

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Policy Development Process (PDP)
Charter Guidelines Sub-Team
TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 04 June 2009 1600 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee Policy Development Process (PDP) **Charter Guidelines Sub-Team** meeting on Thursday, 04 June 2009, at 16:00 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-charter-guidelines-20090604.mp3>

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

Present

Avri Doria
Graham Chynoweth.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr (joined after roll call)

Apologies:

Illya Bazlyankov

Staff:

Ken Bour
Glen de Saint Gery
Gisella Gruber-White

Operator: Hello. The recorder is started. You can go ahead. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Gisella: Thank you. We'll just quickly start with the roll call. On the call today we have Avri Doria. We have Graham Chynoweth. Graham, sorry I didn't pronounce it correctly. From staff we have Ken Bour, Glen Desaintgery and myself Gisella Gruber-White. Thank you.

Avri Doria: (Cheryl) has not called in. I thought she was about to.

Gisella I'll check with where she is.

Avri Doria: Yes, she is trying to call in. She doesn't have the details. I will give her the details on IM. And we were just on another call together.

And (Chatting), he's in Australia right? All these Australian numbers, which is she? I don't know. I'll send them all. And yes this is all being recorded.

Okay, I sent her the information. She'll be joining us shortly.

So (Ken), others, where are we on this? I know that we've got your, you know, you put something out. And I guess you then revised it and put in titles and numbers and all kinds of good stuff.

And then I added a bunch of comments, a few other people added a bunch of comments. And what do we need to do to finish this, just walk through the comments and decide what to do?

Ken Bour: I think that's one sure, is to reconcile the comments where they are in some difference of opinion about whether - what this means, what it should say, whether it should even be in there -- that kind of stuff.

And then once the outline is - we're pretty happy with the outline, then obviously we start the drafting task. And, you know, that will have its own set of challenges I'm sure but that would be the next thing to do. That's what we were hoping to get done in the last three weeks but it didn't happen.

Avri Doria: Okay I'm not - I guess it quite don't understand. Well I actually think in the discussion we have much of the content of what would be in the thing. And also I guess I question on how much more we need than an annotated outline.

In other words, we need an outline of the things that people would have to put into a charter. And then we may need a sentence or two just giving them a

clue about what kinds of things belong there or do you see us needing much more content and if so why?

Ken Bour: I don't necessarily see that a lot of content necessarily needs to be created. And that's what I meant when I said that will create its own set of challenges.

Moving into that drafting phase I think will I think generate that very question. So how much content do we need recognizing who the audiences here.

So if this particular document, the charter drafting guidelines and implementation support, if the audience is the sponsoring organization in this case GNSO counsel, does it really need, you know, three pages of textual description for every bullet item? And the answer is almost assuredly no right? And I think that's where you're coming from. And I would tend to agree.

So it'll be a little bit of a like how much is enough. And the other thing that I'd like to keep in mind is that this document ought to be it seems to me a living document meaning that it doesn't have to just get written and then stay, you know, Version 1.0 forever.

Down the road if somebody thinks that, you know, it'd helpful to have more content in this section, that can be written and added right? And then we go to Version 1.1. And so I think the - probably the big goal to get - to think about now is getting something that is useful into the council's hands with respect to creating implementations and or to implement in working groups and giving them charter documents to work from.

Avri Doria: Yes well I guess yes I'm pleased. Hopefully others will jump in so it doesn't end just by, you know, the (Ken) and Avri Show.

But I think in one sense we already have the outline. And we may drop things from it. I don't know if anyone really objects.

I know some of the places I said does this need to be there? And if we get to a point where there's a consensus that no it doesn't need to be there then it gets dropped. If there's a consensus that yes of course it needs to be there, then it remains.

And so I think we're actually already kind of in that second phase. Because if I look at the comments that we've got there about well what are we talking about here? Well what goes in here and so on.

So I think we can almost jump to the next page of trying to write those two, three lines of guideline or that paragraph of guideline and see how far it goes.

On the second point I view every document as a living document that change on time. And I think that's one of the reasons why I personally am a relative minimalist on this kind of document.

Because at this point we're giving clues. We have some ideas from four or five working groups that have existed or from the advice given us from IATS and from W3C.

But until the - until I can really internalize this whole notion of working groups and using that as a working method, we won't know what it evolves into and how to basically keep that evolution productive.

So that's why I tend to be a minimalist and why I think we're actually much closer being done than I think it looks like.

Graham

Yes I would agree. I really like the outline. And I think that, you know, just kind of synthesizing those comments into a few - I'd almost even put them in brackets and just, you know, as suggested content for each one of these bullet points.

And kind of like, you know, what it - suggested things that it should cover to get a little more meat and then maybe also a suggestion that while all these things are - you think that they potentially belong and the type of direction that should be given to the working groups in the - by the charter that if something doesn't apply or doesn't make sense in the context of the working group issue then people can just put in N/A or Not Applicable so that, you know, it's not - we're not forcing this - we're not forcing the creation of work or the development for inclusion in the charter just for - for the sake of producing something itself and that it really is tied to whether or not there is a specific relevant a municipal.

I mean this is what we think it's going to be relevant for each charter but, you know, we're not - you know, if it's not relevant then people should just say that they thought about it and decided it wasn't relevant to include a discussion of it.

Ken Bour: All that sounds great to me.

Avri Doria: One thing that we may actually do on some of these, we may want to - or not we necessarily but, you know, the whole working team itself may want to designate some as optional and some as required.

For example, you know, things like milestones, we probably want to think required. Things like mission statement, we might want to say optional or not. And I'm not - I just picked one out of the air. I'm not trying to argue that point at the moment.

And then some of them, you know, so that may be an intermediate also in that consideration.

Graham: The one thing that I'd suggest, I mean do we want to kind of - do we need to - do we think on this call that we need to digest some of the comments? Or do we think that maybe the next good step is to just kind of farm out and have

each person kind of take responsibility for one of the elements and synthesizing the comments into, you know, some of that proposed advisory language?

Avri Doria: Yes I guess once we figured - I mean my view is it would be once we figure out how we're proceeding I think yes, going into each of the comments and talking them through.

One question I have is whether we actually want to farm out the writing of these or whether after this discussion -- and (Ken) you tell me whether this is within scope of your contracted work whether it wouldn't be reasonable to ask you to take the discussion and what you've heard and craft some suggested wording that then we would, you know, edit on the wiki and work with you but have you plant the first seed as it were?

Or do we follow the I'll take 2.1 you take 2.2? But I don't know what's in your contracted scope.

Ken Bour: Either I can't absolutely support either one. There's no - the contract is silent on such matters. And if - I think - I know (Denise) well enough after nine, ten months of working with her that if whatever moves the group forward the most effectively and efficiently she would be all for.

So if the group thinks that if I should take a stab at writing some draft language to go in these things and that's what the group wants to do, I think that's going to be supported.

Graham: Plant the seed. Plant the seed.

Avri Doria: Yes. And basically especially if we have the conversation now, stop talking about processing, get into some content if we, you know, have had a discussion here and you're basically able to take a combo of the comments plus the discussion we have and produce the resulting text, I think that that

would probably move it quicker than waiting for me to write 2.2 and someone else to write 3.4.

Ken Bour: Yes, I quite agree. And I like I said, I'm happy to do that. And I...

Avri Doria: And especially since it's in a wiki, I think we'd have no compunctions against offering alternative language if, you know, I know I would have no compunction against offering alternative language. I'm hoping that others would have the same lack of compunction.

Graham: So let's get into it.

Avri Doria: Okay so...

Graham: 1.1

Avri Doria: 1.1.

Graham: That seems to me to be all we need right there.

Ken Bour: Well I - like I - again, if I were to have the pen for initial draft, I would write a paragraph under background that would site, you know, a few of the BGC report. It would just be - it wouldn't be very long or extensive. But it would give a few references to, you know, how this sort of thing came into being and not difficult work and easy to edit. And but I wouldn't make it extensive.

Graham: Yes, and just the other thing is on just the drafting of them, maybe you want to offer some kind of, you know, suggested link there. I don't know, do we want to...

Ken Bour: No. Okay let's keep in mind something...

Graham: Okay.

Ken Bour: ...that's a great, great point. Let me - I just want to get my own head straight on here. What we are drafting right, is the set of charter implementation and drafting guidelines that we would turn over to someone like the GNSO Council that would inform them when it came time to write the first charter for a real working group.

Avri Doria: This is where I think I have a slightly different view. I think we're talking not only about giving it to the GNSOs that write the initial charter, but from the practice that we've seen lately, sometimes it is a drafting team. Sometimes it is an ad hoc group that's proposing a charter for an activity.

Ken Bour: That's fine yes. In fact that's the reason I wanted to make it, I wanted to use terms like sponsoring organization, not GNSO Council other than GNSO Council as an example of a specific customer of such a document.

Avri Doria: I think it's in general community. There may not even be an organization. I can see - and this is from looking at things like other groups that very often for example within the ITF -- and (Juan) is not here but I have 20 years of ITF -- is that often a group of people will sit down together and say, you know, I really think the group the - in that case ITF, in this case ICANN GNSO should be working on X.

