Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Working Group Model (WG) Work Team (WT)
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday, 6 May 2009 17:00 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 6 May 2009, at 17:00 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-20090506.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may

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

Present:
J. Scott Evans - IPC Work Team Chair
Avri Doria - NCA GNSO Council chair
S. Subbiah - Individual
Caroline Greer - Registry c.
Konstantinos Komaitis - NCUC
Alexei Sozonov
Nacho Amadoz - Registry c.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC
Iliya Bazlyankov
Jonne Soininen
Graham Chynoweth

Absent apologies:
Thomas Roessler

Staff:
Ken Bour
Liz Gasster
Glen de Saint Gery

Coordinator: Thank you for standing by. I would like to remind all participants that

                  today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections you may

                  disconnect at this time. If anyone needs assistance, you may press

                  star 0. Thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: I'll do roll, Scott?

J. Scott Evans: Let's do that, please.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you. We have on the call Alexei Sozonov, Jonne Soininen

Konstantinos Komaitis, Subbiah, J. Scott Evans, Caroline Greer, Nacho Amadoz, (Cheryl Langdon Orr and Iliya Bazlyankov

 And for staff, we have Liz Gasster Ken Bour, and myself, (Glen DeSaintgery).

Ken Bour: Glen, this is Ken. May I ask Alexei if he is interested in joining the

                 Adobe Connect room? I don't see his name listed.

Alexei Sozonov: I'm trying. I'm trying.

Ken Bour: Okay, great. I'll catch...

Alexei Sozonov: And I cannot answer the password. So can I enter as a guest?

Ken Bour: Yes, please. All yours, okay, Scott?

J. Scott Evans: All right. So let's start with the working team model subgroup, is

                 they've had two calls - one on April 24 and one on April 30. It appears

                 that they divided into many teams under the subgroup to handle

                 particular topics. And I've reviewed the minutes from both of those

                 meetings. It seems that you had a pretty good meeting on the 30th but

                 did not get to Tim's session due to time. So that still remains to be

                 seen and dealt with.

                 So if someone from that group -- I don't see (Tim) on the call -- would

                 like to fill us in, I'd appreciate it. I know, (Sabai), you're on that group

                 and we're sort of heading the last call, if you would like to sort of fill us

                 in on our progress?

Subbiah   Okay. On just the Tim section or the everything?

J. Scott Evans: Overall progress.

Subbiah   I shall. If you're on Adobe Connect if you look to the left there's a Web link, too -- that's the Wikipedia page. If people on the left column underneath the attendee list Web link too -- I think if you click on that, you will get to the Web page where we have the results or at least we discussed on -- issues. Okay.

                   So...

J. Scott Evans: I've already been to that page and I'm there now.

Subbiah   Okay. I'm just saying for the purpose of the other people on the call who may not have...

                   Okay. So if you...

Man: (Sabai), let me just interrupt. I just want to let everybody know that on the left side of your Adobe Connect you'll see Web links, and the link to the model guidebook Wiki, is the second link, and if you click that should take you right there.

Subbiah   Okay. All right. So you'll see that basically what we did there is we took each chapter heading and we gave them numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, and so on. We were originally given four headings, so we decided there was a need for two more things.

One was an introductory section -- so we actually increased the number of headings that we originally had to 5 -- and then we also realized that some of the stuff that we're putting into these subheadings actually would fit more in an appendix better. So we created an appendix, so there's actually kind of a sixth thing at the bottom.

And then we split this up into various groups of one or two people, and we tried to add in essence chapter headings. Some people got a bit more detailed and some didn't but the point was to generate chapter headings under 1, 1.1., 1.2, and just throw out things for potential consideration.

Okay. And then we had a good discussion about all these things, except for the one section that -- because of time which Ken had mentioned before, in the products and output groups, which turns out to be 5.0.

For the other sections we actually had a decent discussion where I believe that in each of these items that were discussed, the drafting party - when I saw people put up shop, and then at least a couple of other people made sufficient comments on each of these items that the actual text increased by you know, 50 percent. So there's actually a lot of input from people on a bunch of key points in at least the sections that we discussed at length.

So bottom line is - and you can read all these things - but bottom line is that we ended up with an introduction section -- thanks to Ken -- which you can see there - which generally is thought of as an area where there'll be documents and other things that might be of some use, will

be put together for the committee and the new chair before it gets started -- references and so on. That's why we thought of this new item called sort of general point introduction.

Now, in that thing as well I think one key thing that we discussed and I think Ken agreed to -- Ken I think may have suggested it -- was the idea of making it a living document; which is that this would be just a bunch of stuff that standard references made or ICANN policy documents and so on. They'll just grow after working groups continue.

One working group gets started, it gets closed, it passed sync to this sort of pool information and becomes a living document. And possibly there's an idea that maybe even at the end of a working group, that's stuff to be put in there as well, as something like that.

