

**WHOIS Survey Drafting Team  
TRANSCRIPT**

**Thursday 21 July 2011 at 1300 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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.

<http://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-whois-survey-dt-20110721-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#jul>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page: <http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/>

**Attendees** Werner Staub - CORE

Susan Prosser

Elisa Cooper - BC

Anne Naffziger - IPC

Wilson Abigaba - .ug ccTLD registrar

Michael Young - Individual

**ICANN Staff**

Liz Gasster

Steve Sheng Margie Milam

Glen de saint Gery

Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Wendy Seltzer

Don Blumenthal - Ry

Coordinator: This conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much. Good afternoon - good morning, good afternoon to everyone on today WHOIS Survey Drafting Team call on Thursday the 21st of July.

We have Wilson Abigaba, Werner Staub, Anne Naffziger, Elisa Cooper.

From staff we have Liz Gasster, Steve Sheng, Glen de Saint Gery, and myself Gisella.

I have apologies noted from Wendy Seltzer. And if I can please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes.

And Susan Prosser has just joined us as well. Welcome Susan. Over to you, Liz.

Liz Gasster: Thank you so much Gisella. And I also got word from Michael Young that he's planning to dial in, but was having some power problems and may be a few minutes late as well.

Wendy Seltzer has offered kindly to be our liaison to the GNSO Council which is helpful, but she's not available to join the call today. So we should expect to have her participate in the future.

I did send two things out in advance of this meeting, one was a draft agenda, and that's been circulated for awhile now, and the other was a draft charter, which I just circulated yesterday. So it is visible in the Adobe Connect and I'm happy to walk you through that. But I just want to make sure that everyone does have the draft agenda, which is also posted in Adobe Connect, and at least has seen that charter, if not had a chance to read through it.

Does anyone have any questions or comments about the draft agenda for today?

So is everyone okay with proceeding with that agenda?

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Man: Yes, but (unintelligible) in the draft (unintelligible).

Liz Gasster: Excuse me?

Wilson Abigaba: Hello? This is Wilson.

Liz Gasster: Yes?

Wilson Abigaba: This is Wilson.

Liz Gasster: Yes?

Wilson Abigaba: I did not receive the charter.

Susan Prosser: I did not either. This is Susan.

Anne Naffziger: And this is Anne Naffziger. I didn't either.

Liz Gasster: The charter you did not?

Anne Naffziger: No.

Susan Prosser: Correct.

Liz Gasster: Oh.

Wilson Abigaba: Yes. We didn't.

Liz Gasster: Okay. I did send it out yesterday I thought. Glen, do you know - can you check the archives and just make sure it posted.

Glen de Saint Gery: I'll do that for you then.

Liz Gasster: Yes. Thanks.

And you do see it though in the Adobe Connect, right?

Susan Prosser: Yes.

Anne Naffziger: I'm - this is Anne. I'm unclear as to how to maneuver through this document however on Adobe Connect.

Liz Gasster: You change it so that - it should be now so that everyone can...

Anne Naffziger: It is. Thank you.

Liz Gasster: Yes. You should be able to maneuver through now on your own. That does help.

Anne Naffziger: Yes.

Michael Young: Michael joining.

Liz Gasster: Okay. So did Michael just join?

Michael Young: I did.

Liz Gasster: Great. Okay. So so far you'll see who we have on the line. We're just noting that several people did not receive the draft charter that I wrote and circulated. So people have not had a chance to review that charter, so we'll do so on the call today and I'll explain what it is and what I think its utility is.

Why don't we, before we get to the charter, talk just to discuss briefly where things stand? I think also we confirmed that the agenda was okay with everyone to proceed. So the first item - we did roll call, and the first item on

the agenda is to discuss the Chair position and hopefully confirm the Chair position and that of the Vice-Chair's.

You may recall on our first and only call that we've had to date prior to the meeting in Singapore, we asked for volunteers for Chair. We received one volunteer, Michael Young, who's on the phone. I did ask for other volunteers, but we have not received any other volunteers for Chair. We also received three volunteers for Vice-Chair. Wilson Abigaba, Don Blumenthal, and Werner Staub. Thank you.

And so what I would like to do today is - as a first matter of business, is just to ask by acclamation if there are any objections to Michael Young assuming responsibility as Chair of this group.

