

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC)
TRANSCRIPTION**

Wednesday, 21 January 2009 20:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee meeting on Wednesday, 21 January 2009, at 20:00 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-20090121.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jan>

Participants present:

Jeff Neuman - (Registry constituency) elected chair
Avri Doria - NCA - GNSO Council chair
J. Scott Evans - (IPC)
Konstantinos Komaitis - (NCUC)
Alan Greenberg - (ALAC)
Greg Ruth - (ISP)
Tim Ruiz - (Registrar)

Absent apologies

Mike Rodenbaugh - (CBUC)
Bertrand de la Chapelle (GAC)

Staff:

Liz Gasster
Ken Bour
Rob Hoggarth
Margie Milam
Glen de Saint Géry

Coordinator: Thank you. At this time, I'd like to inform all participants that the record - that the call's now being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. Thank you. You may begin.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thank you. Everyone welcome to the Bi-Weekly Call of the PPSC. Glen if you could start out with a roll call?

Glen DeSaintgery: Certainly Jeff. We have on the call Avri Doria, Jeff Neuman, Alan Greenberg, J. Scott Evans, Konstantinos Komaitis, Tim Ruiz, Greg Ruth. And for staff, we have Liz Gasster, (Ken Bour), I believe Rob and (Margie) are all together too.

(Margie): Yes. That's right.

Glen DeSaintgery: And myself, Glen. Thanks Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: Did I miss anybody? Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thanks Glen. And again, I'll apologize for people listening. If anyone listens afterwards, I have a cold. So, if you can't understand me, just let me know, and I'll try to repeat it.

Liz sent around an agenda for this call yesterday. And on the agenda is first and update on volunteers for the work teams. People that have expressed interest.

Then we'll talk about the - well I guess, we'll - we'll talk about the work team charters and the PDP - the working group team charter and the PDP team charter.

And then we'll start a discussion on the work team rules, with the understanding that I'm sure that work will continue until at least the next call.

And then, what I'd like to do is decide on - I sent around an email. I guess it was about a week ago, on designating interim Chairs until these groups are fully constituted, so we can get some work started.

Does anybody have anything else to add to the agenda? Okay.
Hearing stunning silence, I'll assume that this is the agenda. Of course
if anything comes up, then we'll - we can always add it on later.

So, Glen, I think you have the most updated list of volunteers for the
different work teams?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: I think they've been sent around council. But have they been sent
around to the PPSC?

Glen DeSaintgery: No. And I'm - that's my - what I am doing right at this moment. Is
getting people subscribed to lists, and getting the lists up-to-date. If
you could bear with me...

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

Glen DeSaintgery: ...for about - until tomorrow, I'll get you out all the lists. That we are
getting a good number of people coming in and joining.

Jeff Neuman: And one of the...

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes?

Jeff Neuman: ...things I've noticed from the - I saw the list. I guess it was last week.
Is I noticed that there was overlaps between people that have served
on multiple different work teams.

But I'm not sure there was overlaps between the working group team and the PDP team. But I noticed that there was overlap between some of our teams and some of the (OSC) teams.

And I wanted to kind of throw it out there to people to - to - I - I think this may be an issue. Especially because there's so much work to be done in such a short period of time.

I don't want a blanket set of rule that we shouldn't have people on multiple teams. Although that was kind of a goal, to spread out the work. Does anyone have any thoughts on that?

J. Scott Evans: This is Jay Scott. I mean, the reality is that that is problematic, because they're not going to do the same amount of work on one or the other of the teams.

But again, I - I think we would find it very difficult to have a hard and fast rule. I mean, I think Avri's pointed on numerous occasions that her experience as the Chair of the GNSO, working groups tend to be barely flushed out with membership.

And then there's a kernel of a small cadre of worker bees. And then every once in a while there might be more conversation on comments.

So, I just think that that's the way it is in any volunteer organization. And it's difficult to call through that.

You know, you can always make that a suggestion as we have. But I don't know, unless you find them to be obtrusive, or not turning in

assignments that they volunteered to do, and it's putting the work behind, that you have any - anything you can do.

I don't know. That's just what I'm thinking.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. It's Alan here. I - I'm not sure we want to stop it. I know I and others often will volunteer to be on a committee, just to get the mailing lists, and to have an opportunity to comment should I see something that I think is really really wrong.

