

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Working Group Model (WG) Work  
Team (WT)  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Wednesday, 30 September 2009 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 30 September 2009, 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-20090930.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/index.html#sep>

(All MP3's and transcriptions can be found on the calendar page).

**Present:**

J. Scott Evans - IPC Work Team Chair  
Avri Doria  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr  
S. Subbiah - Individual  
Iliya Bazlyankov  
Jonne Soininen

**Staff:**

Marika Konings  
Ken Bour  
Glen de Saint Gery  
Gisella Gruber-White

**Absent apologies:**

Liz Gasster  
Caroline Greer

Coordinator: And this is the operator. I'd like to inform all parties today's call is being recorded and if you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Jay Scott Evans: This is Jay Scott Evans. I would ask that Gisella do a roll call for us or give us a list of attendees.

Gisella Gruber-White: So let's say good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's call we have Jay Scott Evans, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Avri Doria, Iliya Bazlyankov, Jonne Soininen.

From Staff we have Marika Konings, Ken Bour, Glen de Saint Gery, Gisella Gruber-White myself and apologies, we have Liz Gasster and Caroline Greer. Thank you.

Jay Scott Evans: All right everyone. As you know from my email this is Jay Scott again that I sent out earlier this week, we have completed the work on the majority of the charter drafting guidelines document.

But there are three sections within that document that are going to require heavy cross references to the document we have before us today which is the Working Group Guidelines or the Operating Model Guidebook.

And so we are going to concentrate on getting the wording for this document in order so that we can then call for consensus on the three sections that heavily rely on this particular document.

So with that it's my understanding that to date the only person's that's provided comments in writing with regard to the documents are of course the ever-energetic Avri Doria.

So we will now - Marika, I'm going to allow you to control the document and scroll down so that we can begin working on this document. If you would go to the first section I think which is probably intended audience or purpose, 1.2 or 1.3 that actually has text that we can discuss.

Marika Konings: And then if we can take one step back and go to the title of the document that there was one suggestion already there because I know you've been working under the title of GNSO Working Group's Operating Model Guidebook.

But as a newcomer to the Group I was certainly confused as to what that meant and following going through the document my suggestion would be to make it more straightforward and call it Working Group Guidelines.

Jay Scott Evans: Does anyone in the group have a comment?

Ken Bour: Jay Scott, this is Ken Bour. One of the things we also talked about on the Staff was - and we've talked about this in prior sessions of the whole group and that is whether or not we really do have two different books here, two different guidelines or just one with two big sections in it, right, one that deals with the implementation of Working Groups and their behavior and so forth and a charter template, right, for those who would be building a charter document.

And, you know, if we're going to look at changing the titles at this point maybe the right thing to do is to think about merging the document into one complete thing, which probably could be called Working Group Guidelines to differentiate it from the sort of Operating Model versus the charter drafting guidelines that we originally bifurcated.

Jay Scott Evans: Thoughts from the group?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I agree with Ken. If we're going to make it the Working Group Guidelines then it also makes sense that that title would cover both sections as subsections but...

Jay Scott Evans: So we would have two sections to Working Group Guidelines as I understand it, the first being harder drafting guideline, particular audience, which is the charter organization and then we would have Working Group Operating Guideline.

Jonne Soininen: So this is Jonne. I think that makes perfect sense. It sounds somewhat logical at least to me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

Ken Bour: This is Ken Bour. One other thing that would help - would also make it possible - if it's one large document there won't be any cross referencing issues that we would likely have if the two documents are kept separate.

So that's another thing that might create a sort of holistic document and we wouldn't have to be repetitious between two different source books.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. This is something that I think was discussed as well on last week's call and I think at that time those on the call agreed to work through the documents first and then once we have the two documents, you know, nearly finalized then to bring them all together and make sure that indeed we avoid the cross referencing and, you know, have one document that we can either link through internally or point to chapters as well for relevant information can be found without having to repeat things two or three times.

Jay Scott Evans: Yeah, I, you know, in my, you know, years of drafting we're not going to get past the cross referencing, but having it all in one document surely makes it easier for someone to navigate through whatever cross referencing there may be if it's all in one spot rather than having to leave something and go to another thing and look it up.

It's much easier to navigate if it's all within the four corners of one particular document.

Ken Bour: This is Ken Bour. I'm sorry this is Ken Bour again. So I would recommend not changing the title at this point if we're planning to put things together because we can create a title for the entire thing at that time and also maybe even chapter headings.

Jay Scott Evans: Group?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's fine by me.

Subbiah: This is Subbiah. At this point I just - yeah so it seems okay to me.

Jay Scott Evans: Okay well I...

Iliya Bazlyankov: This is Iliya. I also think it is okay.

Jay Scott Evans: Okay. All right. It seems that we have at least reached consensus with the fact that the title should be under consideration once we get the two documents merged, that our goal is to merge the two documents into one overarching document, and each section of that document would have two different audiences but they would all be there for - in the same repository.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

Jay Scott Evans: Okay. Now Marika.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: 1.2.

