Note: The following is the output of transcribing at the PPSC Work Group Meeting held in Sydney on Sunday 21 June 2009 at 14:00 Local time. 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.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: Everyone, the next meeting is scheduled to start at 2:00 but we are going to give it another five minutes because we are waiting on Ken, our staff liaison, to get here.

 [Break]

 Okay, everyone. Our staff liaison has gotten here, and so I would like us to call to order and -- so we can get started.

 So I'm J. Scott Evans, and I'm the chair of the working group work team, which is what this group is. For those of you, I'll just let you know where you are. For those of you that are here for observers, this team is part of the GNSO improvement. And what we are working on is two separate subgroups, one which is getting together a draft template to guide working groups in how to create a charter.

 And the other one is an operational handbook that will help work teams -- working groups, as they are formulated by the council, they will then have some sort of parameters or guidelines for how they are to operate. And so it's to assist us in the process so that as we new people matriculate through the system, it is not reinventing the wheel every time. People don't have to relearn everything, and there is some basis of consensus and consistency in the process. I mean, that's really our goal is to assist new leaders and new working groups so that they can spend more time on substantive work and less time on charting the territory.

 With that said, I'm going to ask Ken who was on our last call, which I believe was held June 10th, to bring us up to date. He has posted this -- for those of you that have access to the Wiki, he has posted this in PDF form on the Wiki so you can look at the minutes there as well. And we're going to bring you up to speed on where we are and what our next steps are.

 Ken?

>>KEN BOUR: Thank you very much, J. Scott. Now, I just need to figure out where am I. So I'm looking at -- I'm going to try to get to the working group team charter page, although if I back up to the working group page that's probably where the notes are, right, from the last meeting? There we go.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: Do you want to project? I can find them if you can't. Let me see if I can do it because I found it this morning.

>>KEN BOUR: Great.

Yeah, I'm not sure that I actually need to go through the call summary from the notes, right? We can just -- yeah, we can just go to --

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: The meat.

>>KEN BOUR: Yeah, to the meat of it. Just scrolling down through the notes.

So from the working group team page, if we go to the team charter -- that's not right. Bear with me a second here. I got it, charter guidelines.

So I'm at the st.icann.org -- the working group team charter page. Does everybody know where that is? Does anybody not know where it is? And we'll get it up in a second. If not, we can plug into me. I'm sure I have got a connection here somewhere.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: Just jump in and I'll catch up.

>>KEN BOUR: Sure. As I mentioned in the notes, the charter subteam, the charter operating guidelines -- we're calling it the working groups implementation and charter drafting guidelines, that subteam, several of us met on 4 June. It was Avri and it was Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Gray was there and myself, I think, was the group that we had.

And we made a tremendous amount of progress actually going through the original outline making decisions about whether a particular element should be in the outline or whether it should be out, and we discussed the rationale for all of that.

And the results are on this page. And I even noted that this is the revised draft outline posted after the 4 June session.

And we ended up creating some new sections, and if we go to the introduction -- I'm not sure if you can see it there or not.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: Why don't we just plug you in, Ken.

>>KEN BOUR: Let's see if this works. Okay. If I hit it again, I

might actually be able to see my screen. That's because I have got a tablet PC. Keep hitting it, right? That's going to turn it off. Let's try it again. Now I'm right side up. No. I will have to read it off the big screen. There is probably a way to do this, I just don't know -- this is a new computer.

>>GRAHAM CHYNOWETH: Do you want to try one more computer and have me do it on this computer?

>>KEN BOUR: Sure.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: I work for one of the largest technology companies in the world and this happens every time we try to do something on PowerPoint.

>>KEN BOUR: Momentarily we'll have this going hopefully.

So the new charter guidelines has an introduction section, and then it has three major sections. And we'll have them in a second. There is the introduction.

And then inside that introduction, we actually described what the three sections are. I'll just read them since it is brief. Section 1 contains background information, informing the effort to create this document as well as suggestions or recommendations related to the implementation of working groups within the GNSO. And so what that's attempting to refer to is all of the material that was in the original outline that -- and I think I liked Avri's term. She called it meta information. It is information sort of about working groups and about how to enable them but it doesn't specifically relate to the building of a real charter. So we took all of the material that was of that meta type and put it in Section 1.

Section 2, then, is comprised of the material that relates directly to a charter that would be written by a sponsoring or chartering organization for a working group.

And then Section 3 is just for amendments, so that was to capture the idea that the document would be living and we would be able to make amendments to it as it goes through experience.

