

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC)
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday, 10 December 2008 20:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee meeting on Wednesday, 10 December 2008, 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-policy-process-20081210.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#dec>

Participants present:

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

Staff:

Liz Gasster
Ken Bour
Glen de Saint Géry

Alternates (not present)

Chuck Gomes (Registry constituency)
Zahid Jamil - (CBUC)
Tom Keller - (Registrar constituency)
Ute Decker - (IPC)
Olga Cavalli - NCA
Catherine Sigmar (Registry constituency)

Coordinator: Excuse me. This is the conference coordinator. I'd like to inform all participants that this is recorded. If you have any objection, you may disconnect at this time. Thank you.

(Jeff): Okay. Thank you very much. This is (Jeff).

Glen DeSaintgery: (Jeff), this is Glen. Sorry.

(Jeff): Yeah.

Glen DeSaintgery: I just would like to ask you whether it is all right for somebody to join the Projects and Development Group as an individual.

(Jeff): Yeah, you know, I think that's a question we're going to answer during this call as a topic for reaching out past the drafting teams to the actual teams once the charters are agreed to. So I think we'll cover that in the meeting.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks (Jeff) because that's a question that came to me.

Avri: Can I ask a question Glen? Did you mean this Steering Committee or did you mean on of the teams that...

Glen DeSaintgery: No. No. No. One of the teams of the...

((Crosstalk))

Glen DeSaintgery: ...Steering Committee and particularly the PDP team of Steering Committee.

Avri: Okay. Thanks. I just wanted to...

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks.

(Jeff): Okay. So just trying to pull up the agenda here and make sure I've got it right. So it's on the - for those of you on the - on the Wiki - hey (Liz) I'm still looking for it. I'm not sure why...

(Liz): I didn't actually put -sorry. I should have. But I didn't post the agenda to the Wiki.

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): I circulated the agenda in email with the - it's the same reminder message that Glen sent out with the teleconference stuff. I just sent it this morning.

(Jeff): Okay. I got it.

(Liz): I'd be happy to walk through it, but...

(Jeff): Okay, sorry. I can walk through it.

(Liz): And in the future I will put it on the Wiki too. That's an evolutionary process of my Wiki, of Wiki'ing.

(Jeff): That would be me too as well since I'm fairly new at this at the Wiki as well. So the agenda that's sent around talks about what we'll do in the agenda review. Walk through the updated Wiki. We'll have a discussion on the PPSC charter and talk about the work team charters and then outreach and then other updates we'll get into as well as timelines for completing the work.

Is there anything else that people wanted to add to the agenda that we're missing? Okay. Hearing silence, I do want to welcome Greg Ruth and Tony Harris who have joined the Steering Committee. Now we now have representatives from all of the constituencies.

And I might be actually skipping ahead in the agenda item but we did send in accordance with the last call, we did send an invite to the GAC and we have, (Liz) correct me if I'm wrong, we have not heard back from them.

(Liz): That's right. We have not.

(Jeff): Did we even get an acknowledgement that they got the invite?

(Liz): I have not.

(Jeff): Okay.

(Liz): But I could check that easily with the staff liaison, Donna Austin because she was going to help facilitate as well. So...

(Jeff): Okay. So we'll obviously keep trying and send reminders. I'm not sure, you know, if we'll have a participant. Hopefully we will and if they are a participant, at least an observer. So that would be - that would be good to get them onboard especially given all the discussions that have happened recently in the governance sessions.

With that, (Liz) do you want to take through - take everyone through some of the changes we made to the Wiki, some of the things that we've added as we go forward?

(Liz): Yeah. I just wanted to let people know that I did post a number of documents to the Wiki that we had discussed in our previous call. The first document is on the PPSC workspace and it is the - just the Annex

A of the ICANN bylaws that deals with the current PDP process. So annex that applies to the GNSO.

So you'll see that as an attachment. And also useful external document link there on the PPSC page. And then where you see initial PPSC teams on the PPSC Wiki, you'll see a bullet for PDP team and a bullet for working group team. And if you click on the PDP work team, which takes you to the PDP work teamwork space, I also uploaded the bylaws there because that'll be relevant to the specific work of the PDP work team.

And I also uploaded two other documents. One is - we had discussed on the last call that of course the voting thresholds once the new council is seated have changed. And everyone thought it would be a good idea to have an easy reference to what those new voting thresholds are.

And so that's posted as a document on - under background information on the PDP space as is a little background paper that just summarizes what the work tasks of the PDP work team are as conceived of by the BGC working group GSNO improvements report that the board approved.

So it's just a Word document that attempts to summarize everything that was in the board approved GNSO remits report relevant to enhancing the PDP intended as just an easy reference for this work team, for the PDP work team.

And then you'll notice that there also is a page for the working group work team and on that page I also uploaded (tax) background on

(FEMA) content pulled from the GNSO improvements report but applicable to the tasks that lie ahead for the working group work team. And just intended as a easy reference for those documents.

The pages themselves contain the draft charters that I also circulated in a Word document just to make sure everyone had access both through the Wiki and to - and an email to what the three draft charters that we're discussing today are.

