Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Working Group Model (WG) Work Team (WT)
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 21 April 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 21 April 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-20100421.mp3

On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#apr

(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
Jonne Soininen – Individual
Alexey Mykhaylov
Iliya Bazlyankov
S Subbiah –Iindividual

Staff:
Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery

Absent apologies:
Caroline Greer

Coordinator: Excuse me, I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being

                  recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You

                  may begin.

J. Scott Evans: Okay Glen can you do a roll call for us?

Glen de Saint Gery: Certainly Jay Scott. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the PPSC working group call on 21 April.

And on the call we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Iliya Bazlyankov, J. Scott Evans, Jonne Soininen, Alexey Mykhaylov Avri Doria, and Subbiah. Forgive the bad pronunciation of your names.

And from staff we have Marika Konings and myself, Glen de Saint Gery. And may I ask you all to give your name before you speak because that would hope for the transcription.

Thank you very much. Over to you Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Hi. This is J Scott Evans. And I understand that we ended - do we want to start today with looking over some of the suggested language or do we just want to push on to 2. 1.3?

Subbiah: This is (Sabaya) here. I'm okay with either. But it would seem that if we didn't look at the suggested language now we'd probably all forget about it until get back to looking at sometime in the future. Probably make more sense to just review quickly right now.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. So that would be in the box provided. Is that correct Marika the...

Marika Konings: No. The proposed language is actually on Page 18 incorporated already in Section 2.2.

J. Scott Evans: In which section?

Marika Konings: Section 2.2 on Page 18 on the bottom of Page 18 and going into top of Page 19.

J. Scott Evans: Eighteen of 20. This first starting with members (Fred Languin). And this addresses Mike O'Connors comments that we needed to put some clarification around member of a working group, what that entails or what the responsibilities of a working group member would be.

So this is going into the section where - which is Section 2.2 which talks about team member roles and responsibilities.

And I think didn't we decided in our first call that we would change - one of the things we decided was to change - is it the term teen to group throughout the document or was it the other way around?

Change the term to working group Marika. So we need to - I noticed that in this section it talks about team.

Marika Konings: Yes the change - I mean some of the change I would discuss in the first call that aren't probably in the notes haven't been done...

J. Scott Evans: Okay all right, right.

Marika Konings: So that will happen.

J. Scott Evans: Working group member roles and responsibilities rather than team member roles and responsibilities. And we put in - we've got chair. We've got co-chair. We've got liaison.

To address Mike's comment we have this new suggested language that is in red.

Now I'm scrolling down the document. Is that doing it - is that scrolling down for everybody?

Man: No. We've all got our own control.

Man: Not for me.

Marika Konings: No it didn't, Marika. Everyone can scroll individually.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. So is everybody there Page 18?

Man: Which box?

J. Scott Evans: It's a bullet point red underscore begins with the term members?

Man: Okay.

Man: Yes it seems about right at least for me.

Woman: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: I mean it seems to me to capture what I read in the transcript is what...

Man: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...consensus was.

Man: Right.

J. Scott Evans: The (Shipo)...

Man: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...link before we get to the sub bullet point talks about the fact that it is your
                    responsibility to drive work done and that this can be done in different ways.
                    And that that plays a role but they are not the driving force, they are to assist.

Man: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: (Unintelligible) sort of an example of some duties that responsibilities without making them look mandatory which I think was Avri's biggest concern.

Subbiah: Yes. This is (Sabaya). My read of this is that it seems to be more or less what we discussed last week.

Man: Yes.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I just had one note after reading through it. Maybe as these are examples, does it make sense to add example of member responsibilities may include...

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...just to indicate that not all of these might be appropriate, some of them might be. Would that help?

J. Scott Evans: Sure. But does everyone else agree?

Man: Yes. Seems okay.

Man: This is (unintelligible). I agree.

J. Scott Evans: Avri agrees, Cheryl agrees, so take it away Marika.

                    All right let's go back up to 2.1.3 which is up. Now we have Marika communicated to the group that's considering the specifics with statements of interest and disclosures of interest, the comments we've received on those sections. Have we communicated that to that group?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes this has been communicated. And I think the folks to discuss it on their call today. And I don't know Avri, are you in that group as well. Maybe you can give an update if they actually...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Marika Konings: I can check back with my colleague and see?

