

**WHOIS Survey Drafting Team (Chair and Vice-Chairs)
TRANSCRIPT**

Wednesday 27 July 2011 at 1300 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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.

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-whois-survey-dt-20110727-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/>

Attendees Werner Staub - CORE
Wilson Abigaba - .ug ccTLD registrar
Michael Young - Individual
Don Blumenthal – Ry
Cintra Sooknanan - At-Large

ICANN Staff

Liz Gasster
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:
Steve Sheng

Coordinator: Excuse me. It's the operator. I just need to inform all participants that today's conference call is being recorded. If you do have any objections you may disconnect your line at this time. And you may begin.

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes. Thank you (Lori). Good morning, good afternoon to everyone on today's WhoIs Survey Dot Drafting Team with the chairs and vice chairs we have sorry, on Wednesday the 27th of July.

We have Werner Staub, Michael Young, Don Blumenthal, Wilson Abigaba. From staff we have Liz Gasster and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. If I could also just remind you to state your names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Michael.

Michael Young: All right.

Liz Gasster: And Michael, just so you know Steve Sheng sends his apologies. He's at the IETF meeting.

Michael Young: Yes. I actually was considering going as well. There is a Whols related (bath) - what we call bar (bath) going on over there but it won't get kicked off. That's not a formal (bath). So I figured before I give away two or three days of my life it's got to be a real start to a working group.

All right. Thank you everyone for coming to the call. I appreciate it. For Don we'll try to catch you up but we covered a fair bit on last week's call and if you could all start by retrieving and opening the Word document I just sent out, hopefully all of you are at a computer and can do that and we'll use that as a framework for today's call.

Just hold on a second. Does anyone not have access to their email right now? Okay. Great. Just another 30 seconds for people to get it open and then we'll moving. Okay. Hopefully you have all got that open. What this document is entitled work plan structure for Whols survey working group, please mind the misspellings and I pounded this out fast and furious.

I had a tight schedule since last week but I think I captured everything that we discussed. We fought through and I'll just walk you through the document and then as we go to the document and recap the ideas that we talked about last week and I elaborated on some of them and incorporate the feedback we had on communications and so forth.

The first section is just a cut and paste from the current scope and I jacked this from the draft charter so that the chairs can take a look at this and keep referring back to it. We may want to adjust this, expand on this a little bit in regards to what we're going to call Part B, which you'll see further down. I think this current scope and objectives language certainly covers Part A.

I don't know that it covers the elements of Part B but it certainly doesn't stop us from doing Part B. And I think the terminology of the report delivered to the GNSO gives us a little bit of license for Part B, which we'll cover in a second further down the document. I've also included here from a link that maybe not everybody has followed and read but originally with the WhoIs requirements report it began with a resolution from council.

And the work was initiated on the bridge requirements documents. I think it was an excellent piece of work. But this particular work we're doing now actually did not come out of the formal resolution. It came out of a discussion and then a statement prepared by Chuck Gomes who most of you know. And you can see I've posted that into the document just so you can review it.

It gives us a little bit of guidance and understanding as to you know, what the council might expect from our efforts as well and where you know, the representation in that group is kind of seeing the concerns. I think it's important when you read Chuck's language to realize that you know, this type of a change or any change that we try and push forward on WhoIs functionality through this requirements work entails both you know, risk of adoption.

It entails costs for providers. On the other hand, it provides opportunities for providers because a lot of these providers operating WhoIs today are very interested in supporting the burgeoning and expanding IDN space and this is one of the areas of focus I think that really has gotten people finally motivated to do something different about our WhoIs implementation.

Our WhoIs implementations have been frankly ugly for years and years and years. And why now are we all of a sudden interested in these WhoIs changes? Well, IDN is one of the big reasons as IPB6 is another one too and we can talk about that a little later. So jumping down to how we structured the

work group, I asked to take this requirements document and ultimately produce a survey and process the results in a meaningful way.

This is you know, difficult work. It requires a lot of thought leadership and I'm really happy in this case that we have had a lot of volunteers that are willing to take on you know - whenever you say you're going to volunteer for a vice or chair position, the way I see that leadership position is that is an additional work commitment on your part beyond just that of a regular member of a working group.