And I think that's basically it. But if anyone has any other suggestions for enhancing content on the Wiki, I'm happy to incorporate them and I will in the future add agendas for future calls et cetera more religiously on the PPSC as well.

Avri: Can I (unintelligible).

(Jeff): Yes.

Avri: (Liz), something that might be good to add to the working group one is from the last charter that the council approved for a working group. Each of the charters has been including sort of a progressively refined notion of basic guidelines for a working group since there weren't any. So that might be a good thing to include as the reference.

And the other two - one thing that might be good to include is we've gotten one or two comment feedback from various working groups that we've tried. That would probably be good fodder to have in there.

(Liz): You're thinking about the (fact books).

Avri: (Fact books) is one and I don't know if we had any on earlier but just...

(Liz): Yeah. There are the others, yeah, for sure. What was the first thing though? That was...

Avri: The first thing in each of the charters in the fast flux and in the - and in the...

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): Oh, I see what you mean. It's the language.

Avri: ...what we did. We didn't have a working group guideline from any formal. What we've been doing is including a set of guidelines in the charter...

(Liz): Right.

Avri: ...themselves and those seem to be something that's worth just having as some of the materials that we've dealt with.

(Liz): Yes. Great. I'll do that.

Avri: Yeah.

(Liz): Thanks.

Man: Avri what was the other one. It's fast flux and...

Avri: There was - it's the IRTP Part A.

Man: A.

Avri: I don't know if they have comments but there was a charter in there. I mean there was a working group description in their charter.

Man: Right. Okay. I'll just...

Avri: And I don't know whether we have any comments left over from it because we've been doing working groups. I think the first experiment was the IDN. Then we did the Who Is. We've done fast flux and now we're doing IRTP Part A. And there may be other comments that have been collected over time on things one should and shouldn't do, things that went right, things that went wrong.

(Liz): So I only know of one and I do agree that that kind of - amassing those reflections would be really useful. So maybe it's a possible suggestion to talk to some of those working group chairs that haven't maybe memorialized their thoughts but whose thoughts we could capture.

But also, I know we talked on the earlier call about, and maybe even in Cairo, about starting to list, you know, the good things and the bad things, what's working, what's not. You know, sort of general brainstorming which is we might want to do more rigorously as well.

(Jeff): Okay. And who - so I know Mike O'Connor and Avri you're the current chair of the fast flux.

Avri: Yeah. But I'm just an interim chair until I can get another one.

(Jeff): Okay. And then the IRTP chair.

(Liz): (Paul Dia).

(Jeff): Oh, (Paul), okay.

Avri: Yeah.

(Liz): And then Philip Shepherd did the Who Is working group last year.

Avri: And (Ron) did the first one. And I think after Who Is, there were both - there were certainly comments. I'm not sure what form that could be collect in but there were comments.

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): Yeah.

Avri: ...within the group. But I'm not sure how we got those up.

(Liz): Right.

Avri: Worth looking into.

(Liz): Okay. I'll take that Who Is one as an action to look through.

(Jeff): Okay.

(Mike): There's also domain tasting.

Avri: That's right.

(Liz): Yeah, now domain tasting was interesting because it was like a drafting team. Right? We didn't actually convene. You had - (Mike) you had sort of the ad hoc group. That was before...

(Mike): Right. It was like an ad hoc working group or something like that. I forget.

Avri: I mean I don't think we have to go nuts over collecting these things. But anything we have is worth collecting.

(Liz): Yes.

(Jeff): Right. Okay. Any other questions on comments for or comments for things to include on the Wiki?

Man: I have a question of something that's there. Under the working - under the initial PPSC teams it lists the people as the initial charter draft team volunteers. I thought we were the volunteers for the actual teams...

(Jeff): Well, okay. So we're going to...

Man: ...who may also draft the charter.

(Jeff): Right. Can we save that for discussion Item 4?

Man: Okay.

(Jeff): We'll get to that. I just want to get through a couple of things first.

Man: Okay. I wasn't sure if it was an error in the Wiki or something we need to discuss.

(Jeff): Yeah, no it's not an error. It, just to be brief, right now it's just a drafting team but it will eventually morph into the actual...

Man: Okay.

(Jeff): ...team. So we'll talk about that. The next thing is a discussion on the current PPSC charter and I noticed right before the call J. Scott has turned around a couple documents that have revisions to this - to the charter which would need to go through back to the GNSO council and I'll let J. Scott talk about it.

But to me J. Scott it really just looked like taking it and reorganizing it. So instead of something in the future, talking about something that current exists.

J. Scott: That's true. I also sort of made it a little bit more open ended in some of the things that you don't drill down. So, you know, a little bit - so if you look at the red line version you'll see I just took out some things and made it a light tighter saying that, you know, the two initial work items will be the establishment of a PDP and working group model and that we're going to establish the procedures.

And I think that's where we are. And that if we're going to work through those issues and that's what we'll do. And then after those issues are worked through, there's a chance that the charter could be expanded to include additional responsibilities.

