

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

**TRANSCRIPTION**

**Wednesday 14 April 2010 at 18:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee Working Group Model (WG) Work Team (WT) meeting on Wednesday 14 April 2010, at 18:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ppsc-20100414.mp3>

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

**Present:**

Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC chair – Interim chair  
Avri Doria – NCSG  
Jonne Soininen – Individual  
S Subbiah - Individual  
Iliya Bazlyankov – Adobe Connect only

**Staff:**

Marika Konings – Staff Support  
Liz Gasster  
Glen de Saint Géry

**Absent apologies:**

J. Scott Evans - IPC Work Team Chair

Coordinator: Excuse me this is the operator, just need to inform all participants that today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time.

I would like to introduce your host for today's call, we have Miss Glen Desaintgery, ma'am you may begin.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you (Lori). On the call we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jonne Soininen, Avri Doria and for staff we have Marika Konings, Liz Gasster and Glen Desaintgery.

Thank you Marika, probably over to you.

Marika Konings: Well over to me just to say who was willing to volunteer to chair the meeting in J. Scott's absence.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We can democratically sort ourselves out in the room, this is Cheryl speaking. It's not as if we're going to be clamoring for space on the floor. But if we just dive into 2.1.2.

But perhaps a little bit of a review from Liz seeing as she held the panel on the notes for the last meeting and there might have been a few action items.

Is there any action items we need to cover?

Liz Gasster: I think that you've already done a really good job of putting yourself in the position of this meeting's coordinator. Thank you, go ahead.

Jonne Soininen: I would also like to volunteer her as the chair.

Liz Gasster: In fact we should elect her vice chair so we don't have these problems any more.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, and I think we need two vice chairs so there we are, we all have a role. Let's go. Any IOs, any issues that we need to cover from last week?

Liz Gasster: I just want to get on the record that we were at 2.1.2 and that we were kind of - this is Liz and we were half way through, roughly half way through that.

I think we had taken care of the needs and coordinators of verification that we wanted to coordinate with the OSC GCOT on the statements of interest and disclosures interest.

And Cheryl, I don't recall if there was consensus among the small groups last week, maybe we could pick up here on this issue of the extent to which there should be verification by the secretariat with the instant comment.

I think we had essentially concluded that there was only so much you know verification that Glen you know would typically do and that that was sufficient.

But maybe you want to just talk to Liz on that and then I think the next comment after that we were going to discuss was Mike O'Connor proposals having to do with roles of working group members.

I think that's where we left off.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That certainly speaks to the memory, hazy as it is for me. Glen indicated at the last meeting that she has some basic due diligence and certainly Miss Avri and Subbiah have other memory.

I thought we felt that was pretty much all that was required at this point but we did also discuss the matter of the requirements of continuous

disclosure, in other words if something changes one needs to post that change.

I know we've got Subbiah and Iliya in the room so welcome to both of you, are they both on the call yet?

S. Subbiah: I'm on the call, I'm just unfortunately (unintelligible) diving into all this morning's dispute on all the comments. I was away for a few weeks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, so Liz the question still hanging there is whether or not we need to look at the role now. Do you want to read to the record what the comments are so we've got that for us to go back on over the tape?

Starting at 2.1.2.

Liz Gasster: With Mike O'Connor's comment or...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, with Mike O'Connor, sorry, that wasn't very clear.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, I'm going to turn it over to Marika for that. You can pick up there at Mike O'Connor's suggested changes to 2.1.2 which have to do with membership applications, working group member roles, participations, other important roles, etcetera.

Team roles function and duties and I think he's really looking for much more clarity around the role of working group members and to clarify what we're actually expecting to do.

S. Subbiah: Sorry, this is Subbiah, just to be sure that I know where I am, in your document on 2.1.2 there is some comments regarding disclosure statements and some other thing.

I guess that's not what we're talking about right now, something else?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well we had actually dived into disclosure statements and statements of interest at the close of the last meeting. But we can certainly read that now if you'd like us to.

S. Subbiah: No, I'm not proposing to revisit. I saw a bunch of comments on the Webpage this morning and I read two or three of them, I didn't get to Mike O'Connor's but I got to some of the others.

I'm okay, I just want to know where we are so that I can to some degree participate, that's all. So where in the document are we in the current displayed document, on Mike's comment in the document?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm just struggling for the page number. I think they're about Page 11?

S. Subbiah: Okay, not nine, okay.

Marika Konings: Page 11 the orange comments.

S. Subbiah: I got it. Okay good. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, so in terms of team role functions and duties, let's just open the floor on our reaction to Michael's apparent need to have far more detail than we have in the current document.

Avri, do you want to start the conversation there?

Avri Doria: I thought we had enough.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Details?

Avri Doria: I thought we had enough. I mean don't we at various places talk about all these roles and sort of give a general guideline? I thought we had that and what do they expect to do is (unintelligible).

S. Subbiah: Avri, you know my own take on it as you know I just briefly looked through Chuck Gomes' comment, the registry community comments, the inter comment. I didn't get to Mike O'Connor's, I just glanced at it.

But it seemed that virtually all of these people were asking in general more clarification, more preciseness to everything. You know they started the chairman's role then they wanted roles of people.

In general they wanted more - like the chartered organization to be specified as GNSO and so on. It seemed that the comments read was more specification throughout the document.