Marika Konings: Okay, yeah, so Chapter 1 is just general, 1.1 is a background and it will need updating and, you know, following the completion of this process. 1.2 explains the purpose of the document. 1.3 the intended audience and 1.4 looks at revisions.

So here is the first question for this group would be how to deal with revisions. We've been discussing it a bit internally as well so it's the idea what would happen if, you know, because of some changes or, you know, some event, something needs to change in the documents who should be responsible for overseeing that process and approving a new version.

And one idea that we've discussed internally is whether there should be some kind of standing committee that should be responsible for all the working team products that are currently being produced and so that the committee can come together or be informed, you know, this is what's happening and make a decision and then just, you know, go back to their usual business.

So if there's some kind of process in place and some kind of body responsible for looking at those things.

Subbiah: Me - this is Subbiah. I just want some clarification. Is this - what you're proposing, is this just the revision at the end of this particular period where we're coming up with all these documents as a whole over the next several months or is it for, you know, are you talking about a standing committee as in long-term for the next five years or something like that, or both?

Marika Konings: No, the second would be more once this group has finalized it and has been approved by the PPFC and the GNSO. After that all has happened it becomes more long-term.

Subbiah: Oh, so the long term - you're thinking about for the long - many years if there's going to be some changes to the document.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: For the next ten years Subbiah:

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Just something you might not be aware of but one of the BGC recommendations was that there be some standing committees formed after the improvements were completed, not only for the purposes that Marika just outlined but also for metrics tracking, are the improvements working, that sort of thing.

Jay Scott Evans: Well, I mean, let me just throw this out to the group. I don't think this team has the ability to do anything other than to recommend to the PPFC that a standing committee be formed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Jay Scott Evans: I mean, we can write everything here and put in as another recommendation is to say that, you know, and put language in here that follows that recommendation.

But I don't think we have the ability to do more than recommend to the PPFC that a standing committee be formed.

Subbiah: Moreover I would have thought that there should just be a single standing committee, correct? I mean, I would think it's sufficient for all these things, you know, both tracking and all the other review documents besides just our own committee or Working Group, that for all of it there should be a single standing committee going forward.

I would have not thought that we would want a standing committee for each different, you know, Working Group issue or whatever.

Jay Scott Evans: So we want to make that - I do believe we think that there should be a recommendation. I'm hearing consensus that there needs - we need to recommend to the PPFC that there be some sort of standing committee to deal with future revisions to these documents. Is that correct?

Subbiah: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Subbiah: Yes.

Avri Doria: Can I ask a question?

Jay Scott Evans: Yes.

Avri Doria: I don't - this is Avri. I don't really have an opinion on it one way or another as surprising as that may be but why wouldn't this just be something that - on an ad hoc basis? You know, the GNSO or anyone could say, "Hey, you know these things have gotten outdated."

And I only ask because it's true what Ken said originally. There was the notion of standing long-term committees to review these things and by and large the position I think that the Council took at the time is, "Hey, you know, when it comes time to review it we'll review it."

Why do we need a committee sitting there as something that looks for work? So as I say I'm fairly ambivalent on it. I could see it both ways. I'm just not sure I understand.

Jay Scott Evans: Well I'll throw this out to the group. I've sort of taken position the GNSO Council is that committee.

Subbiah: Yes. Perhaps what we could compromise here is to say that a recommendation that we place is that the GNSO Council be prepared to set up a standing committee occasionally for review of these things over the long term or something like that. I don't know.

Jay Scott Evans: The difference between a standing committee and ad hoc committee, I think one of the things we may want to say is why don't we make a recommendation that these be reviewed on a, I mean, when are these matrix - are they annual matrix Ken that they're asking to do?



I mean, it seems to me that each - as I understand the way we've designed this process is that each Working Group at its completion is going to do an evaluation of its performance or its experience, correct?

Ken Bour: I think so, yes.

Jay Scott Evans: So it seems to me that the GNSO Council, we recommend to the GNSO Council I guess would take an annual look at these to see if they need to be revised. And if so then they would set up a committee to deal with any revisions.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I think that could work.

Jay Scott Evans: Does that sound Avri like what you're, I mean...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Subbiah: Yeah sounds fine.

Jay Scott Evans: We recommend that you have a hard to do that you have to look at the evaluations and see - and make a determination these do or don't need to be revised at this time.

Avri Doria: Yep.

Jay Scott Evans: And that needs to be done annually and that you need to set up an ad hoc committee to do so if it's determined that they need to be. That would be the recommendation I would suggest.

Subbiah: That sounds reasonable.

Avri Doria: That sounds like a good way of handling it.

Jay Scott Evans: I mean, it builds in flexibility but it also makes a hard recommendation that you need to look at this issue. How do the others feel?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I'm happy with that.

Subbiah: I'm okay with it. Subbiah

Jonne Soininen: Sure. Jonne.