But, not joining with the intent of being one of the active members. And I don't find anything wrong with that.

Liz Gasster: So Jeff, this is Liz.

Alan Greenberg: Since I do it, I don't find anything wrong with it, but.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Liz? Yeah?

Liz Gasster: I'm sorry. I - I'm not seeing a lot of overlap actually. I'm seeing a couple. What I'm seeing more is not enough people populating the three (OSC) teams overall.

That generally we have more people on the working groups team and the PDP team. And that actually, the teams that just seem light are the constituency outreach teams - communications team and the council operations team.

So I think, you know, one thing is just to really encourage everyone to go back to their constituencies and try to get people who have

particular interest and expertise, particularly on the three other teams, so that we can populate as many people as possible.

Glen DeSaintgery: Sorry Liz. This is Glen. Actually those teams are being populated.

Liz Gasster: Oh good. Well maybe it would help for you to give an update on that.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yeah. I'll get the lists to you as soon as possible.

Liz Gasster: But even just give the total numbers for each team to this group. And then we can read the names, if that's useful, for, you know, concentrating on the (PPS) team.

Glen DeSaintgery: Well actually, I can read the names to you right now if that will help anybody.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Why don't you do that, just so people can hear.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay. The constituency operations team for example, we have got Olga Cavalli as the interim Chair. Then we have subtracted (Zied Jamel). We have adopted (Shannon Subutepu).

Jeff Neuman: Actually Glen. Do you want to just go over the ones - the working group - just the PPSC working teams. I think is helpful.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay. Just the working group teams. The PDP and the (WG).

Jeff Neuman: Right. Right.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay. Okay. Okay. The - sorry. Yes. The PDP team. We have got Mike Rodenbaugh, Jeff Neuman, Alan Greenberg, Avri Doria, J. Scott Evans, Greg Ruth, Tony Harris, (Gabrielle Pinero) from Argentine.

Liz Williams, Sophia Bekele, (James Liddell), Paul Diaz, (David Mahair), Marilyn Cade and (Spedznec Lubor). (Spedznec Lubor) is (IPC). I think the only - yes, we've got (ISP). We seem to have all the constituencies on there.

J. Scott Evans: And that's PDP?

Glen DeSaintgery: That's the PDP. Yes.

J. Scott Evans: No. I was on there.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes. You were on there. Didn't I call your name? Yes?

J. Scott Evans: Yeah, I didn't think I was. I thought I was.

Jeff Neuman: Well, remember Jay Scott, you and I are on the mailing list?

Glen DeSaintgery: That's right.

Jeff Neuman: Okay?

Glen DeSaintgery: If you wanted to be on yourself.

J. Scott Evans: (Unintelligible). I apologize.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Now the working group model team is again, J. Scott Evans, Avri, (Constantinas), Tim Ruiz, (Zied Jamel), Jeff Neuman, Michael O'Connor, (Alexei Sozonoff). He is actually a registrar, and he has been occasionally involved in ICANN activities. (Sue Buyer), who I think many of you might know from the (IDN) working groups.

(Zack Brandstetter), who is completely new to me from Australia. Caroline Greer, (Amados) from (Ducktet) and (Elia Vazalinoff) from Bulgaria. And, all of them, I think except for (Zack Brandstetter) have at some time or another been at an ICANN meeting, or, you know, are known people.

Man: Yeah. Jeff and Glen? Have any of these people that have expressed interest been sent the form?

Glen DeSaintgery: For the - for the statement of interest?

Man: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: All of them.

Man: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Glen? (Cheryl) should have been on that list also.

Glen DeSaintgery: On which one? On the working group model?

Jeff Neuman: On the working group.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay. That's no problem. I'll put her on there. Now there was one question that I did have before I sent that out actually on the list, because it might be a good thing. To send it out on the list too, was whether this form has been officially confirmed.

Man: I think that's on the agenda for today.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay. That's all that I have to say.

Jeff Neuman: So it sounds like it's almost all constituency members. A couple ALAC members, but other than that, we're really not getting people from the community in general.

Which is okay. It's just, you know.