Now I mean there's obviously pros and cons to that, some of that I'm sure you've already accepted that it's more reasonable.

My question is since this is coming up again and I think that Mike's are probably the most specific ones I've seen where he's really asking for all the members and stuff, my question is in general as a philosophy - what do we want to do here? Do we want to make this very specific,

this role in the way that the several commentators have made in general?

Or do we want to get only you know take half of what they say and move it up (unintelligible) or if it came down to specifics. I mean I don't know what the answer to that is but it seems that that's a general question over all these comments.

These are basically some of the comments I read.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you for that. Jonne do you want to jump in here? We to this level I thought we were keeping it fairly flexible high level document. So I'd be interested to hear particularly those of us who might have been you know so involved with dotting I's and crossing T's and looking at the words that perhaps we've missed some important information that a fresh reader might need.

Jonne Soininen: So this is Jonne, the thing is that I kind of like - it's very nice to be very specific but this is not - there's not a policy document as such. How can we say for instance what do participants do?

I'm like it depends on the work and some participants just sit and listen and don't do actually anything.

And some people contribute very much, and this is kind of like something that I'm not really sure that we have to go to this specific specificity that is requested here.

I do however hear Subbiah and that is that even the common theme about the questions is that well you should be more explicit, what is done here.

Well maybe we should read this again and think about that, does this give a little bit unclear statement of what should be done?

But I'm really kind of like also wondering that is it just that people who read this are not used to read these guidelines but really there's a policy document, this is what you're supposed to do and this is where you put your number when you apply for something.

If you don't you get kicked out or something like that. And this is not necessarily what you have to do here because every working group will be a little bit different though that we kind of like put the guidelines there that we have standardized the meaningful parts of the working group behavior.

That's just my feeling but I actually looked at the comment just now and I haven't kind of reflected to the actual text much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:       Okay. Liz, go ahead.

Liz Gasster:       Thank you Cheryl. While I do like the idea of some of the flexibility and not getting too granular or prescriptive in general, but I do think there is this sort of noticeable lack of definition.

Yu know when you have the co-chairs, the secretary, the liaison, the staff functions and you don't have participant functions or



responsibilities specified I actually think this is an opportunity to maybe add a little bit of content that I'd like to see.

But I'd kind of like to talk about it a little first and I have a question for you Avri. But for everyone because this came on up on one of our working group calls the other day is to try to you know whether we would want to in this document define a little more specifically what the roles of participants in a working group should be versus staff.

And you know one thing I know we talked about different types of participants like you know you might have a more passive participant or a more active participant but for those who are committed to seeing you know work done or seeing controversy or you know concerns addressed.

How do we get the group itself to take on the responsibility in a sense of providing the path forward rather than the staff.

Which I think is sometimes the fall back because of resources and because of time limitations that people have and time constraints as well as any of the other factors.

So I'd really love some help on that and some thoughts about that.

Jonne Soininen: This is Jonne, so that is actually a very good point that if we want to write down that we actually expect that the participants over the group would contribute and the work is contribution driven, that is maybe something that would be worthwhile writing down.

And I think that's a good idea.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah, I should have raised my own hand but I think as long as we were to keep it that general that the participant group is responsible for driving the group with contributions and participation and I think that's a great idea if we can form one or two sentences saying you know you join a working group to participate and to work.

I think that if we get the point though of it becoming - sorry I haven't heard you type anything, I haven't seen any conversation or whatever from you in the last six weeks even though you've been attending, therefore you're not being a good participant.

That would be a bad thing because I think as Liz was saying, you have everything from the you know watchers only and I'll speak up if there's anything I feel an exception to.

To the people like me that talk to much. And you know a whole range in between, and to sort of try and peg that there's one particularly appropriate role to take for any individual participant.

That would trouble me. But to say something like in general, the participants are expected to drive the work and to contribute is a good thing as long as it's not something that people will get punished for not doing by some notions of doing it properly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed I would be fearing a too prescriptive nature of the thing. Subbiah, go ahead.

S. Subbiah: Yeah, may I suggest a compromise that we should do two things. One I think somewhere in this document perhaps we should address the fact that we you know specifically wanted to keep something flexible.

I mean you know because you know when we finish this there's going to people who make comments, who say look we didn't get specific on that or something.

So maybe somewhere in the document we may want to generally you know make a statement to the extent that we have tried, we thought about being specific but this document is really trying to allow some flexibility so that people can do you know whatever.

That's number one, and number two as far as the specific topic here for the members responsibilities include, I'm looking at what nine here on the suggested changes, he suggested that was a member responsibility.

Perhaps and these things if you like about four or five points that are just generally general statements, kind of general statements. Perhaps we can weave that into some kind of paragraph of these four or five points and then leave that as what we think that maybe add something to that.

And maybe leave that as some kind of working group member general responsibility thing and then you know somewhere else capture the fact that we're trying to be really flexible as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good point Subbiah. Jonne? Are you on mute?

Jonne Soininen: Are you talking to me?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't have control, I can't give you a microphone but I'll call to you.

Jonne Soininen: You can try. So I kind of like both what Subbiah and Avri said are kind of nice. So first of all the thing about Avri, what she said is it's important that we shouldn't make this look like compulsory.

So that - what I'm a little bit kind of like looking at the text that Mike had put here is like if I'm looking at the right section, develop and draft working group documents for instance.