And I'll stop there. If there are - is there further dialog? We can certainly have that. If not, I'll be turning the call basically over to Michael, though I think I'll probably help a little bit on the context and background of the charter because that was really a staff drafted item.

Michael Young: Liz, it's Michael. I just wanted to update the group because since the last call, I my role has changed a little bit. I want to make sure that I'm very clear with people. I don't think that it changes anything. But I did shoot an email to see how I update my Statement of Interest. So, I think probably I should do that and we should make sure everyone's okay with me doing the Chair role. Is that okay?

Liz Gasster: Very good. So we'll postpone then is what I hear you saying, the decision about appointing a Chair for the time being until that Statement of Interest has been circulated and everyone can review it.

Michael Young: Right.

Well, and I can speak to it right now on the call as well. So should I do that now?

Liz Gasster: Any objections to that from the group?

Yes. Why don't you go ahead and do that then, Michael. Thanks.

Michael Young: Okay.

So since the first call that we - or the last call I guess that we did, I am - you know, my role is now Chief Technology Officer of Architelos. Now Architelos, some of you may have heard some press about and may already be aware of what it does. But I'll just clarify what the company does. It's a consulting company and a management (outsourcing) company for registry services. In other words, it doesn't do what a back-end registry operator does. It handles the management layer or assists with the management layer for entities operating and have the responsibility to operate a registry.

So it is - what we do is we do consulting work in a variety of different forms. We don't have - we're a neutral third party, so we don't make any indirect associations or direct partnerships with back-end service providers, because we did not want to create a company that causes us conflict as consultants.

And with registry contract holders, we actually in some cases do some management services on their behalf. I act as registry (managers) in those cases where they want us to, and an outsourcing model. And we supply some tools around management functions, business intelligence, tools, management - typical management workflow tools; things of that nature.

So I just wanted to be clear to everyone what I'm doing, and I don't think it puts me in any kind of conflict in this work. In fact, it actually may give me a lot more sources of feedback and information about related WHOIS issues in

the operating and the marketplace. But, I want it to be very clear to everybody.

Liz Gasster: Thank you, Michael. And so just to clarify in your new responsibilities, in terms of like workload or anything, there's no reason why you would not want to - you still want to continue to volunteer to be the Chair, right?

Michael Young: I'm happy to, and Architelos is happy to kind of have me dedicate some of my time to that kind of function.

Liz Gasster: Great.

And you know just for everyone's benefit, we don't really - the concept of a conflict of interest - you know, often people have an interest - a special interest in the work that we do. So when we think about statements of interest in the ICANN context in terms of working group participants and Chairs, it really has to do with declaring your interests, not so much a conflict of interest in a traditional legal sense. So there's no problem with having an interest that otherwise might be considered a conflict as long as it's declared and stated overtly.

So, does anyone have any questions about that? And does anyone have any questions for Michael in light of this disclosure or anything else about how he might approach this working group that you want to ask now?

Okay. Would people prefer to wait until they see Michael's Statement of Interest before deciding on the Chair?

Let me say it a different way. Would anyone object if you - did you want to go ahead and decide on the Chair now?

Werner Staub: This is Werner. I think we should go ahead now in the interest of time and belief that there is no specific problem associated with any change.

Liz Gasster: Does anyone have a different point of view than Werner?

Woman: No.

Woman: No.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Woman: No.

Liz Gasster: So is it the group's consensus by acclamation that Michael should proceed as Chair of this group?

Woman: Yes.

Man: Yes, I would support that also.

Liz Gasster: Okay. Anybody opposed?

Well, great. I'm going to turn over the reins to Michael now. It's my pleasure to get that out of the way as the first item of business. And Michael, you may want to speak to the Vice-Chairs and then - if you'd like me to comment further on the charter, I will.

A couple of people have asked me about getting the charter in a savable form, and I'm going to just resend it to the list, because I don't quite understand why it didn't before. And you should have it in a way that can be edited. So, I'll do that in the meantime.

Michael Young: Well, I'm amongst those that didn't get that email Liz, so it would be very helpful.

Liz Gasster: Yes. I'm not sure what happened there. You all got the notice though about the call obviously.

Michael Young: Yes.

Liz Gasster: Okay. We'll figure that out. Thank you.

Michael Young: Okay.

Liz Gasster: I'm sure it's operator error on my part.