Man: Jeff it sounds like to me, a lot of those names I haven't heard before, at least on a working group, except for a few.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes. Exactly.

Man: Probably very well may be identified with the community.

Glen DeSaintgery: One, two, three, four, five, six people here that, you know, aren't usual working group people, or...

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Glen DeSaintgery: ...constituency people.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Unintelligible).

Man: I mean, it may be modest, but ghee this is the first time we've done this, and modest may be all we can hope for.

Jeff Neuman: Yep. Okay. And do we say in the notice how long we're soliciting volunteers for? There's really no ending correct?

Woman: That's right.

Liz Gasster: Other than the renewal date for, you know, well I guess if - if the committee's not renewed in a year, then its work teams probably aren't. But, yeah, no. It doesn't seem to be bounded.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So one of the questions I had to throw out to the group is, you know, we have to finalize the charters for the work teams. But, at some point the work should actually start.

And I don't know, has the (OFC) thought of a path forward? Have - have the interim Chairs of those work teams started the work Liz? Do you know?

Liz Gasster: It so happens that we have the (OFC) staff person here with us - Rob Hogarth, who can report on that first hand.

Rob Hogarth: Yeah Jeff, the answer to that is no. They've all been assigned, and, you know, they've done some - some personal planning on it. But, it hasn't moved beyond that.

I think based on some of the deliberations of the - of the committee, the thought was they wanted to see how many folks were - were signing up. And to get some momentum going before they did that.

Liz Gasster: And Rob also, can you answer the question about, are they having their work teams actually finalized - the charters? Or is the (OFC) going to finalize the charters for the work teams?

Rob Hogarth: The - the discussion today is they anticipated the work teams would review the draft charters prepared for them, and then they would finalize them.

Man: Just as we're doing ours (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Man: Yeah, I mean, the - the, yeah. Because the work teams obviously don't have to get approval at the - the council level. But there'll be that coordination with the -the Steering Committee.

And - and you guys have done this, and I haven't just - I just haven't observed it. But, the (OSC) charter was modified from the original version, to incorporate the Chairs of each work teams into the committee itself, so there'd be some more fluid communications in that regard.

Liz Gasster: And the way we handled it in the PPSC was instead to say that the work team Chairs needed to be members of the PPSC. So just a similar slightly different way of handling this and more issues.

Man: Right. So just an update for those that maybe missed the emails. So, we - we finalized the - the PPSC charter. And as far as we know, and maybe Tim could correct me. I think Tim you submitted it as a formal motion now? For the GNSO?

Tim Ruiz: Yes I did. (Unintelligible), but I thought that was the next step.

Liz Gasster: No, I think (unintelligible), we need a second though on that right?

Avri Doria: Yeah. We do need a second, but that's not quite as critical, and I do have it in the motion list. Good if another council member seconded it. I would prefer it wasn't me, just because I like to avoid making and seconding motions, unless they're, you know, formal procedural, so.

Man: So if there's, so - well Tim had put the motion forward. And who else is on the council from this group? Aside from Avri?

Man: Mike Rodenbaugh, Greg Ruth, yeah Avri and myself. And I don't know if I've missed any - oh Tony Harris alternate. Alan are you allowed to second motions?

Alan: No I'm not.

Man: But it doesn't have to be someone from this group does it?

Man: No, no.

Liz Gasster: It can be any council.

Man: Any council.

Man: I'll reach out to one of our councilors and see if I can get someone to review the motion.

Man: Well, Greg's on the call now. If he could just...

Liz Gasster: Sure.

Man: ...reply.

Greg Ruth: Can I just do this verbally?

Avri Doria: Yeah. If you tell me, I'll put it in.

Greg Ruth: There you go. I'm seconding it.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks Greg.

Avri Doria: I will add it - I will add it to the motion okay?

Man: Okay. So that part should be taken care of at the next council meeting, which is next week. So assuming that they don't have any other questions, well even if they do, I think we're going to proceed as if it's going to be approved.

The next thing is to focus on the work team charters. And revised ones have been put up on the wiki, to reflect the discussions that we had two weeks ago.

So, I encourage everyone to - well, let me ask. Does anyone have any comments on those during this call?