And to that end there will be some higher expectations on you as vice chairs and me as chair in terms of meeting attendance and support versus just a standard working group member. And I'll come to that when we talk about the meeting schedule at the end of the document. But I wanted to put this document, just the importance of that volunteer base. I think it's great.

And it's imperative - I went through the backgrounds of everyone that has volunteered. Everyone comes from strong communication backgrounds and I think that that's what makes it possible for us to now take an attempt at breaking up into subgroups and doing some of this work in parallel. So that's where we get this is just a work outline.

So Part A is the idea of breaking the work into the following three areas. And we talked about this, we covered this verbally in the last call but I've actually written it down now in this document and this is the group that will write the actual survey questions. We're not going to look at the Whols requirements document. We're going to look at things like what Chuck has written.

We're going to look towards a lot of the commentary that has come back from the other Whols related groups and make sure that they are considering when they draft these questions all the interested parties and they can ensure these questions are comprehensive, are easily comprehended by the various stakeholders. I don't know if easily is attainable but we'll certainly reach for it.

And another important thing for in terms of creating those questions is the team needs to come up with a strategy that is fair and meaningful to all the stakeholders in terms of the power mechanism that allows us in our report at the end of this to actually come up with a prioritization methodology for the Whols requirements that came from the respondents.

It's important that it's clear. It's important that when it comes to the prioritization the requirements are unbiased and well constructed in the survey. Otherwise you know, we could start a whole circle of arguments of whether or not among stakeholders the prioritization is correct. So that's where we need to think this through carefully. It's important.

The next group is a survey tool recipient decision team. One of the big questions we raised on the very first call is who does this survey actually go to. And while you're deciding the recipients you have to also decide the delivery mechanism because they go hand in hand. So this is a natural coupling of action items to review, figure out who the stakeholders are and who should actually be answering the survey as well as the delivery mechanism.

I also threw in here that this group really should consider stakeholders, how we identify stakeholders and those stakeholders outside the sphere of ICANN related communities. You know, obviously when we think outside of ICANN we go to our close neighbors. We go to the places like ISAC or ITF or the IGF or CENTR members and various places that I would call in the sphere of ICANN.

The question that I think this group also needs to consider is are there stakeholders out of that normal sphere. And if there are, are they able to provide meaningful responses? Do they understand these requirements and these issues around Whols well enough to actually give thoughtful and constructive responses? We may be able to identify stakeholders outside that

sphere but they may not be able to give us a response that is you know, well thought out and that contributes to something that is meaningful.

I don't know the answer to that but I think that's one of the tough questions this group would have to figure out. The third team is the requirements verification team. We talked about the fact that things move quickly, requirements or ideas around requirements change. There has already been some time since the report was written.

The original resolution of officers and stakeholders were consulted when the report was initially done. We certainly all agreed on the first call it would be valuable to check in with those stakeholders but also possibly with some other stakeholders that have subject matter expertise. And for example, maybe we make a prescribed outreach to some of the ITF stakeholders, in particular those that are working on WhoIs related issues.

And ask them to look at the report and comment on it, whether or not they want to add clarification or just their support to what is in the WhoIs requirements report or whether or not they have additional requirements that they think are vital that no one considered. So this is our sanity check, this group. And the results of this group, all three groups actually feed each other to a certain degree.

So group three for example would feed additional stakeholders if they discovered up to groups two and group one and group three would if they came up with something that was new or considered a new requirement or even something that was a significant change or consideration on an existing requirement, they'd have to feed it up to group one so that the questions are reflected back.

So we all recognized in the past couple calls that that cross communication between teams in order to make the parallel work effective is very important. So with that in mind, that's wrapped into the meeting schedule and

consideration. But let's draft and finish the Part A and Part B before we go into the meetings structure to see if everyone is okay with that.

I think that I have a little statement in here helping the co-chairs kind of drive a project management methodology mentality - there's alliteration for you - around how we do our work because I really think that this particular piece of work is actually relatively defined for us, which is fortunate. We have all probably been in working groups where it's not so defined.