That is not - that is a responsibility of the working group, not the responsibility of an individual. Exactly like what Avri said, there are people that are lurking in the working groups and that's just fine, that's part of the work.

But - and you shouldn't have - you shouldn't make the membership of the working group somehow conditional on the work that you do for the working group unless you're trying to kind of stop the working group or something like that.

But anyway the thing that Subbiah said, I think that taking some of these points and putting them there as examples of what the working group's responsibility as an - kind of like through its membership should be.

And what is expected that the participant group does, that might be a good idea.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Very important points indeed. Iliya I'm wondering if you'd like to weigh in with any comment on this possibility of looking at these examples and seeing that some of them are high level for the whole working group.

And some of them might be able to be worked into a set of advisory indicators of what the average member of a work group should be expected to do. You might be muted, you might have to star 7 to unmute. Perhaps we have a technical issue. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Who were you trying to talk to Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Iliya.

Marika Konings: And he or she is not on the call, she's on Adobe Connect but I don't see...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well she just said that she would be on the call as well so that will make it all nine possible to participate on the intakes, okay, so noted. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: No, I just wanted to give you some clarification because I know this point is now introduced under 2.1.2 but actually we talk about the team role and responsibilities in 2.2.

So I just want to confirm that you agree to add there a bullet on participants and our sentence as we discussed on (unintelligible), that participants are expected to contribute and drive the work forward as a group, something along those lines.

Is that correct?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's certainly what we're discussing at the moment. Subbiah you've still got your hand up, do you want to say something else?

S. Subbiah: Oh no, I was just having it generally but I thinking of number 10 and number 11 once we sort out nine I guess.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Well let's work with nine coming in with those questions that Marika just raised. Sorry, Liz, go ahead.

Liz Gasster: Well this might be better raised when we get down a little further to where the other roles are laid out like the staff role. But I was kind of hoping to get a little more - I don't know, direction from the group about what the guidelines should say about you know there - okay so I understand Avri your point about the group.

We want the group to - we want to hold individuals to unreasonable expectations about participation, I agree with that.

But I want to avoid what also happens on the flip side which is concerns about staff capture in the absence of active working group input.

And this tendency - I mean I see two issues, one is just sort of a lot of tasking of staff in the absence of working groups doing the work which you know can create resource issues.

Which is sort of one issue, but the more challenging I think issue is you know the role that the staff would have then in propose - I mean you said it very well in the chat, in the vertical integration working group the other day when you said something about just anything you propose has a point to it, you know has a - whether it's intended or not.

That you know that need for the council, I mean for the working groups to kind of really drive the thinking because I find sometimes we're you know it's institutional that we take these things on.

It's not our intent to drive anything other than you have to put words on the paper for people to respond to if you're tasked with something.

It's kind of a Catch-22.

Avri Doria: Yeah, this is Avri. I guess no, Subbiah has his hand up so he must be before.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think Subbiah's just left his hand up.

S. Subbiah: Go ahead Avri and then I'll say something.

Avri Doria: And I'm glad you just made the comment as accusing you all of capture. But it is you know I mean I know this a lot from various working efforts from you know with (unintelligible) on through that if I really have something that I want to see a document end up I volunteer to be one of the initial drafters.

And it always has a person's point of view so - and the staff has a very particular point of view because - we'll because you're staff and you spend full time in it so that has to affect your point of view.

So that's why I try to keep - and it was really great that you jumped in and said and by the way we don't have scope to do all this work.

So yeah, I mean I see that putting that in there and putting - and so perhaps developing that, what does the working group do includes the you know the make sure that all the points of view get represented in an initial document, working group in additional document drafting, etcetera.

And perhaps the other side of this equation if it's really important is to put something in the staff side that says staff should not be asked to do initial drafting for the working group.

You know so if we really want to keep that from happening both for the staffing issues of you know how many people do you have, do you need support of group and do you really need full time authors?

You know working as writers and this is where we come in to like the W3T model where there is a higher staff person who's job it is to do all the writing.

And they start with it and then everybody just comments on it, which is a viable way to do things. But it happens in a way that ICANN has chosen to do them.



You know certainly within the IGF, the secretariat does all the first drafting and then everybody comments on it and rips at it. That's the way it's done.

And I know how hard it is when doing those initial pieces of writing to not put in just one point of view.

In fact you make sure you have three or four different points of view writing it. So perhaps you know we can frame some wording around this both in the - what is the expectation of the participants in the aggregate and what is the- and then what is not a job we want to give to the staff.

Because that's not the way we've chosen to do things.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:        Okay Subbiah.

S. Subbiah:        Yeah, my suggestion to solve it is you know maybe you have single paragraph that just as a collective you know use this example that those point ten to nine that Mike is in some of them.

Put them together a constructive paragraph to say in general what is expected of you know working group as a whole or you know average member. And then perhaps there's another paragraph after that to delineate the issue of staff contribution.

Now I think first I think everybody realizes that you know when you have small groups and you know people like me who are not attending a few meetings and so on and so forth, it's for sure that you know the dedicated staff members you know points of view is going to slip in.

I mean there's nothing that can prevent that from being 100% totally clean. I mean that's understood. But however, I think that what's more important in this document as a guideline policy document is to bring attention to that fact in a paragraph.

You know to say look you know this is possible and we need to do it because it actually then brings attention to that fact that you know makes it very clear in the document that this is something we should watch out for.