Avri Doria: I must start out by saying oops. We spent all day all meeting talking about SOIDOI. And I didn't remember.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Avri Doria: I am bad. I ended up chairing the meeting because I was co-chair, got totally into co-chair mode and totally forgot what I was supposed to do. I apologize.

J. Scott Evans: That's okay. Is there any way that you could send something to their list that just encapsulates the comments we've received?

Avri Doria: Certainly I can. Let me see where are these - what page are we on, on this one?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think, you know, because I did send everything to (Julie) I haven't...

Avri Doria: Oh okay. We went through all the (unintelligible). We went through all the stuff that (Julie) had. And we spent a lot of time talking about the INTA comments...

J. Scott Evans: Okay that would have been...

Avri Doria: ...and resolved that. So if (Julie)...

Marika Konings: Okay got it.

Avri Doria: ...has them then we're cool.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right, I just want to make sure that they're going to be considered. And so okay...

Avri Doria: Oh yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...now 2....

Avri Doria: If (Julie) had them they're covered.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. So INTA made a comment here that recommends the information be circulated regarding selective work prior to the first meeting especially if members will be voting on selection of a chair or making other (unintelligible) during that first call.

Perhaps that information can be provided with the acceptance email notifying working group applicants that their application has been accepted as they will be part of a working group.

The email did also set out the roles and responsibilities (unintelligible) of selected members in more detail.

So this seems to be saying that they want an introductory email to go out prior to the first meeting that sets forth I guess who all has volunteered for the committee or the working group.

Subbiah: This is (Sabaya). I see no harm in such an email. And as far as the issue of setting up the roles and responsibilities one way of addressing that will be maybe such an email could just include but we just did in Section 2. Whatever it was, just cut and paste that thing, you know?

J. Scott Evans: I just want to make sure from a practical standpoint why don't we get Glen's input here just with what occurs now as secretariat when a working group is put together? Glen are you still with us?

Gisella Gruber-White: This is - okay Glen is there.

Glen de Saint Gery: Can you hear me J. Scott?

J. Scott Evans: I can now yes.

Glen de Saint Gery: Okay. What happened, well the call for participation goes out. The participants are told - are given my address and mailing list is set up. Public archives is set up.

                   And then the call for segment of interest goes up. These get collected and they are posted on the Web site and usually on wiki as well. Do you want other details?

J. Scott Evans: Do you ever - did they ever receive some sort of email from you advising that they're - they've been accepted onto the working group team?

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes. Yes they receive an email saying that they have been accepted on the working group team, that their email address has been put up. They're given a warning that they must not put sensitive information on the public mailing list.

                   And if they are any other particular things about the working group but not - they're not usually.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. So it seems to me that then this would be different from an acceptance email because as acceptance and e-mail goes out to each person as they are dealt with.

The bigger question...

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Did I hear someone say something?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Can I ask something?

J. Scott Evans: Sure.

Marika Konings: Because in addition to this individual email that people get, we do before the start of the meeting of course try to reach out to try to find dates to have a first meeting.

But normally that also includes information or what we would like members to review before the meeting. So it might include information, the charter or background documents.

If we already have the information together on members that are subscribed to date we might circulate that as well.

But often as, you know, members come in often, you know, until the moment that we actually start the working group and often still a few days after that, that's normally no strict stop, you know, a time at which...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) proposals.

Marika Konings: ...application to actually, you know, have that information beforehand might not be realistic and maybe there needs to be some flexibility around that.

Also in the inter-(common date) they talk about selective members and seem to imply that some selection's being made which members are accepted in a group and which aren't which is not the case as it currently is.

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Marika Konings: But (it's a) misunderstanding on how the working group model works or I'm not sure.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Subbiah: I think there is some level of collection because there'd be a limitation if too many apply, right? I mean...

Avri Doria: No that's not the case.

J. Scott Evans: Oh.

Subbiah: Okay, all right. Okay. I mean even if 100 people apply we would - the thinking is that the working group would function with 100 and just go forward?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Man: Okay.

Marika Konings: What would happen is (unintelligible) what has happened in the vertical integration there over 70 people have subscribed. What has happened there is they have installed a certain date after which they won't accept new members.

They take into account the group is already very big and that, you know, with so much information shared very difficult for (each) member, you know, to come in at a later date.