And they sit down and they propose working on X. And they scope out a charter. Now this charter has no particular, you know, legitimacy yet other than as a proposal.

But what we're saying to people is if you think work really needs to be done and you think a working group needs to be developed, well then here's a way of telling us what you think needs to be done.

So I think the scope is wider than...

Ken Bour: Okay. Sure.

Avri Doria: ...supporting organizations.

Ken Bour: Okay, okay.

Graham: So it's...

Ken Bour: Okay.

Graham: ...like a drafter. So it's to the drafter of this charter.

Avri Doria: Exactly, exactly and leave open who it might be that a year and a half from now is drafting the charter.

Ken Bour: Okay I - yes. And all of that's great and I understand. What I was simply trying to - I want to just be clear in my mind that this document is a set of guidelines for whoever it is who is wanting to propose, craft or recommend a charter for some other purpose right?

This is the set of guidelines they would draw upon in the preparation of that charter document.

Graham: The group of people whoever it is, picks up this document says all right, this is what if I take this form and follow the advice that's in it, I'm going to produce something that's - so people in the community will generally understand as a good basis for a charter.

Ken Bour: Okay I think I understand that. And it - there - we might end up as we crawl through here with a little bit of a problem, a challenge.

Because I thought about it initially and built sections in thinking that there was always going to be a sponsoring organization that said to some other group, go write this charter, go draft this charter.

And if it can also come from a wellspring of interest that has not such sponsor, then some of what the material that I put in here that deals with things like, you know, how should you name and announce and advertise the - this working group that you're going - well that's - I'm not sure where that stuff gets put. But anyway, we'll come to it.

Avri Doria: I mean I think at the end of a day when a working group is chartered it, you know, we'll need those things. So it's really there's a duality in it.

Ken Bour: Okay well let's - so far so good. So we're - I can write a background section. That'll work. And then we said intended audience and purpose. And this is where we're going to do some changing right?

Avri Doria: Yes. Oh that's right. I was talking 1.2 while the rest of you were talking 1.1. I apologize.

Ken Bour: No problem. So what we want to do is keep - is to get rid of the idea of the organization. And is it okay to say sponsor? I mean...

Avri Doria: Well yes, it can be sponsor. And I mean I have absolutely no issue with saying sponsoring organization or other. It's just I'm looking for more of a inter-(alia) type of statement including but not restricted to type of statement on who the community of interest is. And that was really my general point. And it was not restricted just to them, but of course it may be them.

Ken Bour: Okay. I'm - what I'm doing is I've copied the wiki, put it into a Word document. And as we go through it, I'm making notes. And I'll just edit my own little - and when I come back to it then I'll be able to interpolate, synthesize and we can take the comments out and then I will have captured where we are.

Avri Doria: But you'll bring it back into wiki for the group to...

Ken Bour: I will bring it back into wiki, yes.

Avri Doria: It's really unfortunate that that is not quite as easy as it should be.

Ken Bour: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. So...

Graham: And I've actually got - I've - that phone call that I just got indicated that I am going to need to leave the call in about 7 minutes. So I apologize but there's a work issue came up.

Avri Doria: Okay. So that - well we can continue through. It is being recorded. So I do invite you to listen to it and then...

Graham: Yes I will...

Avri Doria: ...just keeping following the wiki...

Graham: ...and also look forward to looking at (Ken)'s fully drafted comments.

Ken Bour: Okay good. So the intended audience and purpose will be generalized so that it recognizes that you don't only - it's not only a sponsor, but it could also be any ad hoc group that wants to propose a charter would also be able to use these guidelines. I think I got that point.

Is there anything else in that audience and purpose? Is the purpose okay? I mean it's providing a set of guidelines, checklists, templates, best practice materials. I mean that's - all of that material's okay?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay good.

Avri Doria: The only thing I would say is guiding a proposed working group as opposed to a working group, you know. Oh okay, never mind. I misread it. Never mind.

Ken Bour: Okay. How about we move to structure?

Avri Doria: Structure, yes.

Ken Bour: What did I say here? Okay this would...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Graham: Yes I would just call it the Table of Contents. And I would actually put that maybe up at the top. Maybe that makes Table of Contents 1.

Ken Bour: Okay, so suggestion is to make Table of Contents number, move TOC to the top. Yes, that makes sense to me.

But we think we should have obviously a table of contents and that - we'll put that up at the top, take it out of so we don't need to have a structure really. 1.3 doesn't need to exist right?

Graham: Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay, revisions...

Avri Doria: 1.4. I would really recommend that we can say it's a living document and will be modified, you know, based on experience and then just sort of say something and, you know, this is a problem for the GNSO in the future but not try to determine now what the process will be for reviewing or perhaps

suggesting that it be reviewed in a year, you know, according to the GNSO processes or something like that.

Graham: Well I guess the question for me on revisions is this - does this refer to previous like when you get to the end of the day and you have a charter? Does this say okay, there's a previous version of this charter that exists?

Ken Bour: That wasn't my intent.

Graham: This refers to hey, there was a previous version of the charter guidelines.

Ken Bour: Yes, So because let's say we called the implementation and charter drafting guidelines version 1.0 and it contains all the material we're working our way through and so forth right? We're done. We - and we say this is the first version of it.

When somebody who's actually working with the draft guidelines says, you know, there really needs to be a second in here for such and such that was omitted when these guys put it together. They would have a methodology or they would know what to do to get this Version 1.0 to a 1.1 and incorporate that new provision.

Graham: Well I kind of liked the idea of say something along the lines of this is - you know, this charter, you know, it is suggested that you reference, you know, that this charter was based on the charter drafting guidelines 1.0.

Because then in each one people will - you know, there'll be a version of it. And each charter that exists, it'll be - it'll - you know, there'll be a statement that says this was based on 1.0. You know, subsequent it'll say this one was based on 2.0. And that way if someone gets an old form or something like that or starts to, you know, uses a previous model of something that is - has become antiquated that, you know, you can see where the missing elements are going to be.

Ken Bour: I think I understand. It's almost like the charters that get written should reference the draft guideline version that they - that it was spawned from.

Graham: Yes exactly so that everyone was reading it says oh okay, this is what I can expect out of this and it's - or I can note to myself hey now aren't we on 1.3 and this was used on the model - based on the 1.2 model?

Ken Bour: Yes I see the point. And it's an interesting one because you could have a working group. And there have been some that have lasted for years. And the drafting guidelines could evolve to a 2.7 before the first working group actually closes.

And if there was some learnings that came out of things that might actually retroactively effected pre-existing group, it'd be nice to know what charter guideline they came from.

Graham: That's interesting.

(Cheryl): It's a quality systems issue.

Avri Doria: Right. I would recommend. I'd like to comment on two things. I didn't cut you off did I? Well I just wanted to make sure...

(Cheryl): No, no, no. The version control is a quality systems issue and needs to be...

Avri Doria: I would...

(Cheryl): ...implementation.

Avri Doria: Yes. I would recommend - first of all I think the question that came up as an example in that somebody putting in a section that wasn't prescribed, I think that that should obviously be fine if somebody wants to put something extra in

a charter, you know. There should be no, you know, barriers to doing that because different groups might require a different thing.

So I think it is important to say that these are, you know, recommendations. If people need to add other stuff to a charter that that's - the other thing is I think it's almost like university graduate requirements in that when you enter a university you either get to graduate based on the rules that were in existence when you started or the latest set of rules and that basically a charter written under an older charter guideline is still valid.

Or if it wants to - if it can update to the latest, you know...

Ken Bour: Yes, that's what (Grant) is suggestion.

Graham: And this is - and I wouldn't think that it would be binding. It's just basically a way for people out in the community who are leading charter to know why it might not have stated something or why it stated something that has since become antiquated. So it's just a way to kind of understand what you're reading - give you the guideline.

And also I think if this is the kind of document that gets copied and put out into the Internet places, people can check and see if they're getting the most updated one.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Ken Bour: Now what I would actually recommend, I do this - I've done this in a number of templates that I've created for ICANN in my role.

At the very bottom, the last section, I literally call it like amendments. And it's a little table, just got maybe four columns, version number, date, who and what. So it's a way to keep track of.

So Version 1 was the first one and Version 1 was changed. It's what (Cheryl) I think was talking about, sort of Version control.

And we can put a section like that, a little - that little table as the last section. And I can stick that on the wiki so people can look and see what that looks like.

Now you have a running way to know how many versions there have been and what each one largely did.

You know, the Version 1.7 added a section something or other because it was missing and needed to be - and people thought that it should be in all charters right?

Graham: Yes, no that sounds good. So I apologize for leaving early. And we'll look forward to reading all this stuff. And thank you guys for continue to work.

Ken Bour: Okay, thank you.

Graham: All right, bye.

Avri Doria: Bye.

Ken Bour: So far so good for revisions.

Avri Doria: Okay. So we're now down to something...

Ken Bour: Now we're at mission purpose and deliverables. And so we had some comments here. Okay this is where I guess I recommended the new title.

Avri Doria: Right, so working group. Implementation and charter drafting guidelines. And basically I think my comment was it's a bit of a long title, but yes, why not.

Ken Bour: Okay. All right. Well then if that's the case, we - I can probably just get rid of all these comments right?