So Section 1, then, also has a short introduction to indicate what it's for. And then we'll have a background -- Section 1.0 background and then some material on revisions, applicability and then information in Section 2 about the implementation of working groups.

There is a bunch of information in here, like the announcement of the working group. This would relate to advertising and telling people what it's for and what it's about. There's a section on security concerns, chair facilitation, expectations and so forth.

And then Section 2 is the place where we actually deal with the charter template itself, and there is an introduction section there. And then you can -- we can walk our way through that sort of briefly and you can see that Section 1 deals with identification of the working group's name, who the chair is and so forth and so on. These would all be parts of a real charter.

The mission purpose and deliverables, major sections. I'm not going to go through all of these. Formation staffing and organization and then Section 4, rules of engagement.

There probably is some important stuff to discuss there around decision-making methodologies. We've talked a little bit about whether or not consensus decision-making has to be prescribed in a tight way, and that will probably depend on which type of working group is being commissioned. If it is one that's related to policy, then quite clearly it would have a very definite definition.

We created Section 5 called working group history: The dates, when was it chartered and all of that kind of information. And then the last section, 3, would be for revisions. So this is Version 1.0, and this is the version posted to the working group team Wiki. Eventually, there will be a 1.1 and a 1.2 and somebody should say we should go to 2, 3, 4 and hopefully over time we'll continue. And we'll be able to tell from the description on what was done on each of those versions. This is where we are briefly on the charter work.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: One of the problems that I have identified is getting everybody involved and helping in drafting. And it's my understanding from the last call, Ken, that there was a group that agreed that Ken is going to work with us to put together some preliminary draft language that we would then all engage in in editing it and expounding upon it and clarifying it as we go through the process. Rather than having this divvied up to a bunch of groups drafting sections, we're going to have Ken work with us on getting it drafted, and then we will take it and craft it as we review it and have our questions and flesh out issues that need to be discussed further on this.

And I think that's probably the best way in order that we can get this done because we need to have this done -- I'll be right with you -- as soon as -- you know, by Seoul. So seems like a long time away but it's just around the corner.

We have a question here.

>> JONNE SOININEN: Jonne Soininen from Nokia Siemens Networks. Hi. I think we need a different approach that we have had thus far because we haven't really made the progress that we wanted perhaps to have until we came here. And, really, if we continue with this, Seoul is not very far away. We will have a couple more sections before Seoul

but we won't be ready if we don't take a different approach.

But I think that -- which I would like to propose that we use this face-to-face session time to kind of, like, get the principles done and stuff like that because I think that I can still read from the comments in the draft here that there are questions about if even some sections are supposed to be here.

And then, for instance, adding text to that and working on those texts and putting forward in that text might not be that useful. Some of these things like importance and priority was one of the sections which I thought shouldn't be there, and I saw Avri's comments said it shouldn't be there.

And the question -- getting all the principles kind of done, then we can give this to maybe to Ken or to a small team to draft. But generally I think that, yes, we do need a different approach than we have done so far because we have to move on.

>>GRAHAM CHYNOWETH: Yeah, I guess I would be interested in hearing the enumeration of those things which were still up for debate because I thought we had actually made some good progress on the calls. I think the main debate point was whether or not -- who the audiences were.

I think there was some confusion as to who the audiences were for the document that we were producing. And once we clarified that the charter was -- it was kind of layers of audiences, right? The first audience for this was the people that were going to draft the charter, and then subsequent to that they were going to draft a document based on this form that the audience of which would be the members of the work group team.

And so my thought is we had actually make significant progress on that and kind of clarifying those and I'd be interested -- to me at least on the last call I was on, it didn't seem that there was that much -- that much debate about what elements were appropriate to include in that.

So I think we could -- I mean, you mentioned one. Are there others that are -- I don't know if this is the right time to discuss this. But are there others that are relevant that we would need to revisit prior to kind of moving forward with actually drafting the content?

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: I mean, personally I don't think there is any -- the way we're planning on moving forward, I don't think there is any problem with going with the outline we have and flushing out that. And then as we get into editing, we can make a decision about whether there are certain areas that don't belong there or not.

I mean, Ken is taking the -- you know, if there are certain sections

like priorities that people feel like are extraneous or need to be shorter, those are all questions we can get into once we get into the editing.

I think I would like to err on the side of over-inclusiveness for the original draft because I think when you go to narrowing it down, then you just find yourself revisiting issues. It is always easier to take away than it is to create something that you feel wasn't there. So I would be preferred -- it seems like this general outline is acceptable, that we flesh this out with text and then we can have -- if there is still -- after the text is there, if there are still concerns about some of the subject matter that's included, then we can have a discussion about whether that needs to be shortened, it needs to be removed.