Anyway, then we moved on to the idea of - the first real item which is roles and responsibilities, and the team came up with some ideas to flush this out a bit more. And then comments were added, and this was added as Ken suggests -- Ken Bour: -- he took some of our comments and added them in.

And then moving on, so various responsibilities were assigned. And we generally took the approach -- and this was important for us -- because some of us didn't understand where exactly we wanted this flushing out to be.

So I think we took the view that we're going to put everything in there that we could think of that nothing is being forced on the chair or the committee or anything like that. It's just essentially a super checklist of things that one would add to make the chair or the working group

committee take a look at and say, look, this is what we would like for our committee and this is not what we'd like, and so on. They can customize anything. That was the view they were taking.

And in any cases where we discussed like the consensus, threshold or some -where there was a need for numbers, a need for suggested numbers, no percentage and so on. We threw up some numbers, but I don't think it was intended that anything that even our own group would actually fixate on. We'll discuss that later.

Now, so roles and responsibilities, there's just a bunch of stuff that was added. In fact, one section was pretty much about, is there assessing the skills of the project team member, sort of no knowledge or experience of experts, or whatever.

And this has less to do with technical expertise than more to do with, look, if you are going to be the secretary of the group, then you'd better have some secretarial skills, either know how to use Word or whatever. So that level is where proper assignments can be made for proper people within the group, okay, not so much for high-level technical expertise.

Then the next section was Known. And in the Knowns, I think some of the stuff was actually just weaved in or at least as appointed to the ICANN general policy of known good behavior, that behavior, stuff like that.

And we're not suggesting that everything should be -- even though they're a higher organization than us, the ICANN Board -- we're not suggesting that everything needs to be followed, but we're saying,

look, since we are an organization underneath them, you should take a look at this as well. Because the Code of Conduct bank offers something that we would want to keep in mind.

And then on the key one or two items regarding meeting attendance and consensus thresholds, we've put in some numbers there based on our discussion - that was on the email. Sometime ago there was a flurry of emails - and we just threw that in there, and I think the team threw it in there with no real view as to settling on in or whatever, just as a placeholder.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Subbiah   Okay. Finally, Logistics and Requirements. It turns out that many of the things in Logistics and Requirements section, were nitty-gritty things about what software use, would you consider this software - up to the chair, but putting everything in kind of a checklist of very detailed stuff, will be useful in the initial scans of the guy starting it up as a chair or something.

We decided that some of that stuff got so detailed, that the better place to put it would be throw it into an appendix section at the bottom. We also took stuff from other sections that were more appendix-like and threw it at the bottom as well. And this section also talked about how to bring in training, subject matter experts and translation and application and stuff like that. And this system is a bit more detailed. There's a lot more comments from people.

So a final view of what everything should be has not been made in any of these sections, particularly in this sections, but the new group that

will clean this up going forward, whatever, will then have to select the pieces that may fit.

Finally, under Products and Outsource, we ran out of time, so (Tim) basically took - most of his points were more bullet-point items. And he wanted us to make some comments by email - if he probably had the time, even in just the two days between the previous call and this one. I myself actually made one comment, and that was added, I think. And that's pretty much it.

And under the checklist item, under Six Appendix, a whole bunch of stuff has been thrown in, and Ken's been keeping track of it. I think that's a fair statement of where we are.

J. Scott Evans: All right. Great. After hearing that, my only comment would be on the living document comment. I have no problem with the concept of a living document in that it would be a document that could be amended as we go forward in certain ways.

What I am concerned with -- and I think Bertrand De La Chapelle brought up in one of our calls -- was the fact that I'm a little concerned about something that just continues to grow exponentially, and every time there's a working group it's more and more and more. So a new chair now has 17 hours' worth of reading to do before he or she can begin the process.

And I think we need to provide some sort of guideline. I like the idea of it being a guideline and there being certain things. I do believe we need to think about if some of these things that are quote unquote guidelines. If there's going to be a minimum standard, that there are

certain things that are going to be identified as, you have to at a minimum, have this involved, these things; if you want to do more, that's fine, and here are some other ideas.

But those are sort of my initial thoughts that we can circle back to with the group. But I'd like to, Ken, move the charter outline. I don't see that Avri has joined us, so if you as a person who has been on that call, those calls, could - I notice they did not have a second call because there was no consensus on a good time. So Ken, if you would lead us through that, and I believe that there's a Wiki page set up for that as well.

Ken Bour: Yeah, this is Ken. I'd be happy to, J. Scott.

Since the links apparently aren't showing up under WebLinks 2, even though they do on my screen, I put them up under the Whiteboard. Hopefully everybody can get there.

So I'm on the WG Team Charter Wiki page. And we'll just scroll down to where it says, Tentative Structure for Charter Guidelines. We haven't got to the point here yet where we've numbered the sections, and we probably would also have a General Section number 1. And that's just work I still have to do.