So there after that I think staff did advise that it's not customary to actually close a working group. But they are the chairs and then the working group decided that they wanted to put a certain date, I think, you know, one month after the working group started and actually put a date at which time no new members could join the group. But in principle there's no limitation on how many members can join.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. So it seems to me that what INTA is saying is you're sending out this initial email, it says the last sentence we have is currently drafted.

In addition the ICANN staff are expected to provide the members of the working group with the relevant background information including any relevant historical data and recommended materials reviewed prior to the first meeting.

Marika you said that's already being done?

Marika Konings: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: So it seems to me that what they're also asking is that that email also include a list of the members of the working group and to have that section that we just read, the definition of new members roles and responsibilities to be included in the email to just remind them that they're expected to drive work forward.

So the question is that could easily be handled in a sentence that says the initial email shall also include - and I don't think you could - I mean I'm practically speaking. I'm not so sure it works to put everyone's name in an email.

But couldn't you just provide a link to where the names are already posted? Because didn't Glen say their names are already put out?

Marika Konings: J. Scott normally the names are added to the wiki But it often happens after the first meeting and - because we're still, you know, trying to collect information.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: Another point is that of course in that email in which we send all the recommended information we would of course include this document once finalized because it is of course the key for every new working group that starts.

                    So that information would be in there already. So you might want to say if you want to lift that out. But I think the intention is as well for the working group chair in its first meeting to go through those different key items and, you know, the expectation that members review this document.

                    So I'm not really sure whether you need to call that out even more in the email which already has a lot of information on what, you know, members will need to review, when they need to meet, where they can find information.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: So that would be my concern there.

J. Scott Evans: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes Scott, sorry. (Unintelligible).

Woman: That's (Stephanie).

J. Scott Evans: Okay now it's cleared up.

Glen de Saint Gery: Can you hear me?

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Glen de Saint Gery: An email is sent out with the members' names on just before the list closed or when you think the list is closing.

Sometimes somebody asks you to send the names of all the people that have subscribed to the particular working group at the certain stage just to know who's there. And this is done, so I would bet almost done at regular intervals.

J. Scott Evans: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

Go ahead Glen. Because there's more that you do that seems to be picked up. Yes go on.

J. Scott Evans: So...

Woman: Okay. You go next Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay I was just saying I don't think we need to do any more with this INTA comment other than suggest they have got the wrong end of the stick because that's indication of closing because of selecting members which is not the model that we're looking at.

But everything that is in my experience as being an applicant and then being brought into work groups everything they asked for actually happens anyway.

So Glen has certainly done all of that as far as I'm concerned. I do note that there is always the slight mismatch that also goes on between when people put in their declarations of interest and the full complement of the declarations

of interest as they get accumulated up onto the wiki part that's always linked is another way where everyone knows exactly who is currently on any particular work group as it begins.

And a simple addition of linking this document when completed should satisfy all of the requirements raised by INTA.

But should we have the overwhelming urge to draw particular attention to the section we can do that in a pro forma sentence.

J. Scott Evans: Okay (Sabaya)?

Subbiah: Yes. I have a more general, I mean at this point. My - this brings a more general issue here. I know it's different if they're 800 people who participated in public comment. Then it's obviously a different (kettle) or (ball) of, you know, thing.

But in this case it's just a few people who, you know, lengthy but few people have bothered to put out public comments.

So my question is the way to address that is obviously one way is to read their comments and take what they're saying and make some changes in the wording.

And that's what we're doing. And perhaps in this case the right thing to do is just have a pro forma sentence because we have a lot of it already in - is already in there anyway.

But my question is the second way is a matter of communicating with the person who - or people came up with these public comments to say look, this is how we've addressed it as, you know, instead of my point is this is a public relations exercise at some level, right? I mean people are bothering to write comments.

And my question is is there another mechanism we have? Are we - will we be writing back to the people who wrote the public comments or so saying that besides them digging through the document to see how we've addressed their concerns?

You know, is there sort of less, you know, a formal way or whatever way of letting them know look, you know, this is how we take care of your problem or whatever? Is there one?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It's not practice to, you know, right back to those that submit comments. But what we might refer people to in - on the wiki is once we got through this document and we've captured here all the notes in relation to the comments, those that come back and say well what did you do with my comments, we can point them to this document and say look here you can see, here are the notes from, you know, all the others who've discussed and how we've addressed them. And you'll see in this redlined version including the comments what has changed.

Woman: Yes.

Marika Konings: And then on the basis of that, you know, we'll eventually produce...