Iliya Bazlyankov: Iliya. I'm okay with this.

Jay Scott Evans: Okay. All right, Marika can you capture that and - for our next iteration just put a recommendation there?

Marika Konings: Yep. I'll do some.

Jay Scott Evans: Okay. All right let's move on.

Marika Konings: So then the next Chapter is roles and responsibilities and 2.1.1 is announcement of a Working Group and this is something that was also covered if I recall correctly in the charter guidelines.

And this will be one section where you can see where that we need to sit and where we need to be cross-referenced and furnish specific comments on this one as we already discussed that particular section.

2.1.2 is membership applications and so here the question was raised, should there be any scrutiny over membership applications by the chartering organization or other bodies, especially cases where volunteers are not members of the GNSO constituency or stakeholder group.

Jay Scott Evans: Well I want - something out to the group. Membership applications sounds like something that's a little bit more formal, that requires a lot more of some

sort of approval that I'm not so sure that's this process. Wouldn't it be more like a member - an expression of interest?

Subbiah: Well we need the word volunteers in there or something.

Jay Scott Evans: I don't know. I just asked.

Jonne Soininen: Yeah, this is Jonne. I agree with you Jay Scott. I think the membership applications sounds a little bit too formal for something like this. And Subbiah said like statement of volunteering or like what you said, statement of interest. That would be much better.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Jay Scott Evans: Others? Well why don't we just change that to statements of interest because that's what we're going to be talking about, right.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Could we maybe change that term as we're using statements of interest as well at a later point in time where people just submit, you know, what they're doing first, because this is more than just sending an email I would like to join the Working Group. So could it maybe be expressions of interest instead of statements?

Jay Scott Evans: Interest.

Subbiah: Yeah, expression of interest and volunteering or something.

Jay Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: But on the question, so should there be any kind of scrutiny over those expressions of interest. I think Avri made one suggestion here. And Avri if you want to...

Avri Doria: Yeah, okay. Yeah, one method as I said that's been used is - and this is really just a level of sanity check, is one, do we have a real person here and that involves the reaching out and making the phone call and somebody actually talking and having a one-to-one with a real person.

And in some groups that's not a problem. In the ICANN mode that has sometimes been a problem is that we don't really have a real person. The other thing is - and, you know, decide is has this person been a whole lot of problem before, has this person been kicked off every single list.

So these are things that we've been doing now as we've evolved. I'm not necessarily sure that I'm advocating both of them. I kind of like the real person check.

And I also tend to believe personally that everyone always gets an umpteenth chance. But, you know, I just wanted to pass on what was currently being used.

Subbiah: And Avri, just make a thought on this one. When you mention that if there's somebody who has been kicked off the list and so on, right. Now if you do determine that somebody has been such a person what is the mechanism to propose, I mean, what do we do then?

Does the Chairman at that point call that person up and said, "Hey, if you want to be a member, you know, you have to behave. We'll watch you." Or what - is there a follow up to that?

Avri Doria: It's actually been pretty much - I don't know whether it's happened or not. I think sometimes just putting that that's a condition out there may stop people but I do believe that, you know, it's - I've been mostly insulated from that by Glen.

So she may have the experience to tell. It's been one of the considerations but I don't know if we've ever actually deployed it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. I'm much more comfortable with the real person check than I am with bringing in other levels of criteria. I'd be a little bit fearful that having stubbed one's toes on some form of etiquette of some form of lists may sort of carry over as I think too much of a limitation on input and speech, but the real person check I'm very comfortable with.

Glen de Saint Gery: This is Glen.

Avri Doria: I would certainly go along with that.

Jay Scott Evans: Go ahead Glen.

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes, just to say that when Avri has asked for this it has happened twice but in fact there was an email sent and there was not a - there was not actually a person. It was a sort of company and they wanted to be able to put in anybody at any time into the Working Group.

So there was no one person that was going to be in the group. And then the other time was also a very dubious person I think probably we all know about.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And we're all not going to say Glen. I think that matter of an organization offering alternates, that's perfectly viable as long as everyone in the group then, you know, as part of what's made clear in the group membership, that sharing, you know, organization XYZ will have someone representing it.

And, you know, it could be one of half a dozen people. The effectiveness of that person if they're not brought up to speed and if there's not good sharing from that organization's point of view as continuity and everything else of course works against them in their input if it's not done effectively.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Could a suggestion be to put in a sentence like, you know, the Chair of that organizing - of the chartering organization is together with the Secretariat will at its discretion have the opportunity to verify or follow up with kind of this expression of interest, just leaving the option open that they can check just to make sure that, you know, it's a real person and they're, you know, not a hundred people that will alternate and without informing the group, something like that?

Jay Scott Evans: I don't think it should be discretionary, you know. I'm the neutral Chair. I think that you should have to check and verify that they're a real person. With regards to the misbehavior I think that should be focused on each particular Working Group.

