

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Working Group Model (WG) Work
Team (WT)
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday, 16 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 16 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-20090916.mp3>

On page:

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

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

Present:

S. Subbiah - Individual
Cheryl Langdon-Orr
Jonne Soininen
Iliya Bazlyankov (only on Adobe Connect)

Absent apologies:

J. Scott Evans - IPC Work Team Chair
Avri Doria

Staff:

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

Coordinator: At this time I'd like to remind all parties that today's conference is being recorded and if you have any objections to please disconnect at this time.

If you'd like to minimize any background noise during today's call you may press star 6 to mute and un-mute your phone if you do not have a mute button on your own phone. And if you need any assistance during today's call I will be monitoring the call and you may just ask for the operator assistance.

Man: Okay.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Marika, quick roll call?

Marika Konings: Yes, please.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, very morning to some, and good evening to others. On today's call we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jonne Soininen, Subbiah from staff we have Marika Konings, Liz Gaster, Ken Bour, Glen Desaintgery, and myself, Gisella Gruber-White.

Apologies we have Avri Doria, Jay Scott Evans, and I believe we have Illya Bazlyankov who will only be on Adobe Connect today. And if we could just remind you all to say your names for transcript purposes, thank you. Over to you, Marika.

Marika Konings: Thank you, Gisella. This is Marika, and I've pulled up on the Adobe Connect where we basically left off last time. I think Jay Scott indicated in the last meeting that he wanted to take some time on this meeting to go into the decision making model.

And I would like to ask those on the call, we can have a choice of views on that, but I think this is a big issues that probably needs a wider discussion than really only email. So whether we really want to discuss this now or leave it for what it is? Because this will come back as well, of course, in the working group guidelines, and just move onto the other part of the charter guidelines.

Is there a preference?

Subbiah: As - Subbiah here. As long as it's enough to do, you know beyond the decision making stuff, we can skip that and go to the next step. That's okay with me, as long as there's work to do.

Well, considering that we're, you know, likely to need to re-go to - try the language at least the recording will be transcribed into English, (Cheryl), go back over some of the things we do anyway. Let's just get into the - (it).

Marika Konings: Okay, so now just before we first finish the rest of the document and if we have time left, we can go back to the beginning to look at some of the changes that have been made based on the discussions that we had in previous meetings.

So we can then move onto section 2.4.2, status recording, and Avri has made a comment here that the chart organization may have a span of (on bids) that can be included by reference. And I presume we can include that language in there as stated and are there any other reviews or opinions on this section?

Fine by me, (Cheryl).

Jonne: (Unintelligible), that's fine by me.

Subbia: It's okay with me, Subbia

Woman: So I'll include that.

Marika Konings: And we have section 2.4.3, which relates to problem issue explanation and resolution processes. And what we've done here is we've adopted a - the model that's being used by the IETF. We've mentioned here again (illustrative) - (illustrative) examples. And here again the group might want to consider having a standard that applies. The standard of course would also be taken on board in the working group guidelines and do the same thing as for the decision making model to say this is the standard.

The charger organization has the, you know, the possibility to deviate from that and - but if not, this is what we'll apply. So, we have two different questions here, should we take the same approach here? And the second

question would be, is the approach that we develop here on the basis of the IETF, does - would that work as well in the GNSO working group model?

Jonne: This is Jonne. On the first question I think yes, we should have a (bit from this) and that and only in the kind of like the very special occasions, there is a deviation from that. Because this is a very important process for the integrating of the working group model. Of the kind of like there is a clear definition of how kind of like - (they are) taking into account and how they are driven.

So that's at least my comments. But I - my comment is actually already there, so it's nothing new to it. The - but I - maybe I should say something about the second one. (I'm like) the - on modeling adapt IETF, I think is just fine. We just have to make sure that it suits our purposes, because the IETF model is very particular in a way that there are these directors and area directors that there's the IAD and so. So there are multiple layers on top of the working group where (this appeal) can go.

And so we should look at that, that it's just - that it's compatible with what we have - kind of (diverse) here that chartering organization and so on.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. This is what we've tried to do. If you look at the language we've tried (indeed) to include work process like working with liaison or charter organization. So we tried to put in the terms where indeed the IETF had their own language, and tried to adapt it to the ICANN ways, and I think it's definitely important to do that.