Michael Young: Well, let me jump a little to some thoughts on the Vice-Chairs if everyone's comfortable with that. I think it's wonderful that we have three volunteers for Vice-Chairs. And because I -you know, when - the more I look at this piece of work, the more I think it's a very large piece of work, and I'm very glad we've had a lot of volunteers so far from this group.

But also, that we've had three very solid candidates volunteer as Vice-Chairs. And, I think (those) Chairs, because I can see a structure, or I'd like to suggest a structure to the group on how we can get a lot more accomplished with actually forming up three sub-groups or working groups using the Vice-Chairs to take leadership on those groups. And hopefully, parallelizing some - I mean obviously not all, but at least some of the effort that we'd like to make around this.

So you know, that's an initial idea. Is there any feedback or thoughts on that idea?

Wilson Abigaba: I think it's a very good idea. Could you identify a little bit the kind of subdivision you would propose?

Michael Young: Absolutely.

So, I like to keep these things simple. I have had 25-some odd years of various forms of project management, and I think the simple structures are the easiest ones to (execute) through. So I thought very carefully and looked through the notes on the last call, and here's what I would suggest. I think we do the following three teams.

A drafting team to work on actually comprising or compiling the questions that would go into the survey, as well as thinking about the tally results in the nature of asking those questions. Are they asking a question that we can collect some type of statistic in the answers as well?

The second group I would suggest focus on actually deciding what the survey tool is actually going to be or look like, and work on developing a recipient list for the survey. Who are we actually going to send the survey to? Because, who we actually try and issue this survey to will have a cause and effect relationship with what we think the best survey tool to use would be.

And then lastly, I was thinking we had a lot of people, including myself, express some interest in revisiting the requirements a little bit and just making sure - because things have changed fairly quickly in the last year, and making sure that their fully updated. And if people think that they need to be either added to, refined, or clarified, we - now is a good opportunity while we're building this survey to do that.

So, the third team would be - I'm just referring to them as a requirements verification team. And my thoughts on that team would be that they could start with the original - well in the original resolution to gather these requirements there was a list of - a starting list if you will of stakeholders to touch base with for requirements.

And I think circling back to those stakeholders plus you know creatively considering other stakeholders when they want to get some feedback on - will

help us make sure that this - we're getting all the questions into the survey that we'd like to see.

And so, Team 3 in effect would progressively probably feed information to Team 1 while they're working on their questions.

Now, those would be the three teams. That would be kind of Part A of the work. Each team would probably start I think with the following basic activities. They would derive their scope of work, they would do a task assignment, and they would do a project timeline for their area. And then that comprises basically Part A as a structure - suggest a structure. And that leads into Part B, a structure to get the work done, and Part B is really kind of the interesting part where we have some results back and we assess the results.

And then suggesting what we do with the results, because we had some discussions there, and I was thinking about what everyone was saying, is that we do a whole team exercise to review the tallies from the survey results. So based on the tallies associated with questions.

And by tallies, I mean we really should think about driving some prioritization messaging back from the survey respondents so that we understand as part of the survey scope what people think out of this long list of requirements. You know first of all, is the entire list valid? Great. But even if it's all valid, what did they think are the most urgent ones or the most important ones, or you know effect them as a stakeholder on a prioritization basis.

So we'd hopefully develop our questions to get that kind of feedback. And as a group, we go through the feedback to the survey and work together to prioritize the requirements based on what we got back from the tallies associated with the survey questions. Then, we would add own comments in that process as we went through the responses, if we have any. Our

interpretations. Make sure that that gets documented and ultimately into an end report.

And then lastly, I think the last part of the structure would be for us to create recommended next steps. And I'll throw out a controversial one. But if we hope to see some movement on getting some of these requirements actually into practice, perhaps one of the recommendations might be for - to move forward with an implementation working group for the top three requirements in you know, thinking along the lines of a PDP so that we actually get some movement.

But, that would be a recommendation from us. That would not be absolute. That would be a decision back to the Council.

So that's just a suggestion, so there'll be lots of talk about - and that's the overall structure I was thinking of.

So, I'm hoping silence means a good thing, but if anyone has thoughts about that? And I can - I'd be happy to write it up in a little - I've already written an email...

Liz Gasster: Now Michael, I did just kind of paste it in as you were talking...

Michael Young: Perfect.

Liz Gasster: ...it's Liz - to the notes in the Adobe Connect, because it might be easier for people to actually see it. So I tried to take some notes while you were talking.

Michael Young: Exactly.