Avri Doria: Yes.

(Cheryl): (You do).

Ken Bour: All right. I'm just going to...

(Cheryl): Guys, you've all got to look at the potential for Google Wave as released last week, so doing this in a much more intelligent way in collaboration. I'm very excited about that. I'll...

Avri Doria: Is that a...

(Cheryl): ...send you all the...

Avri Doria: ...on the Google docs?

(Cheryl): No, God no. It's nothing - I mean makes Google docs look like...

Ken Bour: One more time (Cheryl), what was it called, Google what?

Avri Doria: Wave.

(Cheryl): Google Wave.

Ken Bour: W-A-V-E okay.

(Cheryl): Yes, released - just go <http://wave.google.com> and know that I've sat on this having had many coffees with one of the engineers for the last two weeks - two years. And it is going to make this sort of work so good.

And I suggested that our ICANN community could be to test it. And I hope that comes off.

Ken Bour: I'll take a look at it today. I'm constantly - we are - the policy staff's constantly in need of this sort of thing.

(Cheryl): Well you won't be surprised when you get to the end of the presentation that a real-time 40 language letter by letter language interpretation tool happens to be included with you (Ken).

Avri Doria: I'm more than willing to play with new toys.

Ken Bour: Yes love it.

(Cheryl): Yes, lovely new toy. But this exactly what we're doing now would be nice - so much easier using these types of APIs when they're developed.

Ken Bour: Yes, we agree. All right, well we'll just continue to clobber through this one the way we've been doing it. So I'm ready to go to 2.1, mission focused area scope. We had some comments there. So Avri said every charter needs a mission and scope right?

Okay so then ICANN then, do we need to add any guidance here about, you know, what constitutes a well written mission statement?

And Avri said if it's short and crisp and a couple of bullets.

(Cheryl): Understandable.

Ken Bour: That one's not too controversial. I think I can create something that works with that.

Avri Doria: I think you'll find a lot of my comments are like that.

Ken Bour: Yes. And I think what I'll do in the first iteration here is I will err on the side of brevity. And first it'll make my job easier to do.

And secondly if somebody goes, well that doesn't really add any, then we can certainly add more. And is that okay?

Avri Doria: I think that's perfect.

Ken Bour: Okay.

(Cheryl): (Ken) while you're writing this, can you just know it's me doing what you probably are now expecting me to do quite frequently. Can you just whack some of these brief points into Google trends light and see how it goes out into English and Spanish and Mandarin and whether or not we lose the intention in the interpretation?

Avri Doria: But wouldn't he have to be able to read that language to know that?

(Cheryl): Not at all. You go forward and backward and it...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Ken Bour:v I've never done it (Cheryl). I'm always willing to learn a new trick. And so if you could tell me who I might chat with who can just give me a quick little tutorial or a guidance as to how - where I might go to do that and how I do it, I'd be happy to give that a try.

(Cheryl): Yes sure, no problem. It's just when we're writing something that's at the high level, you know, you want, you know, someone in a non-English speaking background to be able to not misinterpret and go off on a total sideline.

Ken Bour: Is this something that (Matia) might have done or does regularly?

(Cheryl): Yes, yes.

Ken Bour: I can ask (Matia).

(Cheryl): In fact, (Nick) and I could probably really talk to half our community without Google Translate.

Ken Bour: So Google Translate. Oh, so that's another tool. All right, I missed that. Okay, got it. Let me look into that.

So you don't need to do anymore. I'll take it from there.

(Cheryl): Thanks (unintelligible). You know where I live anyway.

Ken Bour: All right, so how about 2.2, objectives and goals?

Avri Doria: I think it's the same comment pretty much as before.

(Cheryl): Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay just keep it brief. The guidelines just need to be brief.

(Cheryl): Yes.

Avri Doria: And I think the extra word that I've added here and I had in both of them is that we have to make sure that these things are guidelines, they're not constraining...

Ken Bour:Correct.

Avri Doria: ...you know, et cetera. But we can't currently envision all the uses that this might be put to. And I guess - and this is a total aside. I mean my normal

profession is protocol designer. And one of the things that one always has to keep in mind is the uses this will be put to that you can't conceive of now.

(Cheryl): Yes. I mean I like to think of these things as a skeleton. They're essential of the thing to stand up and move as designed. But what gets hung often is variable and (fit) to purpose.

Ken Bour: Okay. Yes in fact it might be possible to - for me to - I could write something even up in the general section that - almost a disclaimer like Section 1.4 or 1.5 disclaimer that says, you know, the intention of this document is to do exactly that, provide guidelines. It is not - and then we've covered it one time at the top and...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Ken Bour: ...then we can just ignore it therefore thereafter.

All right, so going to import impact priority. And I did, you know, as you could tell, I sort of was throwing the kitchen sink at this time. You know, look I was just thinking what are all the possible things I could think of that might go into a guideline for somebody writing a charter?

We don't have to put all these in here. This one Avri says, seemed like overkill and it was seconded. And then what did I say?

Oh yes it was just - it was more about not so much need to know, but is it helpful to - for a working group that's being commissioned to have some sense of the priority, the import, the value that this work has to the community. It was more about that.

Avri Doria: I could tell you why I think it's problematic. And part of the reason I think it's problematic is perhaps from a - even a council deciding to approve something.

I think that we can get to agreement on what they will do and what the milestones are and what their mission is crisply.

Once we start to talk about why is this important, why should I care et cetera, we get into a much less crisp murkier area where each constituency, each group coming to the work has a different reason why they're going to approve it and think it's worthwhile.

And it's - there'll be surrounding dialogues. There'll be call reporting. There'll be motions. There'll be all kinds of things that have this background information.

But a charter is - while it's not a legal document, in some sense it's kind of like one. And to try and include all of the sort of mushy indeterminate stuff that brings in intentionality and that separate ones become problematic for the group trying to approve a charter.

(Ken Bauer): I'm just capturing a few thoughts. That's persuasive to me. You have a lot of experience with the creation of these groups. And so, you know, missioning them, and objectivizing or however you say it, putting goals and things together is determinate. And - but yes, in terms of like why, how, should we, okay yes, maybe we should just leave this out there.

(Cheryl): And Avri, I wanted to pick up on what was your last dot point in there. And I guess that's from I guess little sort of see that's historian point of view.

If a charter win is disassociated at a later date from its normal context, has reference to at least some of its formative prioritizing information like the motions et cetera that you're mentioning in the last dot point under 2.3, it really makes it easy to put the puzzle back together when you're not coming from a informed internalized point of view, when you're coming from an outsider looking at it and trying to make sense of it point of view.

Avri Doria: Yes. And perhaps, you know, there is good reason for separate censuses documents that are, you know, the end game, the things they could present at the board when PDPs are completed and stuff as opposed to who...

(Cheryl): But they need to be somehow tethered...

Avri Doria: Right.

(Cheryl): ...in some way, shape or form.

Avri Doria: Right. As a person that writes censuses reports part-time for a living, you know, that's what I do at the UN. I write censuses reports.

One of the problems of the censuses report is you always have to figure out what to leave out. You're always taking a - no matter how neutral you try to be, you're - the fact that you are synthesizing leaves out content that may be important to someone else.

So having something that can be referred to, having documents that explain these things is probably a good idea. Having them as part of a charter or required for a charter is one of the places where I'm concerned and worried.

Ken Bour: Because it's be hard to write them.

(Cheryl): How did I ever link to a charter? How do - in a retro-fitted trying to put it all back together view, how would I link a specific charter with for example, outcomes and synthesis documents?

Avri Doria: Well certainly it's certainly linked with motion.

(Cheryl): Okay. So really at the very minimum we need the motion to motion linkage within the charter?

Avri Doria: Right. I think actually yes. I think including pointer to the motion that...

(Cheryl): Yes.

Avri Doria: ...approved the working group as something that's done at the end.

(Cheryl): And then you can follow it straight out which is fine as long as there's that actual cross linkage.

Avri Doria: Right. So yes, putting in the motion that approves it, you know, this charter was created by - I mean this working group was created by motion (blah) and then appoint it to that motion. That is probably good. And then from there, yes, you can file the rest of the...

Ken Bour: Where would I put that ladies? Where do you think it belongs in this structure, in this outline?

Avri Doria: I actually think it's part of the mission.

(Cheryl): Yes, right at the top.

Avri Doria: You know? The mission statement is a brief paragraph that's probably very similar to what was in the motion.

Ken Bour: Right. From there I will just add a comment up at the very top at 2.0 that says insert something...

Avri Doria: Yes, either a pointer - I think a pointer is probably more useful or maybe you insert the motion and its pointer as a trailhead.

And I don't think where we place things is all that critical at the moment. We can always do a cut and paste resort once we see what it looks like.

Ken Bour: Okay, okay. Yes, I've captured the idea. I'll try to figure that out. Let's see, very good. Are we - all right, so we're going to eliminate what was originally in 2.3...

Woman: Yes.

Ken Bour: Yes, okay good. And maybe the next one is similar, success criteria. My original thought there in the second bullet was that, you know, as a sponsor of a potential workgroup or somebody that's creating a team to do something, are there any success criteria, or if there are success criteria, should they - there be a place for them in the charter?