After this initial outline was put up on the Wiki, a couple of people -- Avri and (Elia) -- maybe (Elia) can comment here, because he participated with Avri. They went through this document and made a few points.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Ken Bour: Let's see. So the general structure was to start with a Mission, Purpose and Deliverables, followed by Formation, Staffing and Organization, Rules of Engagement, and that was the last -- so there were three sections.

In terms of each of the sub-bullets - so we'll start with Mission, Purpose and Deliverables. Avri asked right off the top, is this the charter writing team or is this of the charter itself? And I wrote an answer there - or at least an attempted answer -- that our conceptualization of this charter guidelines - and in fact I'm actually recommending a new title for it. The last sentence in that second bullet note suggests that we call it, Working Group Implementation and Charter Drafting Guidelines.

And the reason is that I noticed that if you look at the outline contents, it's more than just what would go in a charter. There are also questions around how you might announce the group, how you would name it, what other conventions might apply in the creation of the working group.

So in essence, the concept is broader. It represents a guideline that a sponsor -- in this case the GNSO Council -- might use in forming a working group to achieve some specific mission or goal. And it's broader than just what should go in the charter, but there's a whole lot of other considerations as well. So I guess I'm suggesting to the whole work team that we change the title from Charter Guidelines to something broader.

Moving a little bit further in then - and in part you'll see a lot of questions. Avri asked some questions in there, I think (Elia) did, too,

like, well, does this really belong in the charter and is this really appropriate and should we - and I think that if you're looking at just the charter document, then the answers would be, yeah, those things probably don't belong. And that's what led me to suggest that maybe we change the title.

So there was a mission - a section essentially for Mission. I think there was agreement on that - Objectives and Goals, no disagreement there. Now, what hasn't happened yet in this document, unlike the other group, is that there hasn't been the couple of sentences and statements written to kind of flesh out what these topical headings should contain, and that's work that has yet to be done. So basically at the moment we just have some commentary questions, and this is still work in progress.

In terms of Import, Impact and Priority, there was a comment made that that might be overkill. My additional comment was that perhaps it would be helpful to a working group to know something about the importance of its work and why it's being undertaken.

That was really the only intention behind having some kind of statement in the charter that would say, this is why this working group is important to the community and why you guys should feel good about what you're doing.

That's just additional - so we have some difference of opinion as to whether certain of these things belong or don't belong, and that will have to continue to be discussed until we reach agreement.

In terms of Success Criteria, same sort of thing. The interpretation of Success Criteria and the way it was originally formatted here was more about how would the working group determine whether it had achieved success, what would its criteria be - not so much what would the criteria be about any result in policy that they might ultimately agree to recommend to the GNSO Council.

Outcomes, Products, Deliverables is the next section, and everybody agrees on that - Durations, Time Frames, Milestone, Extensions. Again, all no problem there, except we haven't done the work to flesh those out.

Budgeting Impacts. Again, there's some disagreement as to whether that belongs in a charter or not. So that will have to continue to be discussed.

Moving into Formation, Staffing and Organization - Membership Criteria, Group Formation and Dissolution, Self-Selection Guidelines - we have differences of opinion as to whether these options or these elements should or should not be in the charter or in the guidelines book itself.

And I think you guys can probably just as easily read the questions. In every case I have put some thoughts where I had some specific ideas around what was meant there and why we thought it was important that it be addressed. I'm just trying to see if there's anything significant that I should call out here.

J. Scott Evans: I guess my major question is, it looks to me like - I guess I'm with the group that thinks a lot of this stuff belongs in the guidelines. Because I

thought the charter guideline was just going to be sort of an outline on what you needed to do to draft a charter. And then the model guidelines would be all the procedural stuff.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. We might find ourselves with three documents -- although I hate the suggestion. Yes. Unfortunately, when we titled the charter guidelines outline, that connoted a narrower set of guidelines than ultimately was included in the outlines.

If I had originally titled the document, Implementation and Charter Drafting Guidelines, that would have been broad enough to have suggested that we weren't just preparing charter drafting guidelines, but also some other areas that impact on the creation, formation, selecting a chair, providing other structural mechanisms - budgets and things of that type - to a working group that might not ever go in a charter itself.

J. Scott Evans: I guess a couple things I have that maybe I'm confused on. But it seems to me that all of that falls into process, and I thought that's what the working team model was supposed to do.

Ken Bour: Well, not exactly. The working team model starts with the premise that a group's been formed, it's been missioned, chartered, created, and the operating model now tells a working group, here are the things you need to consider to function to achieve your mission.

This is Jonne ually have the same understanding of J. Scott there, and I was working out of that kind of like idea that the process model would have the whole process, from creation operation to depth, basically. And the charter guideline was more kind of like, what do you have to have in charter that good charter is in place.

And the thing is what - I think that what would also speak in behalf of something like that is that having the rules or the guidelines for the process in one place. It's very important that you don't get kind of like - that document might be a little a little bit longer then, but that you don't get to things that well, you have to search, look at that guide book for that process. And you have to look at that guide book for that process, and people don't know what guide book they should look at which point.