Subbiah: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...a clean new document. So and that way people can track what we did with comments and how we discussed them, what the group...

Subbiah: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...thought of them and, you know...

Subbiah: So...

Marika Konings: ...what has been incorporated.

Subbiah: So may I suggest - I mean from saying what you just said, a way to address is not only here but other places as well?

                  But I think part of the problem is we hear this all the time, right? I mean all of us here oh, I'm sure in the case of 800 people comment, it's difficult, yes.

                  But generally we hear the comment oh I bothered to put all these comments and they didn't do anything. You know, that's a common thing I've heard.

                  Now part of that can be addressed by little - being a little proactive all right? And I think reading what you've just said perhaps the way would be we make the change whatever in this case a pro forma sentence if necessary like - and number one.

                  Number two there is this link that you're talking about where our discussions are there so someone could see if, you know, we've addressed it, how we've addressed that point besides making the change itself in the document.

                  Now so we can make use of that in this particular case perhaps by saying, you know, into this comment, you know, in this so-called link where this - maybe we make some specific wording to say, you know, enter as regards - into their comment there are based on this and this is how we're taking care of it. So it's kind of there.

                  And the third thing is in this case would it be possible because I mean it exists, but to remind the people who shared the public comments, you know, in this case four or five people, after all this is over after we've done the document, to send an email to them saying hey, you know, we've addressed some of your (unintelligible). It's a generic email. And please look at this link and see how we've addressed all your concerns.

I mean because unless that's not done - I mean the point is to avoid some bitching down the road. That's what I'm trying to, you know...

J. Scott Evans: It would...

Subbiah: ...suggest.

J. Scott Evans: If that's your goal you just might as well throw the towel now.

Subbiah: Well you know, okay.

J. Scott Evans: And I think if you go through this document...

Subbiah: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...there are comment boxes where it says as most agreed with the previous suggestion this, you know, it says what we - when we didn't take action what we did and when we did take action it tells you where and it shows the language in highlighted languages.

Now part of it...

Subbiah: I understand that. I understand that. But the point is that at the end of the thing if we reminded all the people who public commented, look there's such a site where you can go check what we did, right? That's the point.

J. Scott Evans: I think you're right. And I think all - but most of these people know that.

Subbiah: Yes. Well...

J. Scott Evans: This particular instance.

Subbiah: Well a few people (unintelligible) certain, yes.

J. Scott Evans: Regards to the INTA comment I understand that everyone believes that this is already covered.

                    Two, do you - do I - by using your voting mechanism on the Adobe do we want to put in a sentence that just says that and recommended materials for review prior to the first meeting including but not limited to a link to the completed working group guidelines or do we just want to stay silent and put a comment that says we believe this is already being done in practice?

                    First thing is do we want to put a sentence that specifically says at the end of this section or in the - say the penultimate paragraph that to address this comment by stating that we will send either a link or these guidelines to the working group members? So that's first. Do we want to do that? Cheryl says yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If we weren't going to send a link...

Man: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...to these guidelines when they're completed then I'm wondering why I've been getting up at 4:00 am every week for so many months.

J. Scott Evans: I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Clearly work group members need to have access to these guidelines and that's the perfect place to put it in their email. Say here we are. Here is your book of words that you really ought to address and have good working knowledge of.

If we want to put in a pro forma sentence in addition to that that says and please, you know, have a good look at Section 2.3 - 2.2 sorry, then great. But yes put in the sentence.

J. Scott Evans: Avri agrees. Cheryl agrees. I agree.

Man: I agree as well to this...

Subbiah: I haven't figured (that out) yet (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: (Sabaya) is your hand still up or is that...

Subbiah: Yes it's up because I am stupid and I don't know how put the switch - the voting thing on I guess where the button is. I can't see it. But I'm voting...

J. Scott Evans: Place where you can raise your hand, if you do the drop-down button it gives you a whole lot of choices.

Subbiah: Oh other options okay...

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Subbiah: Okay there, got it.

J. Scott Evans: Technology it's just, and you can also...

Subbiah: Oh I know.

J. Scott Evans: ...clear it like I just did and Cheryl just did and everyone just did. All right so let's - so Marika so we're clear. We're going to put in a sentence that states that that initial email will also include a link to the completed working group guideline.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: All right, that's how we - now 2.1.4 again INTA has comments. They recommend circulate information regarding the selected members of the work prior to the first meeting.