Liz Gasster: It's Liz. I should just explain that I did make significant changes to what was posted previously. Basically taking the gist of the conversation last week was - or two weeks ago, which was we want to make absolutely sure these tracks with what the Board instructions or recommendations were.

And there was a couple of questions about wanting to change language that was basically extracted right from the set of recommendations. So, what's up there now is my effort to encapsulate everything that's in the Board report on PDP for the PDP team and working group - charter for the working group teams. That's what's on the wiki now.

So I just want to explain that that was done, because there was some question a couple weeks ago about where each item on the list came from.

Jeff Neuman: Right. I think we had - you and I had summarized them. But now I think you've - you've put more - the words that were actually used.

Liz Gasster: That's right. And - and, you know, all the - I tried to include sort of all the recommendations to the degree possible, or most of the recommendation with references.

Jeff Neuman: So the actual charter is - so I'm looking at the PDP team one. And, I still need - and Glen's on the call. Glen I still for whatever reason can't edit this wiki site.

Glen DeSaintgery: Jeff I'll put you on again. Sorry.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, no, I can - I can edit the PPSC one, but I can't edit the team ones.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah. I found the same - same when I tried to put up - this is Jay Scott, when I've tried to post those working team - working group team charter. I couldn't do it on the working group team sub-wiki site. I could do it on the PPSC site, but I couldn't do it - it didn't give me the option, even sign.

Jeff Neuman: Right. Yeah, same thing with me.

Glen DeSaintgery: I'll speak to them Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So, the charter is actually - if you go onto the wiki, it's - it's - it's the ones we discussed for the charter is really Roman numeral I and II.

J. Scott Evans: Are we on (PP)?

Jeff Neuman: PDP page - the PDP team page.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. That's where I need to be. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: So there's - the charters really one and two - Roman Numerals I and II. The Liz added a link to the most recent work team rules, which will be updated I'm sure over the next few weeks. The - you left in Liz number four, which is the potential initial action steps?

Liz Gasster: Yeah, that is not related to the charter. That charter was old ideas that we had about kind of what might need to be done as part of this effort, so.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Liz Gasster: It's just there for reference - oh and I can delete it if it's not.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I think at this point, we probably should take out four and five. Well maybe we could leave five in. It's the calendar and time table.

Liz Gasster: Okay. I'll take care of that.

Jeff Neuman: And then if we - if we have interim Chairs, then we - we might want to put those on there as well. Along with the actual people that have volunteered.

Liz Gasster: Okay. I'll take care of that too.

Jeff Neuman: So, does anybody else have - since we're on the PDP team. Does anybody - I'm not sure if people have actually read it yet. But what I'd like to do is I'd like to give, you know, about a week to put - to post questions on the - if anyone's got any questions to - to take about the next seven days to - to post those on the - on the list.

And if there aren't any significant questions, you know, other than like little typos and things, then maybe if - if everyone's good with it, potentially we could do a consensus call. At least on these initial chargers, with the understanding that the work teams would also have a crack at this after they were formed.

Woman: Can I ask a question? Now that I remember, about consensus calls?

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

Woman: Okay. When you did the last consensus call, you asked for everyone to say yeah. And - and I'm wondering, did we decide intentionally that everyone had to make a positive assertion of support, as opposed to it being adequate to do a consensus call, where no one indicates opposition?

Because it - it kept, I mean, the two are almost the same, yet they're slightly different. And so I just wanted to make sure when you talked about consensus calls, if we had made - because then it really looks like we're looking for unanimous vote, as opposed to looking for consensus, which means, no one was inspired to object.

And I just wanted to bring up that question, and - and - and when we talked about doing another consensus call, I wanted to ask that.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan here. I didn't - I don't have the right to participate in the formal yes. On the other hand, I interpreted the question more wider than he may have ordered it. So if I had had a objection I would have raised it at that point.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...else. Did all - other people would have also.

Man: I like, if possible, to get all the yes's. And then deal with it if we don't.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Man: But that's my personal view. If people disagree, you know, I, you know, this situation we didn't have anyone say no. And we didn't have anyone not respond, which was good. I mean, I - I liked - I'd rather operate that way if we can. Okay?

Woman: Okay cool. I didn't - I didn't know were being intentional, but if intentional, that's cool. Sorry.