There's going to be a precision in here to deal with that so you would just - don't look at anything else. Just look at this, are they real, they're in; if they begin to misbehave here you have a - you'll have a procedure for dealing with that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I absolutely agree.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Can I comment on one other piece?

Jay Scott Evans: Sure.

Avri Doria: As I said I - I'm totally fine with, you know, everyone getting an umpteenth chance. On the ones that is the list of, you know, basically it's a portal to some company or to some group and in fact you'll find often that you have such a portal in dealing with GAC.

What I'd recommend that - is that there needs to be a person who is the point of contact, who is - if anything is going wrong, if something is being disruptive, if something that there always be a person even if that person is the representative of, you know, and in fact when various groups - hasn't

happened in a GNSO context but I think it's happened in a ccNSO context and in joint Working Groups where there's basically been either one person in the GAC that was forwarding the messages or it was broadcast to a GAC list and then messages were relayed back in any number of mechanisms because of the way GAC operates.

So that makes sense but there was still always one person, you know, one of the Vice Chairs of GAC who was nominally in charge of the connection point.

Jay Scott Evans: Well I think we could put language in that says that you need to check that you're a real and viable person or representative. And if you are representing a larger group that you name one responsible party for your...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Primary contact.

Jay Scott Evans: Primary contact rather than responsible party so that you're not putting an onus that they have anything other than to relay information. Does that sound workable to the group?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

Subbiah: Yes.

Jonne Soininen: Yeah sure.

Jay Scott Evans: All right. Marika, you kind of have the concept?

Marika Konings: Yep I do.

Jay Scott Evans: All right.

Marika Konings: So moving on then to the statement of interest template. Again this is a section that also appeared in the charter guidelines and this is a section that

will need updating and following the completion of the work by the OSG  
GNSO Operations work team.

Jay Scott Evans: Now do we say to get template out to them?

Marika Konings: No I think it's - this is related to the last section because here in relation to the fact if a statement of interest has not been received what shall be done and we put in here a procedure for consideration by the Working Group.

And a suggestion here is at the three month reminders from the GNSO Secretariat a member still does not respond and still not provide their statement of interest they will be removed from the Working Group mailing and membership list.

Jay Scott Evans: Can we go up just a little bit back up. But I want to know do we tell in this document who's responsible for making sure whatever this template is, get to the individual who's filed an expression of interest?

Marika Konings: Yes, it's the GNSO Secretariat, it's the second line. I can highlight it here.

Jay Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: But the Secretariat with the confirmation of receipt of the expression of interest, they will also send the request for a statement of interest, providing the model below.

Jay Scott Evans: Okay. Well maybe what we need to do is we need to make sure that that's - that paragraph is structured so that we change some of the wording we've talked about; secondly, that we put it in order that it will happen.

So the - you express your interest, you're verified that you're, you know, it's a real person or a point of contact and then this is sent out. So we structure the paragraph so it flows...the work will flow.



Marika Konings: Yep. Okay I'll make that change.

Jay Scott Evans: Okay. I just think that then it's all in order. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

Marika Konings: Now moving back to the proposed procedure, I'll just highlight this as well.

Jay Scott Evans: Marika, with regards to this template are you sort of keeping tabs on when they're going to come to a conclusion on what that's going to be or is that something that I should be contacting the Chair of the Working Group to find out where they are or how...?

Marika Konings: I'm liaising as well with the Staff person and she knows it's something, you know, that we're looking at and I've included and I'm waiting for the final confirmation where we're talking on a regular basis as well with just the Staff responsible for the different work teams to make sure that we identify all the labs.

Jay Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: So we try to coordinate it internally by the process, you know, I think and I imagine you as well along with the Chair to make sure that we, you know, get the guide for the form.

Jay Scott Evans: I would ask that perhaps if this person could attend our live meeting in Seoul.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Jay Scott Evans: So that they sort of see where we're headed so if we're not - they can see everything there live and can have their input with us if it's possible.

Marika Konings: Yeah, I'll need to check that because I think some of the OSC teams are meeting in parallel with PPFC teams but I'll look into that.

Jay Scott Evans: Okay thank you. Sorry. All right, now, what did you highlight?

Marika Konings: This is the procedure that we proposed for a member that does not submit a statement of interest after three reminders. There's no formal procedure now and I think when you do tend in Working Groups if someone doesn't submit it at one point we do send an email, you know, this is your last chance.

If you don't submit it now you will be removed from the membership list and Glen might recall, I think it might have happened once or twice. Is that correct Glen?

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes.

Jay Scott Evans: Should we have a sentence here that just says, "But this can be rectified even after three - if you submit it you can..." It doesn't keep you from ever being a member.

Marika Konings: Yeah, so what the last sentence says, once a member in question has submitted the missing statement of interest his or her membership will be reinstated.

Jay Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: And it mentions before as well if the Chair of the Working Group decides that there are extenuating circumstances that allow for additional time for the member in question.

So, you know, someone might be ill or, you know, away I think, you know, we're not going to say then if they don't see the email we're not going to, you know, kick them off a Working Group.