And such is sort of a second paragraph could simply just you know encapsulate what we've already discussed to say you know the initial drafts and the initial ideas and structure really be driven by the team.

And in general the staff function should be more editing, wordsmithing, going off to do some research on extra topics, you know something along those lines, more (unintelligible).

And you know unless of course you might even want to put a line in there to say that of course there's the understanding that in some cases it may well be that the working group as a whole may have you know passed off some of this parts of the work to the staff member.

You know that might even possibly happen. Basically more than to say you know this is exactly what you do or what you don't do because I don't think you can really separate this you know in reality.

So it's more to bring the paragraph there so we bring attention to the fact that these things can happen.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, I think we're certainly getting towards a consensus on the way forward here. I'll back to you in a moment Liz but I want to take off my coordinator hat and put on my contributors hat for just one moment.

I think it's very important to realize that there are going to be times in some types of workgroup tasks where there will be specific staff created documents which are already in existence, which is the basis that the working group has grown out of.

You know things like DNSO come immediately to mind for example. Any working group that grows out of that is going to have to work from a previously created set of criteria that's come from the heavens or wherever it's come from.

So we are going to have to look at some flexibility in our proposals and of course in the modeling and there might indeed be times where some specific professional drafting requirement is going to have to be integrated.

And there will be a very specific staff role and sometimes that happens in legal and contract type outcomes, certainly in the telco world I play in that the occasional work group where you bring in quite literally a professional staff drafter.

Which is a long way away from a scribe type role which is sort of the other end of the spectrum. So I think the flexibility but the delineation of the expectations is important.

Sounds to me with what we've got in chat and Avri, I think you've got a couple of words here that we could probably almost steal straight away that what we want to do is put together a engine or the role of the work group is to do drafting, etcetera.

The individual members however have roles in this, this, this and this. And to that end then do a match up with what the expectations of staff are that seem to be getting a big tick from Liz.

Liz, back to you, you had your hand up earlier.

Liz Gasster: Well I really like Avri's language and you know just was going to ask her what - yeah, I like what Avri's doing here. And I don't even mind creating additional - initial draft, you know resources permitting to the degree that they get the ball rolling and aren't specific to great debate in and of themselves.

It's just when you know it's a controversial subject that it's going to get torn apart, that's when I - that's when I bother.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Liz, you see my response to that is suck it up. I mean there you go. Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I mean just the reality of this is I mean looking at the different working groups I staff for example where I do assist in preparing first drafts which basically capture the discussions the working group, it's definitely not like staff go ahead and think of something out of scratch you know without any contact sense.

And just to point out the reality is I think that that support wouldn't be provided in this day in the current state of number of working groups. It just means that work doesn't get done.

Or it's the reality that working groups will take years and years to you know - many working groups do start out with like we're going to take it on all ourselves and you know we don't need any staff writing assistance.

Then a couple of weeks or months later the group realizes it is quite a commitment of meeting once a week or you know every so many weeks. Things you have to read in between and review and then offer the many - last volunteer is actually willing to take the pen and you know do that first draft.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:       Indeed, and it's that facilitation role which I think again Avri has words in the chat that seem to be capturing that. Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria:               Yeah, just that the words were off the top of my head and not carefully considered. But that's why I used the word should not be asked that drive the work of the group.

So - and so if we put anything like what I wrote -- and I certainly was thinking of it just as, you know, thinking, not as here, take these words -- is that I think yes, when you've looked at the conversations two or three weeks and you've assembled for example in several of the groups that I've worked with on here where we just babbled on for a while.

And then eventually you wrote it down and then we went through this whole editing process. I think that worked well but you weren't actually driving it.

You know whereas I look at some other groups and it may be more in process work teams that it happens in another place where perhaps the writer of the work is actually driving the work and the people in the group are running hard to try and keep up with the drive and are missing things.

And are constantly in discussion with the staff person as author as opposed to the staff person as editor. And I think what really needs to be captured is the role of editor versus author and you know the change control and how changes are made.

And where the initial stuff is in - is collected from. So I think you're totally right Marika on some of these big groups, you know FastFlux and others being prime examples, nothing would have ever gotten done if you hadn't collected the assorted babble and turned it in to a document.

That then people could beat up on. And so when I wrote that I knew that I wasn't being as careful as I should and it's really the notion of staff driving the work. So for example in the BI added thing where it was oh, let's just after the fact figure out how to evaluate these things.

That one sounded to me like a (fairy) request to me because that would have been asking you to drive that particular piece of it. And that would have been difficult.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:           And it also comes to the points of resources, you know there are certain human limitations and even staff of ICANN have, short of cloning some of these people I'm not sure how we could possibly get them to do much more for an ever growing plethora of work groups.

Now we do need to be cautious on that as well. Seems to me like we've hit a consensus point and if someone disagrees put up a big red X to tell me otherwise.

But we will in fact be entertaining alterations into 2.1.2 to include text along the lines of what Avri has put up and to pick up on some of the at least the one, two three, last four points raised by Michael's examples.

In other words to contribute ideas and knowledge to working group discussions, act as liaison between work group and their respective constituencies, ensure the constituency statements are developed in an informed and timely way and actively constructively participate in consensus decision making processes.

As generic your expectations as a member of a work group are included in that list. If we can do that between now and the next meeting online or on the Wiki or perhaps just start at the next meeting with some sample text that we've all had a go at between now and then, that might be the best way forward for that section.