Liz Gasster: So Jeff, will you re-state where you are?

Jeff Neuman: Re-state where - what my thoughts are?

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Oh. Okay. So my thoughts are is to give people in - on the PPSC another seven days to ask questions, raise comments about the two work team charters. Because I get - I get the feeling that not everyone's read them on this call.

Man: Jeff can I ask you something? Of the people that are subscribed to the working group, can the first questions for the PDP and visa versa?

Jeff Neuman: Can you (po) - what type of (ques) - you mean questions on the charter? Or questions on the?

Man: On the charter - on the charter.

Jeff Neuman: Sure. I mean, you - you could put.

Man: All right.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. I'd like to give at least another week for people to do that. And then depending on the number of questions, the types of questions, possibly issue. If not, the week after. Certainly after the next call, to try to get to a position where we could do a consensus call on the work team charters.

And again, with the understanding that the consensus call is only to pass the charters onto the work teams, who will then have another chance at revising it if they see fit. Does that make sense?

But I think it would be good to get the questions in, you know, within a week. So that if there are some good questions, that we have a week to prepare some answers or propose some alternate language or something to that effect. So Jay Scott, do you think that works too for the working group team?

J. Scott Evans: Yes. And my only question would be Jeff, would it be okay if we circulated it to the list for the particular team?

Jeff Neuman: I mean it's a public document. So anyone could access it.

J. Scott Evans: But I mean, I realize that. But if we circulate it on the list, at least those people who have expressed interest, and Glen seems to have already put on the list, will get.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I mean, I don't have an objection to that. I think, you know, the - the people that should raise it to the PPSC are PPSC members. So if - if Jay Scott if you know there's a question came up from someone who's not on the PPSC, if you could just make sure that the rest of the PPSC is made aware of the question.

J. Scott Evans: That's exactly what I'd done. As sort of interim Chair, I was going to circulate the working group list, tell them that there was going to be - if they had any questions, they had seven days to get them to me, so that I could pass them on to the PPSC. Either in writing or on our next call.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. I think that's a good idea. And if - if everyone agrees, I'll - I'll do that as well with the (PDPT).

J. Scott Evans: I'm just trying to get some engagement, to see what kind of response I get.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Sort of start moving the ball forward.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So with your pick down sections four - you'll take down section four of - of I guess it's both of them.

Liz Gasster: Yes I will.

Jeff Neuman: And then Jay Scott that - that's a good idea. I'll do the same with the PDP team.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. And Avri, if she takes down section four, I can still go in later and look at the previous version that would show the wording that was previously in section four correct?

Jeff Neuman: Correct.

J. Scott Evans: Because I just would like to use that if I'm interim Chair, or to point an interim - the Chair to that. So that would stimulate some discussion where they want to move forward.

Avri Doria: Yeah. You can look at all the previous revisions.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you Avri and Alan.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Which brings us to...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, what was that?

Avri Doria: You could even compare them to each other. It really quite useful.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: So that brings us to the next item. And Jay, I had made a recommendation on the list. And I just wanted people to confirm that

that was okay, until we - until the work teams were established. Was that Jay Scott and I had volunteered to serve as interim Chairs of the two groups, just until the work teams got together and could pick someone.

The reason we did this is because we wanted - as Jay Scott said, we want to see things move forward. And so, you know, we just put our names forward.

But I - I wanted to get - if anyone objects to that, let me know and we could chose other ones.

Liz Gasster: I think it's an excellent idea.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Man: Agree.

Jeff Neuman: Anyone else have any thoughts?

J. Scott Evans: Jeff, should we put it out to - as a consensus call to the full group, since we have such a small group this time?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. We could do that.

J. Scott Evans: And just say this - we - this is a suggested way forward. If you have any - please...

Jeff Neuman: Yeah I - what I could do is just take the one email I'd sent to the groups last week, and then just resend that with an additional note on the top

saying, you know, we're putting this out for a consensus call. And, just do it the same way I did it with the - with the header consensus call.

J. Scott Evans: You talking to Liz or me?

Jeff Neuman: Both of you. Anyone. Everyone. So what I'll do...

J. Scott Evans: If I could...

Jeff Neuman: ...by tomorrow...

