

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC)
Work Team (WT)
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 12 August 2010 at 19:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee meeting on Thursday 12 August 2010, at 19:00 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-20100812.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Jeff Neuman - Registry Stakeholder Group - Work Team Chair

Alan Greenberg – ALAC

Tony Harris -

J.Scott Evans

Avri Doria

ICANN Staff:

Marika Konings

Gisella Gruber-White

Glen de Saint Gery

Liz Gasster

Absent apologies:

Gabriel Pineiro – NCSG

Coordinator: Excuse me. I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Thank you. This is Jeff Neuman, Chair of the Policy Process Steering Committee. It is August 12, 2010. I'm going to ask Gisella to call the roll please.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's call we have Jeff Neuman, Tony Harris, Avri Doria, Alan Greenberg, J. Scott Evans. From staff when have Glen De Saint Gery, Marika Konings, Liz Gasster, myself, Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from Gabriel Pineiro. If I can please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you very much. Just an administrative note. We are having some severe thunderstorms in this area. So if I get disconnected, I apologize in advance. Not that I expect a power outage here but I'm in the administrative building as opposed to the building of - with all the networking and stuff. So this building unfortunately - the admin building doesn't have generators like the other ones do. So anyway, if that happens, I apologize. And I'm sure Marika can pick up where I left off.

So welcome everyone. It's been a couple of weeks since we last met. And just to remind everyone where we are; we had asked everyone to go back, re-read the working group work team report and to come back with any issues that he or she has or had with the report, with the goal of any issues that this group agrees upon are indeed issues that need to be explored further would be sent back to the working group work team as opposed to being worked through by us.

So that's where we are. The couple weeks are up now and this call we're set to talk about them to make sure that we can finalize this list with a goal of sending this document or a document incorporating these issues to - back to the working group work team to work through this and, you know, we'll I guess I'll talk to J. Scott. J. Scott's on the phone here.

But we'll ask - after we go through these issues we'll ask J. Scott if he could give an estimate based on these issues here how long he thinks is reasonable to plan for the working group work team to run through these issues and to answer these questions and come back to us, so that we can

then look at those changes and if everything is acceptable, the ultimate goal is to forward it to the Council for its deliberations.

With that said, is there any questions on what we need to do? Great. So what Marika has produced, and thank you Marika for doing this and welcome back from vacation. She has given us two documents that she has posted on the Wiki and had sent around to us earlier.

The first document is a list of those issues that we have submitted - either we have submitted or - yes, I'm sorry, that we have submitted and also a document - the working group work team report that our comments or kind of - yeah, our comments embedded into those locations in which these issues are raised or would be addressed.

So with that said, I think what would be good is to just go through this list and to see if we as a group agree that these are in fact issues that we should send back to the working group work team. Any questions?

Okay. So these first two - oh, Marika, you have a question, comment?

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. I just have a question as, you know, we received comments from the different stakeholder group constituencies. I'm just wondering what - those that haven't submitted does it mean that there were no comments or they're still - they need more time to produce comments or just maybe to clarify whether, you know, there was sufficient time for everyone to, you know, to turn this around and have that discussion on the document.

Jeff Neuman: So let me - and I'll ask and I'll let other people answer. Let me just - I don't think the point really was necessary for us to have to go back to our stakeholder groups. I think a couple of us had said we were going to or that we had already had comments from our stakeholder group on the final report.

But I don't think it was a - I don't think it was intended as a stakeholder group's specific comment period or solicitation of comments from the stakeholder group. It's great if people went back and did it. But it really wasn't - I don't think that was really what the call to action was. Does that make sense?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. It makes sense. Just to make sure that those, you know, went back or reviewed it themselves, you know, they have no further comment that we can expect and this is the final list.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. And J. Scott, was that you - someone sounded like want to say something.

J. Scott Evans: I haven't opened my mouth. Shocking I know.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks J. Scott. All right. It sounded like someone wanted to say something and I didn't mean to talk over them.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I think I'm the only one who said anything. I was agreeing with you.

Jeff Neuman: Oh, okay. Great. Well I like to have that on the record too because that's pretty rare. So okay. So let's go through it. Actually the comments that the - that I had gotten from the registries, we actually talked about on the last call.