And I took out the examples because examples always lead people to say well you said they were only going to do this. I think it's just clearer if we say it could be expanded for reviewing how it's functioning and go with it. And that allows the GNSO some flexibility depending on what issues have arisen to, you know, put that charter out there.

With regards to the working group, the charter for the working group team, I just drilled it down to the most essential which was that, you know, we're required to develop and implement a new model, a new working group model, to improve inclusiveness, effectiveness and efficiency and then define two primary tasks with the - and then move what I thought was more sort of explanatory language of why we're doing that to the end rather than including it and would probably think we might want to headline that like background rather than as part of the charter.

But those are my thoughts. I just think if we keep it short and, you know, short and clear on this one and then on the other one where there is some idea that there may be an expanded role to keep that sort of open and not tightly defined so that the GNSO has some flexibility.

(Jeff): Okay. So taking the Steering Committee ones first - Avri can I ask a question? When does something have to be in to be put on the agenda for the GNSO council meeting?

Avri: A week before so for the next meeting it would be tomorrow.

(Jeff): Okay.

Avri: Basically try to get anything that requires reading and voting unless it's simple, you know, it's a simple thing on the agenda and the agendas are formerly supposed to be up a week before the meeting.

((Crosstalk))

(Jeff): The only thing that would have to go to the council at this point would be the main policy process Steering Committee charter.

Avri: Right.

(Jeff): And J. Scott has whittled that down if I'm looking at the right one here.

J. Scott: All I did was I just shortened it and made it a little bit more malleable when it talked about how it could be expanded. The substance of it is not changed. I didn't add anything. I didn't take anything out that would change the purpose. But those are decisions you'll have to make. But that was not my intent.

My intent was just to make it more concise and something that would be easier to read.

Avri: At this point I would - I would say that that being the case I wouldn't bother taking it to them just yet because we haven't added any milestones yet. And I think us adding milestones when we plan to do something and when we plan to have something done would be an important part with sending it back to the council. So I think that, you know, if we wait a meeting and, you know, perhaps add some milestones, then that could be taken back to the council.

(Jeff): Right. I think we could still - it's not as if we have to stop work waiting for the council to approve the charter. So J. Scott, that would basically - what you wrote would replace the first two sections on the page. The overall - or is that just the overall purpose and description. Is that - and working methods?

J. Scott: I have to look at the thing that (Liz) sent around because that's where I took it from. I just it as being the charter for the overall committee.

(Jeff): Right.

J. Scott: And then I didn't do the - because I'm not on the working group for the PDP working group, working team. I just did the working group team.

(Jeff): Right. No, I'm just trying to see how it would fit in. The way the current one is up there, there's certain headings that - you know, there's the overall purpose, description, working method and then I guess the, you know, membership, current members, other participants. That would stay pretty much as is.

J. Scott: And I'm not so sure - I guess I don't view that as part of the charter. I sort of see the charter as a mission statement for everything. You know, sort of the umbrella of the (chapo) that says here's what our purpose is. X, Y and Z. And then all of the other stuff feeds into that because that's implementation of that charter.

I don't necessarily see that as part of the charter. Now I can see where Avri would might want to put in milestones under the work we're done as part of the charter because it might be better to hold our feet to the

fire. But the rest of it I think is just - you know, we say we're going to create a more inclusive process. Well here's - for this part of the process, here's what we're doing.

But that's just my thoughts.

(Jeff): Yeah, I think - I think the reason Avri added is because there's a couple of things like milestones that need to go to the council for their...

J. Scott: Okay.

(Jeff): ...for them to make a - to approve I guess. So we'll just - what if we took - we took your charter, substituted it for all the beginning stuff up to - I guess we got to look at it, right (Liz) and just - if we put it on the Wiki.

(Liz): Yeah. It's just the team charter goals under working group teams.

(Jeff): Well I was thinking of the beginning part. The...

(Liz): Oh, the PPSC?

(Jeff): Yeah. So why don't - (Liz) and I could talk offline. What we'll do is we'll post this and then we'll solicit feedback from the entire group, from everyone on this call on that. We'll start with (Jay Scott's) version. And then so - but J. Scott I guess you're leading the working group team. So we'll post it and then, you know, you can gather, collect the feedback from your individual teams.

J. Scott: Yeah. I mean I suppose it will all be going onto the list and that I would be getting it as a member of the list.

(Jeff): Yeah. There's two...

((Crosstalk))

(Jeff): ...actually after the last call created two different...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I actually posted to the main list because I incorporated the policy process Steering Committee overall charter.

(Jeff): Right.

Man: And I posted to the working team list because I included the working team. But I didn't post it to the - your working group.

(Jeff): Which is fine. Which is - that was the right thing to do. And what we'll do is, you know, the action item them is to just go through for the whole PPSC is to go through the revisions by J. Scott on the proposed charter. Actually let me take - go back a step.

(Liz) and I will post it to the Wiki. And we'll incorporate all the other pieces that are in there including the membership, current members, other participants, all that other stuff and then the heading for milestones. And then once we do that, then that'll be open for comment by the Steering Committee so that we can come up with hopefully by the next meeting the final PPSC charter.