J. Scott Evans: I'll...

Jeff Neuman: ...is put that out.

J. Scott Evans: If I can find it, I'll be glad to do it. I just got...

Jeff Neuman: You know, I have it. I have it here.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: So I will - I will either fill it out right after this call, or first thing tomorrow.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: I think we jumped around a little bit on the agenda. But I thought it was better to just insert that part there, since we had kind of mentioned it.

So I think the next item on the agenda is the work team rules. And, Liz has actually put the latest version on the wiki. And I know it's linked

from the PDP - from the PDP team. And I'm assuming it's also linked from the working group team, and probably the main PPSC as well?

Liz Gasster: I think it's all three.

J. Scott Evans: It is. It is. There's a red line version.

Liz Gasster: Yeah. The red line is what we're working...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Liz Gasster: ...right now. Because I took the draft that the (OFC)...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Liz Gasster: ...did, updated it, or to show the PPSC acronym. Also to show some suggested edit Tim made in both work team rules, for - in both the (OCS) context and PPSC context. And, made a couple changes to the suggested template for statements of interest, that was suggested by ICANN council.

J. Scott Evans: Liz, can I make one suggestion?

Liz Gasster: Sure.

J. Scott Evans: Can we place the word interim before work team rules? Because it seems to the working group team will eventually come up confirming this or tweaking it. So everyone understands that this is interim until that group sort of comes forward with something.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: So I think that's a good suggestion. I know Mike Rodenbaugh said that he had some comments on - or will have some comments on this, but just hasn't yet had the opportunity to put them out. He said he was - and he's not on this call today.

I don't know if anyone else on this call has any questions or further questions on the work team rules. But I'd kind of like to do the same thing as we're doing for the work team charters, is put this out there for a period of seven days, to see if we can get some questions that we can answer on the next call - if that makes sense.

J. Scott Evans: I think that's a great idea.

Jeff Neuman: The sooner we can kind of put this to rest, or at least interim - or put it to rest for the interim, the sooner we can - can move forward with - with the work. And the changes on the statements of interest are - it's just those changes that are in the draft now Liz? The changing firms, entities that our stake holders?

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Avri Doria: Are we still on the work team rules?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Avri Doria: Can I ask a question when the queue gets to me?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. I mean there's not much of a queue, so, yeah, absolutely. You can do that now.

Avri Doria: Okay. In truth of looking at statements of interest, and this is a general question I've got. For many people end up with many of them. And - and - and I'm wondering is there - and I know that I've often been bad and not submitted a new one, and just sort of left my general statement as a general statement with no exception.

And - and - and is there a way to do these so that, you know, and - and when I read through this one, there's really only the last point where it says, it's (unintelligible) arrangement or agreement, which he's a participant in any other group (unintelligible) regarding the person's selection as, you know, as PPSC (WT) member.

But other than that, it - it's a very general case. And I'm just wondering, as people, you know, for example, the people that are on the council, who participate in the PPSC, who then participate also in the work teams, end up with three different ones.

Do we want that to be necessary? And - and also, we were talking before, why we have a guideline against participating in many. Some people will, you know? Do they need a different one for each thing they do? If they just sort of write a general blanket one that serves for them all?

Liz Gasster: Makes sense to me.

Tim Ruiz: Related to that - this is Tim. Related to that, did the councilors, is their statement of interest on file with the council GNSO? Does that suffice? Or do we need a separate one for the routine jobs?

Jeff Neuman: I think talked about this - we talked about this a couple meetings ago. And it wasn't our intent to have everyone file a completely new one, if they had already had ones on file. Except to update what may be outdated.

I think this is what we had discussed. This is maybe two or three meetings ago.

Avri Doria: Right. That's what I kind of thought. But then we'd look at the work team rules, and it sort of very specific, saying each will, without a statement saying, for, you know, for people who have one on file, update it if necessary, you know. Or something like that.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah I think - I think that would be a helpful addition.

Avri Doria: Now when we came up with this, it was someone's request, but I'm trying to remember whose - maybe Mike? That - that for all participants in this effort, that these questions be answered.

So, it might be worth talking about with a broader group. But it would definitely be awkward to have people with - having to create multiple statements for multiple efforts.