But at this point, I think the best thing to do is to get something on paper and get as much on paper as we can so that we then have something to start discussing. Ken?

>>KEN BOUR: Yes, thank you. I just quickly scanned through because I wasn't clear that there were any that we hadn't already resolved. I noticed there is a note on -- and it's up on the screen. Gray's got it. It's 2.3, import, impact and priority. And Avri did subsequently add a note, "I still don't think it belongs but I will read what you write and offer an opinion later," which is exactly, J. Scott, what I think you said.

So, yes, there was some discussion on this item that it didn't belong. But we -- in our discussion, I remember that -- and the reason it is still here -- and if you read what I wrote, it says, "Not every charter will be for a PDP item." And our hope was that this drafting guidelines document could be used for working groups other than policy.

And so, for example, the team that we are, which we are a working group, we might have used such a drafting guideline document in building our own charter or the OSC might have used it, had it existed.

And in that particular case, impact, import, priority might have been something they would have said. The reason this is important, it came from a BGC report. It is going to influence the way in which working groups are -- so that might have been a place where it would have applied.

But in a policy case, as Avri has pointed out, it gets very difficult, in which case they can simply ignore this. This would be an optional item. Anyway, that's just a thought about that, Jonne.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: Cheryl?

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just picking up on that -- Thank you very

much, J. Scott. When we were discussing it, I think it was really important that we did spend a good deal of time discussing it even at this point. I was keen to point out in many of these work groups or teams that are going to be produced from these documents, you are going to mixing culture and experience, which is unlike anything you have ever done before, which is not inclusive of those who understand how a normal PDP process works.

 And background, even from a historic and archive point of view, is hugely important. If it is deemed important in this case, this is where you can place it.

 >> JONNE SOININEN: This is just something that I picked where I saw that because I wasn't in the last call. So I was just skimming through this and that was one of the points that I saw that there was some contention.

 Just on that point, I don't think that anybody is going to say that my working group is not important. It has no impact and it should be low priority. So kind of like everybody says, This is the highest priority working group because it's mine. This-- has big impact because it has big impact and don't you understand that? And it should be high priority.

  That's kind of like, even if it is optional, I think that this would be always the case that comes out and kind of like having the criteria, what is important or not would be a discussion that wouldn't be very useful.

 But let it be there if everybody else wants it to be there, and we can discuss when we have the text. I'm fine with that.

 >>J. SCOTT EVANS: You know, personally having been involved in ICANN for ten years, if everybody thought their working group was the highest priority and put effort and time into it, I would be thrilled.

 >>JONNE SOININEN: Talking about creation, actually putting time into it.

 >>J. SCOTT EVANS: I understand, of course, that -- you understand, of course, that some of this is going to be relegated by council because council is going to be managing this process. And just because you draft a charter doesn't mean that council cannot say to you, "We've reviewed the charter and we have problems in X, Y and Z area and we are sending it back to you to address those issues." One of them might be where you place it on your priority.

 But, again, I think your points are well-taken. But I would like to just see text, and then we can -- once we see text and how it is all fitting together, if there are still objections, we can talk about that at that time. But I would much rather get it on paper now and see how

it fits in as an overall piece of the puzzle before we don't put the --
you know, we don't have it as a piece because it's always easy to say,
"Yeah, we had a discussion, this isn't going to work, let's take it
out" rather than to say, "Oh, we didn't do this" and we are revising it
two months after we put it out there. So that would be my preference
and given that Ken is taking the laboring oar for us, we have the easy
part.

 >>CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We have the easy part.

 >>JONNE SOININEN: Just as a comment to that, actually it seems to be
always when drafting text that taking text out is much more laborsome
than actually putting it in. I agree, that's a good thing.

 One thing I had another question, this might be because I missed the
last call is that there are some sections in this document that I think
would be more appropriate in the kind of general working group
guidelines because they are general for all working groups. Whereas,
charter guideline is just for chartering the working group. That was
how I understood it.

 And the thing is we're not -- are we going to discuss or when are we
going to discuss which is appropriate where?

 >>GRAHAM CHYNOWETH: Could you specifically reference which sections
you thought -- I think we are trying to get through this now. I think
that's what the purpose is.

 >>JONNE SOININEN: Well, for instance, things like what they call
here security concerns, chair facilitation expectations, those are
general things, I think.