And moving now down on to the rest of his comments, the questions that he brought forward on adding a section to the statement of interest part, requesting applicants to the work group to describe skills, knowledge and experiences they contribute to the working group.

What's our reaction to that proposal? Who would like to start off that conversation?

S. Subbiah: I can do that, Subbiah here. I think that there will be a lot of pros and cons in this I'm sure. So one way to address that would be make it optional but make it sort of a clear optional.

That is there's an empty box, if you want to select, you select, if you don't want to you leave it aside. Now I think then you know anyone who wants to be on the committee, you know we'll have to have an empty box.

They've got to try to sell themselves, right? So I think that you know that might address those aspects of things.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika, just to raise these comments were also passed on to the OSCG call because I think J Scott in a previous meeting that you actually wanted to lead the content of that the SOI and the DOI to that group.

I don't know if you want to add this specific part or rely on the other group or maybe you know encourage them to include it if that's the obtaining of the work group of course.

But all the comments have been delayed including this one, so nominated and (unintelligible) should be review that as well as part of the other comments they're received.



Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, we certainly would like to influence and send across any opinions that we want to formulate on the matter though. Go ahead Jonne then Avri.

Jonne Soininen: Yeah, the thing is about this, I think these are so subjective that people usually feel that when you write something down that what you think your kind of experience or skill or something that like that that you bring to the working group, that's most probably not the one the actual working group will notice while you work actually.

People have different opinions about themselves than the people around them have, about them. And I think that this is anyways we have open working groups so anybody can join.

So what is the purpose of this, this is kind of like well if somebody's active you will notice what their skills and knowledge level are, experience or lack thereof during the work.

And you will bring - make your own picture of that. If they are not active you don't actually really care what their skills or knowledge base is because they are not contributing anyway.

So I'm not quite sure that what is the purpose of this would basically be allowed and feel more that this is kind of like some kind of mini resume that people should have to write.

And I'm not sure that that's really useful.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I couldn't agree with you more and in fact it concerns me very specifically that the assumption here is that there is some sort of

vetting or skill set selection and the whole design is one of an open work group model.

Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: I'm pretty much going to agree, but probably a lot more strongly than it was stated, although I do find places like that useful for adding a bit of comedy in my answers as opposed to just putting in something totally irrelevant that will irritate somebody or other.

I certainly as also a member of GCOT I think (unintelligible) and the focus of them is the right thing and I will argue against it very strongly from my personal view point for everything you guys all said.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Avri. Subbiah?

S. Subbiah: First of all you know I don't know if it's just me or I hear everyone else very well but Avri seems very soft, I can't even make out half the time what she's saying.

Jonne Soininen: She's a soft speaker.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Subbiah, are you comfortable - what Avri was saying was being on the other work group she certainly supports passing this across to them. But she's also commenting that she would be arguing from a personal perspective very strongly against this for many of the reasons that...

S. Subbiah: No, I understand where everybody's coming from on this one, but my own view is that it would force somebody to think before joining a group you know.

The fact that you know do you have the expertise, do you have the - it's not so much I don't think for me this particular section doesn't involve the issue of you know the ability to participate in working group skills involved in making their point across and you know working together and all that stuff.

My real concern is a lot of these working groups end up being fairly you know - I'm sure the ATFA experienced people here now that it becomes very technical, right? And it is- and so on committees like that there are lots of people you know who don't have - my experience don't have the expertise and the knowledge.

And they just come on board because they're asked to or whatever, the group setting is and they're on board. And then it affects the decision making because their voice does count, they do say things.

You know they may be silent, but they do affect the outcome. That's one thing. Now I understand that Jonne's point here which is simply that hey look, if the guy is - he doesn't have a clue about the technical structure, you're not saying anything useful anyway so why - you won't be listening to him anyway.

I see that point of view as well. However my own experience has been that the contrary has been the case for me. You know I mean there have been people that I have seen in working groups who don't really know these jobs.

But you know just by using words and stuff and they - and after the whole things I over I've talked to people on the committees and asked them why didn't you go this way or why didn't you go that way?

And they say well they didn't know. You realize they didn't have the skill sets but they include the outcome anyway.

So I know that cannot be stopped. You know Jonne's point of view is that you know look, you can't stop it so let them be, right? But on the other hand having some - making someone address that point, right, optionally that is, at the point saying you know making them reflect on do you have expertise?

I think in some cases that I have personally known you know might have thought twice and said you know I don't have the expertise for this because they might see some other people's expertise being put up on their SOIs, right?

And say look, I don't think I have and might excuse themselves from it, you know. And that's my - that's the only reason - main reason why I think that it might be an idea to leave it as an option.

But you know it doesn't really - one way or the other I don't think it's that important a deal.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:           Okay, thank you Subbiah. Jonne back to you.

Jonne Soininen: Yeah, just to answer Subbiah, I mean like I don't think that I said that, that these people don't matter if they don't have an expertise, but I

mean like people do build their own views about other people's expertise despite what they would write in this.

To my experience, the people that have strong opinions and no expertise are the ones that do not know that they don't have the expertise.

And they would write in their kind of statement of interest that they have the needed expertise and they may be the best expertise in the group.

And still you would notice that during the work that well maybe these people weren't the ones that have the expertise.

Look, that's how I lived through all my kind of life standards organization where I have been.

