

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Working Group Model (WG) Work
Team (WT)
TRANSCRIPTION**

Wednesday 7 April 2010 at 18:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee Working Group Model (WG) Work Team (WT) meeting on Wednesday 7 April 2010, at 18:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ppsc-20100407.mp3>

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

Present:

J. Scott Evans - IPC Work Team Chair

Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC chair

Avri Doria - NCSG

Iliya Bazlyankov

Staff:

Liz Gasster

Glen de Saint G ery

Absent apologies:

Marika Konings – Staff Support

Coordinator: Excuse me. This is the operator. I would like to inform all participants that this call is now being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time.

Go ahead. You may begin.

Liz Gasster: Okay thank you. So, I'll pull up the other document -- it's Liz Gasster -- in just a second. We have Avri and Cheryl, and (Iliad), and Glen, and Liz on the line.

Glen de Saint Gery: And J. Scott will be joining in a second, Liz.

Liz Gasster: Great. Thanks. Unless anyone else wants to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well Liz, I'm happy to start with the overarching document that's on the screen now. This is Cheryl speaking. I think that's fair enough. It's a short document, and we just need to read from top to bottom. So...

Liz Gasster: There's really just one primary thing that's here, because we can skip the background I think...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Liz Gasster: ...and, who's contributed, because - and then all the detail is covered in the other documents. It's a one - I think the key item here is that several people noted that the use of the term chartering organization was confusing, and one person, GoDaddy, James Bladel, recommended that all references to chartering organization be replaced with GNSO Council throughout the document with an explanatory note that the working group may be formed and governed by other organizations within ICANN. And of course you can read this...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm just busy putting up my status, which is a huge, great red cross, because I disagree with that.

J. Scott Evans: This is J. Scott. I'm sorry to be late everyone. I just completely spaced. I'm getting so many emails regarding ICANN things right now, I just - I must have just lost the email.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: J. Scott, I think Avri in particular understands that position very well.

Avri Doria: You have to devote an hour a week to deal with your schedule (mat).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That is of course your ICANN schedule, because your real life simply disappears.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. My real life is not important, correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I worked out -- I'm actually out actually as a total volunteer working more hours literally -- that's face-to-face hours, not prep hours -- for ICANN than I do for my own business quite some time ago.

J. Scott Evans: Unfortunately, I don't have that luxury and I have a dying pet that's sort of been taking (some time)...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, that's terrible.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, it's not great. All right everyone.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: It's a doggie, and she's very, very, sick.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, is she old as well as unwell?

J. Scott Evans: She's nine, so for her size -- she's a boxer -- that's kind of old.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That is kind of old for a boxer. Oh, my heart goes out to you.
They're members of the family.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. They are.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Okay, here we are. I'm signing into the Adobe Acrobat now. What do we got a big red cross for, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because I disagree with GoDaddy. I thought I'd start off strong. I don't agree with replacing the charter - the words chartering organization with the words GNSO Council, and then giving an explanatory note.

J. Scott Evans: I think that that's too limiting. Yes, I think that's a little too limiting...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...because that's not necessarily you know, what we intend to do. I mean, we intend it to be used by anyone who wants to charter within the ICANN process.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly.

J. Scott Evans: And so, I think we leave it as is. But, I don't have a vote, so we know how Cheryl feels. How do you feel, Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes. I think it's fine to call it you know, chartering organization. I think -- and I need to go back and look at our exact text -- it might be good to put in a footnote that sort of says that you know, the work was initiated as part of blah...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: GNSO improvements, yes.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Avri Doria: But, that's already there so...

J. Scott Evans: We could just put a footnote that just says, "Generally, the chartering organization would be the Generics Name Supporting Organization; however, other organizations may choose to charter working groups. And if so, they should feel free to use this model."

Avri Doria: Yes, exactly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I mean, I'm planning on using this model as a draft form on Friday this week, so it is going to happen.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. So, I think that's what we could...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm going to deploy this in nine work groups on Friday this week.