 >>GRAHAM CHYNOWETH: Would you reference the section so I can get it
up?

 >>JONNE SOININEN: In the Section 2.0, the subsections thereof are
kind of things that I think are general for all working groups and not
specific for a single charter.

 And I think these are important things to write down. The question
is just how we split these two documents because I understood this was
just a document to -- not "just," but a document concentrating on
chartering working groups where some of these issues I think are
general for all working groups, not for a specific one.

 >>GRAHAM CHYNOWETH: My thought on this is -- I mean, these are
instructions that are given to the working group, right, about how --
about how things are going to work. So my thought is that they would
actually apply -- if they're in this document, they would be spoken to
by the chartering entity, and then the working group would take that
information and use that in their work on the working group. So I

don't see why this wouldn't be broadly applicable to all the working groups.

>>JONNE SOININEN: I think -- what was my understanding of the chartering document was to give a checklist, what do you have to show that you have done to charter a working group, the kind of due diligence or checklist of the items that have to be defined for a working group.

Whereas, the working group guidelines was a document that describes kind of the rules or guides how the working group works, which is general for all working groups.

Whereas, the charter document would be something that explains, well, have you -- what are the specific things that you have thought of for this particular working group that you are chartering now.

>>GRAHAM CHYNOWETH: I think this goes back to the question of audiences. And this document -- or at least the way I understand it is that this document is drafted by people who want to have a working group created, right? So that's part of the process -- part of the reason for this document is it forces anyone who wants a working group to get created to think -- to think long and hard about what they're doing.

And then once they produce that, they give that to the entity that would create the working group -- or that would charter the working group.

That entity which has the authority to charter the working group then takes that -- takes this charter, massages it over, maybe changes some of the language and actually issues the charter.

Then that document goes into the hands of the people that would be participating in the working group. So they have a guide with all the relevant terms about what is going to happen in this group that they are now participating in.

I think that's why this is relevant here is that it talks about how this particular group is going to be organized and structured and what it's going to do. And then there's operating norms that go with all of them. But it is really about that packet of information that is received by the people that are going to be on the working group that we want to have -- be the net result of this.

So do you see why I think -- I think it is a relevant thing to have in there, and it is part of that communique that goes from the charting organization to the people that are going to do the work.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: And I think that because of the different audiences, that there may be in the two documents very similar

provisions because they may closely map one another in certain instances and in certain areas. So this is probably one of the areas that is going to map pretty closely in both documents, but I'm not sure that one belongs in one document and not in another document because you have separate audiences and it may not be the same participants that did the chartering that are doing the work. And so you have to have a document that sort of whatever role they're playing covers the material for that role, and it may be that the material is similar because there are similar issues. But we have to cover it in both places. And I think, again, you know, that's the basic point and it may look like it is duplicative.

But I think what gets very complicated for people is when you start sending them, "Refer to Section 2.0 in the other document," they're never going to do it. So it needs to be in the document that's before them.

And the fact that we may have similar provisions in the operating document as we do in the charter document, I don't think the two are mutually exclusive. I think that, you know, you have to have them. Again, what we're trying to do is chart -- I shouldn't use that word since we are talking about charters, but is to plot a course for leaders who are coming into this process without having been involved before. Bertrand?

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thanks, Scott. Apologies for coming late. I'm actually very happy to be able to catch up with the work of this part because it was difficult to devote time to both.

What I understand from the work and what you're saying is that actually the charter exercise and the guidelines or operating principles exercise are working at different levels.

What we're doing in the guidelines or operating principles is basically working methods and they're generic. It basically says a working group works this way. It has a chair, it does, ta-da, ta-da, ta-da.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: That's right.

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: The charter, thing that we're doing at this time is more like a template. It's a fill-in type of box that says, "A charter contains A, a title that says this is the subject; two, this is a brief description of the topic; three, this is how we have decided to distribute it, this is who is going to be the chair, this is the time line," and so on.

So it's basically a template that has to be filled, whereas the other one is an actual document that is complete.

So I don't think there's that much overlap. Quite on the contrary,

the more distinguished it is, the clearer it will be. One is permanent and the other one -- the template is permanent, but the fill-in is different.