So it makes it difficult but if we want to push forward and produce work on a regular schedule, the first meeting you should have with your group would be to define your scope of work and your task assignments and then actually write a sub working group project plan for your team. And I will volunteer to take on those project plans, the three project plans and compile them into a consolidated run on master project plan that the entire work group can track and monitor and see how the milestones are being met.

That kind of would bring us to the end of Part A when we finish that work with the administration of survey and then the responses coming back. But this sort of comes to an end of the formal ask from the GNSO was assuming that the responses themselves form the body of the report. But I think the way I interpret the report and I think the way most of you would is that you know, just handing back the responses without some processing and thought on the responses is just really to some degree throwing data on people's shoulders and not helping them understand it.

So I think that leads us to say that Part B is valid and required in order to have a meaningful report back to the GNSO. And this is where we come back together as a whole working group in Part B. And we would walk through the responses that we have together as a team from the survey results. Again, in order to make this practical this is where we really would find it extremely useful if each question had an intelligent tally mechanism to it so that we're

not trying to interpret you know, the meaning of the responses and the weighting of the responses in terms of the questions.

So if group one does their work carefully and the tallies are clear and easy to comprehend, we'll be able to move through the responses on each question fairly quickly as a working group. While we're doing that I think we would take comments from the working group members on those results, discuss them, define them with each survey question result and then at the end of the review go through and document, see if we have any whole team recommendations.

Hopefully there is full consensus recommendations but if not, we put out recommendations that are both full team consensus, majority or minority positions and that would build really the front end of the report and hopefully will drive some meaning or some context into how we interpret the meaning of the results of the survey findings.

At that point we have a document I think that we can post for public comment and our last action then in that particular round would be compiling any responses we got from public comment into the final report and making any adjustments we thought made sense if any in consideration of the ideas that came back from public comment.

Lastly then we have you know, this is a completely extra item that I'm suggesting that we put in. I can't really justify it like I can the previous items because I don't know if there was a mandate at all put in to Chuck's statement. But I think it's important. If we produce this report and we produce these general recommendations on how to interpret or prioritize the requirements based on the survey and we don't create recommended next steps, the flow or the professed flow of actually addressing some of these major community issues raised not just in this Whols requirements document but in numerous other Whols activities that happened over the last five or six years, if we don't create recommended next steps I don't see any path that

we'd move toward implementing any of these requirements even if the community has clearly spoken up about what the talk through requirements are.

And I just put this in the back just to suggest that that might be one way of approaching the recommended next steps. And so that one in particular I'd really like to hear your thoughts. Does anyone have any feelings or thoughts on that last suggested work item? Wow.

Werner Staub: This is (Warner). You mean are you asking whether we agree about the importance of this work item?

Michael Young: Yes. And actually all of Part B - how do people feel about the Part B work elements? Are you guys good with it? In particular that last one, yes. How do you feel about that?

Werner Staub: I think I find it necessary. The one concern that I have that is not related to Part B is just overall what the timeline for our working group will be.

Michael Young: Yes.

Werner Staub: So maybe we should discuss a little bit how we go into the calendar, the physical calendar.

Michael Young: Sure. Sure.

Werner Staub: And when we expect to be complete because it looks easier in the beginning than I realize it is now that we should possibly try to look for further just in the sense of what you've proposed already by putting some stuff in parallel to see if you're actually getting through in time.

Michael Young: Yes. So does anyone else have comments before I speak to that because I think that comes down to our meeting schedule to some degree too. Does anyone else want to comment on Part B?

Don Blumenthal: Yes. It's Don. I'm raising a question here that I don't have the expertise to answer and I don't know if anybody does here. But generally in terms of survey design and response I can imagine that the idea of a group analyzing the survey that is developed might be a problem.

And I'd really like to get some input from people who are experienced in this to see if there is some kind of inherent conflict.

Michael Young: You know, that's - I hear what you're saying Don. My own experience having done surveys over the years for different purposes is that you know, the conflict comes into play as if we were the decision makers on the outcome.

We're simply a group making recommendations and trying to add some contextual meaning around data that comes back, which is one of the reasons I suggested the tally mechanism around the questions has to be objective, has to be unbiased and it has to be clear because I think where we would get kind of labeled or in trouble as a group is if we look like we in any way were trying to influence the prioritization of the requirements.