And so just to recap what the issues were was that essentially the - we just suggested new wording for Section 2.3 -- I think it's still 2.3 -- that would say the Chair wouldn't show the sub team's properly balanced with the appropriate skills and resources to ensure successful completion and, you know, it's the focus on the skills as opposed to the representation. It's really just a kind of a rewording.

Then the second one was talking about the liaison role and it's just basically putting in some of the same language as was done with regarding the Chair

role saying that, you know, they're not prevented from stating their personal opinion or advocating but they should basically make it clear that they're doing it in their separate role.

So with those two, I'll just as the question is there something - are people comfortable with putting these comments back to the working group work team?

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I have a comment.

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

Alan Greenberg: As you could - for anyone who saw the comment that at large made on the PDP report questioning to what extent the working group structure that we are now living by is really the optimal structure that - to be used.

I think these kinds of examples are - not examples but issues are important. The participation in these groups is far from balanced. And to say things like the subgroups must be balanced or the Chairs or liaisons should not be speaking I think robs us of the ability to do an awful lot of work and get product out of these working groups.

So I'm far more interested in trying to get results and be effective than having rigid rules which inhibit actually doing things. So I support what you're saying.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. And that's good. Yeah. And I (think) to those comments. So you support - clearly you support the substance. I think really what we're doing is just - yeah. So we're making a recommendation to the working group work team to see if this is something that they would accept as far as changes in the report.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: You support that.

Alan Greenberg: Yes and I - well, I don't think we have any other process. We're not going to rewrite the report here.

Jeff Neuman: Right. J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Personally I think this is what, five pages long.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: I don't think, you know, in the interest of time, I just think these - this is not a voluminous number of comments. I think Marika could speak to the fact that I think we could go through this in a couple of conference calls and resolve this. That doesn't mean that they will be incorporated. That means that I don't think it would take us long to consider them.

Jeff Neuman: Good. That's good. And Avri has a check mark here too. And Avri I think you are a member of that group too.

J. Scott Evans: She is.

Avri Doria: I was on mute.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Avri Doria: Sorry.

Jeff Neuman: So it's always good to have a member of the group put a check mark saying they agree with that timeframe. Okay. Great. So let's - I think Tim Ruiz actually went through his comments as well (Morocco). So I'm not sure you need just the time - basically...

J. Scott Evans: Jeff I don't think there's a need to go through this bit-by-bit. I mean I think all the comments are here. They're a succinct number. I think - the question asked is do we - as Chair I can tell you we can do these. We've done them before. We did much longer comments than this. I think we can get it done. And so I think we should just submit this list.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. That makes things a lot quicker. Marika, you have a comment.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. I mean one question I did have for the members of the PPSC is to look at the document that has integrated comments just to make sure because some of comments didn't identify specifically to the exception or part of the document they related. And I think surely then in the parts where I thought they were most relevant.

So if we could maybe give members, you know, a week or something to look at that and basically let me know if they feel that a document is put - or a comment in placed in the wrong part or needs to be, you know, placed somewhere else and that can be updated just to make sure that the comments are linked to the appropriate section in the document. Because I guess that will help facilitate the review by the working group work team. The comment is meant to be specific language in the document.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Let's do that. And can you push that document onto Adobe?

Marika Konings: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: And I think - thanks J. Scott. I think that's a good - I'd rather not go through the list if everyone agrees with that is a good list. Then you - I'd rather not go through point by point on the list and just submit it to the working group work team.

So let's scroll through to - Marika, you want to lead this as far as where these are found?

Marika Konings: You want me to - I mean I don't know either if you want to go through them one by one or just give people time, you know, over the course of a week to look at it and come back. I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Can you - and I haven't - because you just posted this. Can you point out where we would address something like Mike Rodenbaugh's comments? Where would we do that?

Marika Konings: You can see that we have put them all in boxes and highlighted in yellow and you can look where Mike Rodenbaugh's comments went - give me a few seconds. It's on Page 18.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: I put that with the Section on process integrity because that talks about attendance participation. Everyone having an opportunity to provide input on issues and decisions. I've added that to that section and mind you that's related closely to what he was commenting on.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry team - for everybody to scroll because every time I try to use the side scroll it goes back to the beginning.

Marika Konings: It's easier to use the arrows and just on the top type in the page where you want to go to.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, that would be the easy way. Thanks.