S. Subbiah: I see where you're coming from and being a nerd myself, I can't agree with you more that in very technical groups, right, you have people who come in and say they know X, Y, Z and then they're the ones that know the least.

And that's you know a phenomenon that I've noticed as well and it's perfectly fine. But my concern there is that at ICANN it's a little different, you know. We talk about technical things or semi-technically we talk about things that we don't deal - only very few committees are extremely technical, like a DIETF level, you know?

But there are lots of committees which are sort of there are some good at job policy, that's fine. But then there are some that are not - they're policy but they involve a lot of technical knowledge.

I mean they're not at the level of programming and all very specific stuff, very detailed stuff. But there's a lot of these hybrid committees where you've got policy.

You know and what happens is you have a lot of policy people in there who don't necessarily understand the underlying technology well enough to actually make reasonable decisions.

And my point here is that I'm trying to draw a distinction to say that the personality type that you are pointing out, I completely agree with you, you see that very often in sort of very technical groups, you know.

But you don't - I'm not sure whether you see that type of personality as much in a sort of a mixed hybrid policy situation committees. You know I am a full fledged scientist, I mean I teach, I'm a professor and all this stuff.

And you know it's a very technical committees where you discuss things, yeah, it's pretty clear that you know the point that you're making.

But my own experience with this sort of hybrid policy thing, you - that same thing doesn't apply to that same amount. There are lots of people with just very - they are aware of a lot of policy but not so much the technical substance.

And then they're making you know choices that eventually do affect things. That's the reason why I was asking that if somebody as an option, fill out a box, and say I have the expertise for DNS security or this or that, you know.

And actually be forced to put out some words, you know it makes them reflect, you know do they really have the expertise, you know beyond just the policy making side of things. That's all.

I don't want to make a big fuss about this, it's just my...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:       Okay, well I think what we seem to have established so far is that we certainly want to toss this over the fence to the other workgroup.

Is that the consensus on this day with this group of people. from this work group is nixed to say the least on the value of a ticker box or set of skill knowledge and experience opportunities to be listed in a statement of interest.

I actually think that if we were going to be going down the pathway of asking for these micro CV fits then they don't belong in something called a statement of interest.

They belong in some thing else, my personal perspective and coming very much from an at large perspective is one where the opportunity for working in hybrid models is one where people are able to either be upskilled by the emersion and experience in the more technical or indeed policy work that is being done by a work group.

And that in turn allows for a general upscaling in my perspective the at large population that this wonderful thing called the internet is a really good resource of all sorts of access to materials that can help even the most basic user.

Certainly one who needs to learn something about the DNS can put in what his DNS and Google will probably tell them fairly quickly even if it is in the middle of a technical conversation.

And the other matter is that the power of a workgroup would include to bring in and it's probably a very good idea occasionally to have the chair and leadership of a workgroup bring in specific tutorial based information to make sure even the bottoms are on the same page.

Because if you put three big qualified technical geeks in a room you'll probably have seven ideas. Avri, go ahead then back to Subbiah.

Avri Doria: Yeah, just briefly I'll say that you know when this comes up inside the GCOT, I'll make sure to mention that while there was perhaps you know a majority supported opinion or even almost a rough consensus that there was an alternate view.

And I'll do my best to pass that on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I certainly would be very discomfited to see a selection, a vision process coming in to what is a more open workgroup model. Go ahead Subbiah.



S. Subbiah: Yeah, no, I hear this, it's pretty clear, I'm the only descending voice. But I'm not asking for a CV or any of those things. I'm just saying that the small marks, you know maybe they can put three or four lines in.

And it's an option where you can describe you know what...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We hear that and I know Avri will have captured that and you will be amused to know my box in the future will say I am a self opinionated articulate person who is very good at influencing others whether or not I have the background material to do so.

And hopefully I get on every work group I need. Jonne, go ahead.

Jonne Soininen: Well actually - so I just wanted to say that I understand exactly what Subbiah is point at, and I think that the aim is noble and would kind of for all of us and kind of like reflecting sometimes what really are competencies are or do we have them in the first place at all would be very useful.

And that would help. But what I - what my point basically is that I don't think that this is going to help those people that really shouldn't be on the group but they will think that they always have those expertise anyways.

But I don't want to discuss this any further, I hope that Avri can capture the sentiment here when she goes to the other group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm convinced that she's certainly capable of doing that and besides we've got the transcript and the record if she doesn't we can wave it under her nose and complain bitterly.

We've come into the top of the hour, we did start ten minutes later than the hour. I would very much like to finish at least the rest of the comments in this Section 2.1.2 in today's meeting.

Do I have your agreement to creep just slightly past the hour till we deal with the measure of 11 at language to Section 2.1 to look at shortfalls in gaps, skills, representation, knowledge, etcetera? Are we agreed?

If everyone else is - if anyone disagrees then put up a big red X. Okay, let's assume we can now move on to the final point raised in the sections or comments which is as follows.

A proposal was to add language to Section 2.1, introductions and team formation that analyzes the SOIs received to evaluate the makeup of the working group.

Describe a mechanism to recruit additional members to fill any gaps in skill, representation, knowledge, etcetera that are found.

Who wants to start with that one?

Avri Doria: If we don't do 10 then we can't do 11.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Avri. Can you just speak up a little Avri, it's a little hard to hear you.