J. Scott Evans: So, I just think we just - we can put that in there. Just put a footnote that says that generally, this would be for the GNSO; however, there will be other org- you know, other groups that would be chartering working groups within their structure or substructure, and they should feel free to use this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: J. Scott, I think you're being generous, but I guess if I have to agree -- I'm the angel over here -- but yes. I have no problem. We...

J. Scott Evans: It adds some clarity to it, so you know the clearer we can be the better. So, I think we just go ahead and do it.

Avri Doria: And in the document that goes along in terms of how did we respond to the question, you'll be able to add that even in its draft form, while it's been used for one GNSO working group, which is the PDP Group on Vertical Integration at the moment, it has also been used for nine other ALAC Working Groups (dah, dah, dah)...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Avri Doria: ...and use that as - you know not in the footnote, but in the explanation of...

J. Scott Evans: Sure.

Avri Doria: ...how we responded to this particular issue.

J. Scott Evans: Great. All right.

Coordinator: (Iliad)'s on the line as well.

(Iliad): (Iliad).

J. Scott Evans: How are you?

((Crosstalk))

(Iliad): I have the (PDF) file. I think it should remain the same, the proposed.

J. Scott Evans: Looks like we have unanimity from the members on the call, so we will keep it the same and let's just drop that footnote in there.

Liz Gasster: Okay. I'm capturing this. I think the next issue is the overarching issue that's on this document, and then I'll pull up the second is a proposal on the part of GoDaddy to change the title from Working Group Guidelines to Working Group Procedures.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm ambivalent.

Avri Doria: I'm not (in favor), partially because as we go throughout the document - I mean, it's not a big deal, but we go throughout the document sort of saying that different groups may require different things, and therefore this isn't a one-size-fits-all document, you know et cetera. Now, if we want to be diplomatic about it, we could call it Procedural Guidelines, but...

J. Scott Evans: I - you know, as a chair who's sort of sat above and back, I agree with Avri that this is - it's sort of a minimum guideline. You know, you need to at least do this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Exactly.

J. Scott Evans: And, I think that - I think guideline is better because it is saying that you know, it recognizes that it is not rigid. And so, I think that guideline expresses the intent of the document better than procedure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Liz, it's Cheryl here. Can I ask - did GoDaddy in their (foolish) response give greater detail? Did they feel for some reason that without the power of the word procedure in the title -- and there is always the diplomat format that Avri presented us with -- that there was less (inadvertent) mis-power in this document? What was their rationale?

Liz Gasster: It's Liz. I'd have to look at the actual comment that was submitted to answer that...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Well, I just think it's a picker, and we're in a drafting group, and I say - I put it to the group's consensus. Is there a grand consensus that it can stay the way it is?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I can go from ambivalence to agreement.

J. Scott Evans: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes.

(Iliad): Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. So, I say we keep it. Next?

Liz Gasster: Okay. This is again with these overarching issues other general comments include proving further information on who is responsible for drafting a working group charter. That came from the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jesus. I thought we were clear anyway.

J. Scott Evans: It says the Charting Organization drafts it, correct?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: I don't understand how much more specific they want us to get?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So...

J. Scott Evans: Okay, next.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I guess (I'll put up) a big tick that's agreeing with you, J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: I just don't understand who they want us to say. I'm - given the fact that we have taken the position that it is more than one group that can use this, you certainly couldn't say it's going to be the chair and vice chair,

and a subcommittee of the GNSO, because it's not necessarily specific to the GNSO.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And, that should be up to the GNSO anyway.

J. Scott Evans: Right. So, if - actually, it's more an allocation of resources on the GNSO generally than it is title.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What about the change in can and may throughout the document that they also proposed?

Liz Gasster: I think that's a good one. Can means - I mean you know, we want to get precise about language. Can means you are physically able of doing something. May means you are permitted to do something. And just so from a dictionary point of view, yes that one makes sense.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I'm happy to go to the may, I must say. That's one - it's one I can certainly go with.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I'm fine with may, and that's actually grammatically more correct.

Liz Gasster: And then (Mike) suggests a working group process flow, working group context diagram, and a guide for newcomers.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I love flow diagrams. I'm all for flow diagrams, and I'm all for guides for newcomers. I think that's a very good idea.