Marika Konings: I'd like to think (unintelligible), so.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Great. Are we happy with the wording of that because there was some questions afterward on - that they may have come from non-PPSC members actually. But there was some questions that - but I think Mike's words are okay. So this means no meaningful decisions can ever be taken on in working group calls but must always be subject to the list discussion and polling. Do we want to soften that a little bit? Is that the...

Alan Greenberg: Are you asking are we agreeing with what he said?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. I'm trying to agree on how we - I guess what we should do is try to frame the issue for the working group to address. And so is there a - is there a way we can - well J. Scott's got his hand raised. So is it on this?

J. Scott Evans: No. My comment was just the earlier comment that I can't go through this with regards to the IPC comments and ask if they've been placed in the correct place because I didn't - all I did was act as a conduit for that information. I'm going to have to go back to the people that put that together and ask if there are questions.

Jeff Neuman: Good.

J. Scott Evans: I can't do that today because I am not the author of that material. I just supplied it to you.

Jeff Neuman: And that's fine. I think again if we can get this document to the working group work team within the next, you know, two weeks, I'd be happy with that recognizing that, you know, many people are on vacation. So that the working group work team will probably not really meet until September anyway. So that's fine J. Scott. I think that's in line with our timing. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I'm trying to understand from this comment what part of it is comment from the PPSC and what part of it is comment from Mike. And I'm having

trouble sort of deciding. I mean is it the PPSC? Is it saying that no comment - I mean no decision should be made on working group calls? Is that Mike's comment? Is that PPSC's interpretation of what Mike's comment means? I'm...

Jeff Neuman: Right. So that - you're exactly right and that's kind of why I brought this up. As far as - you know, I don't want to reword someone's concerns. But is there a way we can frame it as an issue as a comment from the PPSC. You know, and this is not - I'm speaking in my personal capacity.

You know, I do understand the comment he's raising as far as, you know, it's not - people can't always participate on calls, and therefore through the working group or should the working group work team address the issue of how decisions are made and should they ensure that participation on the calls does not advantage participants in the process as opposed to those just on an email.

And so maybe there's a better way of framing this as objective question as opposed to a statement because I don't know - I'll let Alan speak. I'm not sure - I'm not sure I'd be comfortable in saying this is no meaningful decisions can ever be taken. But I'm comfortable in rewording it as an issue for the working group work team to discuss. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I would certainly support that. Under no conditions would I want this statement being put in under my name. I mean if you look at it form what it's really saying, it says you can't take discussions - can't take any decisions on working group calls and there are working groups where there's virtually no list traffic which means why bother having the working group at all.

And it mentions polling, which as anyone who's on the VI group has been - knows it's being an exceedingly sensitive issue. Working groups and very often people who respond to polls are the people who have the largest vested

interest in it. And unless you have some sort of complex waiting structure, the output of a poll is moderately meaningless.

We went to working groups instead of the task forces because they are not equally balanced and do allow other participation. But there's down sides to that. And how you evaluate polls is just one of - it's one of those down sides. So I certainly...

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Alan Greenberg: ...I certainly can't support what it says. I understand the problem.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Well I suggest that we just let Marika go in and amend that to say rather than saying it from the PPSC directly, say the PCP - the PPSC member Mike Rodenbaugh or, you know, J. Scott Evans for IPC submitted the following.

Jeff Neuman: But you know what though, I kind of rather have to the extent we can frame the issue - to the extent we can agree and the extent that we can frame the issue in a way and Mike might not object to this; we can ask him in an objective way.

I'd rather it be the comments from the PPSC if we can do that. And go through the comments in such a way as to how we can frame that statement or any of the other ones by the way in a way that is more objective as an issue to consider without providing them the answer. I don't know if that makes sense.

So if there's a way we can rewrite this one in such a way that it's more framing the issue.

Alan Greenberg: By doing that on this call aren't we violating what he's saying?

Avri Doria: Can I make a slight (look)?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. And that's why I did say we should ask - we should run it by Mike.

Avri Doria: Can I make a one-word recommendation?

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

Avri Doria: If you started the second sentence with does and ended it with a question mark.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry. Say that again.

Avri Doria: Basically you turn that second sentence into a question and send it back that way.

Alan Greenberg: You've just come up with a new definition of (Cness).