So that's - they've already said that in the last comment. Again, I think some of those comments are already covered just by the way things are currently done this - advising them that everything's public. I mean they're getting an SOI warning, right? It tells them everything they do is public?

Marika Konings: Yes. That's correct.

J. Scott Evans: So it seems to me that our response here would be a comment. Who - do we have consensus that this looks like these are good points but we feel the guidelines already cover them?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry J. Scott. It's a little bit - it's almost two questions in that one. Yes I think the guidelines cover it but I think there is the matter of we in here in the middle of doing all these guidelines are bringing with us our experience set and our - the specific additional knowledge that we get from either that experience or from what the secretariat has reminded us happens.

There is perhaps I think for the new person or the person who hasn't recently gone through joining a work group it may not be clear in the guidelines what happens from cradle to grave in this process such as Glen just took us through.

Now I'm not suggesting that what happens as those operational aspects of how the secretariat manages the beginning of a work group and those logistics belongs in this document at all.

But I am wondering if it belongs somewhere and this document could refer to it. In other words if heaven forbid a meteorite fell out of the sky and Glen was no longer doing this the next Glen could work, pick up a piece of paper and go oh, that's how we do this and it just gets done. Do you know what I mean?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. But isn't that covered already in section 2.1.2 where it says the junior secretary will be cast together expressions of interest to participate in the working group?

And I think somewhere else we talk as well that everything is public and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes but it's - they're very high level. The details that Glen gave us which answer each and every one of the comments, at least ones that I've read through, that's informed knowledge that we have because we've experienced it. It's not obvious to a new person. Do you know what I mean?

Marika Konings: I understand but - I'm worried if we write too many details in here that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh I want it written in here, no Marika...

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible) oh okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I did say not in this document. It does not belong in this document.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It may be referred to in this document. But there is a standard operational procedure performed by the secretariat listed at insert link and that's somewhere else. Now at the moment it, you know, it's in the way that Glen does things.

Woman: Cheryl this is...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes Glen? I'm not sure whether there is a (guild edged) book that someone can pick up and do everything that Glen does it in exactly the way Glen does it.

Glen de Saint Gery: Sorry this is Glen. This - couldn't that be in a procedures manual?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. That's the (guild edged) book I was referring to.

Glen de Saint Gery: Is this group going to also come up with how we should write this procedures manual?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I fell off for a bit and have lost track of what the topic is.

J. Scott Evans: Well...

Subbiah: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: ...actually it sort of dovetails on what we were talking about before. INTA comments .1.3 and 2.1.4 are talking about the fact that they believe that we need to be more specific or clarify the information that will be provided to the group prior to the first meeting.

So in 2.1.3 they say they think that all the member's names need to be circulated to everyone before the prior meeting because they will be selecting a chair and/or vice chairs and they need to be reminded that everything will be public.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Public.

J. Scott Evans: So down to this comment in 2.1.4 which talks about the first meeting and what they're going to go over, INTA seems to say well prior to you getting to this point you need to circulate this introductory information.

Instead of doing it the first meeting it should have already been circulated. So this will help ensure that the members are prepared to make substantive decisions at the time like electing a chair so and advise them well in advance that the meetings, the mailings, everything is public. So...

Subbiah: This is (Sabaya). To me this is, you know, one way or the other. It seems to be sort of covered anyway. But it doesn't really make any difference to me whether we add some lines in or are not. I mean I'm okay with it either way.

But it does make me think about this topic because I didn't think about this - I mean and reflect just in the last few minutes.

And I'm just thinking to myself in the times that I've participated in committees like this one or the one before, you know, I was asked to put a statement of interest and I did so.

And I think I vaguely understood that it was public and everything. But I it didn't - I didn't really understand that until after I sent it in and then it was on a site and I realized yes, it is public, you know.

And that made me think, you know, any email any discussions here, I know it's being recorded everything but, you know, didn't - until I see it out there right, I don't really - I didn't really appreciate that I am putting stuff out there that is public.

Now, you know, it doesn't matter to me. And I've been fine. But I can see how other people coming in from businesses, you know, lawyers representing firms or companies they have to worry about the company's position as well.

And I can see why, you know, I mean it's true it's all that we should understand that, you know, these things are public.

But I myself came into these things without actually having recognized that fact absolutely up front. Do you know what I mean? It - so I can see why INTA might want to ask for this. That's all I'm trying to say.