J. Scott Evans: I agree, but that will require some additional work, so if we will just notate that that is something that we are going to do after we get through the comments, and we can come back and do that later. But

right now, I think that's - I feel like that would be something that would be valuable. Avri and (Iliad), how do you all feel?

Avri Doria: I'm wary of diagrams.

J. Scott Evans: And why is that?

Avri Doria: Because what diagrams do is give you a strict path to follow. Even if you're meant as a guideline, as soon as you put in a flowchart and you've only put in four words at each box, that tends to be what people follow. That tends to be what they look at. That tends to be what they pull out to guide them.

So while I think having such things exist in the universe as materials provided by staff members to help working groups, I'd be leery of adding an official one to the guidelines.

J. Scott Evans: Other? (Iliad)?

(Iliad): I think that diagrams is a good idea.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, so it looks like we at least need to try to give it a shot, Avri, and see what we put together.

Liz Gasster: Well, it's Liz. Could I just ask a question?

J. Scott Evans: You can.

Liz Gasster: About what a diagram would even look like, or what a flow would even look like. For those who think its useful, I know (Mike) isn't on to kind of

represent his own viewpoint. You know, I can see in my mind's eye what a diagram would look like in the PDP context, but I'm not sure I can - I don't see it as a flow exactly.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: I consider it a more organic - in order to keep a working group kind of flexible to do multiple types of things on behalf of multiple support organizations.

Avri Doria: Hi, this is Avri. I can quickly send you -- I don't know how many of you are on the VI Working Group that (Mike) is co-chairing -- but, I can send you a copy of the diagrams that he sent us for that working group.

J. Scott Evans: That'd be great.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That'd be fantastic. Thanks, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. I'll send them out this afternoon.

J. Scott Evans: What I see it more as -- Liz -- would be sort of a flow that just shows the order of suggestion...

Liz Gasster: The order of things.

J. Scott Evans: The order of things, like charter comes down. This is the next step. This is the next step. Not necessarily - just sort of a flow, and we can see how that works out. But, I would see it more just - more in terms of order so that for the more visual people who are not going to read the

text in the - probably the level of detail that others will, it provides a prompt.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: J. Scott, Cheryl here. I agree. I saw in my mind's eye when I read that, I saw it as a very high level document, and I'd be absolutely delighted with what (Scott Pinzon) has done in terms of creating a - and I've used the term in the chat simple flow diagram, and I'd really like to retract the word flow, but I can't. And, I think relationship diagram with some semblance of the order of things is what I should be saying.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: To quite simply capture graphically the whole of the at large world and its relationship to the Board.

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Now, if the boy can do that to our five way global satisfaction, I think having a play with it is going to be worthwhile.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I think we should at least give a chance to see what we can flow out, and then Avri, we could take up your concerns, once we have sort of seen it come into fruition, rather than dismissing it out of hand. So, I just think we should notate that once we get this text finalized, that'll be the next step.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But -- sorry J. Scott, if I can jump in again.

J. Scott Evans: Sure, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The - well, I think what's important in what I'm suggesting about giving it to someone like (Scott) is that they should not be integral to this process of how we've got to these guidelines.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. That's fine. Do you think (Scott) would do it for us?

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure he would.

Liz Gasster: This is Liz. I'd rather handle the internal work assignment...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What ever happens with the work assignment Liz, that's fine. But, let someone who literally isn't integral - if you give a thumbnail sketch that already leans, then you're biasing the flow to become something concrete in a way that's in the mind's eye of those that are immersed in it.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The usefulness of these diagrams is for the uninitiated to look at them and get a sense of understanding of what is going to go on.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Liz Gasster: And just from the staff perspective, you know I think what you've suggested is useful, and I'm happy to try to respond to it, but I also

want the working group to really create the basic structure here, and pick up on that before we turn it over to staff.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, if it's usually an approval process, there's a thumbnail comes back; you rip it to shreds. Something entirely different comes back. You rip that to shreds. I ripped it to shreds three times before it came back the way we wanted it.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. Okay. I think the best thing to do is let's get this together. I like the idea of having a fresh set of eyes look at it to sketch it out for us so that it doesn't get in - I don't want to say infected because it's a negative word, but become influenced by our vision. Because what it's supposed to do is not be a vision of what we think it should be. It's supposed to be a visual display of what we've created textually.