Subbiah: This is Subbiah. I am also, you know, all for having a (risk) basically a standard that really shouldn't be changed in any case. You know, it's a standard that everybody can look to. It's best if it, you know, even ICANN wide if possible, but certainly across GNSO standard.

So that's I'm okay (for) that, district standard. The question I have is regarding this illustrative example, is this already just so that to summarize, is this already reflecting the IETF language as best as possible?

Marika Konings: I don't know if it's best as possible, but it's basically the language that IETF uses...

Subbiah: Okay, that's fine. And that's better...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: The, you know, why we had area director we'd probably change it to...

((Crosstalk))

Subbiah: No, no. I'm just saying, this is what you - anyone - you know, someone who goes through the IETF stuff and says no, I want to make this be like - no, fit it into the ICANN situation, and to the best of their ability, draft something. This would be the recommended thing, correct? That's all I want to know is that's the case.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Subbiah: Okay good. So I...

Marika Konings: Yes, (unintelligible).

Subbiah: Okay, good. So I'm just going now, personally, I'm just going to - you know, I haven't read it yet. So I'll read it now, and just, if I see anything, I'll let you know. But that's the - I just wanted to know what I needed to do, that's all.

Marika Konings: And again, I think this will come back as well when we look at the working group guidelines because I think this is language that will be inserted there as

well, and the working group guidelines will, of course, be the (authoritative) case, why this language resides.

So, I think is one of the areas together with the decision making mechanism that probably needs some further discussion and review of that by the (brother) group. So, things are going to be, you know, finding other points that people want to share. But I think this actually will come back in further discussions.

Jonne: Yes, so and I just re-read the part there and that's what - why I commented. I think that the language on the - on this - on the escalation or problem issue escalation or a solution process is fairly standard and fairly straightforward. You first complain to the working group chair, and if the working group chair doesn't listen to you, you complain to the next guy. And if that - if she or he doesn't listen to you, you complain above, and that - it's quite clear.

Subbiah: Okay. I think I just read that and it seems clear now. The only thing I didn't catch is the two - both types of disagreements will be handled by the same process? Okay, good. I get it. And by (Lee) is gone, we definitely mean (Lee) has gone to the chartering organization, correct?

Marika Konings: Correct.

Subbiah: Correct. And not any other liaison. Okay, good. As long as that's being reflected there then we're okay. I'm okay with it.

((Crosstalk))

Jonne: Yeah, and like maybe we should think about examples, meaning its liaison and you actually can apply - that's the person who's responsible for the work for the chartering organizations. Of course it's in a way a liaison, but it gives a kind of like - it can be misunderstood in the - when reading from here

because most probably the working group has multiple - (Ken Bauer's working group can have) multiple liaisons in different directions.

((Crosstalk))

(Cheryl): (Cheryl) here. Sorry, (Cheryl) here. I thought we agreed in a previous meeting to that - sorry that's - (sneeze). I do apologize.

Jonne: God bless you.

(Cheryl): Thank you so much. That we were going to ensure a standard nomenclature as well as a glossary on that point. So as long as the standardization also include the terminology used for these particular liaisons, as opposed to, you know, I think I made the comment that, you know, just don't use the term (CLO) because I think of that as my common law (driver).

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think an easy way to change it here is instead of working group liaison we change it to travelling organization liaison and I just think that is (where) the language we decided to use and I think the description of the different roles - so I'll change that in the next version.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Sorry?

(Cheryl): Just don't put (CLO) in brackets, that's all.

Marika Konings: I won't.

(Cheryl): You know. A (COL) but not a (CLO).

Marika Konings: I'll make it a (COL) then. And I'll then as well change the introduction language to reflect a bit more as well what we discussed on the decision

making model, that it would be a standard language that is referenced then in the working group guidelines. But if the charter organization wants and (prefers) something different, this is the place to do it.

Okay so, if we then move on...

Jonne: Just one question, actually. This is (smart version) what we are doing here. Are we officially a working group meeting now? So can't we just change things? Or do we have to enter them as comments or something like that, but yeah, there's notice now that the chair is missing?

Marika Konings: Well, I think we can still make add (its) and comments because this will all, again you know go out to the groups, so everyone will have an opportunity to review and rate it at the next meeting.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: I think that - would be my approach, and...