Concurrently with that, J. Scott will work with the working group team to work on that portion of it - of the charter. And I will work with the PDP team. I'm going to post something in the next couple days. Something similar to what J. Scott did for the PDP team. And we can get that underway on the PDP team side.

J. Scott: Okay. (Liz) and (Jeff), just having looked at the Wiki, I would see that this - what I drafted would cover the first two headings, overall purpose and description of PPSC.

(Liz): Right. I'm thinking we should just combine that to charter.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott: Yeah. And I would do that and then working method would begin another breakout.

(Liz): That's right.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott: So the two would be...

(Liz): I have two small suggestions to your edit on...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott: We don't need to go through that right now.

(Liz): Okay.

J. Scott: I'm sure the clean up and stuff and we can do that as we go through.

(Liz): Fine.

J. Scott: We can move on because we don't - we can do that online.

(Jeff): And on the Wiki I'm assuming, and again this is just my ignorance I guess, we can show things as revisions like is there like a track change type thing on there?

(Liz): Actually Avri is the Wiki maven but I don't think it's as flexible as we would like.

Avri: Oh it's very flexible. In terms of tracking changes...

(Liz): Okay.

Avri: ...there's a whole - there's a whole look at previous versions. Go back to previous versions. Compare any two previous versions thing on the side that you can look at. So basically you just make your changes and then anybody that wants to look back and compare what's changed, there's various features that can do that.

(Jeff): Okay.

Man: Okay.

- Man: If you look at the upper right hand side, it says in this case 46 revisions. If you click on that you can start seeing details.
- Avri: Right. You can go back and you compare revisions, you can revert to an older revision.
- Man: All right.
- Avri: You can do any number of complicated things to get yourself in trouble.
- (Jeff): And we could always - we can at least put those in Word documents and do like a Word comparison just to post as a separate document as well. For those Wiki challenged like myself.
- J. Scott: Or one of the things we may want to do (Jeff) is when we come to the final language is post the Word document as part of a mailing list - mailing list because some people will only be checked following that.
- (Jeff): Right.
- J. Scott: So if it's attached as a document as here are the final revisions in a red line version from what appeared and just post it to the list, that's another way to do it.
- Avri: Yeah and I believe it could even give you the ability to throw off a Word document.
- J. Scott: Okay.

(Jeff): So the goal would be to finalize by the next meeting and we got to talk. Actually we got to add that to the agenda. I forgot to add that is the date of the next meeting since we had said that every two weeks we'd meet at this time. But the next one would be I believe...

((Crosstalk))

(Jeff): What's that? Yeah. Christmas Eve so that probably won't work out...

Avri: That's a problem?

(Jeff): So we'll have to - our last agenda item we'll talk about the date for the next meeting. Is there any other questions on the charter or these action items? Okay. Hearing none. I think now we get to the item that was brought up earlier which is outreach for work teams and discussion of other issues related to work teams, objectives, formation and leadership.

So you'll notice on the Wiki what we had started to do - the action items from the last meeting were to really focus on the charter and not necessarily focus on the work of these - of these two teams, the PDP team and the working group team.

And so what we did is rather than - we basically said that the people that were working on the charters could and probably would be initial members of the actual teams once they got working.

But we weren't really focusing on that. Now obviously the people who are - have expressed interest in working on the charter for the PDP team or the working group team probably have a desire to serve on

those actual teams when they - when they do the work. But we didn't make that assumption.

The other reason is that we envisioned the charter teams - the people working on the charter was a much smaller group than ultimately the people doing the work on the actual teams. So is there any question on that initial point?

So what we need to start thinking about though is if we make the assumption that these people that are listed right now and we need to add - we actually need to add Greg Ruth to the PDP team and was it Tony Harris to the working group team?

So we'll add that on the Wiki. But in addition we need to do some outreach to members - to a bunch of other people on the constituencies and beyond. And so I wanted to - (Liz) and I have done some thinking about it. We do have on this PPSC; we do have alternates that are designated.

So that might be a good place to start to see where the alternates want to serve. Or if it's not the alternates whether the constituencies want to go back and, you know, see if there are other people that want to serve on these - on these two teams.

And then also we need to go to others in the community to get - just to basically issue a solicitation for volunteers.

Man: Can we not do one of those emails that I get all the time from ICANN that say's ICANN's soliciting interested parties?

(Liz): We can send...

Man: I get ICANN alerts all the time. Whenever there's a public comment period open, something like that. Could we not send something similar out to that list that just says...

(Liz): Glen can you help me here because I know we have easy access to the constituency list. And Avri maybe you know but I don't know if there's a broader alert. And certainly to the ALACs.

Avri: Yeah, there certainly are broader alerts. I don't know how broad we want to go. We could certainly go as far as GA. One of the things that we've done, and I firmly believe that we should do, bulk community outreach beyond constituencies.

But once we do that we do have to apply some sort of filtering or at least we have in the past applied some sort of filtering which basically constituted does anybody know of this person having been kicked off any other ICANN working group or list.