And so, it will be a - I think it will also be sort of a good exercise for us to see how our text is being translated by the uninitiated.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You are so much more articulate than I. Thank you, J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: So, that's what I think, and so that's what I'd like - let's get this text finished, noting that a flow chart is something that we are going to explore pending once we get the text finalized. Is that okay with everyone?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Liz Gasster: And, I've spent everything in the overarching, so I'm going to pull that down...

J. Scott Evans: Okay

Liz Gasster: ...and go to the detailed comments. And, I think we can go to the first set of...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The boxes.

Liz Gasster: So J. Scott, do you want to...

J. Scott Evans: We see here.

Liz Gasster: I know everyone's probably reading this first one.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Page 3.

J. Scott Evans: Page 3 of what, 52? Lord have mercy.

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We all heard that, J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Objection 1 is straight forward, and we believe (and another standing) committee believes this section can be enhanced (if) the following general recommendation were implemented. Provide information about

the timing of creation of a charter, including the identity, role, or responsibility of the (unintelligible) organization.

To take precautions to ensure that a statement of intent and disclosure of interest do not inadvertently contain sensitive personal information.

Discuss in more detail the steps between the acceptance of the application and the first meeting, in particular, the selection of working groups and distribution of information and charter biographies of nominated chairs prior to the first meeting.

And, consider the creation of supplemental materials such as a Frequently Asked Questions page on the Web site where supplemental issues could be posted (and put between two) the annual update. The committee provides the specific suggestions for some of the subsections below.

Well, I think the Frequently Asked Questions thing sort of falls into that newcomers situation. I mean, if we're going to create something for newcomers, we certainly could create a Frequently Asked Questions page.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Agree.

J. Scott Evans: Because, it seems to me that the most frequently asked questions would be from people who aren't familiar with the processes of ICANN.

Liz Gasster: Well, maybe it's an either/or? Maybe it's a guide to newcomers without...

J. Scott Evans: Maybe.

Avri Doria: Yes. I think it's an either/or, except for you know, the question that's (amended). Who the hell designed these processes anyway?

J. Scott Evans: The Wizard of Oz. Don't look behind the curtain.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So sorry, Avri, I'm not clear. Do you want us to never admit to that, or you want us to admit to that?

Avri Doria: That's a frequently asked question. Come on.

J. Scott Evans: So, I think that - so with regards to the Frequently Asked Questions, I think we'll wrap that into the new guide, and we'll decide whether we're going to - we'll do a guide, and then if we want to distill that down into some frequently asked questions, we could do that as well. So, that's something we will explore. So, Number 4 is going to be explored. Does everyone agree?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: And so, we still take the frequently asked questions that people have to ask question frequently before you know what they are.

J. Scott Evans: That's correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. I think we need to second guess some of the FAQs.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I think a lot of times you have to, and then you can amend them as you start seeing repetitiveness in additional questions.

Provide information to the (entire) creation of a charter, including the identity, role, and responsibility of the - again, I'm not sure what they mean, because I think our footnote handles that Number 1.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You see, I think I do know what they mean, J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I thought they meant a requirement that's going to identify whether this work group -- whatever it is going to do under its charter -- is going to be an open free for all, everyone who applies gets in, or whether it's going to be a specific selection process to allocate -- for example -- in the world I'm working in, I may have a set up where we will be having two -- no more than two -- representatives from the ICANN geographic regions in a workgroup.