Avri Doria: What I was basically saying is the milestones and deliverables are the success criteria.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Avri Doria: In an objective sense.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Avri Doria: Anything else again gets us back into that fuzzy what does my constituency want to see come out of it.

Ken Bour: Milestones and - I'm making a note to remind myself are the - and they're covered in the next - they're covered later. They're covered in two...

Avri Doria: I mean one of the things that's important to point out to people about milestones and deliverables is that they end up the borders. They define the borders of what work can and can't be done.

And when a working group wants to go beyond its chartered deliverables, it needs to go - unless it could substantiate that something is a precursor to a

deliverable, it needs to go back to, you know, the chartering organization and say hey, you know, we need an extra deliverable to work on.

Ken Bour: Okay, yes right. And for sure - yes. For sure we would as we get down here, I think we've covered the idea that any working group would - their charter would have a clause in it that says if you need more help, go back to your sponsor. I don't think it needs to be said but it probably could be said.

Avri Doria: Well it needs to be said the deliverables are a constraint.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Avri Doria: And one of the things that, you know, I've seen happen often in groups in the ITF is there are quite legitimate other things they want to work for. And, you know, in that case it's the IESG who's the approving, the chartering organization.

So it's yes, yes, yes, all good ideas. And we'll talk about it when you finish what's on your plate already. You know, that kind of statement is sometimes necessary.

Ken Bour: Okay, so do we morph in 2.5?

Avri Doria: I think they were pretty close together.

Ken Bour: Yes. All right, so I'm going to (clabber) 2.4. And 2.5, again, I can write a very short paragraph right? This - our again, brief is the rule that basically just says that this section of the charter would contain outcomes, products and deliverables.

And do we want to go as far as to say that those deliverables represent a constraint to the working group or...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Avri Doria: Yes, that - I think the they declined.

(Cheryl): I don't like to get (Scope Creep) which is never a good thing.

Avri Doria: Right. And that's just it. The deliverables are by being strict about deliverables and negotiating them carefully you - hopefully you never completely prevent (Scope Creep) but you hopefully reduce it.

(Cheryl): Got we can only try.

Ken Bour: Yes, so you guys really have a lot of experience with the creation of these real teams. And I'm doing largely from an academic point of view and other working group things that I've been involved in which - in which case we would have success criteria. But it's a different - ICANN does represent a completely different sort of model here. And so this is helpful to me.

Avri Doria: And success is delivering - the best success is delivering your deliverables, meeting your milestones and doing it in the constrained amount of time. Nobody needs that but...

Ken Bour: Yes. That would be a success for ICANN I take it. Right. All right, so let's see, 2.6 then, durations, time frames, key milestones and extensions.

Now it may be that 2, 5 and 6 can...

Avri Doria: Become one.

Ken Bour: Yes, combined.

(Cheryl): Yes.

Ken Bour: Let me just make that comment, combined with 2.5. Is there any point or any notes in here that are critical? Let me think.

Avri Doria: No. I mean other than, you know, I was question response to terminology. But we've already talked about that.

Ken Bour: Okay. All right, good. I think we're...

Avri Doria: Certainly there is the notion of - and this is perhaps one of the things you were getting at with the sponsor is there is a chartering organization. And there is a relationship between the working group and the chartering group.

Okay, they're not necessarily the sponsor, you know, but they're the ones that approve charters. So the GNSO Council in GNSO working groups - and hopefully this is useful to other people, but the GNSO group, you know, the GNSO is the chartering organization for GNSO working group.

Ken Bour: Who would the sponsor be? I did candidly assume that they were - that meant the same thing. I intend it to mean sponsor as chartering organization.

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay, then it was my misunderstanding. I would actually use then in those places where we're talking about the relationship between working group and chartering organization to call it that.

Ken Bour: Yes, okay. Why don't I - I don't have any particular - I'm not wedded to the term sponsor. It was the only word I could think of. We can substitute chartering organization for sponsor everywhere.

(Cheryl): Yes, (Ken), the only thing that came across my mind was a parallel between what I've been involved in in the telco code development parts in Australia and what can happen in an ICANN setting where the mandate for a working

group and its outcome will actually come from something that isn't necessarily the chartering body.

So for example in the telco industry here our regulator will see - will say though shalt. And then the industry self-regulatory body will form a working group to make the shalt happen.

Ken Bour: Who is the - is the first group the sponsor and the second the chartering organization?

(Cheryl): Exactly.

Ken Bour: I see.

(Cheryl): No, like the first group I wouldn't be talking in terms of sponsor. Sponsor has a more friendly (unintelligible) to it.

Ken Bour: The regulator.

(Cheryl): They're a regulator and I bloody well...

Avri Doria: And here at the board it's a regulator.

(Cheryl): Exactly. And I'm thinking about parallel to the board, yes.

Avri Doria: Right. And one of the reasons I think in terms of the charter for example, we could get a mandate either from the telecoms or from the board to do something. And if GNSO could decide to cut it up into four pieces.

(Cheryl): Yes...

Avri Doria: And they would do the chartering organization for a project. But they would want each one to stick to its own compartment. Whether that was reasonable or not is besides the point.

Ken Bour: And maybe we can just ignore for the time being, all right, these are guidelines that really are going - the chartering organization is going to have the responsibility to create the charter.

And regardless of whether there are ten sponsors, one sponsor, 12 regulators or whatever is a bit out of scope for respect to these guidelines right?

So we could just - our audience then is the chartering organization.

Avri Doria: And the writers of charters.

Ken Bour: And the writers of charters, right, the draft - whoever the drafters are even if they're an ad hoc group.

Avri Doria: So anybody in the community that wants to understand why a charter says what it says.

Ken Bour: Okay, I think I've got that.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay good. So 2.5 and 2.6 will just get merged together and become one. Then 2.7, again like I was kitchen sink this thing, does - do ICANN working groups, do their charters need to say anything about budgets or finances or dollars or expenditures or anything like that?

Avri Doria: I think only if we're giving them a budget. But by and large I think that's a, GNSO management problem if we get that far.

Ken Bour: Do you ever give working groups budgets?

Avri Doria: Not that I've ever thought of...if I've ever done it.

(Cheryl): You've got IRT experience recently everywhere. There was expenditure mandated in terms of support from extraordinary budget expenditures abroad.

Avri Doria: That's true.

Ken Bour: Well what I could do here is to draft something simple that says, you know, to the extent that the chartering organization is, wants to, needs to give allocations of funds to the working group, this is where it would go.

Avri Doria: All right. And then just - this one would definitely be one that was marked as optional.

Ken Bour: Yes, absolutely. Right. Okay, all right, then I...

(Cheryl): You know, as required, use only as needed.

Ken Bour: Yes. Use as - yes, I'll add that. Use that as required, right.

Okay, I think I've got that. Formation staffing and organization, here we go.
3.1 membership criteria.

All right, so my note at - yes again, just adding what I was thinking in my head at the time is, you know, might there be in a particular working group case, so back to the people who are doing the chartering and the drafting, are there times when there are specific types of skill sets or particular types of membership in the working group that - where you might specify that kind of thing?

(Cheryl): I think yes. And they can be in a number of ways. They can be minimum requirements or absolutely balanced where you've got something where you need for example, a supply and demand balanced outcome, you might need to specify a balance in the working group makeup where supply and demand is numerically balanced where you've got, for example security and stability issues that need to be considered on something or intellectual property issues that need to be considered on something, then clearly it's a whole lot smarter if you have a subset of your working group with those particular technical expertise. But they don't need to necessarily be on a ratio basis.

Ken Bour: So why don't I take a stab at writing something general? Again, (I'm not) being prescriptive. We're just saying when you write a charter, you should have a membership section. And to the extent that you need something particular other than just hey, we don't really care, whoever wants to join and work on this can.

But if there is any set of specific expertise criteria or skills, balancing or membership that needs to be on this working group, this is where you would say it.

(Cheryl): Yes. For example, I mean I've had experiences where we had codes in the telco industry here in Australia being written for consumer codes without any consumer input.

Interestingly enough we got back to (Anova). And then we had to fight for our 50/50 relationship because what we had was, you know, huge law firms retained by, you know, major telco companies coming in literally against a retired volunteer. So we needed to structure those working groups very deliberately to make equity or representation and put in independent chair people and drafters, professional drafters.

So it sort of fits the purpose again.

Ken Bour: Yes I think so. It - what this section could end up turning out to be is really just a set of thoughtful questions all right. There are things that the drafters might consider when they're in this working on the membership criteria.

Avri Doria: There's one other thing that probably needs to be added in this is a boilerplate statement almost.

Ken Bour: Almost, yes.

Avri Doria: And that is that the - it is open to anyone in the ICANN community without defining that one. But you might want to add who has not otherwise been eliminated from prior working groups for cause.

Ken Bour: I'm typing.

Avri Doria: I don't know how you would say that.

Ken Bour: I think the way you said it isn't bad.

Avri Doria: But you probably want to put that in, you know. And that doesn't mean that those people can never get into a working group again. It just means that they're not automatically in.

Ken Bour: Yes. Okay. I have enough on that I think to get us a paragraph or two that will help on 3.1. Everybody okay on that, 3.2?