Jeff Neuman: Well, you know, I would actually like to take this first sentence and try and make that into a - into the issue, right. Just basically saying has the working group considered methods in which a working group could ensure that participants on the mailing list are afforded the same opportunities as those that participation on calls.

Avri Doria: I mean - this is Avri again. I never put my hand down. But I mean that's very much sort of saying you take the IETF approach, which is meetings and other things can make tentative decisions. But they all have to be reviewed on the list first.

And so I think we've talked about that. I don't know - I don't remember whether we put anything about it in the report. But I'm pretty sure that we did talk about it at some point. So I think sending this back as somewhat of a

question is whether it's the first one or the second one or the whole thing I think gets the point across.

Jeff Neuman: Right. (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: I think to get a question you take out the fact that the PPSC is asserting anything.

Jeff Neuman: Right. And then you could actually - I agree. So if you take that second sentence Marika has kind of just put up there and then taking out the second sentence because that's kind of - that's an opinion I guess. The third sentence is reasons.

So it's a cultural practical - few people have time inclination for this case so maybe you can incorporate this particularly non-English speaker. Is there something from that sentence we should incorporate in the question? Or do think that's already implicit? Or do we want to provide a reasoning for our question?

You could say that the PPSC wants to ensure that those that may not have time or the ability to participate in conference calls. And then you could say in particular non-English speakers have the opportunity participate fully in a working group.

Avri Doria: (My hand up).

Jeff Neuman: Now that may be an opinion too. So I just kind of did that off the cuff. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I think once you go to that second sentence you start to add - and I don't know if that was Mike's content. I think you start to add another content which is well if non-English speaker but of course you mean English writers because - or are you saying we have to translate the provisional decisions before they count?

So I think you may be opening yet another can of worms by saying especially particular non-English speakers. You know. I think it's fine to say, you know, in particular those for whom English is not a first language. But you might soften a little but we don't - I don't know how many cans of worms you want to open with this.

But if somebody says I have to assure as a working group Chair that the non-English speakers understand everything that's decided at every meeting and agree with it, then you're going to drive me to requesting translations of meeting minutes.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. With the exception of a couple of at large groups, the working language is English. You may not feel comfortable in using it and that may make you a little bit more mild mannered but the work language is still English regardless.

Avri Doria: Oh yeah.

Jeff Neuman: Folks can we - Avri, can you repeat those words that you used to substitute? You said in particular for those of whom English is not a...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) English is not their first language.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Yeah.

Avri Doria: Because just as an example I had. When I lived in Korea for a year, people would not talk to me face to face but they would send me (their area) by email. You know, they could write English fine. They just knew they couldn't pronounce it properly so were afraid to.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So the way Marika worded it - and then you cross out the non-English speakers - those words, non-English speakers. And then - well, J. Scott has his hand raised. J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: I suggest that we just don't particularize it at all. We say time or ability but just leave it at that. Apparently Mike is concerned and he's a full-fledged English speaker.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. We have - Alan, you got your hand raised.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I'm concerned that we're spending this much time trying to worry about this one and ignoring all the others. And I think we need to go back to what someone suggested and identify this as a concern that was passed through the PPSC and leave it at that and hope the workgroup investigates the issues.

I mean even the first sentence I don't feel comfortable with. To say someone doesn't participate in any of the calls and then sends one email on the list and we're supposed to bow down to it. You know, I don't think that's what working groups should be doing either.

So I don't say - you know, either we're going to craft each of these or we just have to pass them on saying what they were and hope - and presume that the work team is going to think about them as intelligently as we're trying to.

Jeff Neuman: Well okay. So I - my ideal, and maybe this is just an ideal, was that we would get the steering committee behind these comments or forcing many of them to the working group work team. If you could think of another way to word the first sentence, I'm open.

Alan Greenberg: We can do what you just said but it's going to take us a lot more than this one conference call. And even then we're - the spirit of this one says we shouldn't be doing that on conference calls, so.

Jeff Neuman: Well the group is small enough that we could do stuff on conference calls. But not - look ultimately, again, personal opinion, not Chair. I don't think that we're a people that will come out is that we should never have conference calls and we should, you know, never do any work on conference calls.

I think what may be an outcome may be something like having conference calls and making sure that the substance of calls are repeated on email or summarized on email and allowing those on the list that couldn't make the call to comment on it - which is a different issue than you're bring up, Alan, which is to say someone can never go to any meeting and can never - and never choose to attend. I mean that's something different.