Avri Doria: Sorry, if we don't do 10 then we can't do 11.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:           Excellent point, Subbiah go ahead.

S. Subbiah:           Yeah, well barring that, setting that aside, I think setting that aside a valid point is being made on number 11. I mean whether you like it or not, it is a valid point.

The issue is it's a bit like - it's not too different from a quorum issue, it's like saying you know I think somebody made a comment about quorums, right?

I mean we could make policy but you know suppose we get ten people on the team but there's only one person that day, we don't make decisions, right?

So it's not too - I mean at least analogous to that right, I mean we could all - certainly we can make policy and make decisions without any expectations.

I mean we can, we do right? I think we in the US we have an administration that is very good at that, all right, in the past. So the - but then the question remains you know I mean I'm thinking the worst case scenario we set internet policy on something technical without anybody with any technical qualification on the team whatsoever.

You know make up something that probably won't work, we probably can't, right? I mean this would work out to be you know in reality, now the question is how do we deal with that and that's what this point 11 is asking.

My only suggestion, I know that you can't do 11 without 10, I understand that. But still my point here is again to say look, maybe the way to address that would be to say that whoever the chairman of the chartering organization or whoever is looking at all the applicants and okay, we accept everybody.

And then they sit down and go you know that certain necessary expertise to get this forward doesn't exist. Now the question is who makes that decision?

Well I think the CEO can make that decision. I mean the CEO chartered the damn thing in the first place so there's a natural rights holder who can say.

And I think then how do you address that, if you can then say look, somebody's figured out that there's - how do you address that?

Well the way to address that would be to basically go out there and maybe make a statement to say look, we have lots of good people but we are lacking expertise in area A, area B, area C.

And say we have another week for anybody who wants to volunteer and at the end of that those people haven't turned up well then I guess the CEO in most cases would just indeed go forward because they probably have enough expertise of other kinds to go forward, unless of course there is zero.

I mean basically if nobody is qualified you know I mean the document is to be drafted in English but the only speakers you've got or the only writers you've got are Mongolian or something.

Then in that case you know I guess the CEO would just completely say look this can't go forward, but he'll probably go for it anyway.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well you wouldn't have the effective work group that you need to carry out the role. Jonne go ahead.

Jonne Soininen: Yeah, so the - I think we have or at least a summary in some reincarnation with this paper we had a kind of like a section somewhere that said that there should be certain networks done to make sure that the working group is balanced and has the needed information.

The - and I think that that's the best that we can do. Coming back to the ten is really that's kind of like it, people give out themselves, if the people eliminate themselves there's no of course problem that - it's hard to say well do you have a way that you have this knowledge but we actually do know that you don't.

Which makes it a little bit difficult as well, so I think that the only thing that we - maybe we really can guarantee that the working group will be successful.

And some working groups are doomed to be non-successful and that's just fine. And sometimes yes, the - there are kind of like errors done in the work because people didn't have the expertise or people thought that they had the expertise but didn't in the end.

And that's something that we have to live with. I don't think we can totally safeguard ICANN from that.

Or any organization, I know standards organizations that claim to be technical and claim to know what they are doing and I think they have been kind of like proving themselves not to be competent and not getting done something useful.

But that's kind of the fact of life sometimes and there's not anything that we can do about this I think.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:       Excellent point. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: That is in the guide - I just wanted to point out that we do have Section 4.4 on briefings and subject matter experts, so whenever anyone feels that they are lacking technical expertise or need some you know specialist to brief them or get some insight there is this possibility to invite experts to participate.

And you know from experience what has happened on you know several of the working groups I've been involved in, for example we recently had a discussion on EPP.

And we had one of the members saying well actually I know the person who wrote the protocol, can we maybe ask him to come on the call and explain to us how it actually works and what is technical feasible.

Because we're you know discussing this solution but we actually don't know for sure whether it's possible.

So you know in practice that happens in that way and I'm not really sure indeed whether you at the start of a working group can predict exactly the kinds of expertise you need and is required.

And I think has been discussed as well it's not always obviously from information that people submit. And you know the question of course as well is like who would be the decider or evaluator of those criteria.

So I think it brings a lot of complications with it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, particularly in what is an effectively open work group, the call for more people is probably the best way of filling in a clear lack of member base diversity that's been desired by the chartering organization.

But bringing in expertise as required is certainly a very good way forward and one that's been proved in the foundries of previous work experience to be very successful.

Subbiah then back to Jonne.

S. Subbiah: Yeah, I - you know I think I may have been one of the people who suggested that Section 4 thing and bringing in expertise from outside.

And you know my suggestion then is perhaps in the context in Mark's comments after 11, one way out is to address, you know connect the Section 4 to this by simply saying that you know obviously there have to be mechanisms somewhere to figure out when there's a shortage of expertise.

Either the chair or the CEO before the working group starts or perhaps when the working group itself meets in its first meeting or second meeting you know the chair sits down and says do you really know this, right?

And somewhere firstly to identify the possible places in which the - a gap in expertise can be filled and number two, once that's been determined then you know the idea of recruiting as per Section 4, that too - perhaps those two points can be added somehow or referred to in this section.

So that you know it - you know it addresses this point here. I don't know. That will be one way to (unintelligible) in the comment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think that's alluding back to Avri's point that if don't do 10 how do you do 11? Jonne you had your hand up earlier.