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And so in that space, we would allocate that between applications being arrived date -- insert here -- and the first meeting date -- insert here -- the following people -- probably a subset in the chartering organization or third party who gives a damn -- but allocated and mentioned will be selecting, or it's a free for all. That type of interaction. That's how I read it.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Others? So, do we need to put in a paragraph that says that there could be different considerations for different types of working groups? Some could be more structured with identifying...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, design limitation sub-processes based on the requirement of the particular work group needs to be identified and published.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Then, I don't think that's a problem of adding a paragraph that just states that one choice could - there are two types of you know, fundamental structures. One is open and one is more structured, with identified representatives, and it would be driven by the chartering organization's view of the work that has to be accomplished and the timeline.

So, can you notate that? Because, the drafting - we've left the initial drafting on most of this list to Marika.

Liz Gasster: Well, the thing is - and I'm looking - because I'm not familiar with the underlying document as she is, that I don't know a case when we'd want something more structured. We are moving - I mean this is an open process. This came up in the Vertical Integration Working Group too, and you know the intent of this - these guidelines and our adoption of a working group model is to keep an open...

J. Scott Evans: Well, but I...

Liz Gasster: ...and we would - in my opinion, we'd need to discuss when you would you would have a more structured...

J. Scott Evans: Well, I think that's for the chartering organization to decide. And again, in this particular instance...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: But then maybe (unintelligible) this case just to say that...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: ...so we're to meet this need, that the rules applying - applicable to the working group are defined by the charter...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, the IRT Working Group's a classic example.

J. Scott Evans: Absolutely. The charting organization in that thing was the Board.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: And, the Board said here's who you're going to have on it. And, what we're saying is you - is because the chartering organization is not necessarily the Generic Supporting Organization, it could be anybody. That in certain instances, there might be instances where it needs to be more structured, and that that's okay. Just put a paragraph in that says that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And make sure it's clearly flagged, advertised, and the whole process is time lined and (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Liz Gasster: Okay, so where would that - would that be in a new section? Would that be in the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, it'd have to be in Section 1, shortly after the charter is discussed, and the fact that we want SOIs to have them - or DOIs.
More letters.

Liz Gasster: Section 1 of this?

J. Scott Evans: I would say it would be in 1.1, (unintelligible). Blah, blah, blah. Maybe a paragraph after the last paragraph in 1.1.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Before Purpose. Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Before Purpose to just say you know, that in general, the working group process is an open process -- blah, blah, blah -- however, we acknowledge that certain chartering organizations may need - feel that there needs to be more structure, and here are the specific guidelines we have with regards to more structure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. And, just rip off what that comment was.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. So, that's where I would put it. After the last paragraph of 1.1. It's just sort of a...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Catch all.

J. Scott Evans: The default is open, but we understand that the default is - there are always exceptions.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And timelines - advertised timelines are really, really useful when that happens.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. And I - as far as 2, I think that's superfluous, because I don't think any of the SOI or disclosure of information. Interest documents that we've seen or I have ever filled out ask for personal, sensitive information.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I wondered about that, and I sense because it's like up to the person providing them. And, if I want to give personal information, who's fault's that?

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I mean, but it - basically you know, I've never - I've given information, but I've never felt like I was disclosing you know, like my bank account numbers or anything. So you know, I was giving information that if you put my name into the - a browser on the Web, you would find out 90% of it anyway.

Avri Doria: Exactly.

J. Scott Evans: So, I think it's sulfurous. Does anybody disagree that that needs to be - you know, that just seems like common sense to the filler - the person filling out the information.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And if it's not, I'm really concerned about the person filling out the information.

Avri Doria: Avri you seem to have a comment.

Avri Doria: My comment is any time I have ever found anything that I considered common sense, there's been someone to whom it wasn't, and the need to be explicit became obvious.

J. Scott Evans: We could put something in that section that just states that the statement of interest and disclosure of interest when sent out should clearly identify that all information...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Will be public.

J. Scott Evans: ...appearing in the document will be complete, and open, and public.

Avri Doria: I think that's good. Because...

J. Scott Evans: And so, you address it by saying we have informed the person supplying information of the purpose of this document and that it will be fully public.

Avri Doria: Yes. As I say, in any privacy issues there is no common sense, so yes. I think that...