And that basically - and then reviewing people specifically if that was the case so that there were certain well known problems that we didn't include from the beginning. But by and large, you know, when we're talking about either working groups or working teams, I thought we were talking about fairly open groups.

(Allen): Do we not want to solicit people from the constituencies as their formal rep first like we do on working groups or we have done?

Avri: I would think so.

Man: So you're - (Allen) are you suggesting a two-step process?

(Allen): It could be done in parallel but...

Man: Okay.

(Allen): ...but I think we want the person who is identified as the lead person and can go back to that constituency for opinions and things like that as opposed to individuals who may be from a constituency or not.

Konstantinos: So excuse me. This is Konstantinos. Correct me if I'm wrong but we're looking from all constituencies two people if one of us does not want participating in any of the teams. Correct?

(Jeff): Correct. Right and that's another important point. If a - just because a constituency sent one or two people to the Steering Committee, doesn't necessarily mean that those people also have to serve on one of the two teams.

Avri: Yeah, in fact, I mean - I don't think there's any obligation to any constituency to have to serve on a team. They're certainly all welcome to. And I don't think they need to be limited to one. But I don't know that anyone's ever made it that you have to serve. Obviously that's a good idea. But...

((Crosstalk))

Man: But in these particular teams I think we'd want to strongly encourage it. I mean we want...

Avri: Oh, yes.

Man: We don't want any question later about - at least make sure that our attempt to get full participation is very well documented.

Avri: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

(Jeff): Then the question is if we reach out to individuals, is there some sort of logistical limit? If so, how do we measure that? How do we come up with that? I guess these are all questions for the working group team as a whole to - when they're talking about working groups because essentially that's kind of what we're creating here.

But I wanted to - because we have gotten, and Glen has gotten some people already that have expressed interest in serving or on one or the other teams. And, you know, a number of them have been from the same constituency but asking to participate as individuals.

So we need to kind of think about that issue.

Avri: Okay. And if I could throw in another one that we want to think about, it's actually trying to invite some experts for example within the working group one. I would hope that we can try and recruit someone from W3C and perhaps someone from IETSO.

Of course I can do part of that one from (IETF) that - and perhaps other groups that people know of that have long experience with working groups that can, you know, offer little bits of wisdom.

(Jeff): Now is that something we want to do at the time we make the initial solicitation or is that something we want to do if those people don't volunteer to do that as a work team? So in other words, you look at the composition of the group and then the work team decides who they want to invite from specific other organizations.

Man: Yeah, I think that - well we're supposed (unintelligible) coordinating it and I think what we will do is rather than - we would say that you have the ability to do that. And then leave it to the working teams to decide whom.

Konstantinos: Right. Yes. And I think we need to judge that on an individual basis depending on what work we need we can approach the correct experts I think.

Man: Does that sound okay Avri?

Avri: Oh yeah. I think any way we want to do it is fine.

(Jeff): I mean if these people - if these experts volunteer on their own...

Man: Right.

(Jeff): ...in response to the solicitation, that's a bonus. But I do agree with the suggestion that once these teams are in place that they as a team

reach out to whatever organization they think is appropriate whether it's the IETF or W3C or others that people have participate on.

So the question then is - so we get - lets say we get a representative from each of the constituencies on the two teams and then we get a whole bunch of applications or people that are individuals, is there a logistical number limit that should be placed on these or is that too arbitrary?

Or well lets start with that one. And then the next question would be whether, you know, if we see a bunch of individuals but they're all from the same constituency, are there any limits put on that?

Konstantinos: This is Constantino. I think that we might need to think at least supposed, not for any other reasons, simply because it might be a danger of us being overpopulated.

(Jeff): Right. How do we deal with that?

Avri: Yeah. Avri.

(Jeff): Yes.

Avri: I don't know - I mean obviously we've got to limit which is the number of people that participate in the phone call but I think that's bigger than any number will (ever be). Because that's like a hundred or 200 or something. And I don't think that'll happen.

But even if a lot of people volunteer and get themselves on the mailing list, you'll never see more than 10 to 20 people who are actually active

in any group just historically. I've been in groups with 500 people and yet there have been maybe, you know, two dozen who were the active ones.

So I don't know that - and since we're not, you know, doing voting and stuff like that but perhaps it does become an issue. I think that putting on restrictions at the beginning may be a difficult exercise but that might not be necessary but that's just one view.

Man: And Avri am I correct in historically at live meetings that number's closer to 80 to 100 people who participate? Now they don't all have something to say but they certainly are in the room.

Avri: Yeah. I think when people are coming to like our weekend meetings when we're talking about...

Man: Right.

Avri: ...that's about as many people as you get. And some of them are pure tourists.

Man: Yeah.

Avri: And some of them come because it's an issue they care about.

Man: There's also the issue someone said we won't be doing voting but indeed we're going to have to be making decision and there's going to be differences of opinion. And we're going to need some methodology to decide what goes in the final documents. And that may end up

involving voting or something resembling it and the question is do sheer numbers count or do some people count more than others?