Ken Bour: Let me try another approach, and then I'll stop.

It might be helpful - the way I looked at it, or the way (Liz) and I looked at it when we first started was who are the audiences of the documents? Okay. So one audience is the sponsoring organization, the GNSO Council. So we were going to write one document to give to the sponsor that would help them with all of the guidelines they needed to get a working group established and chartered.

Then the second audience was the prospective working group that is being commissioned or being formed based on the charter and the sponsor's wishes. So you have two audiences, and each one needed a guide book.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, I see that.

Ken Bour: That's how we got there.

J. Scott Evans: I think that the charter guideline document then needs to be far more summary, because - and just have bullet point considerations they need to do rather than fleshing out some - and GNSO's been around

for ten years. These people know how to set up working groups and teams. They've been doing it for ten years.

What they may need to do is we have some sort of standardized considerations that need to be considered. But I don't think it needs to be the same in-depth guideline that you would do for the working team model, because the working team is where you're going to be in my opinion and in my experience over ten years, going to have much more fluidity and new people involved. Yes?

Subbiah   May I just suggest something?

Man: (Sabai)?

Subbiah   My suggestion is, I think to sort of compromise basically - that we keep the charter guideline as a very short document, basically principles and how you go about chartering, and keep that kind of (unintelligible), a very simple-minded summary document.

And then we can just say as an appendix to that is a charter initiation checklist, just a bunch of bullet points without it being too detailed, of what the next steps would be in going forward with the charter, actually creating it. Would that suffice?

J. Scott Evans: Well, that's sort of how I - I mean, I sort of think it needs to have some general principles and then a checklist of considerations. I don't think it needs to set down how to go about deciding the budgetary impact. I think it just needs to tell the GNSO, you need to consider the budgetary impact.

Jonne Soininen   This is (Yung). I told the peer review audiences - I would like to add to that a little bit if I may.

Man: Sure.

Jonne Soininen   The thing is I was told that there might be peer review audiences. I think the rules or kind of the guidelines are the same. And the problem is if you start to have especially two overlapping set of guidelines, you get easily into the problem that people are reading different guidelines, and the guidelines have to be really well in synced. So you need to do extra work to keep this in sync. Because then it means that there are different set of rules or different possibilities for interpretation by two different groups.

                 And though that there are possibly these two kind of like sets of audiences, I think they should be reading the same document. They might just read differently. And I really think that's kind of something like a checklist, which would be simple enough that people actually cancel it out, would be actually beneficial, and that's what I thought we were doing at the beginning.

J. Scott Evans: There is nothing, (Yung), that stops us from developing the charter document and then subsuming it in as a chapter in the overall document.

Jonne Soininen   Yeah, I'm not worried about that. I think the charter document, what I thought in the beginning, was what you said, that that's a kind of checklist that these items have to be in a charter.

And that's just fine. I was saying just about the kind of like two different audiences, that one is for one set of procedure for people who approve working groups and one set of procedures for people who are part of a working group. That's was what I was commenting, and I think that was Ken's suggestion. So I was just reinforcing what you were saying before.

J. Scott Evans: I understand Ken's point, too. Ken's point is that members of a working group aren't necessarily the people who charter and establish them. That's done at a different level. That's going to be done by the GNSO.

And the GNSO, in establishing a working group and setting up a charter, has maybe in some instances touch points that seem similar but a different goal and a different outcome and deliverable in setting up the working group as the working group that is actually going to get the substantive work done. And those two separate end goals and audiences mean that they're separate considerations.

And I see your point is that when you start dividing stuff up and saying, well, one audience, then you just lead yourself down the path where there's misinterpretation and that kind of thing.

Man: Can I just make a comment? I raised my hand but I didn't seem to have gotten...

J. Scott Evans: I apologize. I was on the Wiki page. There's only so much I can keep up with.

Man: Oh, no, no, no. I apologize if I was interrupting anyone else, because I tried the first one, it hadn't worked yet.

J. Scott Evans: Is that all right?

Man: Yes, it is. So I guess I had two points. The first one was that to me it
                  seemed like a more detailed guideline, a more detailed document on
                  the charter guideline was relevant. Not because it should be creating
                  new considerations or somehow envisioning a process that would exist
                  in the future, but rather one that would document the things that the
                  GNSO currently thinks about when it's creating a charter, or when it
                  would create a charter - or the things that they should think about.

                  Because that kind of information acts as a repository of institutional
                  wisdom that may or may not effectively handed over time from one
                  GNSO Council network to another.

                  Assuming the case that obviously there's some people that have been
                  involved with GNSO for a long time. And they know perfectly well - I
                  mean they're very - they know what the right things to do are.

                  But, you know, as those people in, you know, whatever period term off
                  or go onto other things, the wisdom that they have collected I feel like
                  it's worthwhile to have it in a detailed way some place so that new
                  people coming into it can read and have a touch point. That's the first
                  comment that I had about the value of having more details
                  documented.