Jonne Soininen: Yeah, just forgot it up, I didn't want to actually speak.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Then Subbiah back to you, go ahead.

S. Subbiah: Sorry, then if ten is out of the picture then how is - I mean I understand we've got Section 4, I've got to go review it. But the - how is that determination made? I mean when is the determination - who makes the determination at least in theory when there is no expertise?

There are certainly software license, that way we are defaulting to as opposed to somebody at the outset...



Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Subbiah no, I think not. And as we're bringing this particular part of the conversation and indeed the meeting to a close, I think it's important to think are we trying to give a script for a workgroup, or are we trying to empower a new workgroup model with different mechanisms and particular roles to the organization?

S. Subbiah: I think you're misreading me. I am not that distinct one way or the other anything here. I am simply saying if the mechanism for bringing in the expertise is by you know by bringing in an outside expert, my question is I just want to make sure right now since this person brought up this comment that that mechanism - it's clear when that mechanism would be involved.

That's all, right? It doesn't matter when because any working group going down some path, if it realizes - I mean without the expertise they probably can't function. That's - you know in most cases that's a reality.

So I just want to make sure that if that's the mechanism then there is a mechanism for that to happen and that's clarified in this document, that's all.

Now I don't have four in front of me but I think somebody brought up Section 4, so in that case then the - I guess it's just the working group during its working sessions decides hey, we don't have the expertise and then they call somebody and that's what it's - what the mechanism is left for right now.

Is that what it is in the document?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I go ahead - I didn't put my hand up, but I think first of all for the most part even without people checking things down and you published a whole list of names, the group of participants looking at those names can say oh my, there's nobody here that knows about how a registry works.

Oh my, there's nobody here that understands DNS (BOO), etcetera. So first of all I think that just putting up the list of people for all of the people to see most all of us know most of us, if not for - or at least know some of us.

So we know the answer to ten even without anybody really giving it except for the totally new people.

So I think at that point you know whether it's the chairs, whether it's the chairs and staff people that are working with, whether it's a busybody like me, whether it's somebody that looks up and says yeah, we really ought to get somebody that knows something about how competition authorities in various countries behave before we write this thing down.

And so it can happen up front, it can happen any time but groups are smart and they know when they're missing the talent.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that ability for self determination is very important for the work group's success. Because if a work group doesn't have that sort of self determination, then they are going to question their purpose.

Are they just there for some pro forma rubber stamping experience?

S. Subbiah: I completely agree with what Avri is saying, that's how things work and we all know that. But my question is simply that in this document we're not going to address, that we're just going to basically say leave it the way it works.

We're not going to specifically address that these things are the ways in which expertise will come in, we're not going to do that.

That's the only thing I wanted to be sure about because I think in some sense the commentator on this is really looking to that I think, that is there nothing (unintelligible) with expertise.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I hear what you're saying and I certainly recognize that you know we have got to come in and we are responding to the comment.

What I'm not hearing is that other than we have addressed this particular issue of short fall and of bringing in expertise, and we do have liaisons with the chartering organizations, who should have a role in making sure that the mandate from the charter organization is able to be carried out.

And if not then go back up and say hey, you know we need to call four more members with these particular skill sets because we the group have identified this shortfall.

I think we're all - we're agreeing with that, we're just not necessarily agreeing with we need to leave in 2.1.2 a reference to Section 4.

S. Subbiah: Okay. But I do want to point out one other thing and I think that the it's just a little different from what Jonne said. The IETS or the IGF, or - these are organizations that don't force anybody to do anything.

You know they're just volunteer organizations, they put out standards, you can choose to follow them if they want. There is no liability issue.

In the case of ICANN there is a liability issue, right? I mean for example if a working group comes up with some thing and based on you know wrong expertise, it's a (unintelligible) working group let's say.

But anyway they come up with something and it's a standard that's wrong, that's put out there and it goes into some contract, it goes out and you know their registry is following this or whatever, right?

You're exposed. ICANN is an organization that is exposed with lots of money and that - I'm not saying one thing or the other, I'm just simply saying that's a little bit different from the situation where...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Avri, go ahead and then we will need to wrap this up.

Avri Doria: That concern is one of the things that's covered and I think needs to be covered in both what the council does in its management activity of seeing if the work was done properly.

And that's also something I think the PDP team needs to take into account in terms of deciding what kinds of oversight they have put on a working group.

So that's all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, and I think that's a very good point to wrap up this box of issues on. Now have we assured ourselves that we've done justice to everything in the comments of Section 2.1.2?

Subbiah you've still got your hand up, go ahead.

S. Subbiah: Yeah, I mean you know, I'm sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. In which case there's a little bit of homework in terms of the bringing in the determination of the various duties at a generic level of what the expectations are for work team members for the example.

We've got some beginning text, thank you very much Avri for on the fly drafting but you're also very, very good at that.

We can have staff extract out of the chat and put together and on behalf of our chair I'd like to thank each and every one of you for the time and effort and energy we've put into 2.1.2 and notice that we will be starting with a review of our homework at the beginning of the next meeting.

And then moving straight into 2.1.3 and the comments on the first meeting. We're not terribly extensive but did come in from INTA, is that, yes, INTA. So that's where we'll begin, same time, same place next week. Thank you one and all.

Avri Doria: Thank you for playing chair.

Jonne Soininen: Thank you Cheryl for being...

END