J. Scott Evans: That's - so, I think that's probably the best idea. (Iliad), do you agree?

(Iliad): Yes, I do.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. So, I think that's just the best idea is just to say so it's - you know, like tell them what you're going to tell them. Tell them, and tell them what you told them, so...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. The statements in disclosures are public, so if there's something private, don't put it in.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. Discuss in more detail the steps between acceptance of the applications and the first meeting, in particular the selection of working groups. Okay, well we'll look at that when we get there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: So, let's go down to 1.3, which is on Page 4. You know, that's a - I assume it's going to be translated into languages...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Friendly amendment. I mean, it is a standard boiler plate, isn't it? I mean, I wouldn't go with ensure we reach the broadest possible audience. I think that's something that is unnecessary. But, I think the statement - if something is being translated, you usually state what it's being translated into. In the world of ICANN, it tends to be the six UN languages.

J. Scott Evans: You know if it's going to be translated, I don't think we should put in that broadest possible audience.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No.

J. Scott Evans: If I don't - if I speak Swahili, I may not think you've reached the broadest possible audience (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And you'll - you're going to get huge push back from Asia when you put those words in.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. So, let's just put if it's going to be translated Liz, let's notate it there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, list the languages.

Liz Gasster: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, 1.4 on Page 5. I don't think that that's really...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We said FAQs already.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I mean, all they're saying is that this needs to be - if you update this, then any ancillary materials with it would need to be updated. So, that means if we get a newcomer packet, it would have to be updated. If you had a Web site, it would need to be - you know, just they all need to be in synch with one another.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But, they do go back to this sensitive information. They're talking about people inadvertently disclosing sensitive information. So, the recipients of the SOIs would have the power to redact.

J. Scott Evans: I think we've handled that, when we'll put in that comment in the section that relates to those, that you need to inform them this.

And, we could also put in the responsibility of the Secretariat - we could say the Secretariat is going to review, and if they believe any information is sensitive, they would contact the submitter.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's a good plan.

J. Scott Evans: You know, and just say, "I noticed here you've put down XYZ. I just want to make sure this is something you want to disclose, because this will be public." I mean, that's like a double safety latch.

Liz Gasster: But, that really puts the burden on the Secretariat to know or identify.

J. Scott Evans: Is it our - who does - who sends these out? We'll look at it when we get there. Let's just keep that idea in our thoughts. Again, we are going to amend this section to say that it needs to be - they need to be forewarned.

Okay, we're now on Page 6.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Teams. I think they've got the wrong end of the stick. That maybe is just me.

J. Scott Evans: Well, I have no - I mean, if we want - if introductions and team formation. If we wanted to say introductions and working group formation, I don't have a problem changing to be consistent.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In the title, yes. Because I think it only happened in the title.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. So, I don't have a problem with that. We can do that. Let's just notate that and do a check for consistency's purposes. It says it's in the titles of 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3. We can...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. So, just in the title...

J. Scott Evans: ...that's easily fixed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...that's fine.

Liz Gasster: Right.

J. Scott Evans: All right. 2.1.2 on Page 7. GoDaddy says (2.1) describes the process, requirements for gathering and embedding candidate members of the working group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible) (TA1).

Liz Gasster: Yes, there's the one right before the into...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Top of that page.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. All they're saying is they're - how wonderful they think it is, so I just skipped it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, let us know.

J. Scott Evans: They say the call for volunteers - this call will be very helpful to ensure that everyone - you know so. Okay, it wasn't really substantive. It was just praise. Thank you all. You're very bright. I appreciate how well you did.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you J. Scott. We needed that passed on.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I just want to say you're brilliant. All of you. Each and every one. I love you dearly.

2.1.2. Describe the process requirements for gathering embedded candidate members of the working group. You take the (unintelligible) whether each - it tasks the - is a real person, but is not (unintelligible) about how this will be determined.

Avri Doria: I don't know that we need to elaborate how. There's all kinds of methods that I know -- and I guess Glen is on this call -- that Glen has used without the chair saying, "Well, I know the following six," you know with her asking - with her talking to people on the phones. With her having met - I mean you know, how many ways - it's you know.