So I think there's some discretion there for, you know, in certain circumstances.

Jay Scott Evans: Guys, what do you - when I say guys I mean ladies and gentlemen.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think we're perfectly happy being non-gender specific under guys. I always think pain points are excellent things and certainly endorse having one in this process.

Jay Scott Evans: Anyone else - does anyone have a problem with having this type of mechanism in place? I think it helps administratively.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

Marika Konings: The question for Avri because she just put a comment there, Chair and Secretariat should be able to handle it. What do you exactly mean with that?

Avri Doria: I didn't think that anything special needed to be done. I think, you know, but - and they can just basically, you know, bother the person a lot faster. But, I mean, you know, wanting to put in a mechanism that makes it easier is probably fine so I'm not objecting.

Jay Scott Evans: I mean, when you consider...

Avri Doria: I tend to be minimalist about things or hope to be minimalist.

Jay Scott Evans: If this is a guidebook for, I mean, we have to think this is for somebody that doesn't have our level of experience, right? And so you - giving them a guidance of when they've done enough I think is helpful.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So let's move on.

Marika Konings: So moving on, 2.1.3 is planning the first meeting and this is more to provide some background on what things to think about in setting up the first meetings. So some recommendations as well, what needs - can be done at the first meeting like introductions, election of the Working Group Chair.

Oh, I'm already moving too fast. Well one note made there as well and I think that's something that the group probably will need to come back to once the PDP work team finalizes its work.

And the group might want to consider building in a special model or example what needs to be done for PDP Working Groups since they've already raised that.

For example something they would like to see taking place at the first meeting is request for constituency statements. So they mentioned that that's something they would like to relay to the Working Group work teams when they come to that stage to have as well as specific reminders on what a Working Group should be thinking of in a PDP Working Group.

But that's something we will need to think of when the PDP work team comes to conclusion.

Jay Scott Evans: Is the PDP work team putting together some sort of document of what would be required of PDP work team - Working Groups?

Marika Konings: Not yet. There are suggestions or recommendations to - for us to develop some kind of, you know, how to run a policy development process that would, you know, outline the different stages and something like that might come back in there as well.

Jay Scott Evans: So...

Marika Konings: But they're not at that stage yet. They're first trying to go through the actual process and, you know, are not at the stage yet of talking about what document they will need at the end of that.

Jay Scott Evans: All right. Because it seems to me that we could do one of two things. We could either incorporate whatever writing - document they come up with here to say, "If you are a Working Group that is subject to the PDP process you need to go here."

And do - and then list it all in this document or we could just say, "If you're a PDP you need to go look at that." I don't - again that's getting away from it all being in one document so we need to decide are we going to incorporate that kind of stuff here or are we just going to send them somewhere else?

Ken Bour: This is Ken Bour. One option there might be to include like an Appendix to this document that would contain additional procedures or recommendations related to PDP Working Group, you know, elements.

Marika Konings: An alternative would be - because of course all the other elements would, you know, would apply to PDP work team as well but that you work on some kind of color-coded boxes that, you know, pull out the things that are specific to PDP work teams. Because all the other elements, you know, having the first meeting, introductions, elections of Working Group Chair normally would work in the same way.

So I think, you know, I think we will probably need to see what the PDP work team comes up with and what elements they would like to see added to see whether indeed that's better to include it in document and have it annexed or whether it's a completely separate document that...

Jay Scott Evans: Yeah. I like the annex idea so why don't we just make a note if possible annex.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, put it as a recommendation and that will nudge that direction, yep.

Marika Konings: And the problem with an annex of course you would start copying or duplicating - I don't know if that makes sense to just have two different documents because the other stuff here would fall in there as well.

Jay Scott Evans: What I would suggest is we don't have two separate documents. We tell them to develop it and we'll stick it in an annex here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I think what Marika might have been referring to - is there duplicate material like for example if the PDP team says, "The first thing that should happen in a PDP Working Group is the introduction of meetings and election of Chair," that would be duplicative material.

But I think the Staff organization should weed all that stuff out, right. That's part of our function is to make sure that the teams don't overlap like that. And when the PDP team sees what we have done already then they can say, "Oh, we don't have to cover that because they already have it."

Jay Scott Evans: Right.

Marika Konings: Well my point is a PDP Working Group will have a lot of the elements that a Working Group Guidelines will have as well. So the only few differences are that they are required to follow a specific procedure that might need calling out in certain steps of what we have here as well.

If you ask the PDP work team to develop a guideline for a PDP Working Group they'll take most of what is here and just add some little bits and pieces and we would have two documents that will look very similar...

Jay Scott Evans: Right. Okay that's what I'm suggesting though. What I'm suggesting is why don't we give them this section and say, "We've already covered these generalities. All you need to do is the points that would be specific to PDP work team, Working Groups."

And then have them just develop those specialized points. And then take their specialized points and put them in an annex.