Avri: That's where, you know, at the moment at least at the steering group level we're under consensus mode. That's a decision that I think we're going to have to make or these groups are going to have to make. And they full consensus, are they rough consensus. Hopefully they're not and they're not voting. But, you know, yeah.

Man: I mean we're discussion some rather crucial things and there's going to be differences of opinion, strong ones I suspect.

Man: Exactly.

(Jeff): Right. Well it's a little bit...

((Crosstalk))

(Jeff): I won't say it's a little easier but it's more manageable at the PPSC level since there are a limited number of people - much harder. So the question is maybe it's just the working work teams putting forth all the opinions and numbers and trying in some way to classify whether these comments by individuals or constituencies and then having the PPSC look at those and try to figure out from that - from the output of the work teams what to do.

Man: That's certainly one option.

Avri: I mean basically we were getting a fair amount of experience at working in the support, you know, three levels of something is

supported, something has some support, something is a minority viewpoint, et cetera and something is just an extra opinion that someone wants to make sure is heard.

We're getting a fair amount of experience at working in groups and recording things that way that that may be a model that we continue with.

(Jeff): Avri, should we - that's actually written down in one of - in all of the...

Avri: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

(Jeff): ...in a number of the...

((Crosstalk))

(Jeff): Could we post that up on the - on the Wiki?

(Liz): Yeah. I think that's part of what would be actually encompassed in what Avri was suggesting has been in like the charter for a couple of the most recent working group descriptions that have been approved by the council. So I'll post some of those. They may all be the same language.

Avri: They're similar. (It's evolved) as written. Most of it - it evolves a little each time.

(Liz): Okay.

((Crosstalk))

(Jeff): Can I go back to something - I'm sorry who's - yes who is that?

(Tim): It's (Tim).

(Jeff): Hey (Tim), you go first before me.

(Tim): Okay. Just one thing I wanted to - hopefully we can look at as we get further - closer to that point. Because I've always been concerned with in some of the working group models is that it always wasn't very - it wasn't very clear always, you know, what kind of the interest was of the participants.

And I - from my perspective anyway that seems to be an important point so that we can better understand what rough consensus might mean based on everybody's viewpoint.

If we don't understand - if we don't have a good idea of who's involved and what their interest or stake is within the community then it's difficult to say, you know, whether there's consensus with any one particular stakeholder group or even as a whole.

Man: So (Tim) what you were saying is everyone who participate should at a minimum file an interest statement and...

(Tim): I don't know how detailed we need to get with that. We need to have some idea of, you know - I'm involved in representing the registrars'

constituents and someone else involve - they're only involved as an individual, not - with no other stakeholder beyond that.

For one thing I think it's important for us - that we know, you know, that everyone was represented and that everyone's viewpoints have been heard and that they have not (committed) to participate.

(Allen): That's not really a statement of interest but a statement of who you representing.

Man: Right.

(Tim): And if that's enough, you know, perhaps, but we need to be able to identify I think at some point as we're trying to review, you know, whether consensus would really reach.

You know, if there's a hundred people involved and 60 of them are from a single stakeholder group, you know, the view of the other 40 might be a minority. But it's because of the, you know, disproportionate participation from a particular group.

((Crosstalk))

(Liz): Isn't that pretty customary in the new working group to have statements provided by all - I think that's required in - I'm not sure of the distinction (Allen) you were making and not a statement interest but a statement of...

(Allen): The statement I made probably wasn't - to cover everything. At the very least we want to know who is representing large groups and

specifically GNSO constituencies. We also want to know your lineage to some extent of what your personal interests are.

(Jeff): Right. So if you're - if you're say a lawyer and you represent a client, you know, maybe you don't have to name who that client is but you should be upfront and honest and say, you know, I'm representing a client who is a member of the business constituency or who is a registry or who, you know. We should know that that's the case.

So it's kind of - it's a statement of interest with a added feature of whether, you know, asking whether that person is representing someone else in - who is acting as a representative of another party when participating in the group. Does that make sense?

Man: I think that's fair.

(Jeff): I mean do you want them to just - is there a form that we should have people fill out or is it just something that you just basically ask on day one.

Avri: I think there's a template that Glen sent around to people.

(Jeff): Is Glen still on?

(Liz): I think Glen requested them from everyone in a letter talk about the template and jump in. But it also I think would be reasonable to articulate what you want. I think we did that actually in (Fast Flux). We asked for - I'm not sure it totally worked. But I think we asked for some specific questions for people to respond and I'll go back and look.

I wanted to make just a slight segue here and mention that one of the GNSO improvements that actually I think is encompassed in the Operations Steering Committee is the idea of a standardized statement of interest that would be more of a consistent request or requirement that is a recommendation of the board in the improvements package.

And that'll be the job of one of those work teams. I think it's the one that falls in the GNSO operations to come up with an appropriate model for that that is consistent and addresses the concerns of the community.

Avri: Okay. We can pretty much do anything and then when they get a real form we can do that.

(Jeff): Yeah I mean I'm thinking, you know, as part of the solicitation that we craft for volunteers, do we also create a form questionnaire that any participant who wants to be on fills out. And then the question I had was really for Avri where you said something about a filtering process. How was that worked in the past and who were the ones doing the filtering?