                  The second one was with the audiences. And I think it - to me it does -
                  there are two sets of questions that are really happening here. One is
                  as a, you know, member of the working group, what am I supposed to

do as a member of the working group? Right. And I look to that to the working group guidelines, right.

But the other - and I think the other thing is as a, you know, a member of the -of the GNSO who's creating the charter, you know, what are the - what are the things that I need to think about before I create the charter? And so that's why I feel like there is a - there's a relevance to the distinguishing the audiences because they're going to be asking different questions.

And these documents are going to have to answer the questions for those respective audiences. And I think those are different answers and why that, you know, it doesn't necessarily - it makes them sense to have them all in one place but that those answers are going to be different depending on the audiences because those audiences are going to be asking different questions.

Man: Well I certainly think that that's a point but when I look at these two documents just having looked at them over the last day or so, they seem terribly duplicative to me. And so...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...that's where I get the concern that we're going to get into (Yung)'s concern is it looks like...

Man: Yeah.

Man: ...they're asking the same questions.

Man: Could you point out a couple of places where that would be the case? We took great pains to make sure that they weren't mutually exclusive.

Man: And (Sabai) would like to say that we did - when we were going through our document, there are many places in our team we said, look, this might be better off in the other guidelines. And we actually noted a couple of places like that.

             And I'd just like to make one more point, is that even if to some degree they end up, we want to remove duplication, but even if they end up being slightly duplicates and talking back to Scott Evans' point earlier which is that, you know, we - a lot of - 80% of the stuff that we put into the model document, we understood it to be customizable. Meaning that the chair or whoever it is would be probably be leaving it out or doing it or whatever.

             So we could actually, going back to what Scott said, you know, have a minimum set of things that kind of must do. But we could certainly in that document, you know, highlight basically, you know, the minimal set of things you might want to consider as, and then the rest that is, you know, most of it is just customizable (RTU).

             If we can - if we have two separate documents even in some slight duplication or whatever, the fact would be that they may be annotated as such as these are all customizable, extra stuff and it's up to you. Whereas the minimum core things (unintelligible) up, that might get rid of some of that, you know, potential sort of duplication (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: This is Ken. There's no intent to be duplicative. There are certain topics and headings that you'll see in both but they come from as

(Greg) just pointed out, they come from different points of view and different - for different audiences.

So let me take an example like rules of engagement. The sponsors when they're writing the charter document have to make a decision and they'll be guided like what they follow the guideline book. They'll be guided to think about do they want to establish a specific definition for example for consensus.

So if it's a policy matter and it's a working group that's going to be deciding a policy question, the charter and the sponsors may want to absolutely nail down the specific definition of consensus that will apply to that working group.

And it may have numbers or percentages or whatever it is, right, and we've had some discussions about that in the past.

Man: Yeah.

Ken Bour: If you look over at the operating model, what it says there is if the charter doesn't provide you with a specific meaning for consensus then you ought to consider writing one for yourself before you begin your deliberations. That's all.

            So its...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: The charter document always trumps the operating model whenever there is a decision point. So if the charter document doesn't contain

like any norms or special instructions then the operating model team, they would have to create their own, right. So top down sort of approach.

Man: But, you know, maybe Avri who's joined the call can jump in here. But I think it is a huge mistake if one of the things that doesn't come out of this group is that we don't define for the entire process what consensus will be. And then get the GNSO and everyone to come to terms with that.

I think if you go down and you start doing it willy-nilly per the topic, you'll open yourself up into a huge morass of argument over process, over every decision that is made.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (There's a point) I do agree.

Man: Consensus model has to be adopted and imposed on every working group. Now maybe...

((Crosstalk))

Man: ...I'm mistaken. I...

Man: ...one question there is about the granularity, right. I mean that is - and you're going to know this better than I do because I'm new to all this stuff but is it a useful lever to be able to determine what level of consensus is necessary? Or - and I guess you're saying that it's not useful.

It needs to be one size fits all and if you don't do that there will be a mass amount of time wasted on determining whether or not this particular working group should be subject to complete consensus, should be subject to rough consensus or should be subject to some other kind of consensus which we would define.

Man: Yeah and I - I mean I'll let Avri speak to that but...

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Thanks for (putting me) - sorry I was late. I would think - I think it's somewhere between but I'm not quite sure I've caught all the conversation. Is I certainly think that the terms have to be the same. That consensus for every group is exactly the same thing. Rough consensus means exactly the same thing.

I think that it may be the case that for PDP objects it will require the consensus marker. It will require the rough consensus marker. I think that perhaps different kinds of work groups will have different sort of requirements you must meet majority at least or you must meet this and in defining what they have achieved, they should be able to define it.

But the words always have to mean the same thing.

Man: So in other words, you're saying that Avri the definition of consensus and rough consensus and complete consensus needs to be standardized. But working groups can e chartered to say that for this particular topic they have to meet complete consensus or rough consensus will work. But those terms would be defined across the board, standardized definitions.