But again, so the ideal was to come up with issues from the PPSC as a group as opposed to issues from individuals like - so J. Scott, you have a comment or was that just left up? Okay.

So with that said, I mean let's go with the wording that we have and then Alan, why don't you think of a way - if you don't like this wording, why don't you think of a way we can frame the issue for the working group work team.

I mean you understand what we're trying to convey and I don't think you disagree. Right. I don't think you disagree with the notion of the working group work team thinking about how people can participate if they're unable to sit in conference calls.

Alan Greenberg: I don't disagree with that at all and I think words from us or words from anyone saying that we should ensure that all active participants are, you know, have an opportunity to participate. That's semi-redundant but the wording there I don't agree with.

But I'm more worried the fact that we're spending 20 minutes on this one, which we happened to go to accidentally because someone asked where

does Mike - where did Mike Rodenbaugh's comment go. And I think we need to change or define comments from the PPSC to identify exactly what it means.

We need to go through every one of these yellow highlighted ones with the same level of granularity we're doing this one or make sure the header says that we haven't.

Jeff Neuman: Marika, you have a comment?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I have a question because I think J. Scott proposed to take out that sentence in relation to no - and there's no native language. Was there agreement on that or is it understood you're locked in?

Jeff Neuman: Well if we use Alan's philosophy I guess of trying not to express an opinion, the team's like - maybe we should just take that part out, but...

Alan Greenberg: I don't mind expressing opinions but I think we need to go over all of them, not just this one. And I'm a little...

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. Okay. So let me...

Alan Greenberg: ...I'm a little bit worried that we happened to have landed on this one and are tearing it apart and putting it back together.

Jeff Neuman: So - okay. Let me - let's finish with this one. I think everyone can take a look at it. Let's leave it in there for now like this and then we're going to give two weeks or let's see, what day is today, the 12th. Two weeks is...

Alan Greenberg: Twenty-sixth.

Jeff Neuman: Well it's ten days. We'll give people ten days to go through it. We do have time on this call to go through other comments that people wanted to go

through to make sure it's worded in a way that we're all comfortable that this is a comment from a PPSC. I think that is an exercise in (unintelligible).

So if we have - if we can get comments from people on the list in ten days to submit new wording, I wouldn't object to that. J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: I just think - I don't understand why we can't say that - just explain in a cover to the working group what we did. The PPSC reviewed this. They asked the members of PPSC to go to their individual constituencies and solicit a review and these are the comments that were brought back from that round and not in any way make it a PPSC.

Just make it a -we're just the process. We don't own any of this. We just think that everyone should look at it again and got those comments and we're putting those forward to you for consideration rather than it being from the PPSC because then we have to get buy in from all these folks on - is it worded right? Is that something that we feel comfortable with PPSC?

I think what we were comfortable with is we reached out to groups. We asked them for comments. We brought them back. We gave them to the working group to consider.

Alan Greenberg: Well we can add - we can add into that what Jeff is saying the other members of the PPSC can comment on the comments.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah and then we sent - and we could explain that. We also sent it around once they were consolidated into the thing that was sent back to the PPSC for consideration. And if we get comments on them, I think we should just put those comments in too but not alter any of it.

Alan Greenberg: That I can live with easily.

J. Scott Evans: Just don't edit it. That way you don't spend a lot of time.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Let me try one more angle on this. I'd like it - I would like us to agree as a group that these are questions we all view were important enough not to reopen the process but were important enough to refer back to the working group team for its consideration.

So even if we don't all agree on the wording, but we don't agree with the substance, we all agree that it was appropriate for these questions for the working group work team to spend time on the issue. That they were that important.

And again, I'm trying to establish kind of a - I don't want to establish a precedent especially - and maybe I'm thinking too much about, you know, one of the other work teams as well. But I don't want to establish a precedent that we did this to substitute the - to substitute the work that went on and was just another opportunity to comment that should have been done in the working group work team.

And maybe - so Avri's got a comment as well.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: You may go Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. I guess I'm sort of agreeing with J. Scott and once again offering what's effectively a one or maybe two word substitution. If each of the comment from PPSC was just changed to comment forwarded by PPSC. And you had his top (shapo) paragraph. Because I think he's right.