 >>J. SCOTT EVANS: Well, I do believe that there could be, you know, some subject matter that is almost identical, because, I mean, you're covering similar -- it's just it's at different levels, and so like this section here where it talks about how to announce the working group and all of those things, because the working group itself is going to have some communications that it's going to have to take care of, and so I'm just saying that just because we put something in -- a subject matter in one document and we cover it in a certain way doesn't preclude it from being in the other document. It may be that it's a different -- it may be that there's a different take on it, or a different approach to it based on the level of where that document is -- who it's speaking to. Again, it's different audiences. Similar information but who's your reader, who's your audience and what is the goal of that particular document, whether it's to define a parameter for how a working team works or working group works, or if it's how to charter that group.

 I see Jonne and I saw Avri and is that it? And Ken.

 >>JONNE SOININEN: Yeah. So this is something that is a new concept for me, this different audiences, because to be honest, actually I don't think that they are different audiences. They're the same people.

 Like there's not going to be a new breed of people coming in ICANN that will just charter working groups but never are going to participate in them.

 And the other thing is that what I would find very confusing, if you find similar but not the same rules or kind of procedures of the same topic in two different places, and keeping those two topics kind of in line would be difficult.

 I take your point that well, people won't go and read a document if you point to a section or stuff like that, but that's packaging. That's what we don't have to do here. We can do that then in a way that, well, when the Secretariat sends the template to the person who's -- or the group who's interested to do -- or the charter working group, they will copy/paste what is in the operation document about chartering a working group. And then you still -- and this would be the template, what is needed to fill out.

 So I think I have the same view as Bertrand has about what is a charter template and what is the difference between an operational document.

 >>AVRI DORIA: I pretty much agree with what Jonne just said. I think anything should only be documented in one place. It can be

included by reference in many places, but having -- having the same thing, sort of, in several places and trying to keep them aligned is close to impossible and disastrous, because then you argue about which set of rules you're following.

So I think a lot of things should be documented just once, in one place, and then included by reference everywhere they need to be.

>>GRAY CHYNOWETH: My thought on this is that -- and the way I see them working together and referencing some of the same stuff but not exactly the same and it working out and making sense is that, for instance, announcement of a working group, to me if you had a variety of different ways in the operating models which described different methods you could use to announce a working group, publicize its existence, different types of outreach that might be involved. That in the charter what would make sense to me is that the chartering entity would say, "All right, of a variety of things which you could do, we want you to do X," right? So in the operating models you say, "These are the various things you could do to announce a working group," and in the charter it would say, "Of the things that we've discussed that are in the operating models of how to do these things, we would like the group that puts this together to announce it with this choice." So with an e-mail to the variety of different constituencies, potentially, you know, a blog in a -- you know, something on the ICANN Web page, whatever it may be. That this would direct the group to select from different options that occur in the operating model which things it should -- which -- in which manner it should implement the different elements of the operating model.

Same thing with the -- with each of these elements. Where there may be many -- there may be things in the operating model which describe particular variations on ways to do things, the charter would be important to reference that because the charter could then say, "Of the various different things that you could do, this is the one that you should be doing. These are the -- these are the elements of that that you should really be paying attention to."

And in relationship to the audiences thing, I think that there's -- I don't -- I think that it's really just about the information you're trying to communicate. I don't think we're talking about different people here.

So -- and when you're talking about referencing the same thing or having the same information in two places, J. Scott, my thought is that it -- it describes the way in which you're going to use or implement the operating models. It gives direction to the people that are doing the work. And so in that sense, it makes sense to have the same thing, in essence, with some direction to it.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: Well, here's my suggestion: My suggestion is the discussion we're having now is fairly academic, and I would suggest

that we get something on paper and then once we get the two documents
fleshed out into a rough draft, we can begin having this discussion
about where we want to put certain sections and where we think it needs
to serve the better purpose.

 And I think that that -- if we spend all of our time talking about
where stuff needs to be, we're never going to get to getting it down on
paper.

 And I don't think there's -- nobody here is committed to being
creative and understanding there might be better placement for things
once we see how everything starts to fit together, but at this point we
don't have anything, so we need to get something on paper and that
would be my suggestion is, we just get it on paper knowing that there
are concerns of these issues -- Avri's been very clear, Jonne has been
very clear, Bertrand has been very clear about their positions.
Keeping those in mind, that those are issues that when we get the
fleshed-out draft documents, those are questions we need to ask
ourselves is, is this the right place for this, will this serve better
in this document or that document, and do those.

 But it needs to get written whether it's going -- it doesn't matter
which documents it's in initially, as long as we understand that we
still have not, in my mind -- it's still a work in progress and until
we get them down on paper and then we start deciding when we see how
they are going to fishtail together, we can do that. That would be my
suggestion. So let's just get the drafting done.