J. Scott Evans: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes well and one of the things that we did talk about in the Operations Team meeting was indeed on the SLIDOI and making sure that people knew that this was public and, you know, privacy, et cetera.

I know that the IUTF and other groups got into this kind of thing. But yes it was all open mailing lists and yes we all knew that it was public, et cetera.

But in various places, you know, before you ever signed up for anything there was a - there is a big (nata bena), you know, I think that says or please note well - or whatever they say.

It's, you know, written in big bold white letters on a black background anything you say, you know, anything you write...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Will be taken down and held against you.

Avri Doria: Exactly. You know, is public, it's recorded, it's archived, it's anything, you know. Be aware.

And so I agree we all know it. We all should know it, but somebody walking in the door doesn't...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's the newbies.

Avri Doria: ...and again it's a liability cover for anybody that, you know...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...I never knew that was secret. Well yes, see the big sign at the door?

J. Scott Evans: Okay. So why don't we just state - I'm not so sure where we put it but it seems to me what we're basically saying way to do this, (altercations) from the GNSO session (unintelligible) regards to working group activities will bear a disclaimer reminding participants that mailing list or, you know, blah, blah, blah, blah, is all public. That...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I mean I think we put here several times in the document I mean the paragraph before here as well talks about that mailing lists will probably get archived, the meetings are recorded...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...and are transcribed. I think as well it's called out in the first meeting to make sure people are aware.

I don't know if you are making things overly complicated by, you know, in having requirements to add language to each message and things like that.

You know, people are required to read this document when they start a working group. And, you know, I agree some people don't do it and they might not be aware.

But, you know, I think we should be careful as well that we are not overly, you know, holding their hands every step of the way and make sure as well that they have some responsibility.

And I think it's one of the chair's things to call out in the first meeting, you know, be aware this is information that's going public. Your statement of interest will be posted.

And, you know, it's called out here several times in the document that and, you know, it's all about transparency and openness.

So I'm curious, you know, what more would you like to...

J. Scott Evans: Cheryl?

Marika Konings: ...do. I mean one thing to add here is like (unintelligible) are required for working group participants and will be publicly posted. I mean if you want to highlight that for example it's an easy way to do.

J. Scott Evans: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes I just want to go back to the fact I don't think we need to tweak this document to make it all things to all people.

I do think we need to remind them as Avri was outlining that in the initial correspondence between a potential work group person and then putting in the declaration of interest and it being publicly posted in that interaction which is an administrative thing, that clearly if we can put it out in big bold letters then equally fine.

But that belongs in what Glen described as a small piece of a procedural manual, not in this document. This document can have the - and is publicly posted perhaps highlighted at the relevant section.

But to go into the minutia of, you know, what color pen people are going to using is just not what these documents are for.

The point I guess we need to remember is people don't get to these documents until a certain way down the pathway.

They've already started to interact to say yes I even want to be part of this work group and may very well have put in an SOI before they get hold of this link ascertain, assured known way of knowing that they have to get this and read it.

So we just need to pick up that beginning stuff. And that's actually done administration-wise, not enshrined in the documents at least in my opinion.

Subbiah: No that - sorry this is (Sabaya). And I think I just realized what I mean. I was sitting here trying to reflect because I haven't, you know, I've been work part of the working group so I see bits and pieces and you know, we make changes.

I'm in the middle of it. I don't see this whole document as an entirety because, you know, as this outsider coming in.

So I'm asking myself this question, what does it look like with somebody who read the whole thing is a new thing from the outside?

And here we have of all things a lawyer, you know. And either they - I find it - I'm likely to think, you know, in terms boy the dumb lawyer or whatever to read this and do this. I mean I'm pretty sure they're very careful and they're lawyers.

And they're looking at this and they felt it necessary to make this point twice after reading this - the same point twice after reading this document.

That means that makes me think that somehow it's not upfront and obvious. And I was asking myself why?

And I think Cheryl seems to have answered that because I didn't realize that which is what she's saying is that these lawyers - say a lawyer or the

intercommunity if somebody wants to get onto this committee and they've already put an SOI before I read this, right?

I think that answers the question of why maybe these people are saying what they're saying because they want to make sure of that even before they get in.

And I don't know how to address it but I'm just trying to answer to myself why did they bother to want to make this a point, that's all.

J. Scott Evans: Well it seems to me that circulating introduction information regarding selective members of the working group chair, that's one thing.