((Crosstalk))

Marika: That certainly has Subbiah started and when I pointed out we would need to be going over or re-going over some of these things at a future meeting. I think we're all in agreement there.

Jonne: Yes. But Marika, what you could do for us is if indeed there are later on some, you know, changes from what we as a group here have decided might be okay, is just flag it for us and you know, we - there are those who make the comment on this call, it will be flagged for us and then be, you know, (allows us) to think about it in the future.

Marika Konings: Okay. We're going to move onto section 2.4.4, closure, (unintelligible) and self assessments. Is there any comments on that one? (There are none in the) document as is.

(Cheryl): Nope.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Marika Konings: A - 2.5, working group history, this section should record key dates in the working group's history, (revolving length), sample decisions, some working group (back on) documents. (I see the) comments are right in there, one from Avri, saying essential recording of any an all changes made to the charter as well as delivers and milestones. And (Jonne:you commented perhaps all the changes to the working group should be recorded here and (fitting) people changes, like chair, vice chair, you know etcetera.

Jonne: Yeah, that was - this is Jonne this - my comment was more of a suggestion, just that somehow the history of the working group (wording) the people that have been in charge, would be a nice thing. I don't know if it's really a very important issue. But the kind of like, the essential change to delivers milestones are the most important ones.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. I have a question on that. So, basically this would be a section if there would be changes made to the charter over time that would have to be approved by the chartering organization, this is the place where they would be recorded. (Is) - that is the idea behind this?

Because others, like it's mentioned here, the key days, what is mentioned in the first description is more, you know the steps that have led up to the creation of the working group. So it's more (links) that might be of use for the working group to review when they have been formed.

I think what Avri's referring to and Jonne: is referring to is more changes that are being made during the course of a working group already being in existence and already having a charter.

Jonne: Yeah, I mean like this is the question when the work group becomes working group. So I think that Avri and I having the same kind of picture with (IETF) is basically that have the view that a working group is not a working group until it's chartered. And when it's chartered, then unlike those changes that were before that working group was chartered, those are not changes because it wasn't chartered yet.

But when it's chartered after that those are significant changes - that changes that come after that, which are mostly changes of dates and times that happen. But sometimes also that the direction of the working group might change during its course, either some (path) has been found to be illogical or - and it's geared towards another direction or something like that. And those should at least be visible.

Subbiah: Yeah, I'm okay with that. This is Subbiah. But I have another point to make here actually. We - I'm sure the effort is made, but I think we should make it a visible statement if possible, to say that all these changes when there's a working group that exists and to record everything they do. And then if there are any changes within the working group it will be recorded as well.

All of this should be archived more or less sort of for eternity and easily available. The reason is because give, you know, over the last ten years of attending ICANN, you know, I can tell you there's some issues in which we're end - you know, just not ending working groups. I mean the equivalence of working groups, right? Great example, the (IDO) issue.

We've got about ten committees now? Revisiting the same things over ten years and we can't reach different conclusions each time. And if one wants to hops back to history and said, you know, that committee said this, or this

committee said the exact opposite. You know, there should be a way in which there could be (institutional) memory where, you know, when this is recorded, not only is it recorded for a long time, which I think the intention is, but not just buried away somewhere, but rather (edicts) and groups of this - in a few different who-is committees, or whatever.

They should all be sort of together somewhere so that someone later can, you know, actually make some statement that is not just, you know, you know I've been here forever, and you know, long, long ago, there was a committee that did this and you know facing that - what that's - I don't know. Do you get my drift?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think (Sabia) separate effort is going on now which helps us to reorganize the GNSO or Web site, which will hopefully as well bring a bit more order.

Subbiah: Yeah.

Marika Konings: And enable us to bring, you know, relevance and groups together in one section so people can see that. Because I'm not really sure whether that's something that will be, or could even be, included in the charter or...

Subbiah: I mean the - I understand. But the first part is the statement that, or you know - even the what the working group does, right, in its archives should be archived for some length of time, not just a year or two and it disappears, but for a long time because that's - on the timescale of this institution.

Ken Bauer: This is Ken. Can I jump in?

Marika: Go ahead, Ken.

Ken Bauer: Thank you. I just want to remind us that we're in the part of the charter drafting guidelines, which is the template of the charter document. And I would suggest to us that the section (2-5) here probably should be re-titled.