Don Blumenthal: Yes. Precisely. My concern is writing the questions to get the answers we want.

Michael Young: Yes. So maybe that's a question specifically for group one to try and answer. Maybe what we do is we see if we get an independent body to review and bless the questions basically saying whether or not those questions appear objective and well structured for an unbiased response.

Don Blumenthal: Okay.

Michael Young: Does that make sense?

Don Blumenthal: Yes. I mean I don't even know if it needs to be that formal. Like I said, I was raising an issue from ignorance.

Michael Young: I don't know how ignorant that is. That's a pretty good issue. Sorry. I was just thinking.

Liz Gasster: It's Liz. Just my hand is raised from the other chair.

Michael Young: Yes Sorry. I am bad. I did not open my Adobe Connect yet. I'm working off my document here. So go ahead Liz.

Liz Gasster: Just to say that in my brief experience with the surveys that we're working on right now for Whols I'm less concerned about the same entity analyzing the data than the entity developing the survey.

But I do think that having an independent or fresh look at survey questions to screen for a number of different things, clarity, loadedness of terms, facility in like plain English, a number of different views is extremely useful and we just did that on one of the surveys I worked on and it was very important to the degree where I think even ICANN might have a consultant who you know.

In others words there could be some funding to take a couple of hours to look at what's done by this group to offer an independent view that we'd be glad to contribute if that would be helpful. We uncovered some things that were really incredibly helpful in some of the work I just did.

Michael Young: That would I think be great Liz. So you know, group one would finish off their work and if we could have an independent consultant review comment on it, that would be a great check and balance.

Liz Gasster: And obviously I contribute - Steve's not on the call today I mentioned earlier. But his expertise just from the standpoint of formulating questions from his research expertise goes without saying as well.

Michael Young: Right. Okay. Fantastic. Do we have...?

Liz Gasster: One thing I'll add just about Part B is you know, you could hold in abeyance in a sense the degree to which you decide you'd want to recommend next steps or identify a number of requirements whether it's three or two or five you know, based on that feedback that you get from the survey.

Michael Young: Right.

Liz Gasster: Just you (know) for now that the survey is going to reveal information whatever it might be and that it could be that it leads you to some number of obvious requirements or some surprising results in a different way.

Michael Young: Yes.

Liz Gasster: You leave yourself open to say the very fact of analyzing the survey is going to inform this group about the extent to which making you know, recommendations that you're comfortable with as a group naturally come out of the results of that assessment.

Michael Young: I think that's a very good point. So again, we can make sure that the survey questions actually perhaps cover with the respondents not just prioritization of requirements but perhaps how they might go about addressing those requirements.

What implementation or next steps level steps would they think make sense? I mean it'd be tricky to develop those in survey questions but I'm sure with some effort we could. So that's helpful. Thank you. Anyone else with comments on Part B in particular? Okay.

I'm going to go on to the meeting schedule and then after the meeting schedule I'd just like to - actually before the meeting schedule can we just confirm? Don, I'm going to put you on the spot for a second. We've had volunteers already to lead groups one and two leaving group three open. And we were really hoping that you would feel comfortable with taking the leadership position on group three so that we have a nice confirmation. Is that something you think you could do? Do we still have Don?

Don Blumenthal: I just came back. I lost my Internet connection which blew up Adobe Connect and Skype.

Michael Young: Okay. Don, I'll repeat my question. Last call we already had expressions of interest for leadership on groups one and two and leaves three wide open. But when I think about your background and your deep relationships with a lot of these stakeholders, we were hoping that you would be willing to take leadership on group three so that would make everything just fall nicely into place.

Don Blumenthal: That's fine for two reasons. I've done a lot of the outreach since I joined PIR but I still have a lot more folks to get to know. (So I can do that).

Michael Young: Wonderful. So Liz, I guess we've got that. We can finalize that now so (Warner) on group one, Wilson two and Don three.

Liz Gasster: Great. Thank you.

Michael Young: Okay. And so let's - you know, just after talking with - I had a couple of emails from people on the call last week just thinking about how we keep the cross communications going and a great suggestion on how we get volunteers for the different sub teams. So I'll go to that suggestion last.