But this whole thing about advising them of - they get that or at least the comments we provided the other group is putting together the SOI and DOI information is we...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: They'll be taking that out (here).

J. Scott Evans: That they need to tell them when they put in these (unintelligible) of interest or statements of interest about the (unintelligible) nature of the group.

Now I don't know if they're going to adopt that but that's how we've addressed it, right?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Maybe to add one other thing on if you look at Page 8 2.1.2 that we do say the GNSO secretary will send a confirmation together with a request for statement of interest using the model below, dah, dah, dah, maybe at there as well and details that this information will be publicly posted.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Apologies. Sorry I should have put my hand up J. Scott. I apologize. I've got a different desk configuration because of other work that I've been doing.

And I'm reading from the wrong screen. And because my body language is different I'm not putting my hand out to my keyboard so frequently.

In that particular sentence that Marika just called out it could be added there that that information also includes the link to the work group guideline.

And therefore right early on in those beginning interactions we've at least given them a link to the preparatory the potential applicants, before they even put in their SOI can make themselves available - I'm sorry can make available to themselves this work group guideline.

And I think that sort of helps a bit. But it's a bit chicken and egg. But I would be happy with putting that in up there.

J. Scott Evans: That we put it in the call the announcement of a work group?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, yes.

J. Scott Evans: Point one point one.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Here's any homework, buyer beware.

J. Scott Evans: Ideally the call - when you talk about volunteers say that the call for volunteers will not only ask for statements of interest but it will also include a link to the finalize working group guidelines?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Does that's seem to be? Because if we do that it says in here three times.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: So does - can I see for those still awake? Avri? Somebody has tuberculosis.

Marika Konings: Somebody's dying here.

J. Scott Evans: Okay Avri?

Subbiah: Cheryl don't use that Apple screen.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You know.

Avri Doria: But it would be rude to tell somebody that was dying coughing that they should mute themselves.

                     But anyway, yes I just I totally agree with what you're saying except for the phrase finalized working guide, working group guidelines. Because just finalize working group guidelines means something to us.

                     But what's really necessary is, you know, to the working group or the current working group whether that's - because it's also quite possible conceiving of this that when they're putting together a working group some chartering organization may not only have the working group guidelines but may have some additional ones for the purpose of that specific group.

                     So I think we need to, you know, just pick the words that we say for, you know, the relevant working group guidelines or something.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, I think relevant working group guidelines works. Can I see some green checks if people like that?

                     So Marika as I see how we would handle this the consensus is point one, to include part of the announcement to the working group or - and the call for volunteers that there is a link to the relevant working group guideline?

Marika Konings: This is Marika.

J. Scott Evans: Marika?

Woman: Did we lose her?

Woman: No she's...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'm a bit confused now. Because we're saying the relevant
                   working group guidelines and we're referring to other documents which
                   there's no mention of in this document?

                   I was under the impression we would include some like this announcement
                   will include a link to this document as this is the document we're working from
                   and we're assuming that this will be the standard.

                   So I'm a bit confused as we what are...

Woman: Okay.

Marika Konings: ...that we're referring to.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: I don't care if we put a qualifier on it all. As far as I'm concerned -- but I don't
                   get to vote -- but it seems to me you could just say a link to the working group
                   guidelines.

Avri Doria: If I can Marika the reason I said it that way is because one of the preset
                   positions we've had is that the chartering organization, specifically the council
                   in some particular situations may add an additional, you know, set of
                   requirements on a working group for a particular time. So it would be these
                   guidelines in addition to that.

So I just didn't want to preclude. You're right most of the time the present working group guidelines is this set of guidelines, nothing more nothing less.

But we've I said from the very beginning that that kind of thing is a chartering group's prerogative to add stuff, subtract stuff, say, you know, this is a special group and we expect you to, you know, get 15 members specific from the following group and to get the work done in 2-1/2 weeks. And that would therefore be part and parcel of the relevant working group guidelines.

Marika Konings: But this is Marika. Can't we just then add something the announcement will include a link to the working group guidelines and/or any other relevant information?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure, sure. That's what Avri was saying I think.

Well she broke it out into two clauses. I have it in one but it's the same. But hers is clearer.

J. Scott Evans: And so...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: As I see it Marika you'll give us some suggested language in 2.1.1. And then down at the 2.1.4.1 where INTA comment is we put in a comment group feels that it addressed by its consensus position of adding language 1.1.