Instead of being working group history, which might very well be an important document that might get referenced in the next set of guidelines we're going to talk about, which is the operating model guidelines. For the charter, I would suggest that this ought to just refer to changes to the charter document itself.

And it would - we've been using a little template on the staff here for a while that basically puts the date, who made the change, what the change was and what version we're now on. Something along those lines is what I'm thinking that this should probably refer to. And so unless something in the charter itself was changed, it wouldn't appear in working group history here. I mean I think that's the wrong title, in my opinion.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika, and I think we've probably (done) these two boxes, because I do see a value as well in having recorded in the charter, you know, the relevant links to, for example, issues reports, or background reports, and as well some of the expected milestones, what are those. And then indeed having a separate box that will record any changes that might occur over time to the charter. So maybe that would be a way of capturing everything that's (un-boxed) now.

(Cheryl): Marika, (Cheryl) here, and I do get a little bit passionate about version control and document (stuff) nomenclature and it's something that not only this part of ICANN is so needed desperately, but it needs to be across the whole of ICANN, because what's being said in today's call is absolutely true.

I would argue with you on that, Marika, and suggest that this particular document needs to be a little bit more purer. But what it needs to have attached in a standard manner is a schedule of those events. And therefore there is always on this charter document a schedule A, history of working

group or whatever you want to call it, and that paper, schedule A, X, Y, Z, doesn't matter, may very well say no substantial changes occurred to and here is the timeline all does mix. See report following links. Or, it might have a ten-year history, heaven forbid.

Marika Konings: But it's something you would include in the charter among other things to include now?

(Cheryl): I wouldn't include it. You were saying you need two boxes. I'm saying I wouldn't include it at this point in this document other than to refer to a standard schedule, which is always to be attached to this document which is the history. I'm not saying don't include, I'm saying how to include it, where to include it, and in what standardized format.

Marika Konings: So then - then I have another question. So then are we talking actually about three different elements that we would like to see? The one element is just you know the history, the background document, you know, essential timelines there that are included. One is if there are any changes that are actually made to the charter itself.

And then another part, which is what has the group actually done? And how can you indeed find that information of what they've been doing and then there's the meeting and where are the documents and things like that?

(Cheryl): Well, I wouldn't call those three separate, but yeah, they're integrated parts - two integrated parts because when you started to talk about links to issues reports, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera, I see all of that as schedules or appendixes to a standardized document.

Marika Konings: Yeah, I know I absolutely agree, but for (electronic) purposes of course, that's the only information a group has at that point. I agree if once you go further you have of course much more information that you want to document and report.

- (Cheryl): That's right. Yeah. So all that has to happen here is the reference to where that information, if and when it occurs, is going to be found. And how it gets married to this standardized input.
- Ken Bauer: This is Ken. I have to admit I'm confused. I'll just use our working group as an example. We have a charter document that put us - put us into motion to accomplish certain goals. And we have done a lot of work and we have all kinds of wikis and we have reference documents and all things in different (unintelligible) stations. None of that got appended to our charter. Should it have been? Is that what we're advocating here?
- (Cheryl): I'm saying that in the charter it should have a reference to see schedule appendix, don't care about the nomenclature, but (a standard) nomenclature, (blah), for the activities for these groups. And that that, that very soon, very non-negotiable tie to the rest of the data pick wherever it's held in the world of ICANN, should be part of this document.
- Marika Konings: This is Marika. What we've done in some of the other PDP working groups for example, is to include in the working group guidelines already the reference to the mailing list or in the charter to the mailing list and to the working group wiki. And that I guess is already a way of documenting that in the charter where people can go to find what is being done in that working groups, and when discussions have been held. So that I guess is a way as well to do that.
- (Cheryl): Yes, and (IY) is fine but this (unintelligible) charter needs to define the way that from now on it will happen.
- Jonne: Yeah, exactly, this is (Johannan) and I like this similar than growing analogy again to the IETF, so that - for instance the IETF charter has to be oriented to the working group mailing list and to any others additionally for there is to working and the documents that are currently under process and the documents that have been finalized by the working group.

Subbiah: Sure - this is Subbiah. May I say that that's fine, so what we have is a line in there that says in the charter document here that any changes - the history of getting to here relevant documents, and any future changes to this document are in - trapped inside schedule A.