But in the meeting schedule what I've set up here is in Part A suggesting we have the sub groups meet every two weeks proceeding with the work elements every alternate week. So this means that the chairs are going to be having weekly meetings in order to make fairly good progress. And this alternate week meeting would really be while I would make a point of structuring it very carefully with a good agenda.

And hopefully if we're efficient at something we can knock off in a half an hour and it's there for us to you know, feed the ongoing cost dependent knowledge to keep our work going, it's a check in point and it's a regular project management meeting where we'll check each other's milestones and look for showstoppers and so forth.

And if necessary, help each other's group out if one of the groups is falling behind for any reason. And then there was some expression from the general members of the working group that they'd like to you know, get an overview of everything that's going on periodically as well during this period so I was going to suggest that every third chair meeting is a full working group meeting.

We'd run basically the same agenda as just a chair meeting but everybody would be invited and you know, we'd start the call with maybe a little bit more detailed overview of where we're at and probably start with the project management review of the milestones so that all the team members can see where we're at, comprehend where we're at and also observe the rest of the meeting and see if that overview and understanding of the total group progress maybe will allow them to red flag something that they're working on that for whatever reason wasn't successfully communicated through the chair meetings to cross chair meetings.

Okay. And then you know, assuming we get through Part A Part B would be people, our working group members indicated a willingness to meet every two weeks for an average working group member plus a lot of the work that

we'd be doing takes time to process, review and for people to write things in some cases.

So in Part B we'd just go to meetings every two weeks. If we thought we could get a two-hour commitment out of people we'll go for that. But at least an hour because at this point we'd go to a serial work flow so the longer we can sustain the meetings, the more hours we can put in, the quicker the review portion of it goes.

And of course we'd have a break in those meetings during the public comment period while we waited for comments to come back. So I wanted - to your idea of calendars, I'm pretty rigorous a project manager in the sense that I need people to define their work elements and size up their work before I would sit there and say this is going to take two months versus six months versus eight months.

And I also think if we don't do I think quality and doing a good job on this ensures the most likelihood of actually some of these requirements being implemented. So I would almost say that you know, if we rush this and do a poor job of it it'll just result in another similar exercise being done again versus you know, moving on towards implementation.

So you know, you can see with the attempt to parallelize, I'm big on progress. I don't want this to take a long time. On the other hand, I think the first thing we need to do is you guys with your sub groups is to have a meeting and determine how long you think it takes for you to do your work. I would probably size the work of going through the survey results and building up a report and relevant recommendations.

You know, we're meeting every two weeks and we can squeeze two hours out of people, we might get it done in two months. If we can't squeeze two hours out of people then it could take three to four months going on past experience with other working groups for Part B. Part A is completely

dependent on the answers that you as sub group leaders come back with on how fast you think you can do the work. Does that make sense?

Werner Staub: I agree. I agree. I mean the thing is indeed we probably don't have the ability to go back and correct things if we got them wrong. So if you got the questions wrong so to speak or people don't understand them or they go down the wrong track, once we've already started the survey and people have started answering then there is no more time to change the questions.

Michael Young: Yes.

Werner Staub: So we should be sure to get that one correct. Then as soon as we evaluate those and maybe have to make do with whatever plugs we have in the questionnaire.

Michael Young: Right. So that's another thing for you to think of. If we get a response back and we know that the question and the responses are clearly slanted because it was a clear misunderstanding of the question, you know, do we discount that or disqualify that question from the survey results because we know it went off sideways? Liz, are we even allowed to do that, you know?

Liz Gasster: Sorry. Are we allowed to do what exactly?

Michael Young: Well, let's say you know, we put out - this is an interesting thought train but we put out you know, a survey of 70-80 questions and we get a few of them come back and we can tell by the responses that the question was misread or misunderstood from how we intended it to be comprehended. Do we disqualify those questions from the survey results or are we even allowed to do that?

Liz Gasster: Yes. These are questions Steve - I would look to Steve to help answer. Yes.

Michael Young: Okay. So maybe we can or maybe that's something.

Liz Gasster: You know, if too many people totally misread a question we have to discard it, you know, unless you get into it from the misreading what they meant and count it a different way.

Michael Young: Yes.

Liz Gasster: But you know, you obviously don't want to include something that has the validity is unsubstantiated.