Liz Gasster: Yes. So you all kind of see it visually there too.

Anne Naffziger: This is Anne. Mike, I'm going to ask a question.

Michael Young: Absolutely.

Anne Naffziger: I just wanted to make sure I'm interpreting this correctly. What I'm hearing you say is that really the Part A piece will be where we in a sense break up into three subgroups to deal with these three pieces of that portion of the project.

So then, I hear you saying that we'll be then circling back into a larger group for Parts B...

Michael Young: Part B, yes.

Anne Naffziger: Okay.

Michael Young: Yes. Part B I think would be - I mean really, what we're doing is we're not making up content anymore in Part B. We're reviewing and walking through the responses that we got, making sure that we all agree we've read the responses and we have a consensus on what prioritization the recipients or the respondents rather have put in - put to these questions - to these service requirements.

And you know, I think it's very important that we as a group - I mean, not just a statistical but a data interpretation exercise, and it be a very strong response if we as a group have a strong consensus on how we see the results.

Anne Naffziger: Okay, great. Thank you.

Michael Young: But of course, I guess the - really the very first step is for us to - is to finish off the charter. This - technically, you know any time I've been in a working group and we get kind of half way through and we get a little iffy on whether

or not we should step into a sideways but related piece of work, it's that charter that always brings us - answers that question for us.

Liz Gasster: And this is Liz. If I could just expand on this charter concept. The Council, when it convened this group, didn't do so in a - you know using a formal resolution, which is fine. But, the Council just focused on kind of the Part A, developing the survey. And it's just our thinking kind of generally that it would be good to have the same people involved in developing this survey also considering the survey responses.

So that piece of things was just a thought about using this charter as a way to basically make that recommendation back to the Council so that there are maybe more defined parameters to what the scope of work of this group is, what kind of a beginning, a middle, and an end, where you know your expertise can be used not only to develop the survey, but to you know help us analyze it so that that isn't exclusively a staff function.

Michael Young: Yes.

Liz Gasster: A lot of the charter language is boiler plate. We're trying to get to kind of a standardized charter that will help all the groups you know, have easy reference to working group rules and such. Not everything applies in this case, but I think the idea that we would want to at least discuss Part A and Part B, or part of Part B as within this group's scope of work and get the Council's concurrence on that once you all agree was my thinking behind our preparing this.

And the charter can be changed and is intended to just be for you all to consider. And in terms of like dates and deadlines and those kinds of things, that's completely up to you. It's just a way of looping back to the Council to confirm and make sure there's no ambiguity about what the scope of work is.

Michael Young: As you can see, the structure that I suggested and Liz noted is something that I guess via work elements in the structure anyways. It's not the way we break out the work. But the work elements in the structure could be added to our charter for clarification to basically tell the Council this is what we're intending to do. You know, so speak now if there's an issue with that.

It also allows us to know when we finish our work and what our success criteria is when we hit the finish line.

Does anyone have anything that they want to add to the scope of what we've put up here so far, or do they feel this covers the issues and the points of discussion that we had on the (previous call)? Because I was - really, what I was trying to do was to get everyone's concerns and thoughts included into this scope of work.

I'll take that silence that we covered it fairly well.

Liz Gasster: So for staff clarification, should we be adding the Part A and Part B into the charter?

Michael Young: I think so, minus how we actually physically do the work Liz, because I don't think it should be in the charter that...

Liz Gasster: Yes. Yes.

Michael Young: ...you know, we're going to break up into three sub-working groups and so forth.

Does everyone like the idea of breaking up into the three sub-groups? Does that - quite practical, or does anyone object to it?

Werner Staub: This is Werner. I was just wondering if it can actually be parallelized or if we have this serial decision problem? So between drafting...

Michael Young: That's a good question.

Werner Staub: ...drafting the - you know, we can have a team - you know, get the team together but that at some point a team comes up with questions. And we have a survey tool - at some point, these things have to be brought together, and one of them needs to be based on the other one's work.

Michael Young: Right.

Werner Staub: So you know, the other survey tools can do - handle all kinds of questions?

Michael Young: Right. So I had my - I totally hear what you're saying and I had a functional idea about that. I think that there has to be an ongoing communication or a feeding between groups. I think they can work in parallel if they are in communication with each other and feeding each other systematically.

For example you know the drafting team for questions, there are - there's plenty of information in the existing requirements document where they could start getting some of the questions done. But they would need information from what the requirements verification team are finding out in order to complete that work.