So, one of the things that we also need to think about in a different context is, statements of interest in general. Because that was one of the issues on the - in the GNSO improvements that I think was

properly within the scope of the GNSO operations group. To come up with the updated statement, or enhanced improved - new and improved statement of interest that would be more detailed.

So I think on the table might be whether this or something like it should be adopted more broadly. But I don't at all want to pre-suppose the work of that group, or.

Jeff Neuman: I think this is good. I think if we - if we add a sentence, sort of like Avri said. You know, if you already have one on file that addresses each of these questions, that may be.

J. Scott Evans: You simply need to make sure it's current.

Man: Can I?

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Alan Greenberg: Can I ask what the intent is of the last item? Does that say that if you are representing the (IP) constituency you should say that you are doing that? Or does this have some other intent that I'm not seeing? Does it describe any arrangements or agreements?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. I think that - if you're with a constituency, but also if you're a consultant in your business - to registrars, registries, to ICANN, you have to disclose it.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. But it says regarding the participant's selection as a member, does that mean something that should be considered when deciding whether we should select them? Or that we need to know?

If - if it's what you're saying then, then it's - it would part of a normal statement of interest. If it is the explicit statement that I am here representing a constituency or a particular group, and - then that's not going to be part of a - a standard - a stock statement of interest.

Jeff Neuman: So if you took out the word selection and put in something like service, then it would - would that make more sense to you Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I'm really just questioning what there - what the intent was.

J. Scott Evans: Well the - the reality is you're self-selecting right? You just - you self...

Alan Greenberg: You volunteer.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Yes sir. There's no selection process.

Jeff Neuman: No. A - constituencies may well have got together and decided that...

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: ...first an X will be speaking on behalf of the constituency.

Alan Greenberg: Right. So, but I think what we want to know is, not regarding your selection, but it's regarding your service as a member. So, if you're there on behalf of a constituency, or behalf of an organization, or if you are a consultant who does work for an organization, we'd want to know that.

Jeff Neuman: That's right. But in addition to that, we may want as a separate statement, not necessarily contained in the statement of interest, whether you're there repre- formally representing any group.

Just so we know when we do consensus calls and various other things that - that we know they're speaking on, not behalf of - on behalf of themselves necessarily, but on behalf of - because somewhere else later on it says, if you are speaking, you know, you have to make it clear whether you're speaking on behalf of yourself or a group.

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Jeff Neuman: So I'm just saying, up front you should be saying which group is it you might be representing. Which if we want to use stock statements of interest, is not really part of the formal statement of interest.

So I'm not trying to complicate things. I just wanted to make sure I understood what - what it is we're asking.

J. Scott Evans: Well - well what I would suggest, because it's difficult to conceptualize Alan, is that you put it - if you think that there's alternative wording or additional...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: ...that you'd put it in writing and circulate it to the group, so that we could see it, because...

Alan Greenberg: Okay. When - when I read it again, I'll see if it - it's then crystal clear or warrants something.

J. Scott Evans: (Unintelligible) focusing on this - the difference.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. The other thing I think we need is a sentence or something that - that requires people to keep it updated, which seems to be missing. So it's not only an initial statement of interest that people are submitting, but it's, you know, something - any development that happens that may change your (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: And that should go after the last bullet point. Because it basically refers to everything you put into the bullet.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

J. Scott Evans: Liz, do you want to try to draft something? Or do you want me to?

Liz Gasster: I mean, I can draft something that says, you know, I don't know. Participants are asked to update their statements of interest whenever their circumstances change.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah I would say - I would say that they were - instead of their asked to, that they're required to.

Liz Gasster: Got it.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. So is there any other questions at this point on the work team rules, with the understanding that we all kind of need to go back and - and re-read it, and make sure we actually take advantage of the email list to post questions?

Sorry about that. Okay. Hearing silence again, I will- we'll make that our - an action item. Let me go back to the agenda, but I think we've pretty much covered what we're supposed to cover.

So should we go over the action items?

Avri Doria: Can I ask?

Jeff Neuman: Sure. Is that Avri?

Avri Doria: Yep. Can I ask a question? Or maybe - maybe I don't need to. No, never mind. Okay, so this - this - these work team rules would apply equally to both of the work teams. It's not specific in that respect?