Michael Young: Exactly.

Liz Gasster: So you know, my question would be more okay, can you change it? You realize that - but I think that's one of the reasons why you do this review is to try to really determine these.

Michael Young: Right. And you know, would it be permissible so we could have a consultant to do that. But would it also be permissible to have somebody to actually have a beta group?

Liz Gasster: Sure.

Michael Young: Right.

Liz Gasster: Right. I mean as you like.

Michael Young: Okay. So (Warner), maybe that's you know, a beta group plus a consultant plus a described methodology by which we might discount a question from the results if it was clearly misunderstood. That gives us some coverage.

Liz Gasster: I mean you could even - this might be extreme but you could even ask the GNSO council to assign from each constituency a stakeholder group, one or two people to review this survey you know, with like a public comment.

Michael Young: Or we could have them as our beta group testers.

Liz Gasster: You could have them as a beta group and then you get the council's buy in. I think you should feel as creative as you like in terms of what extent you think is prudent.

Michael Young: Right. Coming back to the meeting schedule for a second, I will make myself available to all of you to support your individual co-chair meetings periodically to help you because I am basically asking you to come to weekly meetings.

So therefore I am prepared to come to weekly meetings as well. So if it's helpful for me to sit in on particular meetings or help you work through materials for a particular meeting, I just want to make it clear I'm available for that. Okay. So I think we're in pretty good shape. We've confirmed our group leaders, we have gone over the meeting schedule.

Does anyone have any other issues, comments, thoughts before we actually get to it?

Liz Gasster: I guess one would be - this is Liz - to try to nail down the charter with the group, incorporate into the charter as much of this planning as you like.

Michael Young: Yes.

Liz Gasster: And then you know, Wendy Seltzer is not on this call but I think offered to kind of be a liaison to the council, take the charter back or you can send a note to the council that I can post.

Michael Young: Right. So our goal was to - I'm going to adjust then based on this call and if there is no negative feedback, I'll try and wrap the elements of this work scope here into the charter and feed that back by saying in tomorrow.

And then at that point Liz, I guess we if it needs to go back to the council then I guess you know, it goes back to the council. But first our working group on the mailing list has to agree to it, right?

Liz Gasster: Of course. Right.

Michael Young: Okay.

Liz Gasster: And hopefully it goes without saying that you know, if any of the sub group leaders want help from staff on you know anything, but I'm thinking more - whatever - logistical or substantive (unintelligible) - Michael on all that. But feel free to consider us resources especially from the expertise we might have around study methodology. I've got studies coming out of my ears.

Michael Young: Right. I don't think we'll be embarrassed to ask for as much work as you're willing to do.

Liz Gasster: Particularly Steve's knowledge.

Michael Young: Yes. That's fantastic. Okay. So one of the suggestions that Liz actually maybe you guys can help us with is getting a maybe we can get a little mini survey going with a Doodle with the WG members seeing which groups not which group they want to be in.

But a very good suggestion that one of our WG members already made to me was that we should ask people to list the working groups they'd like to participate in priority. So pick their top one, two and three. That way we have a little bit of an excuse to slide people to their second choice if we find a very uneven volunteer base.

And also to remind people that they are allowed to participate in more than one group if they want to but they are going to have to be careful about managing their meeting times.

Don Blumenthal: As somebody who has had to organize class project groups, you're going about it exactly the right way. Make sure we don't have overload and to (improve) the group feelings.

Michael Young: Right. Okay. So Liz, is that something staff can help us out with, to get a Doodle up for that?

Liz Gasster: Yes. Gisella, we're just going to ask people you know, to pick their first and second choices you know, for the three groups, which I think we can set up in a Doodle maybe using you know, available.

Werner Staub: (Promising material) - what would you use for their choices in Doodle for people to express their preferences?

Liz Gasster: Right.

Werner Staub: I mean everybody could put in a comment for that matter. That would make it, it could be compiled easily.

Michael Young: Yes. It's not that many people. Yes.

Don Blumenthal: This is Don. I forgot to say that in my last comment. I haven't worked with Doodle that much.