And the survey tool and recipient decision team - while the recipient team could probably - you know on the recipient side, they could probably you know, get a list of 75% or 80% of the stakeholder ideas around who the stakeholders or the people filling out the survey should be now. But, there may be some ideas that float in from the requirements verification team as they go out and find other stakeholders, and there may be some ideas from the group.

So what I was going to suggest to keep that communication in terms of the nature of the way we work is that we would periodically - and I'm still a little

waffling on the schedule in my head. And a lot of it depends on how often people in this group are willing to attend meetings or able to attend meetings.

But, I was thinking we would alternate between meeting where the three sub-groups have their own independent meetings and push forward their work, and then periodically, I don't know if it's every second interval or every third interval, we come back as a group meeting team and the subgroups report on their progress and cross-communicate deliberately with each other so that we're ensured that that feedback's going on iteratively.

What do you think Werner? Do you think that would do it?

Werner Staub: I think it could do it indeed.

The - we just have to, as you suggest, get the groups to be - to you know, come back into synch on a regular basis so actually the suggestion of having the regular calls together or possibly you know, the Vice-Chairs and Chairs trying to synchronize the work. That might be an idea.

Michael Young: Right.

And if we're challenged on getting everyone on the calls, we could fall back to the Chairs meeting periodically to synchronize, yes.

Okay, so you know in terms of the logistics of that - I mean, we don't have to - I think we have some good ideas around that, and I'd also like to talk with Liz and - about the practicality. But how often - let me ask the question to the group. How often do they think they could make a meeting commitment? Is it once a week or once every two weeks? Or you know, where's their availability at this point?

Werner Staub: Well - sorry, this is Werner. I think for many of us, it might depend on what the duration of the effort is. I think doing a one meeting per week for six

months would absolutely extenuating. So the question is how much of that could be you know, how long would it be? You know, is it for four weeks or so to have a meeting every week that's fine. For eight weeks is okay too. But as soon as we go beyond that, it becomes a problem then you could lose the thrust.

Michael Young: Right. Right.

And the other thing I was thinking is that some of the work that everyone's involved in requires you know, outside resources getting back to the subgroups or even to the whole team with answers or feedback in terms of - especially you know we're looking for new stakeholders and getting their comments on the existing requirements. So you know, expecting them to turn around any answers in between weekly meetings might be unrealistic as well.

So if we did the meetings - if we tried to plan the meetings every two weeks with maybe an expectation that the synchronization meetings then are put on the Chair's heads and they are - they're the ones that end up maybe doing ultimately weekly meetings because they're going to do synchronization meetings in between the regular subgroup meetings. And you know, I like to think that if people are willing to volunteer for sub-Chair, they'd be willing to do you know, at least a short meeting once a week for awhile.

Werner Staub: I agree. I think that's a good way.

Michael Young: Okay.

So okay, any other comments on that structure?

Anne Naffziger: This is Anne again. I think that makes sense. The one thing I would add, and it would probably be helpful, if we are going to be divided up into these three subgroups, while we wouldn't be on the weekly meeting, perhaps once a

month or at least before too much time passes we have a meeting of everyone so we can get an update as to what's happening.

Michael Young: Right.

Anne Naffziger: And what I meant - okay.

Michael Young: Yes. No, I totally hear what you're saying. So we've got the synchronization meetings with the Chairs. We've got the subgroup meetings. And then at a reasonable interval - and if we're doing two weeks intervals, I'm trying to allow people that aren't - haven't volunteered for the extra work as a Chair to do a meeting - a work meeting once - say once every two weeks. Then maybe every third meeting we do an entire group meeting so that people can all get updated.

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Michael Young: Okay. Good.

Any other thoughts or comments?

Liz Gasster: It's Liz. I guess you know, one question is whether you would want to set up just different subgroup mailing lists? And of course you know who's going to do which subgroup and all of that. We can help with just setting up the list if we know how you want to proceed.

Michael Young: Right. Liz, what would you say has been most successful in terms of - because you've seen subgroups formed before. Do you find that doing dedicated mailing lists for the subgroups is better than just trying to do the traffic through the main list?

Liz Gasster: I actually personally, because this is a relatively small group, might suggest that you consider doing the traffic through the mail - main list with like maybe

subheaders in your emails so that you can be sure to stay informed? But you know, you may find that impractical or unwieldy. It's not a really big group, but it - you know, so it sometimes can work better with subgroups.