Now over and above that, if we could also have a sentence to say, that has to be done. I mean there's no such thing as that not being done. You know, it's not just saying this document is - in this document this is the real stuff out there. But rather another statement is saying, you know, it's a necessity.

You have to do this and also any working group that you charter down from underneath you, they have to do the same thing, or something along those lines. It's not a, you know, yeah, here's where you can read about this stuff. But no, no, no. Here's where you can read about this stuff and this is all we've done, or a statement to that extent. Because at the end of the day this is the chartering document, correct? This is the one we create for that kind of thing.

(Cheryl): That's right. That's certainly how I would do it, (Sabia), because what - it's all very nice putting mailing list links and wiki links in, but technology changes and that has to be a forced archive.

Subbiah: And the reason why I feel strongly about this, this idea of the history, is simply because I've been on so many (IDN) committees where over the years, where I go to an (IDN) committee and there are people on the committee who are - you know, joined ICANN in recent years, I guess. And well there's some documents to read and so on. And the documents only go back to a year ago or something, some related document.

And then some of us like me or (Chuck Norms) or somebody who's been here and already (tracks in) for every ICANN meeting I think, the only ones I think we've been to every single one. Even the pre-ICANN meeting. We were

on the committee and we say, you know what, has anybody read the committee report from eight years ago or seven years ago on the same thing? And everybody says what committee? ICANN (staff) says what committee?

(Cheryl): Yeah.

Subbiah: And this is someone who's been given an award by the Board, you know that committee had a name to it and somebody had given an award for it.

((Crosstalk))

(Cheryl): Well, (Sabia), the thing is that is not part of a charter as such.

Subbiah: Oh, I understand that.

(Cheryl): But what can be part of the charter is the fact that links like that have to occur somewhere.

Subbiah: Right, right. It's just that it's not so much that we can't do it or not achieve it, but the culture of doing so, that's what I'm you know, more concerned about. I mean we'll never be able to do it in a good way, but at least it's there that says, you know, there's an idea that that's important.

(Cheryl): Ken, can I ask, are you less confused or more confused?

Ken Bauer: It - I'm still confused, but you know what might help me, (Cheryl), is if you could apply that whatever that was just discussion, to our exact charter. What would it look like? What would we do to implement that rule for our own group and our own charter? What would that look like?

(Cheryl): Well, in this particular template it would refer to A schedule, which is a formal part of the charter document where all of this knowledge base is linked in a standardized and continual way.

Marika Konings: In this case it would be a wiki.

(Cheryl): The schedule would be - the schedule could be, you know, someone's hand written version at the (sole) meeting that then becomes in whatever is the current standard for document storage in ICANN, a catch to this charter. And like any other part of any other document management system, if a schedule changes, its version changes. And I note on the master document in schedule whatever or appendix whatever must say, you know, version 2.1, date of, (altered to) state.

Subbiah: Ken? This is (Sabia). I think we already in way to help you here Ken. I think we are already doing this in many of the documents that, you know, you sent to me previously. There's a box at the end, right, that says this is the version, who changed it, when and so on, correct, Ken?

Ken Bauer: Right.

Subbiah: Right now there already isn't one, correct?

Ken Bauer: Yes.

Subbiah: So that's already there, it's at the end of the document and it's already there. That's one item. The other item is essentially the concept of any other related, not the changes to the document itself, but the (document) that we just talked about. Then the second one is any related material that we've already talked about in, you know, other related documents that we've looked at. You know, the Board's paper to us to help create this, you know, charter document and so on. Well, that's a related document.

(Cheryl): Yes, and -

Subbiah: So those are all - yeah, we've tracked it...

(Cheryl): Of course (Sabia) is going to say preexisting work groups. Your idea and example is perfect.

Subbiah: Yeah.

(Cheryl): Let's assume this example we are doing yet another (IDN) PDP, we're having an (IDN PDP) work group for the (J - sites), is the example we're running. Then at that schedule or appendix level, a link to all the material and a list of the material if it's not linkable because some of it isn't actually on the ICANN Web site unless in the current state in (IDN), or if it is it's certainly bloody hard to find because it's defied my ability to find it. And to prior related committees such as the president's (IDN) committee, which by the way you can't actually find when it ended. Now it did end, didn't it (Sabia)?