((Crosstalk))

Don Blumenthal: There is another thing called Survey Monkey that I have used (that was) much more flexible. It might give us more flexibility (also free). (I think it might help us with a survey in the end).

Liz Gasster: Yes. For the survey in the end we're not using Doodle. Yes, yes, yes - there are 20 or better choices there for us to use one of them. This would just be so

that members of the working group can weigh in with their first and second choices for which sub groups they want to work on.

Michael Young: Yes.

Don Blumenthal: I know. I just - it's Don again. I don't know the limitations of Doodle for even that purpose so that's why I was throwing out Survey Monkey.

Liz Gasster: Gisella, if you're on let us know what you think would be best or we can discuss it offline and let you know (the feedback).

Gisella Gruber-White: This is Gisella. I'll be in touch with you. I just need the questions and then once I've got them I'll just see what I can - if I can do anything with Doodle.

Liz Gasster: Okay. And Steve can help you too. Very good.

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes.

Michael Young: Okay. Does anyone want to bring up any new business or topics? I guess for our next meeting would be our next goal between now and the next meeting set up would be to get the updated charter to the list.

If I get that to you Liz, by midday tomorrow how long - and that goes up or I put it to the list rather, how many will we get to maybe the end of Monday for working group members to either edit or approve? Yes. And then how long will it take to do whatever rounds are appropriate for the council?

Liz Gasster: I expect the council to kind of approve it on the list by staff formation and not require any special vote. If I find otherwise I'll let you know.

Michael Young: Okay. So would it be safe for us to you know, just worry about getting it approved internally in our group, pass it to you guys for the next steps and

just go ahead and assume we can begin our work? I mean we can always adjust for it if it comes back with some adjustments, right?

Liz Gasster: Exactly. That's what I would suggest.

Michael Young: Okay. So you know, I guess chairs, I would say that you should go ahead with Gisella and set up your first meetings probably. If we're getting out the draft signed off by end of Monday then you know, any time mid to late next week would be great to start the meeting cycle off.

Don Blumenthal: What's the time table for putting the request out for sub group volunteers?

Michael Young: I think we should do that right away. So we put that out now, we ask for people to get their responses back by say the end of Monday as well so that coincides with the draft charter.

Liz Gasster: I would think we would be able to get out a request within the next day or so.

Michael Young: Yes. Okay. So we're Wednesday now. That gives people a couple of working days plus over the weekend. Let's be careful. Let's say they should have their choices back on the working groups by the end of Tuesday.

But that really shouldn't affect your kick off date I guess for your meetings. Probably - well, maybe yes because you know, you may want to reach out to people that you know are going to be in your group to identify that meeting time.

Why don't we plan the first sub group meetings for not next week but the week after just to make sure we have enough time to process all this and you have enough time to reach out to your sub group members once they're identified?

Werner Staub: Of course you have problems with some people, me myself being away. So week after next I will be mostly traveling.

Michael Young: Okay. So you know, as chairing that sub group (Warner), you'll play with the schedule as appropriate.

Werner Staub: Okay.

Michael Young: Yes. We'll attempt to stay - I'll attempt to anchor the chair meetings but you guys can certainly flex your meetings in and around those.

You know, if you miss prior week and the chair meeting is on Thursday and you can squeeze in the prior week's meeting on the Tuesday of that week and do two meetings in one week and that's okay for you, I don't think it bothers any of us as long as whatever works for you.

Werner Staub: Okay.

Michael Young: Okay. All right. So am I missing anything guys?

Don Blumenthal: I don't think so.

Michael Young: Okay. Well, let's call it a wrap then. And just one more time, action items are I'm going to update the charter, Gisella is going to get the question out for the sub groups.

The co-chairs are going to work with staff to set up their meetings so first meeting is not this week but the week after. And our deadlines for the working group to come back and approve the charter is the end of Monday and the responses for the sub groups is the end of Tuesday. I think that's everything.

Don Blumenthal: Okay.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Michael Young: Fantastic guys. I hope the meeting was constructive for you.

Werner Staub: Thank you.

Don Blumenthal: Definitely.

Liz Gasster: Thanks Michael.

Michael Young: All right. Take care everyone. Thanks so much for the support.

Don Blumenthal: Okay.

Michael Young: Bye.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you.

END