 >>JONNE SOININEN: So I totally agree with you, but...

 [Laughter]

 >>AVRI DORIA: Totally, but...

 [Laughter]

 >>JONNE SOININEN: Yes -- so I think that the -- yes, the discussion
is academic but I think that the discussion -- for instance, I don't
think that we are disagreeing at all. I was just thinking that
something here was generic whereas you said, "No, it's actually about
choices and this document is about being a template where you document
choices." And I think that the discussion is important that we get the
principle, because I think that we had a little bit of confusion about
the principle here.

 You, J. Scott, had a little different view than maybe us two, and we
didn't know that we share the same view. And for getting the drafting
right or the direction right, I think we need the meta-discussion to
give the guidance what should be and where, that every -- that we get
to the right direction. In that sense, I think the discussion has been
fruitful. At least for me.

>>KEN BOUR: I can take another shot at it.

This discussion goes back many, many months, where we first talked --
and when we used this term "audience," think of it as a role, right?
Not -- not -- we're not trying to bifurcate people but we're saying
that people have different roles.

When you are in the charter creation or working group creation role --
so if you're the GNSO Council or if you happen to be the operating
steering committee or the policy process steering committee -- you're
in a role of having to create a working group.

The document that we're looking at now is intended to be instructive
and informing to a group that is intending to create and charter a
working group.

What advice, counsel, guidance, templates, practices, rules,
suggestions would we give to a group of people in the role of wanting
to create a working group.

So that's how this -- that's what this document is intending to do.
Therefore, it's reasonable to say to some group that's wanting to
create a working group, "Here's some things you should think about:
What kinds of liaisons or experts or consultants or staff personnel
might you want to think about as you create this working group?"

That's what Section 2.4 deals with here. It's in Section 1 and it's
a meta-issue. It's not part of the charter itself.

All right. Now, so that's the role of the people creating the
working group.

Once they have actually established one, they have said, "Okay, you,
working group A, you are now chartered," the next question is: What
would that group of people -- it might even be some of the same people
who were in the -- who were creating the working group team that now
are going to join the team. That's okay.

In their new role as working group members, what advice or guidance
would we give them about how to carry out their tasks?

Now, clearly their charter is going to tell them a lot of what to do,
right? It's going to tell them what the mission is, and what their
time frames and deliverables are. But the -- the operating model
document was also going to talk about things like norms and behaviors
and expectations, what kinds of reports and things might you create.

So there would be a whole different set of guidelines that would be
given to a group of people in the role of working group members and/or
working group chairs that would help them or guide them in completing

their tasks.

So that -- I don't know if that helps. It seems pretty clear to me that there are these two different audiences in these different roles and that's what these two documents were intending to do.

And so here again, while you might see this concept of "experts," if I'm talking to the sponsors of creating a working group, I might ask them, "What experts or consultants or guidance do you think your working group's going to need?" They may say, "We'll let them figure it out." Right?

In which case, they defer that item in the charter, right?

When the working group gets together, they might see in the guidelines -- they might see a section that says, "Hey, if you think you're deficient in some particular area of expertise, you should raise your hand to your sponsoring organization and ask for that help to be given to you."

That's a completely different perspective but it's the same topic. Okay.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: Again, I think that once we see a draft, a lot of this will become more -- clearer to us, and my suggestion is that we get together, Ken, and we over the next couple of weeks -- two or three weeks get something on paper on the Wiki that people can look at, and then we can start having a more drilled-down discussion about these things.

I agree with you, I think most of the people here who have at least been in the process of dealing with working groups and having chartered them realize that there are similar subject matters that have different viewpoints, depending on what your role is, and those will have to be addressed differently, because there are different roles.

And so let's -- the take-away from this meeting that I'm getting is that we are going to agree that we're going to let Ken give us a draft that we can then work with him in crafting and building upon and clarifying, so that we can move this process further quickly.

And I just want to make sure that everybody's on board with that. I think that is the most efficient way to do this at this point, so that we then can have discussions on drafts, rather than sitting around trying to wait for people to complete drafts that don't get done.

I mean, it's -- it's merely a working draft, a discussion draft for us to then craft into the final document. Does that sound like something that is acceptable? Bertrand?

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Actually, it's -- just before that stage,

I wanted to come back just briefly on the two -- on the two comments, because I still have -- and unfortunately it's because I have not participated in the whole thing, but there's some ambiguity in here that I'd like to clarify.

The first thing is, you may have a single document that basically says -- and covers the two dimensions that you're saying. It basically has the first part that says, "The charter of the working group should contain at least those elements. Optionally those elements." And that's what I call more or less the template charter.