Ken Bour: This is Ken again. Maybe if I say this - I think what we're advocating here is that there isn't a separate PDP Working Group guideline book. We have to - we should avoid that at all costs.

There should only be one Working Group Guidelines document that this team puts out and if we need help from another group to finish writing sections of it because they pertain to an area in which we don't have expertise, then we would incorporate that material in here in some way.

Whether it goes in an appendix or as Marika said in color-coded boxes in different sections, we can discuss that later. But the key is not to have, right, multiple documents doing the same thing that people have to consult.

Jay Scott Evans: Right.

Marika Konings: Correct.

Jay Scott Evans: And so one of the things we may want to do is when they get to the point of drafting is let them know we've already got this part drafted and we'd like to share it with you.

Marika Konings: That won't be too difficult to do because I'm the Staff person responsible for that group as well so...

Jay Scott Evans: Well you drafted this part so as long as this is in conformity with just broad generalities you really only need to focus your drafting on specific issues that relate to PDP part.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: PDP. Yep.

Marika Konings: Correct.

Jay Scott Evans: And then we can talk about and get their consensus on how they'd like to see it incorporated into this document, with our recommendation being that it be an annex but that's not a determination at this point. Does that sound...?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep, works for me.

Jay Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: Okay then moving on to Section 2.1.4.2, unless there are any other comments on the introduction part. The first name would be introductions, getting to know each other.

As well I think there's something that was mentioned as well in the charter guidelines that Working Groups are supposed to be open, transparent, meaning this will probably be archived, meetings are recorded and archived. And statements of interest are required.

So 2.1.4.2 is election of the Working Group Chair. So here again the question is what is described is what is the current practice used by the GNSO and on - once a Chair has been elected it's normally confirmed or approved by the GNSO.

And there is an opportunity if you have an objection by members of the Council but - and I think Avri mentioned that it actually has never happened. So the question is do we follow the same procedure that a chartering



organization confirms the Chair and as well include then, you know, the process. like if there are objections and there should be a vote.

If there's a majority then it's fine. If there's no majority then it should go back to the Working Group to request them to reconsider their choice and - or return with a new proposal to the chartering organization. So that's the question here.

Jay Scott Evans: Well one thing I want to note is in Line 3 fulfill was misspelled.

Marika Konings: Yeah, there's two Ls. You're right.

Jay Scott Evans: Sorry, that's not...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Pittance. We need pittance. Pittance are important.

Jay Scott Evans: So Group what do you think about Marika's question?

Avri Doria: If I understand - this is Avri. If I understand it's around the same procedure that the GNSO follows now that rarely needed to go into it to stand. I'm certainly in favor of that as a procedure.

It seems lightweight enough if there's no problem but there is a way to deal with things if there is an issue.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep. That was Cheryl saying yep.

Jonne Soininen: And here is Jonne saying yep as well.

Jay Scott Evans: (Sabia) or...?

Subbiah: Yeah, it's fine.

Iliya Bazlyankov: Fine too.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Come on. You got to get your voice heard here.

Subbiah: I didn't have to yip after all your yaps.

Jay Scott Evans: All right...

Avri Doria: A yip is different than a yap, come on.

Jay Scott Evans: Let's move on.

Marika Konings: So moving on to Section 2.1.4.3, so items for review. So this is just a recommendation of which documents the Group should review in its first meeting such as the charter, the guidelines and any other documents relevant as part of discussion such as, you know, if there is a PDP process, a guidebook, a issues paper and any other documents.

And there's a lot of recommendation that the Working Groups develop a work plan that outlines the necessary steps and expected timing and all of achieved milestones set out in the Working Group charter. Anything else should be added here for review at a first meeting?

Jay Scott Evans: Should - okay, never mind. It looks fine to me.

Marika Konings: If not then moving on to Section 2.2, team roles and responsibilities. This is again something that also came up in the charter guidelines and has basically copied and pasted from there.

And again we need to see once the two documents have been finalized whether it stays here or moves to the other side of the document. I don't know if you all recall the agreement of the group was to have a number of

standard roles and that will be described here and the Working Group is expected to use those standard roles.

But then the Working Group would have an opportunity to develop other roles as they would see fit and provide developing descriptions with that. So just going down, I think Avri made some suggestions here.

Jay Scott Evans: Avri you want to explain your bracketed comments?

Avri Doria: Yeah, I was just adding as requested and appropriate. There was a whole lot of roles there and the first instance I believe it's up to the Working Group to decide which of those roles that need - obviously there's a Secretariat.

But going beyond the Secretariat it seems to be something that the Working Group should request. And then the as appropriate, not every role is appropriate in every situation.

And so there was many, many possible roles there which could get us 15 Staff people for every Working Group if, you know, we felt the need to fill them all the time. So it was really those two thoughts and that's why those two words.