J. Scott Evans: I don't think you need to spell that out. I mean it just seems to me...

Avri Doria: That's what I was...

J. Scott Evans: ...again, you get to where you're - that's just so much detail that reality is we've given an objective, and as long as you get to that objective - and if it's a question you can articulate how you got to that objective, I think you're fine.

Avri Doria: I once tried to write a dissertation on the (touring test) and never finished it.

J. Scott Evans: Additionally, the section...

Glen de Saint Gery: J. Scott, this is Glen. Yes, I quite agree with Avri. I don't think it's necessary to spell out how you do that.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Additionally, this section calls for both a statement of interest and a disclosure of interest, but does not sufficiently explain the differences between them. That's probably true. And, includes a template only for the SOI. Is there an opportunity to merge these and/or include the DOI as a subsection or a component of the SOI?

Also, has the (PPSCWGWT) considered recommendations for verifying the claims made in the (unintelligible), or how the discovery of false information or material omissions may impact member standing within the working groups?

Avri Doria: On this one, I think we need to go back to the other group that I spend too much time with, which is the Council Operations Team. Because, I think they've done a whole DOI/SOI section and stuff that we should be able to just include by reference.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Perfect, Avri.

J. Scott Evans: All right. And as far as you know, verifying information, I just don't think we have time to do that. I think what it is incumbent upon members of the community to point that out, and for those to be investigated. I mean, that's why we have appeals. That's why we have a chairman. That's why we have the GNSO or chartering organization if it's not the GNSO to manage this process.

I keep hearing anticipatory breath, like someone wants to say something.

Liz Gasster: Well, Cheryl has her hand raised.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That was me hoping you were about to sling to me because my hand was up. And, I know we discussed this at the time we were

crossing this as well, but it's within the purview of the chair and to some extent the work group itself as it does that first meeting. But if one recommends that there is an issue with continuous disclosure, that also you know, catches some of these things.

Yes, things do change between filling out your SOI or DOI, and a - sort of a pro forma piece in every meeting's agenda that says is there any disclosure any of you need to make. You know, it catches those sort of things. But, that's up to the group itself, in my view anyway.

J. Scott Evans: Right. So you know, when we get to those section - in this section we could put something about ensuring that they are accurate and kept up to date. And, we could say something that - we can put in some language regarding if they are challenged, that would go to the process of going to the chair, then the chair liaison. You know, that kind of...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Like any other challenge.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. Does everybody agree that that seems to be the most natural flow?

Liz Gasster: So, this must kept updated would be the task of the participants.

J. Scott Evans: That's correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If you're not to have continued, it may - yes, worked under continuous disclosure, then yes, that doesn't (move) well.

Liz Gasster: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: All of that stuff is covered in gross detail in the (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Okay, so what we could do is just cross reference and say...

Avri Doria: I think so. And then leave it...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: ...that these need to be in compliance with the XYZ, which is found in XYZ.

Avri Doria: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good.

J. Scott Evans: All right. CG. Who's CG? Chuck Gomes?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I guess so.

J. Scott Evans: Why does this - again that's the same question.

Avri Doria: That's covered.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Avri Doria: Which is one is general and one is on this specific issue (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Avri Doria: But, we covered that in gross detail.

J. Scott Evans: (INTA) - well, I'm on Page 9 by the way. Purple comment. (INTA). The comment understands that the GNSO (unintelligible) will collect the expressions (unintelligible) to participate and verify (the submission) was from a real person, then (unintelligible) blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. Therefore, the Committee recommends taking precautions to ensure - okay. We've already handled that.

Making the following changes (to the template for SO), bearing in mind that the proposed template is being developed by the OSC GNSO Operations WT. Well you know, all we're doing is (adopting) what the - they tell us they're going to use as a template. So, these comments are superfluous for our purposes. Because if they want, they can make those comments with the OSC...

Avri Doria: I would object to add country or location (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I mean - but again, we're not deciding that.

Avri Doria: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Do you want to do them the courtesy of tossing it over the fence to them both?

J. Scott Evans: I have no problem with doing that. To say that - Liz can we do that? Or whomever is also serving on that, make sure that they know that this comment was received with regards to the template.