What I - what was - you submitted (unintelligible) dependencies. Okay, I didn't really add any thoughts to that, happy to take 3.2 out if we don't think we need it.

Avri Doria: Yes, the other - the only thing that was mentioned there is dependency. If there are -- and this could be an optional thing -- if there are several working groups working on similar problem, then it, you know...

(Cheryl): It's (unintelligible) here.

Avri Doria: It might be noted but, you know, and that was the comment that came in after mine...

(Cheryl): I think if it needs to be noted with the advisory that time course, milestones, et cetera therefore can be validly adjusted. You know, if you've got a major co-dependent activity that has been held up for very good reasons, then it is utter madness to force completion on the allied ones.

Ken Bour: Yes. And again, it may just be that it would - maybe 3.1 can have Section A, Section B and we can talk about - instead of making a whole section out of dependencies...

(Cheryl): Yes.

Ken Bour: It's a membership formation issue. I take it dissolution...

Avri Doria: Well that we need to come up with probably a standard. I think the latest that I'm looking at the GNSO is that every working group needs to have its charter reviewed, you know. And I'm not sure what the periodicity is.

Some people try to say six months. And I think that's what we've put in some places. I tend to think, you know, we barely have time to blink in six months. So I think it's yearly.

But there may be all, you know, as with all charters, they need to be reviewed on a yearly basis or some basis.

So...

(Cheryl): Maybe they need to establish a basis for review as part of their charter.

Ken Bour: Yes, do the working groups instantiate that review or does the council manage that process and ask the group? I mean that might be in a council rules procedure versus in...

Avri Doria: That really should be council. But it should be noted that the working group better be ready for it.

(Cheryl): Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay.

(Cheryl): Yes.

Ken Bour: That might be a rules - I wonder if that goes down under rules of engagement somewhere.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: And perhaps one would even want to suggest that on a yearly basis, you know, they need to give a - I don't know.

(Cheryl): But I mean not all working groups go on forever. I mean some, you know...

Avri Doria: They tend to unless you stop them.

(Cheryl): Well that's where I'm sort of getting to. You need to stop some of them, particularly if you're having a fairly large number of them working and you're going to be recycling the same suspects through a number of them. You get volunteered death if not dilution of energy.

You know, they need to be reviewed for purpose or change your name date or even rechartering if need be. I think period - from time to time I can't speak. It's 3:00 am.

But the thing I wanted just to make when you mentioned, you know, the difference between the council and the working group making these decisions and the working group clearly needs to be aware that the review is going to go on, something that was really I think very worthwhile even in a code development perspective in the domain name industry code of practice that we did now some 6-1/2 years ago here in Australia is it (fix) by the ADA board for a periodic review?

But up until other than one occasion, the periodic review says everything's fine and we don't need to convene another working group.

But the one time when there was exploitation and we needed to tighten up for a consumer protection perspective we said and now we're convening a working group and we're trying to fix this.

So it is important to have it even if it's just a sort of a pro forma activity from the chartering organization. It just stays on their agenda and it doesn't slip through.

Ken Bour: What I will do is I will essentially rework 3.1 and the title of it to be broader so that it isn't just about membership but also membership group form. You know, I'll try to incorporate all that together.

And I will include some statement in there that we can look at later. And then we can work on the wordsmithing on it. But it gets the idea that there needs to be this sort of semi-annual or annual review or some cycle of review that the working group...

(Cheryl): And I think the advertising predictables so people know what's going on.

Ken Bour: Yes, and again we will predict, we won't say what it is for any particular working group, but we will say it could be something like semi-annual or annual - whatever the chartering organization determined and that they would put that in that section.

Okay good. I just call to your attention that it's 1 o'clock and I don't know if you guys can continue. I'm - I feel like this is very, very productive. I don't know if you can - if we can go on for a little while longer or what.

(Cheryl): Yes, yes. I've got a (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: I'm sorry Avri you...

Avri Doria: I'm fine for a while. I'd like to add a point on that one.

Ken Bour: All right.

(Cheryl): Yes.

Avri Doria: And that's that there's another termination point that should be understood is that once all the deliverables are delivered and decisions have been made relating to those deliverables...

(Cheryl): You're out of there.

Avri Doria: Right. You blank out of existence unless you've been rechartered.

(Cheryl): Yes. Oh yes.

Avri Doria: And you don't just have a working group that is now in search of a job.

Ken Bour: Do you think, is there or should there be any formal you are now dechartered, thank you for your work, we appreciate it, dah, dah, dah, dah, dah or is it, the way you just said that, it sounds like it's a de facto occurrence that's not marked in any way?

Avri Doria: Yes, it probably should be. And I think it's...

(Cheryl): It's a very rare situation when that's not the case - very rare. So if you make it the norm and then you can have an exception for when you need something to continue because a watching brief is required or there's ongoing developments or there's new dependencies coming up, that they should be the exception to the rule.

Avri Doria: Yes. And the GNSO council has several times in various places made decisions that sort of said ceasing to exist is a default condition.

(Cheryl): Yes.

Avri Doria: And so now they don't cease to exist as soon as they've made their recommendation because obviously they have to be processed and you want them to stick around in case there's questions or issues.

(Cheryl): Yes.

Avri Doria: But once, you know, and I'm not quite sure exactly how you phrase this in a general manner, but once the work is done, you know, the work is done.

Ken Bour: Yes. I think I captured in my notes what the discussion was. Again, I'll throw something in there and then you guys can say well that's not quite what we had in mind, we'll fix it later. But I got the thought down. Okay good.

Now I want to go to Section 3.3, self-selection guidelines. I can tell you where this came from. We might have already discussed it. I think we did discuss it already.

There was something in either the BGC report or somewhere that said people just can nominate themselves to work on a working group and they don't really need to be in a constituency or this, that and the other - that's all that was really meant there.

(Cheryl): And it comes, you know, open to the ICANN community further up the pile.

Ken Bour: Yes. So this way I'm just going to make a note. This is covered in 3.1.

Pardon me, I just messed up. That's weird. Okay, 3.4, team representation, constitution and roles.

Avri Doria: I tend to believe that the top of a charter should be name of chair or chairs, you know, and name of liaison or liaisons that those two are required parts of any - it can be interim chairs obviously but that there need to be chairs and the whole liaison mechanism which I think is the critical link between the chartering organization and the working group.

And, you know, but...

(Cheryl): Beyond that, yes.

Avri Doria: And certainly the role of a liaison needs to be understood in council and in the working groups by a liaison. So maybe having a sentence that describes the role of liaisons and the role of chairs not a bad thing.

(Cheryl): Are you going to define the difference between an independent chair and just a chair?

Avri Doria: The chair should be - you know, the behavior of a chair?

(Cheryl): Yes.

Avri Doria: Yes, I think all chairs should be...

(Cheryl): Oh look, I'd like to live in Utopia too Avri, but I don't.

Avri Doria: Well yes. And I think though that we've - and this is something within the GNSO and I don't know how it translates. One of the notions that we've been working with is that we accepted every chair, you know, obviously comes to the job with some opinion. And the preface that we've made is that a chair can state his or her opinion but not argue for it.

And it sort of becomes, you know, if you put it on the table, the chair can put their thing on the table but...

(Cheryl): A chairmanship was something like the GNSO has clear leadership and responsibilities that are slightly more onerous and long term than a working group chair.

You're going to have the need to develop a plethora and in-service train and support a plethora of working group chairs. And they need some pretty concise guidelines on what is and is not okay.

Avri Doria: Yes, but does that need to be in the charter?

Ken Bour: Well let me say it this way. What we might want to do is to put it in the guidelines...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Ken Bour: ...so that it's thought about as to whether it belongs in a charter.

(Cheryl): It's actually more of the selection criteria for who either the interim or for chair and vice chairs of such a working group is.

Ken Bour: So I think the question we're trying to struggle with is what recommendations are we making to a potential chartering organization about the team constitution and roles that they should have.

(Cheryl): Yes. I mean the charter needs to name them. Somewhere else we need to define how they should be chosen.

Avri Doria: Yes. By the way (Ken), I was just wondering, have you actually read -- you probably have - IATS charters and the -- I forget what RSP is the current one now -- on the rules and regulations for a working group?

Ken Bour: I did some background reading just based on Internet research looking for material like that. And I think I do remember reading but it's been a while.

Avri Doria: Because some of that type of discussion might be useful (tomorrow).

(Cheryl): Yes.

Avri Doria: I'm just thinking in terms of saving effort.

(Cheryl): Yes.

Avri Doria: And I know that's not the perfect model for everything. So I'm not - I'm certainly not suggesting, you know, lifting wholesale. But some of the stuff they mention in there may be useful.

Ken Bour: Okay, so I'll check IETF.

Avri Doria: Yes, and I can send you the RFP number when I look.

Ken Bour: Okay super.

(Cheryl): 1601? Isn't it 1601?

Avri Doria: I have to say I don't remember numbers.

Ken Bour: All right.

Avri Doria: That's why I went into...

Ken Bour: So we agree...

(Cheryl): Right now I've stated I'm doubting myself. It's all right.

Ken Bour: The three of us agree that this section even if we rename it, certainly I don't think representation works, but team constitution and roles. And so the working group has to have some minimum structure to it. And certain rules we think belong in every working group like chair and vice-chair whether they have a secretary or not.