Avri: Okay. What has been done in the past in terms of adding people to (unintelligible) are (two phased). One is Glen has pretty much - Glen and I think others within ICANN have known who have been troublemakers kicked off of lists in the past. And if one of those was applying would raise the flag.

And then the other thing that I've done is on a closed list, we've sent names to any of the council members in this case and said does anyone have a reason why this person should not be included. And

they should send that message to me and then we would talk about how to deal with it further.

We've never had one of those occasions. So I've never explored what it is we do next. But that's sort of been - and it's how to be open but how to be cautious. You know, we all know that there are certain people that are historically very problematic, you know, but the number of people can be numbered on one hand, maybe two hands, I don't know.

So it's not a big issue. But that's sort of what I've done to date. And as I said, I've never gotten to the second point of, you know, so and so is - now, the way I thought of handling it is if somebody was from a constituency and someone from another constituency said whoa, you can't let that person in because of A, B or C, I would have gone back to the leadership in that constituency and said, you know, lets talk. What do we do about this? In terms of an outside person, I hadn't really given it much thought yet.

(Jeff): Okay. So if we deal with that kind of following that methodology, if we could get a draft up and review by the PPSC a solicitation statement for participation, have the PPSC review that along with a short questionnaire, you know, basically trying to solicit the information that would be in a statement of interest.

Avri: Well yeah, there was one other piece on that. That one check Glen does. Glen does a check of making sure that, you know, it's a real person that's reachable.

(Jeff): That's actually a good check.

J. Scott: I have a question (Jeff) just in process. This is J. Scott. Are you saying that before we go back to the constituencies and solicit participation, we're going to put this solicitation document and statement of interest document together so that that can be used in reaching out to the constituencies as well as individuals?

(Jeff): Yeah, I mean I would think that everyone would fill it out. It'd be pretty easy for a constituency member to fill it out.

J. Scott: Absolutely. I just wanted to make sure so I need to wait before I go back and say we're going to formally soliciting until I have documentation to do that with.

Man: We don't need the vetting process for representatives of constituencies.

J. Scott: Unless there's, as Avri said, she's never had happen, someone should raise a complaint.

Man: Well if the constituency puts forward the person as the representative, I don't...

Avri: That we don't even check on.

Man: ...think we have a choice.

J. Scott: Okay. All right.

Man: There might be other members of that constituency that want to be involved and then those would be vetted.

J. Scott: Okay.

Man: Yeah.

Man: I'd assume, yeah.

Man: But the formal...

J. Scott: All right.

Man: ...designated person, no.

(Jeff): So the question for (Liz) and myself and J. Scott, do we think we can have a draft (solicitation) form and a question, a simple questionnaire by the next meeting?

J. Scott: I think so especially given the fact that it appears that Glen may already have something that we can use as a starting point.

(Liz): Yeah. Apparently she's not - it's in the meeting view. I don't - not responding.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yeah, I'm on. I'm on the call.

(Liz): Okay Glen. Do you have a template statement of interest that you customarily send to working group participants or is it just a request for a statement that they develop themselves?

Glen DeSaintgery: No it's a request that they develop themselves and the request normally goes out to them in email form. And then I check by telephone conversation to know that there is a person there.

(Liz): And do you provide any guidance as to what should be included in that statement?

Glen DeSaintgery: No, except that they have responded to a request as has been the case for example in the Who Is working group. A request was put out on the Website and they have responded to that. And in other cases as well they have responded to the request that has been made.

(Jeff): I think what we can do (Liz) and J. Scott, I think we can go through, you know, we can randomly take statements of interest that have been submitted for working groups or even the council and kind of discern some common elements from those...

J. Scott: I agree.

(Jeff): ...to create a simple questionnaire. I don't view this as being something complicated and I don't want to use it as an obstacle for people participating. I want to make it as easy as possible but getting the information that people need to know when they're on these work teams.

J. Scott: Okay.

(Jeff): So why don't we make that as an action item for the next meeting? And so Glen for the people that have volunteered already, if we could just

let them know that we're still at the - we're still finalizing the charters of the teams and once we finalize that, we will issue a formal solicitation for participation and then detail...

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay. Thanks.

(Jeff): Right.

Glen DeSaintgery: That's good to know because I have had a couple of inquiries.

(Jeff): Okay. And lets make sure when we do send out the solicitation that we make sure that they get a copy of that, you know, since they've already volunteered, they're good people to go back to and just get them to fill out the simple form.

J. Scott: Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay.

(Jeff): And we'll also make it clear in the solicitation that the purpose of the form is not to weed people out but just to understand, you know, where they - understand a little bit of more about them and who they may represent because I could just see it being twisted as we're trying to weed people out and that's not - that's not the goal.

J. Scott: Okay.

(Jeff): Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: I think that's great (Jeff). Thanks.

(Jeff): Okay. Thank you Glen. The next item is - okay other updates. I guess we talked about we have not heard anything back from the GAC. We'll follow up with them. (Liz) was there anything else you had in mind as far as other updates?