I think if we try to wordsmith these things for something that all of you can agree with and since I'm only sort of an alternate alternate in the PPSC, not, you know, one of the formal NCSG participants.

But this is - you know, you're not going to come - even the few people that are on this call going to come to agreement on the wording of all these things. So, you know, I think just saying that you're forwarding them. You know, and you don't have to worry was it a member of the PPSC?

Was it something you heard in the wind? Was it something that the PPSC decided wasn't a thing? It's that basically these are all things that the PPSC thought we should consider. But each of the individual statements is not necessarily reflect - does not necessarily reflect the PPSC position.

Alan Greenberg: On the other hand, would it be bad if we appended to each whether - to what extent it was supported by the PPSC members?

Avri Doria: Then you'd have to manage to get the PPSC to be a fully functional group with all of its constituencies and stakeholder groups represented properly.

Jeff Neuman: Well so...

Avri Doria: Which obviously at the moment it's not quite.

Jeff Neuman: So, all right. Here's what I think we can do. I guess as a PPSC member, the comment by Mike - again, this is as a - let me clarify. This is my role as an individual and registry I guess, not as Chair.

I think each of the - I read through all the comments. I think all the comments have issues in them that are worthy to go back to the working work team for them to work on. And I agree with the notion that we may not be able to all agree on how to frame on the wording to frame these.

So if it's - what I was trying to do maybe is come up - and maybe it's different. Maybe it's - maybe here's the - maybe it's a statement that we have that tries to come up with a couple words that describe the issue and that attach to the

- to that statement that exact comments that we received. In what's kind of the best of both words. Or was that too complex?

J. Scott Evans: I think I need to hear it one more time.

Jeff Neuman: All right. My - and but - my idea was if we could summarize in a couple words each of the issues to what they are and forward that to the working group work team and attach to that list, like an appendix to the list, word for word the comments received from the individual members.

Alan Greenberg: So you're saying summarize each of them and in the case of this one it would be there is a concern that working groups may unreasonably favor those who participate in calls or those who are vocal on calls.

Jeff Neuman: Right. If there's a way...

Alan Greenberg: Or something like that.

Jeff Neuman: ...(unintelligible). Yeah, something like that. That's - the issue is right but the PPSC and that's exact wording of the issue as Mike worded it. That's going to get passed through as an appendix. But then the issue itself is sort of like how you mentioned it. Right.

So if that's better - again, I'm trying to make it a little bit easier. We are supposed to act as a steering committee and supposed to boil all this stuff down. And the issue itself is not the outcome. Mike had an outcome in his comment. Mike's outcome was - calls no meaningful decisions should be made on phone calls. Right?

That's not the issue. That's kind of - that's his belief or his - what he wants as an outcome. The issue is to what extent or how are those that are unable or unwilling to participate in working group calls, how are they treated as vis-à-vis the other members of the group. Right? That's the issue.

Alan Greenberg: So you're essentially looking for someone, staff or us, to summarize each of the issues in an unbiased and even hand it away which doesn't predict the outcome but focuses the working team on the issue.

Jeff Neuman: Right. And then if the PPSC as a group can agree by consensus however I measure that - I'm just kidding. That was a joke. If we can agree - a consensus agree in this group, then we could forward that on. That's the way I kind of would like it. Because then we can - it's a straw statement to the work team to say that the steering committee believes as a group these were important enough issues that should be considered.

And by the way, if we think there's some individual comments that shouldn't be considered or that we believe the working group has already considered and we'll rely on J. Scott to help us with that, then we may not want to forward every comment on.

And again, what I'm trying to...

J. Scott Evans: I have no problem with doing an evaluation of the comments received to decide whether we want to put them forward. And if that's what we're going to do, then I would suggest that we take the list that Marika has put together and maybe we want to rather, you know, do an issues list. Here are the issues. Here are the comments. And let the PPSC do a vote.

Or put it out three and say this is what we're going to - it usually works easier if you say this is what we're going to submit to the working group. Do you have a complaint or want something done differently?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, or do you have anything to add. Do you have any - well...

J. Scott Evans: Because we're going to call consensus.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

J. Scott Evans: And then once we do that, give them a week and then after the week, then send it back to the PPSC folks that delivered the comments on behalf of the folks, the integrated copy that has them inserted into the draft and say review this and let us know if these have been placed in the draft in an appropriate spot and give them a week.