Jonne Soininen: Yeah I - this is Jonne. I think those two words actually are fairly useful in this area and to make the clarification that you don't really need to take all of them. And that I think this is pretty logical change.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. Yeah I agree with that but more importantly I specifically agree with the fact that the responsibility comes back to the Work Group to make those requests.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. The only question or concern that I have is the requested part, how to deal with the action the Working Group would request like all these

functions, exempt the Staff to say, "Well, no, sorry we don't have the capacity at this moment."

Or if a certain Staff person has been allocated to a Working Group, kind of working with them there, well, you know, we don't like that person so we prefer to have someone that has operational implementation capabilities and will request another person to serve on this group or...What does the group think of that or how can that be avoided?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I think that's partly where as appropriate comes in. Certainly, you know, Staff when - and it'll probably be the person of the Chair making the request and there will be a Secretariat and the appropriateness of the roles and that discussion, you know, would occur at that point I would think.

And that is perhaps another reason why as appropriate is reasonable and the Staff, you know, manager definitely participates in that appropriateness determination.

Marika Konings: Okay, that makes sense.

Jay Scott Evans: So do - my question is do we want to say that - put Secretariat above that and say, "ICANN Staff will serve as Active Secretariat." ICANN Staff can also perform the following distinct roles as requested and appropriate and list the others?

Avri Doria: I would think so. I think that that one you always need. You always need that - at least that one point of contact to get your meetings scheduled, to get stuff put on the Wiki, to get mailing lists.

Jay Scott Evans: Yeah. I think, I mean, remember we're drafting this for people who've never done this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. I think that's important, yes.

Jay Scott Evans: So I think we should bump it - that up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bump. Yep.

Jay Scott Evans: And then list the others.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

Jay Scott Evans: Any - everybody okay with that?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. One comment I have because normally I think the practice is now for all, you know, almost all Working Groups if not all is that there indeed is a Secretariat function but there's always a policy Staff person as well that is supporting the Working Group.

And sometimes the support can just be - being on calls and just making sure that, you know, we followed the discussions and are aware of what's going on. And sometimes that can go as well into those roles that are listed, you know, listed here are trying to get that input.

So I don't know, you know, we'll be using those roles from lists like the Secretariat function in addition to, you know, Staff manager or Staff support person that is available or I don't know how to...I could formulate that but...

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I actually wouldn't think so. I would think that the base of the Secretariat which after all is a person in the policy group, you know, would be at - the sufficient base.

I think the understanding of what kind of policy person and policy manager and do you need an analyst or do you need a whatever is something that would come later.

So I would tend to be against doubling up at the beginning but really just including just the Secretariat, which as it's organized is a member of the policy group.

Marika Konings: But it's not the current practice. Current practice is when a Working Group forms it's often - the Secretariat performs a very important function indeed getting the mailing list and all that set up, but it's often the Staff support person that, you know, works with the drafting team and trying to get the first meeting and, you know, fulfilling an important factor as well.

And as it currently works it's not, you know, the Staff person's already allocated when the Working Group starts. It's not a question when the Working Group meets they can, you know, have a discussion on what kind of person would we like and what skills do they need.

I mean, those different levels of expertise can be requested and be brought in but normally that's a small part of the Staff role to identify who might be the person that can provide that expertise and bring them in and brief them on what is needed by the Working Group.

Jay Scott Evans: So why don't - how about this concept that ICANN Staff performs two distinct roles. One is the Secretariat and two is a policy liaison that is a Staff policy person assigned to the Working Group to liaison with the policy Staff.

And then ICANN Staff can also perform the following distinct roles as requested and appropriate and list the others.

Marika Konings: I think that makes sense because in that sense, you know, if indeed there is a case where it's only the Secretariat they can still perform the policy liaison function as well.]

Jay Scott Evans: Right. But what you're just saying is that they do two things, one is they do the - all the administrative then the liaison with policy Staff, you know, and

then - but they can also either do or arrange for these other things if it's requested and it's felt it's appropriate.

Avri Doria: Okay so you're saying it's - this is Avri again. You're saying it's a policy liaison's function but not necessarily an extra person if it's a very small group where the Secretariat is...

Jay Scott Evans: That's correct.

Avri Doria: Okay great. Yeah.

Jay Scott Evans: I mean, so far in my experience it's been two ICANN Staff people, right. It's been the GNSO Secretariat, Gisella and Glen doing all the administrative functionalities and then the policy liaison person, the Kens and Marikas that are dealing more with other issues.

So in reality it has been two people but there's nothing to say it couldn't be one person if one person could handle everything. All right. At that point we're at 56 after the hour so rather than moving on I think we should just finish this section here and then we can call it and we'll move in - our next call will handle the next section.

Subbiah: Yeah, you start - I just realized there was something I wanted to point out in 2.1, just a phrase that...

Jay Scott Evans: Can we go back Marika? 2.1.

Subbiah: Yeah, in terms of the documents that are supposed to be gathered or whatever at the first meeting to be shown to - made available to the Working Group members, is it possible we could also add something along the lines of any documents that may relate to past history at ICANN on the same topic. You know, something called issue papers there. I was just...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Background information?