Michael Young: Yes.

Liz Gasster: I mean, you just want to have the transparency too where like the subgroup emails are archived as well. So it's really up to you all what you think would work best, given...

Michael Young: Well, I think...

Liz Gasster: ...the topics.

Michael Young: Yes. I think even Werner's issues that he raised and my own thoughts as well, and Anne's is that we want to keep the cross-communication going. So I think the idea if we can all exercise a little discipline is to beside any subject lines, or that we actually tag our subgroup name as well. That way people want to read all the subgroup emails, they can. But they'll see just by the subject line that it's a subgroup email and they can choose to not if they don't feel - you know, if they feel it's too much information flowing past them, and we stick on the same mailing list.

I'd be afraid if it's a separate mailing list, too much information would get...

Man: I would like to echo that actually. I've made experience that in the case of multiplication of mailing lists, people get lost. And it's - you know, there's an uneasiness about having missed something. At the same time you know, the people have a temptation to cross-post if something actually is of concern for more than one. So it adds more confusion than actually would help to subdivide. So, I'd be happier with a single list actually.

Michael Young: Okay.

And you know, we'll all try to manage the subject lines proactively. So if we're trying to communicate specifically with our subgroup, and optionally people can read it, we'll just tag the subject lines you know, Subgroup B or Subgroup C.

Okay. Liz, I'm not exactly sure what you - I mean, I think we've gotten 1 through 3 now, and I'm just thinking about 4 here. I think with the draft charter, we just have to add - well, let me go back to 2 and clear it off. I think if I understand where we're all at, we just need to add that additional language and get comments back on the list and make sure everybody's okay with that in order to next step on that.

And then also at the same time, I think as an action item follow-up, Liz if we could suggest a meeting schedule around the concepts we just talked about that would - for people to look at and for those that aren't on the call. And then, I'm not exactly sure to meet target or objective for (TACAR). I don't know if that's a little premature - charter and we finalize the - we get the scope of work going.

Werner Staub: I'm sorry. I didn't understand the last sentence. Could you repeat that?

Michael Young: Sure. I was saying that the target or objective for (TACAR) just seems a little premature because we don't have the charter finalized yet and we don't have - you know, the subgroups haven't defined the work that they're doing just yet or their task items, and we don't have a project schedule yet.

So I would suggest that we defer that one until we get the scope of work finalized and we get a - you know, a suggestive project delivery timeline out of the subgroups for their work.

Liz Gasster: And - this is Liz. I think that's absolutely fine. I mean, the agenda item is there really to get you thinking about it more than anything. And of course, giving -

at some point, giving the Council feedback or an idea of what your schedule is. So you know, what I would suggest is if you don't mind taking a first crack or a next crack at modifying the charter the way you think it should be, Michael, based on your work - you know just your plan, and then giving the subgroups a chance to meet and...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Well, it...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: ...before the next larger meeting.

Michael Young: Right.

Liz Gasster: I think the question is really in terms of a mailing list, you could all communicate on the same list. But if you think you want to have subteam calls, how you want to treat that.

Michael Young: Right.

Liz Gasster: And so you know, if we were to set up you know, three subteam calls for next week, and I'm just making this up, you know or for the week after, to start to talk about you know your schedule and the task so that you could complete - you know, you could still do the high level charter, get it completed, and you know have Wendy as liaison, for example, send it to the Council for its information. And then, continue to talk about the deadlines you want, or the milestones you want to work on and work plans for each group, say on subsequent calls.

Michael Young: Okay.

Liz Gasster: But, you may need to have at least organizing calls for each of those subgroups.

Michael Young: I would think so. Yes.

And while we have two of the Vice-Chairs on the call now, Wilson and Werner, do either one of you have a preference for one of these subgroups?

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, this is Wilson. Okay first of all, I would like to - okay, to ask a question. On this (unintelligible) - most of the (unintelligible) dates that - which we are discussing I think depends on the (unintelligible), on when the - also, I don't know (when these are very different)? Is it (unintelligible)? I'm (unintelligible) part to train our (unintelligible). And also understand how - what - or also understand how we should (unintelligible) I know that.

But in that, if we (unintelligible) (for business) then I would like to be part of Group 2. (That is).

Michael Young: Group 2? Okay.

Wilson Abigaba: (Unintelligible).