(Sabia): Yes. It fizzled. It fizzled.

(Cheryl): If it fizzled it's fine, but what I'm saying it's only our corporate's knowledge that tells you and I that that's the case. There should be a document knowledge, a piece of knowledge management tool, that also tells the new GNSO, (IBN), (PBP) work group that back when (Adam) was a little boy, this thing existed, here's its records, and here's its references and oh on September 27 it closed.

Ken Bauer: This is Ken. You know back - this is going back now. I went back to section 2.1, working group identification. And we wrote material in there. This section of the charter should identify the main identity of the working group and any sponsoring motion as well as links pointers, maybe we could just expand that section...

Subbiah: Fine.

Ken Bauer: ...to say including any historical...

(Cheryl): Fine.

Ken Bauer: ...links, and that...

((Crosstalk))

(Cheryl): But it has to go outside of just the GNSOs. I think what (Sabia) on I are on that, too.

Ken Bauer: That would be nice. I mean we could start with it. This is so - but yeah, that's like, sorry. What we'll mean is that it has to go outside of the GNSO in this context. That is that at least within the GNSO when a working group is being created, we don't just point the GNSO prior GNSO document, but possibly prior ICANN-wide documents. Meaning that if I'm with GNSO committee wasn't an (IDN), then perhaps I'd like to see an (IDN) document that the (CCN) or somebody else did some time ago.

(Cheryl): Exactly.

Ken Bauer: Frankly, this is asking a lot in a sense that, you know...

(Cheryl): Geesh.

Ken Bauer: ...it's asking a lot. However, the important thing is when a new working group is being chartered, somebody in the chartering organization is going to be their job working as an ICANN staff member to create this working group. That person, hopefully, will read this charter document and realize, ha, in this charter document it says, please go find, you know, all of the things, you

know that relate to this and update it. If it doesn't exist, you know, (pull the substance) of the working group, right?

All the old documents, not only in the group, within GNSO but perhaps externally. And maybe if there's no - there's going to be automated one to pull archive of, so I can't even organize my (sock drawer). But you know, but issues that - there is some statement to that effect here so that people would start doing that more of a culture and - right. That's - and the two ways that we just discussed about does it address that, I mean one for the boxes of the changes to the document itself, and then the other one for the history.

But I would also like to see a third thing somewhere, you know, an expression of a stronger expression of commitment to do that. You know, I mean, you know, that is that you know, that - I don't know how to express it. I mean to say that this is - to push the idea that this is important, you know, this is an important part of what we're doing. A - you know, to me it is as important as, you know, if you ask me to join a working group committee, and you know, they're supposed to do some stuff, so that's important.

But it's almost as important for me to know what the history was. You know, otherwise we are about to repeat it, right? Correct?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Are you happy for me to have a first (order) trying to incorporate what we discussed now and then...

(Cheryl): Yeah.

Marika Konings: ...I probably won't get it wrong for you then to review and suggest language that does reflect your views, is that a way forward?

(Cheryl): That would be excellent Marika, because I think what we're trying to establish here at this point, and it is a pivotal point, is to make sure that time taken at this point in a document - you know, charter's development, will actually, and

it is time taken and it is a task to do, will actually save time at the other end of the process. Because as we've all seen when projects of working groups is under review, people spend a huge amount of time going did you think about, did you know about, did you discuss about?

And if that can be clear from the start that those things are accessible or able to be looked and should be referenced, then that's going to save a huge amount of time in three minute (bites) at microphones if nothing else.

Subbiah: You know, just to give you an example. Today there's a lot of issue ICANN-wide about vertical registry, registrar integration. I mean that's become a hot topic. There are people doing all kinds of things.

(Cheryl): Yes.

Subbiah: But if we go back to the beginning for those of us who have been at the beginning of ICANN, 10 or 11 years ago, you know, there was a lot of talk about that. I mean, you know, it's - a lot of things come back. And so that's part of the reasoning for this.

(Cheryl): And it's not a bad thing if they come back, because needs and (pressures) and...

Subbiah: Yeah sure.

(Cheryl): ...and requirements change. But it is extremely frustrating for at the end of a working group's production and presentation life, that it gets (all its own) crap dished up to it, that I didn't know about, or B, it should have known about, or C, it actually looked at and we have to go through a huge amount of it to say yes we know, yes we did, and you know, (Mary Jane) told us about that. That's messy. Let's get encapsulated in very definite terms how that can be avoided in something as important as the charter.