If we could mention these different rules and they can chose to put them in their charter or not - right. But the point is the guidelines would ask drafters to consider these kinds of items.

Similarly you might want to go even so far in writing the charter to say that the chair's duties and roles are as follows, or something like this.

So we'll throw enough material in here that would give the drafters good suggestions and best practices around what chairs and vice chairs and other roles - liaison's other one that got mentioned. And I noted that. We want to specify that - right?

(Cheryl): Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay good. So I think I've got enough material there and (Aubrey) I will appreciate that reference. And I'll drag some stuff in that seems appropriate.

We'll have plenty of times to fix it, wordsmith it and correct it later.

Avri Doria: I think though one of the things we just need to be aware of is that not in ICANN, not in any organization unless we're going to - and even we try to hire them they're still going to come with baggage that you never have someone that's completely neutral. Therefore we have to give them a guideline on how to behave neutrally.

(Cheryl): Yes.

Ken Bour: Right.

Avri Doria: And I'm an incredibly opinionated person, yet I think I've learned to behave neutrally sometimes.

Ken Bour: Well I've certainly noticed that in your work on the drafting team. You've been very - very fair-handed in terms of working your way through all those issues.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And yet if you notice me in some other areas when I'm not constrained, I am truly an opinionated person.

Ken Bour: Okay, good. So how about 3.5 now let's see - okay, yes again I don't where I picked this up from. The question is do people chartering working groups ever have to worry about - and you know what maybe we did capture this in 3.1.

In the sense in which I create any structure (around) what the membership of the working group should be, I will have dealt with any worries about capturing and things of that type - right?

(Cheryl): Because in there also I mean sure the guys you'll be recommending that a declaration form of interest is standard.

Ken Bour: Any other thoughts there? Did we lose Avri?

Avri Doria: No, no, you didn't.

Ken Bour: What I was just - was thinking is that there doesn't need to be a section 3.5 like that - so. Maybe I can throw a single sentence into 3.1.

So as the charter drafting people are thinking about this thing they are going to create, you know, one of the things to think about is any worries around security or capture and that kind of stuff in the formation or in the construct of the membership. And that's enough to be said, right? As long as it gets thought of we're not trying to be prescriptive. Is that fair?

Avri Doria: Yes.

(Cheryl): Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay good. Number 3.6, okay, yes.

Avri Doria: I didn't understand it.

Ken Bour: Right.

Avri Doria: What are we talk about it...

Ken Bour: And this is an example of what I was talking about earlier - right. So here - the reason that the title got shifted to implementation and charter drafting guidelines is because I had in my mind that you'd be talking to a group - a chartering organization, right?

And you might be saying to them you know, what naming structure do you want to put in place and other conventions or protocols around how you talk about this thing you're creating -- this working group.

And it's a bit of a subtle point and it may not need to be - it may not need to exist.

Avri Doria: Yes, I have - I guess this is a personal (shiner) I've got. I have noticed that what we call things is sometimes some of the most controversial subjects. And trying to come up with a convention for naming is...

Ken Bour: Yes. And that's not - and that's not what I had in mind. All I was thinking of is should we create in the guidelines anything that talks about - not to create a structure for it, but that says when you build the working group you know, you'll need to give a name. And if you have any specific conventions around that, you'll need to consider those. And I think that's probably...

Avri Doria: Yes, I can't imagine - I mean I can't imagine our names and things like you know, Enter Registrar Transfer Part A. You know...

Ken Bour: Mm-hm.

Avri Doria: ...and it's really there contextually is you know, it's the context you know. And then we end up with abbreviations like (PEDNAR). You know, for post expiry deletion things.

So, I just think that names are almost organic at this point you know, they just happen.

Ken Bour: Yes. Okay...

((Crosstalk))

(Cheryl): You know can all get fit down to a set of letters like (THICK).

Avri Doria: Oh I love (THICK). I think (THICK) is one of my favorites. I love talking about the (THICK) decisions. It's a great joy.

Ken Bour: Okay 3.7 let me just ask this question, when the chartering organization is going to create a working group is - are there announcements and publication questions and issues and things that need to be thought through?

Avri Doria: I think...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...that's something that's been handled by the secretariat. And I think as long as we have a structure that has the notion of a secretariat, it basically - you know, whatever I can process there happens to be at that moment.

And of course it's something that changes over time as ICANN grows and evolves, that these are the ways things are announced.

(Cheryl): So that - to me Avri that means (that) a little boiler plate piece here again you know. In this section relevance should be made to whatever (unintelligible) in ICANN.

Avri Doria: If it needs to be there at all, but yes.

Ken Bour: Well actually what I'm thinking in my head right now is that, the things that you have tagged Meta issues. I'm now getting a - an aha moment. Because

what we've done is - what I've done here is I've blended two concepts that don't logically connect very well.

One is if you follow through these sections, this outline, every one we've been through so far actually would be a section in a real charter for a real working group, right?

Avri Doria: Except, for Section 1. Except for your...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: Yes, okay, yes, exactly. And what I'm actually thinking about now is, maybe this guidelines document should have Section 1 and Section 2.

Section 1 would contain any and all meta issues. Background, naming issues, whatever we might agree on, or the things that would guide the implementation about working groups, but are not in the - would not end up in the charter document.

And Section 2 would be all those sections and outlines that actually would be map-for-map except those that don't apply would actually end up in a charter.

Avri Doria: So in other words a template. Yes, that would probably - that would probably deal with my issue...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: ...of this doesn't belong in a charter, but it's fine to discuss it somewhere.

Ken Bour: Yes. That's - that was an aha moment for me - okay. So yes, every time we identify a Meta issue, I'm going to be looking to slide it up to a whole different section. That'll be nothing but Meta issues.

Avri Doria: Exactly - yes.

Ken Bour: Okay, cool. We're making progress.

Declarations of interest...

(Cheryl): Essential, need to be updated.

Ken Bour: All right, so this belongs in the charter. And...

Avri Doria: Yes, the charter should have a statement...

Ken Bour: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...probably a boiler plate statement.

Ken Bour: And therefore the guidelines should do it as well, right?

Avri Doria: Right.

Ken Bour: And this might be something I can grab too from IETF.

Avri Doria: And there is one - well, no actually IETF has no statements of interest.

Ken Bour: Oh, all right. Okay.

Avri Doria: Because in the IETF everyone participates. The section is everyone participates as an individual. There is no constituencies, there is no - it's a group of individuals. So that's different.

Ken Bour: And do we want to - I remembered we just talked about earlier on this call that (Glen) - there has been some attempts to (not only) standardize, but to create some - a boiler for...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: ...you think the guidelines should contain that material around what should go in these declarations?

Avri Doria: That's not a bad idea.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Avri Doria: Right. And also the point that has been made and it can be made in both the boiler plate and in the (stuff) is that there needs to be one on file, you can write a general one so you don't have to do one for every - for everything you participate in.

And that was an important bit of differentiation that we made in the - I think the PPSC talked about it at some point. Or maybe it was just the working group work team...

(Cheryl): Yes.

Avri Doria: ...target on where we talked about something, but.

Ken Bour: Okay.

(Cheryl): Yes, Avri, for example I've now taken to just having you know, a space about me. And that's what gets updated. And anything I'm declaring just references that.

As we move into unified communications in collaborated work spaces, you know, different seeds will also be going into that space, saying you know, what areas of interest I'm focusing on and other stuff.

So you actually get richer information if we just ensure that effective and updated and current information is held rather than what you put in on the 23rd of January 2004.

Avri Doria: Mm-hm.

Ken Bour: Okay. I tried to capture that - those characteristics.

(Cheryl): Now one thing that we do in a couple of our not for profit boards that I'm involved in. Is we have a placeholder and a agenda at the beginning of each meeting which is a declaration of interest.

And that's the opportunity when most people say nothing for everyone at that table to say there has been a change in what is posted originally.

Avri Doria: We have that in the GNSO every council meeting.

(Cheryl): Fantastic. Yes, I really like that type of thing.

It's just a reminder for you to go, "Oh yes, that's right. I've just got that new contract haven't I?"

Ken Bour: Okay. Okay to move to 3.9?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Ken Bour: Now constituency statements. Yes, again kitchen sink item for me. I wasn't really sure so our declarations of interest by the working group members all that's needed. Because - right, we even the BGC report sort of even talked in the working group model, there is a de-emphasis on constituency's right?

Avri Doria: I think what's important to mention and this would be in your top section. Is that in their working in their setting of milestones and deliverables, they must into account community review. Be that constituencies our full community.

(Cheryl): Yes.

Avri Doria: So I think it's important to say somewhere that you have to take that into account. But I again I don't see it as part of a charter. I think when you're talking about creating milestones, be sure your milestone include time for review.

Ken Bour: Okay. It's okay.

Avri Doria: And then for PDPs for those working groups that are PDP constrained, those particular reviews are defined in bylaw. So you may just want to say if you know...

(Cheryl): Yes.

Avri Doria: ...if a working group is a PDP working group, well then you know, the bylaws define you know, the review requirements. Pay attention to those when you're setting them out.