Michael Young: Okay. Werner, did you have a preference?

Werner Staub: Mine would actually be in the drafting team for questions.

Michael Young: Okay.

Werner Staub: Group 1.

Michael Young: Wonderful.

So I guess we don't have Don on the call, but Liz I guess we can reach out to him and see if he's okay with taking 3. I rather suspect given his wonderful long history - technical history, he probably would find this interesting.

Liz Gasster: Yes. We can do that.

Michael Young: Okay.

Good. Okay, so Liz I guess we have our action items. I have a little bit of work to do and drawing up what we've discussed in terms of the - you know, both a separate I guess work schedule with milestones - suggested milestones for framework. And then the actual work elements that we talked about are the - or the goals that we've talked about that are you know, included in those items you put on the Adobe Connect, we have to get into - comprehensively into the draft of the charter. So I can work on that for sure.

It'd be good if what we could do is ratify the structure over the list, maybe even ratify the draft charter once I've edited over the list, and maybe get the initial organization calls done with the Vice-Chairs just to kind of - between the Vice-Chairs and myself, maybe just to get things organized. And then, we can put out - and then go to a group meeting and put out calls for volunteers for the different groups.

Does that sound like a - the right action steps to everybody?

Werner Staub: I would support that.

Liz Gasster: So are you thinking Michael, maybe like a call between you and the Vice-Chairs next week?

Michael Young: Yes.

- Liz Gasster: And, calls - and work on calls that the Vice-Chairs in a sense would Chair for each of their subgroups the following week? Something like that?
- Michael Young: Well, I think Vice-Chairs and myself next week just to get organized, and then calls probably immediately in the mailing list - more entire group calls. So two weeks from now, one more entire group call.
- Liz Gasster: Okay.
- Michael Young: Yes, just to ratify the volunteers into the different groups. And you know if we get - you know, that'll also help because we get you know, 90% of everyone wants to be on one group, then it would be good to get everyone on the phone and see if we can't you know entice a few people to switch to any understaffed groups if you will - under-resourced groups.
- Liz Gasster: So a two week follow-up would be somewhere around the 4th of August. Is this date and time - I know Gisella would ask is this date and time okay for people? Like if we were to just target for this for a call in two weeks?
- Wilson Abigaba: Yes.
- Woman: Yes.
- Woman: Yes.
- Werner Staub: That's good if - for me. One thing I have, that I will be traveling the later portions of August. So, probably would have to at least work around that.
- Liz Gasster: And I suspect you're not alone.
- Werner Staub: Yes.
- Michael Young: Yes. Yes. Summer's going to be tough for everyone I think.

Liz Gasster: Okay. Well then we'll go ahead and set up a call for you know, in two weeks, roughly at the same time if that works, and we'll double - Gisella, what I'd suggest is a Doodle just because we've got a number of people who aren't on the call today to make sure that the reason is just that they have a you know, bad day this day and not that this is a perennially bad time for others.

Gisella Gruber-White: It's Gisella here. Just so do you only - well, do you want to see options on that day or the options that week around this time?

Liz Gasster: Michael, what do you suggest?

Michael Young: I think that the day is probably okay, but I think we give an hour before, hour after the current time, you know just to give people a little bit of wiggle room and see what...

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay, I'll do that.

Liz Gasster: And is there anyone who's at a particularly - where this is an onerous time for them and they are - I'm not sure where everyone's located. Is anyone really in the middle of the night?

Werner Staub: You mean right now the time that we're using currently?

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Michael Young: Yes.

Werner Staub: For me, it's actually rather practical with this outside of office hours but still when I'm moderately awake.

Liz Gasster: Okay. And Wilson, are you okay with this time?

Wilson?

Wilson Abigaba: No. It's Wilson. The time is okay with me - perfect with me. It's 8:00 pm right now, but it's perfect with me.

Liz Gasster: Okay. Just want to make sure.

Wilson Abigaba: But would like to - but to - yes. So send out a reminder about the meeting so that people can be prepared for it just in case.

Michael Young: Okay, good.

Vice-Chairs, is - I'd like to break a little bit from this pattern for next week. Is - Wilson, Werner, since you're on the call already, is there any chance we could do a call on Wednesday instead of the Thursday next week?

Werner Staub: Let me just check.

Wilson Abigaba: That's fine with me.

Werner Staub: Just checking.