Jeff Neuman: Correct.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: If the work teams meet and feel like there should be something unique to that work team, they are free to make that suggestion.

Avri Doria: Yeah. Hopefully if they do, that can be coordinated between them. Of course I know one of the purposes is to get a general set of rules that will apply for all...

J. Scott Evans: So, and that (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: ...working groups always, but, yeah.

J. Scott Evans: That - that's one thing we will consider as the working group team - will consider...

Avri Doria: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: ...is that. But I mean, you know, it's routinely done where you have a set of principles that serves as a floor.

Avri Doria: Yeah, yeah.

J. Scott Evans: You have to have this. But should you feel the, you know, need or desire, or it's required to have additional, that's not prevented.

Avri Doria: Right. Additional, but not to change...

J. Scott Evans: That's right. You can't take away the basic...

Avri Doria: ...- you want something saying, no appeals.

J. Scott Evans: ...so, okay.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: The action items that I have on - Liz is going to - I'm sorry. Glen is going to send around the most updated list of volunteers for the - even though she read it on the call. She'll send around for all the work teams.

The work group team charters, we'll give everyone seven days to post any additional questions that they have on the work team charters. With the goal of answering those questions and doing a consensus call at the next meeting, or shortly thereafter.

And the next meeting for - just to remind everyone is, we have it every other week. So it'll be in two weeks on Wednesday.

The next action item is to review the work team rules again in a period of seven days, to post any questions, with the goal of finalizing that for a - a consensus call on - at the next meeting,.

And as with the - both the charters and the work team rules, they are on an interim basis until the work teams have a chance to look - especially with the charters - to look at the charters, and see if they have any changes on those charters. And also if they want to add to the work team rules, or make suggestions.

To that end, Jay Scott, I don't know if you've already done it, or will be, and I will be sending you onto the work teams, these drafts of the charters to see if there's any questions from people that aren't on the PPSC. And we'll forward to the PPSC any questions that we get.

And on the forth item with interim Chairs, I'll put a consensus call out after this meeting, or first thing tomorrow, to nominate Jay Scott and myself for the interim Chairs of the two groups.

J. Scott Evans: And our next call's on the 4th?

Jeff Neuman: I'd have to look at a calendar.

Man: Yes. It's on the 4th.

J. Scott Evans: It's the same time - same bat time, same bat number?

Jeff Neuman: I would assume it's the same number, but at the same time.

Liz Gasster: Yes it is.

J. Scott Evans: All right. Super.

Jeff Neuman: Also on the agenda if - if we do finalize the charters, and we finalize the work team rules, then we will also discuss whether we actually need a call every two weeks. Or alternatively reserve that time for the - sorry about that.

I don't know if that's my phone. Or reserve the time to - for the work teams individually to have calls, as opposed to the full Steering Committee. But we'll - we'll talk about that next time. Any other questions?

Tim Ruiz: Hey Jeff this is Tim.

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

Tim Ruiz: Just to let you know now that I won't be able to make the call on the 4th. But I'll keep an eye out for the consensus call so I can respond to that.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Good. You have an alternate right? (Unintelligible)?

Tim Ruiz: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Can you recall exactly who it is?

Tim Ruiz: I'll see if he can fill in.

Jeff Neuman: Did the business constituency select an alternate? I can't - I'm not on the charter page. But did they?

Tim Ruiz: Yeah they had (Zied Jamel).

J. Scott Evans: Yep.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. All right. Is there any other comments, questions? Hearing none, Liz, you good with everything?

Liz Gasster: I'm good.

Jeff Neuman: All right.

J. Scott Evans: Have a little chicken soup.

Jeff Neuman: Oh yeah, I need it. I'm exhausted. I got to get some sleep.

J. Scott Evans: I'm telling you, I - I had it over Christmas, and it's next to tuberculosis. It's horrible. I hope you get better soon.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I got to get on a flight in two days back, so that's going to be wonderful.

Woman: Good luck.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. All right everyone. Have a good two weeks. I'll talk to you on the 4th.

J. Scott Evans: All right. Bye-bye.

Jeff Neuman: All right. Bye.

END