Marika Konings: That's correct.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Back down we've - and we've only got about six (minutes) for this and GoDaddy's next. So we will start next week with the GoDaddy comments.

So if everybody would sort of review those and come to the table with your position on those we will begin on page what is currently Page 14, the Go Daddy comments which are listed as GD.

And they are on 14 and bleed over one line onto Page 15. And we will be in the 1800 UTC next Wednesday which is the 28th.

Marika Konings: J. Scott this is Marika. Can I make a comment?

J. Scott Evans: You certainly may.

Marika Konings: I just want to point out that if this group wants to have something to discuss in Brussels a final document will need to be put out by the 31 May.

So just to think about if that's the deadline the group wants to be working to how to incorporate it in that time, reviewing all the comments also producing an updated version and having the consensus call.

So suggest maybe to try to do maybe more work on the list or, you know, people might be reviewing comments and providing suggestions or I don't know, or maybe we don't want to be done by Brussels. That's of course another option.

J. Scott Evans: Well I mean the reality is, you know, I just want to, for practical purposes where is Avri, the group on the SOI and DOI? Are they going to have those before Brussels?

Avri Doria: That's done. We basically are doing one more review of the final language. But essentially that's done.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Because, you know, we've got - and let's see here. Let me get to a calendar online. Provided...

Man: This is...

J. Scott Evans: ...a call...

Man: ...just for comment. So the thing is that we have quite many comments. And like the - we seem to need quite much time for meeting for just like we went through two comments this time.

J. Scott Evans: I know. That was my point is we're not...

Man: We have to pick up the speed a little bit. And that means off-line work I think.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Well why don't we do this, why don't we as a group go through all the remaining comments in Section 2.

                 And our goal is to have your position stated. And let's move through these quickly and be finished with - try our goal to be finished with Section 2 which there's not that many sections left, but be finished with Section 2 by the end of our next call.

Woman: Sure thing.

J. Scott Evans: Do you think that's something we can do? Then we'll do - break it down like that. And...

Marika Konings: So J. Scott, would you like me maybe then to send those comments like maybe in separate threads to the mailing list so people can actually start...

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...commenting on them on the mailing list and that might help..

J. Scott Evans: Hopefully.

Marika Konings: ...some other...

J. Scott Evans: Sure.

Marika Konings: ...that are not on the call or can't participate to join in the discussion?

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Avri I mean it looks like Cheryl didn't die so...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I didn't die. It was touch and go there and it probably still is. I agree with what you're saying and to block it out and say, you know, we're going to - at the next meeting we are going to finalize Section 2.

But I want to say two things. One is in a lot of these comments, they are repetitious and at times the same thing's said in different ways.

I'm not suggesting that we in any way try and aggregate them but I do think we need to do this read ahead business.

Because what I was going to say is in the five minutes we've spent deciding whether - and how we move onto the next meeting we could have actually dealt with GoDaddy's comments. Because some of it's already been dealt with what we've dealt with INTA and other things further up.

So there is that sort of ability to read ahead which I think is probably important. And what Marika just, said putting it out in lumps and actually getting the rest of the work team involved as well could be really handy from that point of view.

The other thing is J. Scott if we do find ourselves pressured in terms of deadline times you could consider if the group wants to meet at a - the same period of the day but for a - an additional 30 minutes on a couple of meetings.

And if we know that...

J. Scott Evans: Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...in advance we can clear our schedules so a 90 minute as opposed to a 60 minute meeting. That's all I was going to say. But thank you for wondering if I had survived. Yes so far so good.

J. Scott Evans: It looks like Avri agrees. So let's just get through 2. - let's get through Section 2 next week.

Again if you feel something's already been handled that's a - that is a valid comment.

And if we get enough consensus based on the mailing list we don't even need to cover it in the call. We can only cover - we can cover those things where there's consensus that it needs to be addressed. Okay?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But to do it in small lumps otherwise we...

J. Scott Evans: Absolutely.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...are defeating the purpose that...

J. Scott Evans: The goal is to finish Section 2 by the end of the next call, all right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: That gavel down. Everyone we'll talk to you same bat time, same bat channel next week.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All right.

J. Scott Evans: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Avri Doria: Bye.

Marika Konings: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Thanks.

Glen de Saint Gery: Cheryl get better.

Woman: Yes, be well.

END