I don't see any problem with that. Wednesday's okay.

Michael Young: Okay, great.

I am going to try - we have a long weekend...

Wilson Abigaba: Wednesday's okay with me.

Michael Young: Yes. We have a long weekend here in Canada coming up that week and I promised my children I'd take them on a canoe trip on the Thursday.

Werner Staub: Okay.

Michael Young: So, that would be fantastic.

Okay, so do we want to target the same timeslot on Wednesday next week?  
1:00 my time and I think you said 8:00 and...

Werner Staub: And 7:00 respectively.

Michael Young: Yes.

Werner Staub: Yes. I think that's a good time.

Michael Young: Okay.

And (unintelligible) can attend that time, but I mean he's in the same time zone as me, so I would imagine he could probably make that work.

Okay.

Liz Gasster: So for clarification, we're talking about Wednesday the 27th, right?

Michael Young: Correct.

Liz Gasster: At what time?

Gisella Gruber-White: 17:00 UTC.

Michael Young: 1:00.

Liz Gasster: Thanks. Okay. Great.

Gisella Gruber-White: Gisella here. Just clarification. Do we need recording, transcript, et cetera for this call?

Michael Young: Um...

Gisella Gruber-White: For the one -- sorry -- next Wednesday?

Michael Young: Yes. It's a working call with the Vice-Chairs. I - you know, this is a protocol issue, so Liz I look to you for some - and I look to both of you actually for guidance on that. Should we be doing transcripts? Since this is an organizing call, maybe we should.

Liz Gasster: You know, I don't have a strong view. I think sure. Yes. Let's just stick to that.

Michael Young: Okay.

Liz Gasster: Others can join on the group if they want to, right?

Michael Young: Yes.

Werner Staub: Yes. I think that's a very good way anyway, because the - it just comes in as very helpful if somebody joins and then you know has a view or input for something that the others did not have. So it's always a good idea if you have...

Liz Gasster: Because if we don't have - there's some people missing on this call.

Michael Young: Right.

Liz Gasster: So why not - you can make it a call specifically for the Chairs and Vice-Chairs to get organized, but sent to the full list - invite the overall team if they would like to participate and go ahead and post the transcript as a regular working group call.

Michael Young: Yes. Just set them as optional and the Chairs as required.

Liz Gasster: Yes. Sounds great. Is that okay with everyone else?

Woman: Yes.

Michael Young: Cool.

All right, does anyone have anything else?

New business? New issues?

Liz Gasster: Actually Michael, I should just ask you do you think it's okay if anyone wanted to join more than one team?

Michael Young: Wow. You know, if they are willing to dedicate their time, why not?

Liz Gasster: That might be something to mention to...

Werner Staub: Yes. I think it's good to mention that of course all the teams are open to everybody, so it's about facilitating focus but not about excluding anybody.

Michael Young: Exactly. The more work people are willing to do, the better off we are. So yes.

Okay, so I'll make sure in the work plan elements that I write up that I specify that just so it's very clear to everyone.

Anne Naffziger: This is Anne. Can I clarify one point on the formation of these groups? Are you looking to let - have you let us - should we be letting you know now if we have an interest, or do you want us to hold that until we have this meeting in two weeks?

Michael Young: No. I think what'll happen is after the Vice-Chairs get organized on Wednesday and they'll be - they'll put out emails right away looking for their volunteers. And so you know, volunteer on the list initially.

I think the call's a real backup in case we don't get a - we get a very uneven distribution of volunteering.

Anne Naffziger: Okay. Thank you.

Michael Young: Do you have a favorite already?

Anne Naffziger: I do.

Michael Young: What would you like?

Anne Naffziger: I would like to work on the first team with Werner. I think (I'd want to do) that one.

Michael Young: Excellent. Okay.

Werner Staub: Excellent.

Michael Young: All right. So Liz, do you have anything else?

Liz Gasster: I don't. Steve, do you have anything?

Steve Sheng's also supporting this group, so make sure...

Michael Young: Hi, Steve.

Liz Gasster: Yes. I think we're all set.

Michael Young: Okay.

Well, so I'll formally wrap up the meeting, and thank you everyone, and I look forward to producing some results from this group.

Werner Staub: Thank you.

Woman: Thanks.

Woman: Thank you everyone.

Michael Young: Bye.

Werner Staub: Thanks. Bye-bye.

Wilson Abigaba: Thank you. Bye.

END