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Avri Doria: And I'm a (unintelligible) the co-chair - I mean the vice-chair of that group, so I'll...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, it's your fault.

Avri Doria: ...try to remember.

J. Scott Evans: All right. Again, the registry is all about the difference, and we're going to handle that.

MO. Who's MO?

Liz Gasster: Oh, Mike O'Conner.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Suggested changes to 2.1.2. Now, these (unintelligible) which bear on various role and responsibility of the working group. Describe the role of the working group members. It'd be useful to take the opportunity to clarify what working role members are actually expected

to do while participating in the group. Once descriptions of member's activities have been added to the appropriate section, the list of activities could be used to embrace - enhance 2.1.2.

Members - describe the skills and experience they bring to the group by including additional questions in the statement of interest. What do others think about that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (He continues) on the following page as well.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I see.

Liz Gasster: Well, could I jump in? It's Liz.

J. Scott Evans: Sure.

Liz Gasster: You know, it seems actually relevant to this newcomers guide. That is also being recommended.

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Liz Gasster: Right? I mean, it's - we're kind of - I think we're seeing a little gap here. We think some of the content is here because it's implied by how the working group overall functions, in terms of you know, Team Member Roles and Responsibilities, Section 2.2. But, there's some basics that probably just aren't set forth anywhere to help a newcomer.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. Look, I understand what you're saying, and I certainly think that there does need to be a newcomer's guide, but I am sympathetic to the need for determining in very clear but simple

language, and I think your examples have done that. What the role the - the expectations are of the roll of work group members. And, I'm declaring a clear bias here, where I tire of people being in work group in name only, and contributing absolutely zero to the process.

J. Scott Evans: But, I don't think you can - I mean, that's very difficult to police, and I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I understand it's not a policing issue. I think it's a setting up expectations issue, so I'm a little sympathetic to having some references.

Anyway, Avri's on the...

Avri Doria: Yes, and I've got the complete opposite.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

Avri Doria: I think it is fine that in most working groups, most the people are just there to watch and to basically speak up in the exceptional case that they see something they don't agree with, or that they that they think is problematic. And - or either they're watching because you know, they don't feel the need to talk if somebody else has already said what they're thinking, or are there to report back to their group and come forth with comments if their group has them.

So, it's like I think it's one of the things that makes groups workable is that you have a large body of people watching, and a small body of people talking.

J. Scott Evans: And, I think that's true, and I think also - I mean we have provisions so if someone's being obstructionists, it can be addressed. And, that's really all we're concerned about, right? Is somebody's who's obstructing progress, not somebody who's just simply in the room and not obstructing anything, but not necessarily positively moving the issues forward.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We're going to have to agree to disagree on that. I'm the minority. I actually think people need to earn their keep, but that's just me.

J. Scott Evans: Well, that's something that we - a broader debate. I think anything you do that looks like you're trying to limit people holds you up to ridicule and criticism at this level.

It is now noon, so we're going to stop here at 2.1.3 and we will pick this up next week. I'm going to go ahead and put this call on my calendar since I seem to have spaced it.

Liz Gasster: J. Scott, how do I capture the upshots, since we have a different - maybe we just need to take this issue up...

J. Scott Evans: I think we will - what I would like to do is start here again. Hopefully, we'll have some additional members of the team here. So, I would like to start with 2.1.2. And everyone think about this over the week, and that's where we'll start is with this idea of members roles and responsibilities or expectations.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And, if it's in the newbie's guide, then at least it's captured somewhere.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But, I...

J. Scott Evans: But, we can consider that, and we'll - but that's what I say is we'll table it for now. We'll bring it back next week.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: All right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you all.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you all very much.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you. And, I'll send out a notice for next week's call.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you.

Liz Gasster: Thanks, Glen.

J. Scott Evans: Bye-bye.

Glen de Saint Gery: Bye.

Liz Gasster: Bye.

Avri Doria: Bye.

(Iliad): Thank you. Bye-bye.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: J. Scott, are you still on the line? No.

END