And then we come back together and look at what everybody's come up with and we send it out. So it's kind of two stages. One is we agree on the list of issues whether it needs to be included or not and we show them the comments. Then once they say yes, we put the - we give them an issues list and the cover. We tell them we've inserted the appropriate comments where we've been, you know, directed by them.

Alan Greenberg: J. Scott, that process eliminates the ability of PPSC members either on their own or behalf of their constituencies from saying yes, it's an issue but I disagree with what the commenter said.

J. Scott Evans: Well, I mean we - okay.

Jeff Neuman: That's kind of why I suggested if there was a way we could pull out of these comments what the issue is and then attach - and then that's a list. And then attached the exact comments that were received and...

J. Scott Evans: Yeah. Okay. I have no problem with that. I mean saying that the issue one is equal participation, right. Isn't that what Mike's comment has to do with - equal treatment of participants?

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Alan Greenberg: That's right. And I would - I support that but I wouldn't support what he's suggesting. So how do we convey that in a written report - in the written report?

J. Scott Evans: I think Jeff's thing is we would say we received a comment and we've identified the issue - the PPSC has identified the issue as equal treatment of participants within a working group both those that attend meetings and those who participate only on the list. And then see comment from Mike Rodenbaugh attached.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, something like that.

J. Scott Evans: I think what everyone - I hear everybody saying is they want to take out sort of the either conclusion or the emotion or the...

Alan Greenberg: The parts we disagree with.

J. Scott Evans: ...or the parts - be directing you to - this is how it has to be solved.

Alan Greenberg: Just imagine how this call would be different if Mike was on it.

J. Scott Evans: Right. I - you know, I think he raises a - you know, all the issues should be considered. And I'm not so sure that that issue wasn't considered. I know that certainly in the working group that put together the rules - Avri, correct me if I'm wrong.

What we normally did was we had two or three people who couldn't make calls. One had a particular standing of class but we would come to resolution on the issue with those on the call. And then everything always -- Marika and Avri if I'm correct -- then went to the list saying here's what we've done. What are your thoughts?

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Jeff Neuman: And so that's I think - and that's good that you all did that and that's not reflected in the working group work team report. You know, so the issue is like you framed it is equal or equal may imply something but - which Alan may not agree with.

But you agree - so if we could frame the issue as taking out the emotion, taking out the parts people disagree with, taking out that kind of stuff, even from the registry, you know, statement as well which I think if we put all that down, you know, one is the ability of the liaison to express opinions. Right.

The issue is that. Right. Instead of our recommendation, which is change the wording to make it same as it is for Chairs. Right. You boil each one down to a simple issue, I think we can do that and that way I - my goal I would love it for the group, the PPSC to say yes. This is what we think the issues are or these are what the issues are and we want you to address. And it's stronger coming from PPSC as a group.

So with that said, does anyone - so if we can - Marika, if we can - and maybe you and I'll work on this. If we can come up with an initial list of trying to boil those down and then send that to the group like as J. Scott said for a week's time to see if people have comments on that list and the wording of those to make sure that we've done our job in removing the emotion and removing the...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Two questions asked. One, is this - do you believe that this list of issues should be sent back to the working group?

Jeff Neuman: Right.

J. Scott Evans: And if so, do you believe the wording in this issues list conveys the issue adequately? Right?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: Because those are the two - that solves one, whether we should send it back and two, whether we're saying it in a way that doesn't offend anyone.

Jeff Neuman: I think that's a good suggestion J. Scott. So Marika do - you got that? So the first question is should this issue - so we will boil down these comments into a list of issues hopefully removing the emotion and the biasness or outcomes.

Then so - then we'll ask two - and we'll submit that list to the PPSC members with Question Number 1 saying should these issues be referred to the working group. And second question is if so, do you believe the wording as we have conveyed it here. Or do you believe the wording conveys the issue?

J. Scott Evans: Only caveat I would put with that and other Chairs can disagree but if you disagree about the wording, you have to provide wording. You don't just get to say no.

Jeff Neuman: I think that's a helpful suggestion. So I think we should ask for that as well in the - in that email.

J. Scott Evans: Because then you just get into a spin of you're bidding against yourself.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. I think if they said it's an issue then you've at least crossed the first hurdle.

J. Scott Evans: Right.

Jeff Neuman: If they say it's not an issue that should be referred, then we'll have to deal with that if that comes in.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I think we have our marching orders on this. Marika...