Within the headlines, for instance, you can say, "Your charter must designate a chair, and the modalities for designation of a chair in a working group is X," or "is X or Y or Z," depending on how you want to choose or not.

Then you get a second part that says, "The working matters -- good standing, operational recommendations -- for a working group are as follows."

And you can even have a third part that is general recommendations or tips or good check boxes or checklists that are things that are good to know.

In the discussion on the PDP, we had lengthy discussion on the paper that has been produced by Thomas Narten, I think, on the birds of a feather, which is a very interesting document that is absolutely not constraining but it is an incredibly good list of how you run birds of a feather. So that's one document.

Then when the charter is being -- is being set up, either there is one working method, one type of working group, and basically you fill the blanks, so on the one document it says, "The chair will be designated by a vote by a majority among the participants," or whatever. The charter contains, "The chair is Mr. or Mrs. So-and-so and has been elected," blah, blah, blah.

The document will say, "The description of the topic and the time line should indicate clearly the milestones," and the charter will say maybe, "These are the milestones that we have agreed upon."

The thing that I want to clarify is, I was very struck by the experience of all the preparatory work for all the different subgroups in the PS -- PPSC, OSC, and so on. The amount of time that has been spent or needed very early on in drafting all those charters indicates the need of the work we're doing now.

My question is: Has the GNSO agreed on the notion that there should be one working group, working method type, or that it should be several working group types clearly defined, or that it is basically a menu of functioning options?

I think these are three different approaches. You can choose one of the thing. But it has very strong consequences on the drafting exercise that you were suggesting. If there is one working group and the goal is to get something that is as generic as possible, it's a different exercise from identifying, for instance, two or three types of working groups very clearly defined or having a menu where you actually choose and pick.

 >>J. SCOTT EVANS: It's my understanding that we're going to have one form, format, for how they would operate that would then adapt. Because one of the things that the working group is supposed to do is to do a self-evaluation at the end of the working group to say what worked and what didn't work.

 So I would assume over time, Avri, that the working group model will mature --

 >>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: But one.

 >>J. SCOTT EVANS: But it will only be one. I think you get into a real problem when you start changing forms because then you get people who feel like the form was picked to drive the agenda.

 >>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Absolutely, yeah.

 >>J. SCOTT EVANS: And so I think you have to come with one consensus form that fits -- it's one size fits all. There may be nuances to that depending on -- you know, some may be 60 people in a working group because of the issues. Some may be 12. You know, size may be a thing that will fluctuate. There's not a -- but it's one model. And I would think most people here agree that that's where we're headed is towards one model, not a menu. It's not McDonald's.

 >>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: No, no. I was misunderstanding, then, your comment when you were saying "pick and choose the different elements." This is why I asked the question. You think it's better to have one, but...

 >>GRAY CHYNOWETH: Yeah. I think I would clarify my statement to be it really goes towards what you're talking about, J. Scott, whether we're going to have 60 people or whether we're going to have five people, whether or not we're going to, you know -- that kind of direction is going to be in the charter. And then you have -- then you have the operating model, which is regardless of whether you have a group of 60 or of twelve, this is the way that you, you know, operate. And to me, it's kind of like a constitution which sets out the direction for the whole thing, and then bylaws of an organization, or a mission statement and then bylaws of an organization, which are your operating norms, how you make decisions, you know. And I think that it could be -- it could be either one document or two. It doesn't really

matter.

 >>J. SCOTT EVANS: Yeah. It's basically so that every member of a
working team knows what their obligations are and what the norms of
behavior are and how it obligates. And then it has in there procedures
for if people aren't being cooperative or they're -- you know, there
are some administrative things that are answered by those could you
understand of things. It's questions -- the toughest question we're
going to have, and we haven't -- we're not going to get to that today,
but everyone needs to remember -- is when we get into this consensus
and how do you reach a decision. And that is a section of the document
that's going to take the most, but I wanted -- and I felt like everyone
agreed that it was easier to sort of know that's an issue we're going
to have to get to, but let's get this thing fleshed out knowing that
the hardest part of our work is going to be that one section. That's
going to be the most difficult part of our work. And it has -- it has
really are challenged ICANN from the very beginning. I mean, we've had
this whole discussion about what's consensus, what's rough consensus,
and we're going to get to that but I want -- I felt it was best -- and
I believe I had buy-in from everyone -- that we get everything else in
place, knowing that that one center piece is going to be tough, and
we're going to have to spend a lot of time on that. So that's the
reason I'm thinking moving ahead with getting this draft in place,
knowing that we're going to have one model, knowing that there are two
different purposes to the documents and the -- the purposes will be
driven what's in the perspective, although it may be -- and that's what
we're going to do.