Ken Bour: All right. So but again, all of that - all of those comments really belong up in the milestones area of the charter - of the guidelines?

Avri Doria: I think so.

Ken Bour: Yes.

Avri Doria: That milestone...

(Cheryl): I agree.

Avri Doria: ...that a working group has to have reviewed. And where that becomes tangible for a working group charter is in the definition of milestones.

Otherwise we have a boiler plate statement everywhere that says, "And remember to check with the community."

Ken Bour: Yes, okay. But there are no - the working group doesn't need to - there isn't anything called a constituency sort of statement like a declaration or anything like that that's needs to be part of this guideline structure.

Avri Doria: I don't think so. That's the SOIs of the individual participating. Because working groups are at the individual participant level.

Ken Bour: Yes, okay. We're good.

3.10 Chair a Facilitator - here we go. Now I had forgotten that there were - and where am I, we're in Section - formation staffing and organization. Okay, so, we talked earlier about what expectations the chair facilitators would need.

And let's see, (unintelligible)...

Avri Doria: I mean as the - I think again this is one of your top section things. I think talking about chairs I think value guidelines. You know certainly can be good.

No one should chair a group that hasn't ever been member of a group. You know, if it's going to be an intense work group think about having co-chairs to share work or, vice chairs whatever model appeals, you know, some questions on behaving neutrally even though it legitimate to state your opinion -- things like that.

Ken Bour: Well if guidelines about chair behavior don't appear in a specific working group charter, where would a chair read them?

Avri Doria: I think in - well, the document that has them in its top section. I think that's fine.

Ken Bour: Well it's - but I'm thinking now I'm going to put myself in the position. I have just been asked to be the chair of XYZ working group.

(Cheryl): Yes.

Ken Bour: I don't know the first thing about any guidelines that anybody has written for anything - right. I've been pulled out either as a consultant or a contract whatever - or.

I mean I can, and I am now going to chair a working group. And somebody says here is your charter. And I go oh great, got to have a charter. And then I start reading in there and says oh no, as the chair you have certain obligations. And these - by your chartering organizations you have certain obligations and they are as follow: you must be neutral, dah, dah, dah.

That's where I would learn about them - right because I wouldn't know anything about a guideline book as a chair.

Avri Doria: Well.

Ken Bour: Unless somebody said okay, there is first - the first two things you have to do as a chair is - you have - here is your charter. And oh, by the way there is a drafting guidelines document that has some material in it about how chairs should behave. And you need to read Section 1 of that.

That would be the other way to do it.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Ken Bour: But I'm just thinking, it might not be a bad idea if there is a boiler plate that people could introduce and put into the charter that would guide the chairs then it's all in one place.

Avri Doria: Okay, just a couple of things. One is I think that if somebody - and this is again, that's why it's another comment. I think that if the council or any chartering organization put somebody in to chair a group. Who has never chaired before within the organization, there is a real problem.

(Cheryl): Oh yes.

Avri Doria: So that's one of the reasons why in the Meta section I think you know, you need to have rules you don't pick a chair who hasn't been a member of a working group before.

Ken Bour: Yes. You know what I know I got it. I think this sort of material actually belongs in two places doesn't it really. There are Meta issues around chair selection, chair expertise and so forth that are - that doesn't belong.

And then there are probably specific behavioral expectations that do belong in the (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: And what's happening is there are not being separated here.

Avri Doria: And I don't know if they actually belong in the charter. I think you may be describing as much as I hate to say this, yet another document...

(Cheryl): (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: ...that is guidelines for chairs.

(Cheryl): Yes.

Avri Doria: Which is generic almost you know, ICANN (Y) document.

(Cheryl): The chairs handles. Yes.

Avri Doria: And you know, hey it's more contact time. What are you complaining about?

(Cheryl): We could be interviewed Avri.

Avri Doria: So, yes.

Ken Bour: Do I have to send you guys commission?

Avri Doria: You know, because it's a generic statement about how one behaves when chairing.

Ken Bour: That's an interesting observation. Now, let me just ask you this. What if we took this approach, in the material in the charter that we talk about, about roles - right, which we actually covered earlier...

(Cheryl): Mm-hm.

Ken Bour: ...we say very little but just the bare minimum around what the role - what these roles are and how they've behaved. Like - because we want to write a liaison handbook too - right. Or, a vice chairs handbook.

Presumably there might be even other roles that get identified. I see the distinction that you're making there. What if we try - I'll try to just put the bare minimum essentials into the roles section and not try to write a chaired handbook.

Avri Doria: I'm fine with that.

Ken Bour: Yes, and again going back to sort of brevity is best. And then if down the road if chairs think that they need a separate handbook, well that's another task - right. That's something that they can come out of one of the - out of the committees. Better not be our committee.

Okay, I'm cool. And I think you're right, 3.10 as written expectations for expertise skilled and threat. That is a Meta issue, and that does belong in the other section.

Okay, I can take a shot at that. How about 3.11?

Avri Doria: I think it's similar.

(Cheryl): Yes.

Ken Bour: Council administrative (unintelligible) selection. Okay, so what - again I think that's exactly similar - right.

So what we have is we've got a Meta issue around the liaison. But the charter itself would say very little about what the liaison's role actually is.

Woman: Mm-hm.

Ken Bour: So I'm going to move - I'm going to move this up to Meta issue also - Meta section, and won't say a lot about it.

Yes I think this is going to make a lot more sense architecturally when we get finished with it.

Avri Doria: All right, yes. It was so presumptuous as to even give a template of what I thought a charter would look like.

Ken Bour: Yes, at the bottom - right. Yes, you do.

Avri Doria: I forgot I had done that.

Ken Bour: I left it in there because I didn't want to lose it. Okay, expert advisors and consultants same sort of thing.

Avri Doria: Yes. And I do - to answer your question, if we do bring in an outsider to chair something, I sincerely hope that whoever gives them - also gives them the handbook when they give them the charter.

Ken Bour: Yes.

(Cheryl): Oh yes.

Ken Bour: Yes.

Avri Doria: I mean it would be insane not to. And anyone that you picked as a chair, if they didn't go looking for it, I wonder about.

Ken Bour: Mm-hm, right, right, right. Okay, now we're into Rules of Engagement. If there is a better title, I'm happy to pick it up. The idea simply was...

(Cheryl): No, no, I actually like the (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Okay. Okay yes, so the question - the concept - my comment here - yes, does this belong? And my thinking was that too the extinct that the charter drafters - the charter organizations sponsor or whoever, has any specifications this would be where they would put them. Not requiring that they do, they might say all you need is a mission deliverable and off you go.

But if - so the question might be for example - and we've had this discussion around what the meaning of consensus is. If the charter had to do with PDP or something that was really - it was really important that the working group follow a specific set of decision making guidelines, this would be where I'd put them.

Avri Doria: Okay, I can see that as far as an optional section when required either by PDP bylaws or chartering group.

Ken Bour: Yes.

(Cheryl): And to be honest under normal circumstances it's sort of the first order of business for the working group itself to establish.

Ken Bour: Yes that's - yes exactly. So the idea was only in those cases where the chartering (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: ...we're not leaving these decisions to you.

((Crosstalk))

(Cheryl): ...clearly not a default.

Ken Bour: Right.

((Crosstalk))

(Cheryl): ...an exception.

Ken Bour: Okay then 4.1 says would deal with decision-making methodologies. And I'm not sure there is a lot that we need to say is other than if there are decision making methodologies that the chartering organization wants to specify, put them in this section.

Avri Doria: Right. Now this is you know, and see I'm not sure how far - and this is almost a PPSC question is basically making a decision that you know, all working groups function on rough consensus unless specified otherwise or all working groups function on, you know, full consensus unless specified otherwise. Whether that kind of statement A, needs to be in a charter, and B needs to be made, it probably needs to be made. I am just not sure to what extent it needs to be in the charter.

(Cheryl): Yes I agree Avri. I really think again this is one of those it comes from the instigating body or it's sits as a first order of business for the working group itself.

Avri Doria: Right.

Ken Bour: Yes, the way I would right it essential that way (Cheryl) just exactly that say you know, under normal circumstances you now, the working group would make its own rules about decision making methodologies unless - however if the charting organization needs it to be a specific way, then you would say so here. And then we would - it would not go through a default situation.

Avri Doria: But you know one of the things that I think we need to define somewhere and are in the process of getting defined and processed. Is sort of what kind of content shows up out of a working group.

And that no matter what decision process you've made the reports coming out have to show that you know, all points of view were dealt with et cetera.

Ken Bour: Yes. I think we're going to cover that in a minute.

Avri Doria: Yes.

(Cheryl): (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Yes I don't happened to be looking. I've walked away from my computer and don't happen to be looking at...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: Yes it's a couple sections down. And I think we're going to - all right, so are we okay on this one?

Woman: Sure.

Ken Bour: I mean we think it belongs in the guideline. It's going to be an optional only when we required. And if it's there it's there, if it's not then the working group makes its own decisions.

Woman: Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay. The next one was council versus working group responsibilities. So to the extent that the chartering organization wants to specify different levels of accountability or something. I want say exactly what I had in mind, what did I have in mind here? Probably not worth fussing over this one.