Avri Doria: That would certainly be my, you know, my contribution, my guess on it is that for example sometimes you're going to have a working group that's not a PDP but it's just something where you need to distribute it to be processed. And so perhaps the majority view will be sufficient for that. And I'm only speculating.

But if it's real easy original chartering group which is, you know, most all cases, the Council that decides what this group needs. Now it may 90% of the time say rough consensus or better but, you know, that is an item of flexibility.

What can't be flexible I think are two...

Man: May I suggest something so that we can more forward? What we can do is first of all we will the - I think it's a very good notion to have the same word mean the same thing across the board. So our job is to define what these things mean, number one.

Number two, we also each have a document we're talking about. We just also say this is the recommended sort of, you know, suggested practice. This is what we think you should do in a working group. And then leave the option for hey, it's possible that the working group itself can opt for some other things but using the same terminology now.

And then we can get this document done and then towards further down the line we can decide we want that customization option in there or not which I think Scott Evans is saying maybe not. But the point is we can at least move forward because we can recommend something

and then we can discuss later down the line whether we want to give that option or not.

Man: Okay.

Man: Does that make sense? In all these topics. That might help move forward.

Avri Doria: The last thing I was going to say was that of course things like PDPs may be fixed definition of working group. So there may be things like, you know, things that affect contractual condition that do have a very strict all these must meet type of rule.

Man: Okay. Now Ken you have third on the agenda, model outline summary.

Ken Bour: That's what I just did.

Man: Okay. So our next step. What I think needs to be done is we need to have everyone look at both Wiki pages and everyone make comments to the work that 's been done to this point so that we can make sure that we have consensus on where we're headed.

                 And if we can do that within the next week, that would be my suggestion. And then once we have done that, have another call on moving forward on jelling these into more fulfilled documents. But I don't - what I don't want to have happen is to have two groups going off and doing a lot of work, flesh these outlines out and then not have consensus on what the outlines were.

So before we move forward with any further fleshing out, I would like to everyone to look at these two documents and see if we can come to some sort of consensus.

Man: This (unintelligible) now. I have just one question of that. Is that if we come up with a kind of understanding what these two documents are because some 20 minutes ago we seemed to have some confusion about that.

Man: Well that's certainly one thing we can consider as we go forward but I mean, it seems to me that Ken was very clear and I think (Gray) made the point and if you've been following the text as well, I think (Cheryl), (Linda) and (Orv) has also made the same points.

The people that I've heard speak up in the majority at least at this point believe that we need to have two separate documents that take into account that they are speaking to separate audiences. That as (Sabai) pointed out there is some chance that there may be some touch points that seem duplicative but they are not wholly duplicative and Ken said there has been great effort to make sure they are not.

But that - so I am taking away at this point we're continuing on with two separate documents. One is a charter guideline document or charter - we have to understand whether we want to sort of change the title of that according to Ken's suggestion in the second bullet point on the Wiki under Section 1 and that's the charter guideline document. Two separate documents with two separate audiences in mind.

Man: May I suggest that while we are doing what Scott Evans wants us to do in the next few days? We could also all look out for perhaps with Ken

keeping, you know, a stronger key about whether there's anything that we already see that is clearly duplicative between the two so we can highlight those for later discussion.

Man: I think that that's fine but what we need to do is get a set of eyes on both...

Man: Right.

Man: ...these documents. And I see Ken has just put out the tentative schedule for activities through Sydney in the white board section of the - of the Adobe. So...

Man: Sounds good though.

Man: Yeah. I think Ken my - unless I hear objection, I would like to push everything back a week so that some teams again drafting detailed documents begins on the 18th which means then we would - everything. So then the next thing would the 25th date so it would be June 10. And I'm not sure what date that is. We don't want to do it on a Friday. See my birthday's on the 5th, which is Friday so the next one. So that's like a Wednesday the 10th, June 10.

Glen DeSaintgery: June 10 is a Wednesday there Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. So we want to do a...

Man: Scott.

J. Scott Evans: ...conference call for the full team on June 10.

Man: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: But what I really do need and I told Ken I would address that is we really do need people to go to the Wiki and if dealing directly on the Wiki difficult to block and cut it and put it in an email to the list. But we need to have some robust discussion on these topics. We cannot be silenced during the interim periods and then expect this work to move forward.

And we really do need for everyone to look at this. And I'm glad to look at it and give you my opinion, but I'm supposed to be the neutral chair. So I'm trying to stay out of it. But I can certainly give you my opinion and you can consider it or not consider it. But at least it's another set of gray matter looking at things.

You know, when I look at it so that I understand that we sort of all understand what our - that we're sort of singing from the same page of the hymnal. But the next week I would charge everyone which is really going to mean for the two groups that you each look at the other document and then let's flesh it out and make sure we have consensus where these documents are headed so that we can begin the detailed drafting on these documents.

(Gray):   That sounds good. Just so that I'm clear on what my job is that I will take your admonition and be more diligent in the next week.