 So that's where I think we are is to get a draft to the -- to the
teams that we can then begin working on.

 >>JONNE SOININEN: So I have a really, really stupid question.

 [Laughter]

 >>JONNE SOININEN: This -- the question is that this is the only time
that we have scheduled for this week, and the thing is that in some of
these things -- like, for instance, the charter document is not that
long. Getting that fleshed out during this week would -- getting the
first draft shouldn't be an issue. I don't know what else Ken has to
do this week. Probably nothing.

 [Laughter]

 >>JONNE SOININEN: But kind of like this is doable. And this is the
only face to face meeting we have before Seoul, where this should be
ready.

 Is there any way we could use this fact that we are in the same place
at the same time and kind of look at that? We have -- have a first
draft and have the understanding that if we're going to the right

direction and so on?

>>KEN BOUR: You want me to speak?

>>JONNE SOININEN: No. You just say, "Yes, that's fine."

[Laughter]

>>KEN BOUR: Hmm...it's tempting.

[Laughter]

>>KEN BOUR: Unfortunately, I would not have any bandwidth this week to even add one paragraph to this.

There are a number of other huge projects I've already been assigned, and I'm even late on those.

And so -- but as soon as this meeting is over, you know, one of my top priorities would be to start working. And Avri had given me a number of links to documents from IETF and some other things, so she has other resource material. Other people have written guidelines like this before, and so we will also borrow shamelessly and try to get this material done shortly after this meeting.

I do want to raise a second point, though. While I think personally, just based on the work that the sub-team has done, that the charter document, the charter outline, is ready for drafting -- I mean, I think it is. It's time for us to -- and in fact, at the end of that session, the group that was on that call said, "Ken, you're ready. Go!" Right? And so it's time to write. And I accept and I -- so I've got the ball on that one.

On the operating model outline, though, we have not reached that point yet, in my mind. Where that sub-team has really wrestled with every element in that outline, done the thinking and back-and-forth dialogue as to whether it should be there or not there, and so forth.

That work could get done in Sydney if that sub-team could get together either in some time that's remaining in this meeting or sometime later, and try and hammer that out.

Then once that outline is nailed down, and all the comments are extracted out of it, then I could start doing some drafting work there too.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: Well, unfortunately this meeting is -- is at an end, so I am certainly willing to send out an e-mail to the group asking if this -- those members of the team that are here would like to meet and to try to get a time together. You know, I'm more than willing to do that. We could send out perhaps a doodle.

>>KEN BOUR: Was Dr. Subbiah in the house?

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: Huh-uh. I haven't seen him.

But again, we could also put something together and then put it out there for comment and give it a -- you know, a time -- so somebody who didn't have input would still have time to comment.

So I mean, I think that's -- if that's something that folks want to do and Ken has identified that as a -- something we need to do this week -- and just because you're not -- you're on that -- not on that sub-team, if you're on the other sub-team and you want to participate, there's no -- you can participate anywhere you want to participate. You're not -- there's no stricture, so, you know, what I would suggest we do is we do some sort of e-mail to this -- to the -- to that model team and ask them if they're here, if they want to have a side meeting, and if so, what time.

I can tell you that most people may be pretty booked up, but we can give it a shot.

>>AVRI DORIA: Do it at midnight.

[Laughter]

>>MARIKA KONINGS: 6:00 in the morning.

>>GRAY CHYNOWETH: I think that sounds like a great idea and I'm sad that we didn't get to delve into this first because I think this is where a lot of the work needs to get done.

>>J. SCOTT EVANS: Okay. So I will send an e-mail here in just a moment and this meeting has to come to an end because I'm not sure if this room is in use, but we were slotted until 3:00 and we've reached our 3:00 time.

So thank you to everyone for attending. I will say this: That if Ken is taking the laboring oar to produce drafts, I expect that the members of this group will become engaged and will speak up and will help to flesh this document out.

You have to take responsibility if you're going to be on the team. We have to work together and we have to hear from you because I do not take silence as assent.

I do not believe that when you say -- when I don't hear from you, that means you agree. We need to hear from you. And we need you to come forward with any concerns and things that you have so that we can address those and get them handled as we draft.

So I would appreciate you to read the documents and get back with us.
Thanks.