J. Scott Evans: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: ...you have your hand raised, so.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. I do have a question. So the original language as is currently in the mix will still remain as is but just submitted as a separate annex and each of those issues that identified in the list need a separate description in more neutral language. Have I understood correctly what the approach is?

J. Scott Evans: Correct.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Correct. Reminds me J. Scott of law school.

J. Scott Evans: Yeah I mean one of the things that I would probably do is to say - is to have that five page document you put together and you would send that along with the issues list and say - then this is the whole PPSC list. Say we received the comments that are attached in the five-page comment document. We have distilled that down into a list of issues, which is attached here too as B.

Then I would say here's what we need from you. Is the list of issues that we've provided something that needs to be passed onto the working group for further consideration? Yes or no. If so, is the wording in the issues

document satisfactory or do you believe it, you know - if not, please provide us with alternative wording for consideration.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. I think that sounds like a good approach. Anyone disagree with that approach? Great. Okay. So we will do that. And then the goal is then - Marika, when do you think we can - you and I can send that around to the list?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I can probably send you something tomorrow.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Then I'll look at it. So the goal will be get it out by Monday. And then if we look at a calendar here - let me look at my calendar.

J. Scott Evans: You're into the following Monday, 16th to the 23rd.

Jeff Neuman: Sixteenth to the 23rd and then give...

J. Scott Evans: Then get the - then get the - then we'll send - once we get the list of issues, we send it back to those people that made the specific comments to make sure they put in the consolidated document before close of business on the 24th. And that would make it like the 31st that they would need to get back to us which would put us right on track for a September meeting of the working group.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. You got that Marika? So after that happens - after we get these comments back from people on the wording of the questions and whether they agree to the issues should be raised, we'll go back to your - we'll go back to the working group guidelines document that's now posted on Adobe. We'll re-insert the new wording of the issue in the places we believe they should be raised.

We'll send that back to the people that submitted comments on the PPSC somewhere around the 24th hopefully. Give them a week to say yes, this is

the right place in the document or no; this is not the right place in the document to insert the comments. And that should allow us to send this back - the entire thing back to the working group work team by the 1st or somewhere around September 1 or August 31. Does that make sense?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just a question. So you don't foresee any other calls?

Jeff Neuman: I don't think we need one.

J. Scott Evans: That would depend on what we get in our feedback.

Jeff Neuman: Right. And this will appease Mike Rodenbaugh because it will all be done - no meaningful decision is taken on the...

Alan Greenberg: Ever.

J. Scott Evans: And I would suggest that just so we don't get accused of filtering anything that while the issues are put into the consolidated document that the specific comment - that five page sheet be sent around as well.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: So they can say - the look at the - the working group says okay, they say email blah, blah, blah. See comment from Mike Rodenbaugh. Boom.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. I agree with that. And what we should probably do is set up a call for - which we could always cancel. But we should probably set up a call...

J. Scott Evans: Why not do a call on the 23rd?

Jeff Neuman: Could and maybe I'll ask you J. Scott to Chair that call. I'm out that week.

J. Scott Evans: I'm just mentioning that because that's when - if we needed a call, that would be on the issues list, right, and that's when it would come in.

Jeff Neuman: Right. But J. Scott, can I ask you to Chair that call?

J. Scott Evans: Let me just make sure I'm not committing to something I don't have power to do. Nope, I'm completely free that day.

Jeff Neuman: All right. How about everybody else, the 23rd, this time?

Alan Greenberg: Probably okay for me but I'm not quite sure.

Jeff Neuman: All right. Marika, if we could send out a note to the steering committee and just make sure - just send around, see if this time is good for everyone but me. And then J. Scott could Chair and I'll be following the emails.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Everybody good?

J. Scott Evans: Yeah. I got to run because I got to go upstairs to a meeting. So thanks. Thanks everyone especially Avri and Alan.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks guys. Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: And so can we - I think that's it. So we can stop the recording and everyone have a great couple weeks. I'm sure I'll talk to a number of you on other calls.

Avri Doria: Or no other meetings for these couple weeks. Going to be so nice.

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Man: That would be.

Alan Greenberg: Take care all.

Man: (Good night).

Avri Doria: Bye bye.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you everyone.

Woman: Bye.

END