J. Scott Evans: Is this (Gray)?

(Gray): Yes it is. I'm sorry. It is - it seems like there's general consensus that there would be - well, it seems like the right thing to do is to consider them as two documents and then as oriented as oriented towards different audiences and that - and it is in that context which we should be providing our comments. Is that correct?

J. Scott Evans: That is where I'm coming out of unless I hear - I know, (Yung) has some disagreement with it but I sort of think the overall group is still for those that are here believe the two document approach with two audience approach is the approach we need to proceed at this point.

Is there anyone other than (Yung) that believes we should not do that? Hearing nothing, unless someone's on mute and I'll allow you to come through if you're on mute and don't realize you are, I would suggest that (Gray) then you look at the documents with that - those parameters in mind.

That there will be two documents with two different purposes for two different audiences in mind. One is that the group that will be establishing the working group, that's the charter guideline and implementation document. And the other group is once it has been established and turned over to a working group, they have a guideline of how to operation their working group.

Ken Bour: This is Ken by the way, I will add an audience like who is the - who is this document designed for in the general section of both Wikis. So I'll do a little bit of work.

J. Scott Evans: Great idea.

Ken Bour: And I'll also create a general section on the charter group and I'll renumber those sections and make it easier to operate towards it.

J. Scott Evans: All right. I think - and I think that that's - that may help us Ken if in both documents we use the general proportion to set context and audience so that someone who gets steered to the wrong document would know in the first paragraph and a half they're either at the right place or the wrong place.

Ken Bour: Right on. Done.

Man: You know, Ken, if you're engineering this anyway, you might want to number it so that if they are sort of sections that are somewhat duplicative or whatever in idea, concept between the two documents. If it's possible to have the same numbers sections that would be probably useful.

Ken Bour: I'll take a look at it.

J. Scott Evans: All right. So that's - so everyone we're going to send out a doodle poll. I would also ask that after next week, a week from today, Glen will be sending out doodles with regard to sub team calls. And we need to make a commitment that we will make these calls because, you know, it's important that we have your participation involved because you bring different perspectives to the table.

Culturally, intellectually from the groups that you are brining viewpoints to. (Cheryl) has dealt with a lot of large groups and understands how confusion can occur. That's one viewpoint. You know, I think every - as much participation as we can because the more robust the discussion,

the better the documents are going to be. So we really do need commitment to make these sub team calls and to work together as best we can.

(Cheryl)'s up at 3:00 in the morning. I think that's pretty damn committed. And we need to all make sure we're doing that so that we can move this work forward.

Ken if you would also - when you send out minutes, could you readjust that deadline that tentative schedule by pushing everything back a week?

Ken Bour: Yes. In fact I - yeah, I'll include the - a new revised schedule just as the one you see but I'll push everything back. Could I just ask a clarifying question because I didn't understand that you wanted the sub teams to reengage on like a teleconference. I had the impression we were going to just work on the Wiki. But you want the teams to actually...

J. Scott Evans: Oh, I mean - I guess I - somehow at least the charter team, you know, they need to divide up the work. And if they want to do that by email, that's fine.

Man: Just a point of order, something that maybe missed the last teleconference on the charter team that when there is a doodle (unintelligible) conclusion out of the doodle be published on the - kind of what time was actually chosen published also on the general list and not only kind of on the - on the list where the information - then the call information comes in. Because that's somehow easier to follow in those many emails.

Man: I think that - Glen can we do that?

Glen DeSaintgery: Of course I'll do that (unintelligible).

Man: Just make sure that any sub team call goes to the full list.

Glen DeSaintgery: Full list. Thanks (unintelligible). I'll do that.

J. Scott Evans: So I tell you what. Rather than mandating anything, that would be my suggestion that there be a call. But I will let after the week the two groups decide how they want to proceed Ken.

Ken Bour: Oh just because it's - we don't have chairs in both teams. I mean (Sabai) agreed to lead us through one meeting and then today he agreed to carry on. But we really didn't elect a chair in the model team. And the charter team never did either. So I think that if we don't set something up now or come to an agreement as to what we're going to do, entropy will take over. I mean it'll just not happen.

J. Scott Evans: That's the reason I like to have a call is if usually people come prepared.

Ken Bour: Maybe we could ask each of the members on the call today who are part of the two sub teams if they think they should have a call and if somebody will agree to sort of chair it.

Man: So from the charter team I think it would be good to have a call and I thought we'd have chose Avri as our chair.

Avri Doria: We did what?

Man: I thought so too.

Ken Bour: That's what happens Avri when you stick your head out and do the
                     right thing.

Avri Doria: Okay. I have no problem with having another call. I'm not sure exactly
                     when we could schedule it but...

J. Scott Evans: It'd be the week of the 18th. So Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Now the week - if you wanted next week, it will be the week of the
                     16th of May. The week of the 11th of May or the week of the 18th. I
                     think the 18th Avri prefers, doesn't she.

