following sections are required for...

J. Scott Evans: ...the following sections are generally required - are required.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, not generally. Just are.

J. Scott Evans: Don't say generally, just are required.

Avri Doria: And are we - is that a full list?

J. Scott Evans: We need to check that.

Avri Doria: Right. We just need to make sure. I think it is. It's certainly the list that INTA gave us. And (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: It's working group identification meant for this purpose and deliverables and state of interest and disclosure of interest. I'd just - I'll have to go through it before I can - I don't know...

Avri Doria: The INTA has been pretty...

J. Scott Evans: Yeah. Particular.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: ...about making sure they said everything that needed to be said. And I didn't mean that as a bad thing.

J. Scott Evans: Well it says e.g., so that means for example. So we should look just in case there are others that we may want to include. Okay. Next.

Marika Konings: Just to give you a heads up. This is the last one. And I'm actually going to be disconnected in 20 seconds. So you can really talk and I'm just going to dial back in.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: I have like (unintelligible) on my phone and (I'm going) to disconnect. (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Avri Doria: And I think we're done, aren't we?

Marika Konings: It's just this one. This is the last one. I'll be back in a few seconds. Apologies.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Woman: (Unintelligible) is right here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I again think what Subbiah has written was in my comfort zone perfectly well.

Avri Doria: Yeah. Sounds good to me. Glad he did his homework. (Unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. We just need Marika back so she can...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...see what we're doing.

Marika Konings: I'm back.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: I think the solution is...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Subbiah is right.

J. Scott Evans: ...to substitute the first sentence of that first paragraph with a sentence that Subbiah has suggested.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: This is a Section 6.2.2.3, which I'm not so sure was in INTA's list.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes it - oh, 2.2.3, you're right. It wasn't.

J. Scott Evans: I don't think it was. I'm not having that list in front of me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. They did Section 2.2...

J. Scott Evans: Yeah. And I would say that - I see what they - yeah, 2.2 and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. We need to add it. You're right.

J. Scott Evans: Well, you know, here's what I want to know. Wait just a second. This is a drafter's thing though. If it's - are required like Section 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 that's everything under there, correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So that's it.

J. Scott Evans: So it would be 6.2.1, 6.2.2 and 6.2.3. Get rid of the 4.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: And so that takes - you know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All of those and everything that works under them.

J. Scott Evans: And we could for the...

Avri Doria: All required - are we sure that they're all required? Everything under this is all required?

J. Scott Evans: Well, I mean we can go through and look. But...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Workgroup definition, mission and purpose, timeline and milestones and disclosure of interest.

J. Scott Evans: I get - I can't get to the document.

Avri Doria: Yeah. It's probably true. I'll check it later, but yeah.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Avri Doria: I have to run...

J. Scott Evans: And for the appearance of clarity we could say like Section 6 - like 6.2, 6.2.2, 6.2.3 and all associated subsections or something.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That makes it even more (simply), yeah, good idea.

J. Scott Evans: So they know that it's inclusive of every sub point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh my heavens.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And beautifully timed Mr. Chairman. Beautifully timed.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. We are done.

Avri Doria: I got to run. I'll talk to you. Bye bye.

J. Scott Evans: All right. Bye.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

J. Scott Evans: So our plan now is to get these final changes into the document and then have it circulated for comment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Our group).

J. Scott Evans: And were we going to try to have a call next week Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes that could be the final review and I don't know if you then - I don't know whether you want to do the consensus call before submitting it to the PPSC.

J. Scott Evans: Well I mean I think we have to do a consensus call before doing it. My question is do we want a call next week or do we want to have a call on June 3, ah 2nd.

Marika Konings: Well, it depends if all the deadlines for submission - I mean I was talking with (Charles) before. I mean the deadline for adopting...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So these...

Marika Konings: ...for the Brussels meeting is the 31st of May.

J. Scott Evans: But that's for the GNSO, right? Not to the PPSC.

Marika Konings: No. In principle that's documents that are being discussed in Brussels.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, So.

Marika Konings: Although you could of course argue that, you know, it's not the community that is discussing this document but it's the PPSC. But - so.

J. Scott Evans: Right. Why do we want to get into that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But if it means the difference between meeting next week or not and we're at this point...

J. Scott Evans: Yeah. Let's just do it next week.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Marika Konings: Well I think you have to decide for the less - I think relatively shortly because there are only a few changes.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: So what I can do is one document that has the, you know, the comments and our callout and the as tracked changes...

J. Scott Evans: I would ask...

Marika Konings: ...and I'll just file a completely clean version (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Okay. And I would ask a question Marika with regards to them - with regards to any sections in six that they believe are important enough that they should be required.

Marika Konings: Okay. And should I ask people then to - if they have any further edits to provide them, you know, close of business by Tuesday...

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...so that we have a kind of final document...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...to review on Wednesday.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Marika Konings: And then you can still have a couple of days for like the consensus call to see if...

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Marika Konings: ...there are any major issues and have it in by the - to the PPSC by the 31st basically.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And so Marika for the ease of a quick read which some people might be doing, those sections that we're taking from the other workgroup, can we put those in a sort of slightly different font or text or size or just so it's seen this is, you know, lifted and moved. Otherwise, they'll be intending to go you don't mention GNSO in the following sections but you've got it stuck here, here, here and here. And we don't have to respond to that here. Well that's coming from another workgroup.

Marika Konings: So maybe put a (cur sign), does that work?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just something. Just something to highlight, you know, this one is actually - (unintelligible) whatever is current from the other workgroup.

Marika Konings: Yeah. I can maybe - and then so I can try to find a way to (fix) that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Some - yes. Something (that they can implement), just makes it clear.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: All right. All right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's fantastic. J. Scott could I ask how old kitty is?

J. Scott Evans: Fifteen.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh wow.

J. Scott Evans: Fifteen and she's just getting old. And I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: ...hate that. Now next week I am in Boston at the INTA meeting which means that this call for me is going to be at 1:00 in the afternoon. Okay. I just got to keep it in my head. All right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Thanks J. Scott. Thanks Marika.

J. Scott Evans: Thanks guys. Thanks Marika.

Marika Konings: Thanks everyone.

J. Scott Evans: Bye.

Marika Konings: Bye.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks very much.

END