Subbiah: That's fine with...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bauer: This is Ken, the more I think...

Subbiah: Yeah, a final point is that it's - see at the beginning of ICANN it was okay, we were a young organization. Now we're a decade old, in essence right? You know we have baggage, we have history. We need to keep that in mind.

Ken Bauer: This is Ken. If I might take a shot at summarizing all that. I was questioning and confused. I think I was confused, I appreciate the extra discussion.

(Cheryl): Our work is done. We have Ken less confused. This is fine.

Ken Bauer: It strikes me that section 2.1 is where we want to beef up and explain the value of the history and the commitment to reflect that wherever possible and to how much an extent it's known in the archives.

And some - in certain amount of research it always be done in trying to develop that material, link it and document it in section 2.1. I think that's essentially what I was getting, and if we could write that into 2.1, it sounds like we would capture both (Sabia's) and (Cheryl's) points there.

And then in 2.5, we should probably change that to just charter document changes history. Because that was really just intended to whenever you make a change to the charter itself, you should document it. And we might even provide that little template that we've been using now in a lot of the staff documents, which as (Sabia) pointed out, it just has a place for one...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bauer: To change controls, methods.

(Cheryl): Yeah. (Version) control is hugely important.

Ken Bauer: Yes.

Subbiah: And that's just great.

Ken Bauer: Did that help?

Subbiah: That's (perfect).

(Cheryl): I think there's two things not three here.

Ken Bauer: Yes, I see those. All right. I'm going to go on mute again.

Marika Konings: Okay, so then if we move then onto the last part of the document, which is just background, and you know we just need to record like how this document was developed, what discussions were held, and you know, provide this history of how this document came together. And as well, that revision, you know, will and can be made and you know, should we go back to the staff and see what the procedure is for that applicability. And then we here have as well the (amendments) and provisions of this document, which , well I already forgot to include (in reference to of) those versions, so. I did it (quite on accident).

So, this is the whole document. So the question is now do we really want to take it from the top or we just include these changes that we've discussed now and leave it in for the next call where we hopefully will have some more people on the call and then run through the whole document with the aim of being able to finalize this?

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: I heard a yeah?

(Cheryl): Well, my preference is for the latter because we're not going to gain anything by not doing it with a larger group. What's everyone else think?

Subbiah: Fine. I mean I'm all for if it's a difficult topic like decision making, it's best to wait for everybody. But if there's any other topics that are not sort of easy to, you know, deal with, then we could. But otherwise...

Marika Konings: (Johannan)?

Jonne: Yeah, I'm like have some difficulties to (hear actual) material that (Sabia) had. But I think we have 15 minutes time and we have to do the decision making in a larger group anyway, so I would prefer that we do it in larger group. We have 13 minutes left.

Marika Konings: Yeah, that's...

Subbiah: That's pretty much what I said.

(Cheryl): Yeah, but (Johannan), that's exactly where I think getting some draft wording so the larger group can chew it over and discuss is some important, which is what Ken and Marika are going to be doing.

Subbiah: Yes. I - maybe I missed some part of the things due to audio problems, but of course, having some wording we cannot start from scratch. That's basically clear.

Marika Konings: So, what I'll do then is - we'll produce an updated version and send it out to the (unintelligible) strongly encouraging everyone that this is getting, you know, getting close to final and that everyone is really encouraged to properly review it, share comments on the list so that on the next meeting we can

have a complete read through and hopefully get very close to final version of this document.

(Cheryl): M-hmm.

Marika Konings: Does everyone agree with that approach?

(Cheryl): Yep.

Marika Konings: Well, as we don't have Jay Scott on the call, I'm just presuming that we'll have our next call next Wednesday, Sametime?

(Cheryl): M-hmm.

Marika Konings: As the work of the people on the call now?

(Cheryl): Yep, same time, same place.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: We'll just confirm with Jay that it works for him as well. So with that we have - we can finish ten minutes early. Isn't that great?

Subbiah: All right. All right, okay, thank you.

Marika Konings: Thank you all very much.

Ken Bauer: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Bye, Marika.

Marika Konings: Bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

END