(Liz): Just the GAC at the moment unless anybody else had anything else.

(Jeff): Is there any other advisory group that we want to reach out to - I'm sorry, advisory committee? We have the ALAC. We have the GAC. Is there any other one that we feel we should reach out to that wouldn't otherwise be reached out to for, you know, on the work teams?

Man: Well those are the only two that the bylaws say sort of officially interact with the GNSO. Nothing stops us from sending out, you know, the call to the chairs of the other various committees.

(Tim): I wonder if we can, this is (Tim), if we can do that as needed. I mean the other advisory committees are more - are very technical in nature right.

((Crosstalk))

(Jeff): Yeah, one of the things that - I've had conversation with several people on is there seems to be an automatic, and this would probably be discussed as part of the PDP team I would think. But there are - there seems to be an automatic presumption that advisory committees, including committees like the SDAC have an ability to generate or request an issues report without ever going through the GNSO and so

they could essentially kick off the policy and development process without the involvement of the GNSO.

Avri: That's in the bylaws.

(Jeff): Right. So...

Avri: Only ALAC has taken advantage of it to date but yeah.

(Jeff): Correct. Only ALAC. SDAC has not done that and I'm not sure if the GAC has not done that.

Man: I believe we're the only ones.

(Jeff): Right. So I guess it's something that the PDP team I guess will look at and may make a recommendation on. But given that it would affect the SDAC maybe it's something for the PDP team to think about as opposed to the PPSC as a whole.

Man: Yeah. (Jeff) I think the biggest issue right now, because I'm going to have to go here soon, I've got back-to-back calls, is when are we going to meet again.

(Jeff): Okay. That's a good point. All right. So the next meeting was supposed to be the 24th but obviously that's Christmas Eve for a number of the people on the call. For me it's okay. I got Hanukah but that's, you know, later on. But I understand that the...

Man: Actually it's earlier.

Avri: Yeah, it's actually earlier. We're earlier this year.

(Jeff): Oh. I don't even know...

Avri: Yeah. You don't even know when it is.

Man: Actually calling yourself out is not the best Jew.

((Crosstalk))

Man: You're outing yourself (Jeff).

Man: (Jeff) is right. It's also - it's also after also.

((Crosstalk))

Man: How about January 9th, second week of January.

Avri: Yeah that seems like - that seems like right.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Christmas and then New Years.

Avri: Right.

(Jeff): The meeting after that will be scheduled for the 7th. I would like to avoid if possible a whole four weeks. So what are people's schedules like the few days before Christmas Eve so like Tuesday the 23rd or Monday the 22nd.

Man: Twenty-second is better for me.

Avri: I'm in an airplane on the 22nd.

Konstantinos: And for me the 22nd is better. I'm on an airplane on the 23rd.

Man: Twenty-second is okay depending on the time for me.

(Jeff): You know what? Glen, can we do one of those - I forgot what they're called now.

Man: (Do draws).

Glen DeSaintgery: (Do draws).

(Jeff): For those for - I would suggest the 22nd, 23rd and if we have to just to see feedback the 29th and 30th.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay.

(Jeff): And this particular...

Glen DeSaintgery: Twenty-ninth and 30th. Are you sure because that's just before New Year.

(Jeff): Yeah. I just want to - people can respond no. I just want to see - I mean it's better to have that choice.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay.

(Jeff): And if for some reason we get more people saying they're available the 29th and the 30th as opposed to 22nd, 23rd, then, you know, we'll do it then.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay.

(Jeff): And why don't we suggest this time on those dates.

Man: Yeah.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay.

Konstantinos: Okay.

(Jeff): So if everyone in the group can go and respond to that, we will pick the day that seems like the most people could attend. And we'll post the action items - after this meeting I will go and I will - did people find my informal notes helpful?

Man: I did.

Konstantinos: Yes. I did very much as well.

(Jeff): Okay. So I'm going to go try and do that again. It's not any kind of formal minutes or anything but just something from notes that I've taken down. And I'll do that again and we'll post the action items. And what I have is the working on finalizing the PPSC charter that (Liz) and I and J. Scott will post on the Wiki.

Also there's different teams need to continue work on finalizing their work team charters. And we will also - (Liz), myself and J. Scott will work on a - and Glen, work on a solicitation form/questionnaire that we can hopefully approve at the next meeting.

Man: Okay.

Man: I have a question. I'm on the PDP work team. I haven't seen any email. Is it - is the list up or am I not on it.

(Jeff): You're on it. The list is up. Nobody's posted anything.

Man: Okay.

(Jeff): I'll change that in the next couple days.

Man: Okay.

Konstantinos: Okay.

(Jeff): But you can test it out if you want to send a test to make sure.

Man: I know that the two lists that I posted today were because I got messages with the members list, so.

(Jeff): Okay. All right. Is there any other questions, comments?

Man: No.

(Jeff): Okay. Well I will see everyone on the next call.

Konstantinos: Okay. Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Thank you (Jeff).

((Crosstalk))

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks. Bye (Jeff).

(Jeff): Bye.

END