Avri Doria: I much prefer...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: And I think...

((Crosstalk))

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay. I'll put...

J. Scott Evans: ...back a week, the 18th is a better week for these calls if they're going
                     to take place.

Ken Bour: Wait a second. This is Ken. I'm - now I think we're two weeks back
                     now. I think schedule wise we just - as I understood it, we were going

to postpone the next WGT call from the 3rd to the 10th. That's a one-week postponement.

And so what I was - what I would have thought is that we would take the week of the 11th, right, which would be next week for the teams to convene again to really nail down these outlines. And then I though the 18th we would start with sub team drafting except that we won't have had a large WGT call between that time.

J. Scott Evans: What I had just asked for so everybody's real clear is I asked that between now and next Wednesday which is the 13th...

Ken Bour: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: ...that each group look over the outlines as they are in forms so that we can make sure that the outlines and the items that we've identified that will be fleshed out, we have consensus. So that's going to put us back a week on drafting because I want to get consensus on the outlines. And...

Ken Bour: How will we achieve that - in other words, we will just assume at the end of the 13th that we had - we then have consensus or...

J. Scott Evans: I can send out a consensus call at the end of the 13th.

Ken Bour: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: And the way that I've done it in the past is I send it out to the full list and I ask if they would - if I don't hear anything, I consider there to be consensus.

Ken Bour: Okay and I presume we'll do that between 14 and 15 May, so Thursday, Friday of next week. Okay. Cool.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah. It'll probably happen on Wednesday because I'm at an IRT meeting that ends at 3:00 Pacific Time and so I will probably do it after that.

Man: Since I guess I have been kind of a volunteer chair for this thing, my suggestion - because I have - our team members, a number of them are on this call. The way - I'm just trying to plan for what we have to do on this other team.

                 I see three things we need to do on our team. One is to go over the Section 5 (unintelligible) one comment by me. But we may have to either by email or talking, go over that, you know. Make sure that's clear.

                 Then we are supposed to read the charter group stuff.

J. Scott Evans: That's correct.

Man: And then make sure that if we have comments and we want to go through that either email or by talking. And the third thing that, you know, I think will be useful for our team to do also while we're looking at the other team's stuff, figure out whether we ourselves see where there are any further duplicate areas or something like that and highlight them.

So given those are three tasks that my team has to do, you know, the question is - since the team members are there, my question is to my sort of sub team here is should we have our own call in between to get these nailed or do we want to...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: (Sabai) if you want to send around and ask your group if they'd like to...

Man: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: ...and then just contact Glen...

Man: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: ...and she'll send out a (unintelligible) and you can do that.

Man: Okay. Fine. All right. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Nothing's preventing you from doing that. So I will send out a consensus between close of business on Wednesday the 13th and close of business Thursday the 14th. And it will give everyone a deadline. So, and it'll give you about 48 hours. And I'll send it out urgent to the full list.

And then once that's done and we know that we've got consensus on the outline then we can start the drafting process Ken, which would be again the week of the 18th. That's the reason I pushed everything back to the 18th, the 25th and the 3rd. And then we would have a call again on the 10th.

Ken Bour: Okay. Understood. Now just - it wasn't a foregone conclusion in my mind that the same sub teams would do drafting that also did the outlines. That we just want to...

J. Scott Evans: I think that it's best that we just stick with the teams that we have. If we find out we're not having some participation, let me know and we'll see if we can adjust some. But since these folks are already familiar with the thinking and they flesh these ideas out, I think it certainly is not - I think it's a good idea to let them live with the document and put in together a first draft.

We may then want to think about doing some adjustments on editing for a second draft but let's - I think the best thing is these guys know where they're heading and let them flesh these things out.

Ken Bour: Okay. So the sub teams that are already convened - and also I guess I'll put in the minutes too that if folks who are on the larger group team haven't assigned themselves yet to a sub team, and there are some folks that haven't done that yet...

J. Scott Evans: Please do and I think that where we need some people is the charter team. So I would suggest that you put out a call for them to join the charter team.

Ken Bour: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Okay guys, we are three minutes over and it is 4:03 in the morning in Australia.

Avri Doria: Oh you're too kind.

J. Scott Evans: So I think we sort of have an idea. I really, really, really want people to have a robust discussion over the next seven days with regards to these two documents to make sure we have consensus. Please respond, you know, to each other and stay in the loop and have discussions about this. And let's move this process forward.

We are doing well. We could be doing better but we're doing a good job. And I thank everyone for their participation so far. I want to especially thank Ken for cracking the whip with me and the rest of us to make sure that we stay on task and that we do what we say we're going to do. That it's not always a pleasant position to be in to be the guy that's always bringing up the difficult issues. And we certainly appreciate his help.

And let's just keep positive attitudes as we move on forward. Okay everybody.

Woman: Sure.

Man: Okay.

Woman: Indeed.

Man: Well of course.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Bye bye.

J. Scott Evans: Bye everybody.

END