Jay Scott Evans: Why don't we just say, "and any available historical data."

Subbiah: Correct. That'll be good, yeah. Because oftentimes we're visiting the same subjects at, you know, because of different needs at that time of issues from before okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And we did - (Sabia) we did of course - what you're raising is we did of course seeing quite sometimes discuss this and the various mechanisms and how it might work.

Jay Scott Evans: Marika I think that was - that's down in the section that talks about what to review.

Marika Konings: Is that what is highlighted now that, you know, what is expected to be provided to the members of the Working Group? Do you mean the section I've highlighted now (Sabia)? Is that the section you were referring to?

Subbiah: Yeah, either there or, you know, there was also - yeah, it could be there or there's also another place where I thought I saw it. That's fine.

Marika Konings: Okay, and again this also comes back in the charter guidelines where we made as well that reference including their historic materials.

Jay Scott Evans: If you'll just note that Marika and let's drop down because I just want to finish this section because there's some additional verbiage after this.

Marika Konings: Yes, so there - the last part here is related to a suggested procedure to conduct elections can be nominations or soft nominations, vote by simple majority, notification of and confirmation by the chartering organization of results of action. And Avri has put in a note here. Avri you want to comment?



Avri Doria: Okay, oh the one about more review than approval?

Jay Scott Evans: Yes.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I'm not even sure that it needs to be - basically there's been - and this word has appeared in a lot of things from the GNSO lately whether it's, you know, review of GNSO operating principles by the Board or this.

And I think the notion I want to make sure is carried and perhaps confirmation does that is that from the second you pick this Chair, this Chair can function and it's only if there's later problems.

You don't want to be in a situation where you need to wait three, four weeks until there's a Council meeting to basically bless the Chair. And one would expect that the liaison working with the group, working with and finding of the Chair, really already knows many ways, appropriateness and not.

So what I really want to make sure is captured is that this is a review in terms of the confirmation but it's not a holding state that basically, you know, things continue. You don't wait. And maybe that's captured but I wanted to make sure it was captured.

Marika Konings: I'll put some language in there to try to capture that if everyone agrees.

Jay Scott Evans: I just want to ask a question here Avri. Have we ever had a situation where the GNSO Council has come back after learning that someone has been voted a Chair and said no?

Avri Doria: Not yet.

Jay Scott Evans: Do...?

Avri Doria: You know it will happen someday but certainly not yet.

Jay Scott Evans: Well then I guess it is the confirmation but the only clarifying language needs to be that confirmation in no way - you don't need to wait for confirmation - affirmative confirmation to conduct the work.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Would the words "subsequent confirmation" get it done?

Avri Doria: Oh yeah, it probably would and you could probably also if you want to really be explicit that the newly elected Chair acts on a provisional basis until that confirmation.

Jay Scott Evans: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's fine, yes.

Subbiah: Yes.

Jay Scott Evans: All right, that sounds like Marika, if we could just do something to capture that concept there.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Jay Scott Evans: Clarify that point. At this point I'm going to call the call to a close, because we are right at one minute over the hour. I would like to if possible is - are you still on the call Gisella? I'm not hearing her. I'm going to ask...

Gisella Gruber-White: I'm sorry, I'm here. I thought I was on mute.

Jay Scott Evans: Let's set up another doodle poll again to see which days of the week and if we can set it up so it's not - whether Wednesdays still work or Thursdays still work and times again.

So maybe some of these folks - let's just try to get a better sense of maybe if we need to do some adjusting. I'm not saying we will but let's...

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I definitely won't be here next Wednesday. I'm...

Jay Scott Evans: Okay. So if we could do that. I am going to be sending out an email this week, probably Friday giving everyone a week to object, if there are any objections to the other document, all the language we've agreed on to date, excepting out those sections I mentioned before.

So that we can just bring that consensus and we only need to go back and really focus on those other areas. Is that something everybody's comfortable with?

Marika Konings: Yes.

Subbiah: Yes.

Jonne Soininen: Yes.

Jay Scott Evans: Good because I - we're getting there. We're...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We are indeed.

Jay Scott Evans: And I appreciate it and I appreciate everyone's attendance today. And we can - supporting that.

Gisella Gruber-White: Jay Scott, it's Gisella. Quick clarification to just make sure that the doodle is for next Wednesday, Thursday with various times.

Jay Scott Evans: What I'd like to do is if - is there any way to set it up that just says what's - no dates, what day of the week is good, Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday and the times?

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay and no specific dates.

Jay Scott Evans: Yeah, so in other words what we're seeking to do is set a weekly call. We understand that there are some problems. Would you please look at these days and what's a good time for you?

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay.

Jay Scott Evans: And we'll - and I'll, you know, we'll just look at it and if we need to make adjustments we will.

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay.

Jay Scott Evans: Okay? All right, I thank you all very much.

Marika Konings: Thanks everyone.

Avri Doria: Bye.

Ken Bour: Bye everyone.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye-bye.

END