The charter is going to tell the working group what its responsibilities are.
And...

Woman: Absolutely.

Ken Bour: Yes, I can't - I don't really - yes, I've lost that. I'm going to delete that one.

(Cheryl): Excellent move (Ken). Excellent (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Okay. 4.3, okay Status Reporting. You're going to help me here as to - so in the rules of engagement, one of the things that the chartering organization wants to say is we want reports this frequently and with this kind of content.

And we're not saying what that should be, just that this is where you do that kind of thing.

(Cheryl): And from whom?

Avri Doria: Right. And that's where I was saying basically that is I see one of the liaisons role is to you know, be available - to be able to give a monthly status or a - essentially monthly status update.

And we may want to add the thing we talked about earlier of you know, the working group itself giving a you know, formal status report. You know, every six months.

Or, three weeks before every you know, ICANN Meeting.

(Cheryl): Yes.

Avri Doria: Or - actually I kind of like that one. I mean I won't expect anybody telling me I have to report three weeks before. But working groups should, they should report three weeks before any ICANN meeting.

Ken Bour: Okay, I've captured that, I've captured that. I think that's working.

Avri Doria: Yes, and if it's put into the charter that you know, part of accepting a working group is you know, that - you know, liaison, monthly, and the group, you know, chair's report as it were.

(Cheryl): Yes and the chair's report doesn't need to be in the same you know,
(unintelligible) it can be you know...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes, the chair's report is probably - I know, from my prospective as GNSO
Chair, you know, I asked for one to be given to the - the council at each of the
face-to-face meetings.

Ken Bour: Okay. All right, I'll take a shot at getting some content in there again, a
paragraph or two at the most. And then we'll have something we can work
on.

4.4 Problem Issue Escalation and Resolution Process.

Avri Doria: Right. And that's something that we've got extensively in the current one. So
there has to be a whole appeals mechanism.

Ken Bour: All right so when you say the current one, you're talking about the...

Avri Doria: Yes, the basic...

Ken Bour: The one we use that actually we work - the working teams charters were
done from it, right?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Avri Doria: Basically that and I think that needs to be a standard thing that is pointed to -
unless there is an exceptional basis. But I think that has to be pretty much the
same for everyone would be my view that we need to have a well known and
practiced (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Well there is two thoughts that's occurred to me. One is, the charter will specify what escalation and issues resolutions processes. The chartering organization wants them to exercise.

Then I'm asking the separate question is, is it a Meta issue that goes up somewhere else that generally guides sponsoring organization around resolution processes or should we just leave it here in - as a charter item and not a Meta issue? Am I making that - was that clear?

Woman: Well I'm confused.

Ken Bour: Yes, so we're trying to separate out the things that we actually want to write in the charter.

Avri Doria: Right.

Ken Bour: And things that we want sponsoring organizations to generally consider as they implement working groups, specific or generally.

Avri Doria: Yes. And in this one I'm saying that I think that certainly for GNSO and so that's what we're currently writing this for that there should be a reference to a standard of escalation processes that can either be included by reference or by...

Ken Bour: By boiler plate.

Avri Doria: ...or by boiler plate you know. And that's - but that they really need to be the same.

Ken Bour: Yes, I like that.

Avri Doria: For all groups.

Ken Bour: That works, I got it. That's great. Yes, so what - once we - we can for now - we'll keep - we'll put the boiler plate right in here in 4.4. And so we'll have it to look at and it'll be right here.

We could decide that you know, this ought just be a standalone document with a link. And then all that goes into the charter is the reference to it.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Ken Bour: Yes, so that the charters end up not being hammered by...

(Cheryl): Yes I like (green) charters.

Ken Bour: Yes, yes, yes. So that's cool.

Oh well look at this. I can't believe it, but this is the last one.

Avri Doria: That was or we have one more?

Ken Bour: We have one more.

Avri Doria: Oh, okay.

Ken Bour: 4.5 Closure and Post Deliberation Analysis and Self-Assessment.

So and I don't - again I don't know whether or not this is something that working groups should be - or frequently asked to do, or that there is an actual engagement step here or not.

Avri Doria: Yes...

Ken Bour: The way I wrote it is, if the sponsors want a working group to provide feedback in the prescribed manner, the charter would so indicate in this section.

If they don't, they just simply ignore it.

Avri Doria: Yes I mean...

(Cheryl): Yes, I'm happy with that.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Avri Doria: I think it's always good to have these you know, postpartum reviews. Or, post mortem reviews.

(Cheryl): Yes I like, has more than the proposed item certainly.

Avri Doria: Well it really depends on whether you produce something that's living or produce something that's dead.

Ken Bour: Right.

Okay I didn't have any other content sections that occurred to me. And I was trying to be exhaustive as I could think of, in terms of what could go in.

You know Avri I just for whatever reason I did not pick up in this copy paste your...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: ...Let's just - yes, let's just see if we can - let's just quickly run down yours.

Avri Doria: Basically what I have is...

Ken Bour: The name of the group we got, chair, liaison.

(Cheryl): Name, chairs, liaison, advisors, URLs of workers...

((Crosstalk))

(Cheryl): ...wire repository, details of descriptions of tasks, details of definition of scope, deliverables, the date, (non-deliverable), milestones, the date, (unintelligible) working group history dates, first chartered and original delivery date listed, renewal dates listed, and dates (of) negotiated changes listed.

Ken Bour: Actually there are a few items in there that I think will fit that weren't specifically mentioned. And I'm going to go ahead and I'm going to copy this and paste it in my document also.

I'm going to see if I can accommodate those items where they belong. I think our document outline incorporates places for...

((Crosstalk))

(Cheryl): I think...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Oh yes, I don't think that was necessarily adding stuff. I was just trying to get away from our conversation and just sort of list an outline.

Ken Bour: You just put your own brainstorm on it - right.

Okay...

(Cheryl): Anything that has less than seven subpoints always makes me happy.

Avri Doria: This has more than seven.

(Cheryl): No, I like list.

Avri Doria: Okay, then we have to get rid of some stuff.

(Cheryl): I don't - I don't - they can be (subbed), but you know, seven is pretty much is not just the - I'm spending way too much time in certain areas. But yes, seven is handled by the human brain really well.

Ken Bour: Yes, I've heard that before, yes.

(Cheryl): Eight gets to be challenge.

Ken Bour: Okay this has been great guys I really got a great - set of - I think I can - I want to get busy working on it. I'm energized.

((Crosstalk))

(Cheryl): ...we've inspired - Avri, we've inspired him.

Ken Bour: You've inspired me to get - yes to get moving. I was really worried before the call that, I don't how we're going to reconcile these comments and all this stuff.

It seemed like a morass to me. But, boy we really went through it nicely and it's all making good sense to me. I hope I can do justice to it in the next draft.

Woman: Perfect.

Ken Bour: Now I'm going to - what I'm inclined to do is to put up a document that is a draft of the charter guideline.

(Cheryl): The draft - hmm.

Ken Bour: Without all these comments. I mean I'm taking all that stuff out now - right. We're moving to the next phase.

Avri Doria: What I'd recommend doing, what I've always done on the wiki is, I just create an old page and I just cut and paste everything from this to the old page. So the history is still there.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Avri Doria: If anybody ever wants to go back to it. But it's in a separate subordinate wiki page that's got history.

Ken Bour: Done.

Avri Doria: And then I just cut and paste as I go along. I just keep taking out the old (crust).

Ken Bour: Okay.

Avri Doria: And leaving the new one.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: Well we're okay with starting with a - without destroying anything that was there, we're okay with starting with a brand new fresh document.

(Cheryl): Absolutely.

Avri Doria: As long as there is a pointer to the old, I think we're fine.

(Ken Bauer): Okay, yes there will be a pointer to the old, yes.

(Cheryl): We all need to go and look at Google Wave when we have spare time.

Ken Bour: Yes, I wrote that down and Google Translate.

Avri Doria: As I said I'm enough of a geek that anytime somebody points me at a new toy, I'm ready to use it immediately.

Ken Bour: Well somebody pointed...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: ...go ahead - somebody pointed a new one at me, and I haven't looked at it yet. But it's called Jive - J-I-V-E.

(Cheryl): Okay.

Ken Bour: Actually Mark Salvatera just told me about this yesterday. Let me - I got the site for you. It's www.JiveSoftware.com. And I haven't looked at it, but he said this might be - because the policy staff has been looking for a collaboration tool.

We will look at Wave also, but he said oh, you want to look at Jive.

(Cheryl): Well, I'm looking at Jive now, so I'll get back to you. But...

Ken Bour: Okay. That's all I wanted to do is pass it along. Like I said, I have it up on my screen, but I haven't looked at it yet. It's on my list to do when the call came up.

(Cheryl): Just the fact that Wave is designed by the guys who came up with the idea of Google Maps (unintelligible)- yes, impresses me to begin with. But the fact that it's totally open source and they've said here you are developers, go play in our sandpit and make your APIs and it will be interoperable, and it will be interactive, and it will be updatable, and it won't (proprietary) gets back to my old open source call, I'm very pleased about.

Avri Doria: And that matters a lot in the volunteer organization because I can't use like Adobe stuff.

(Cheryl): Yes, that's right.

Avri Doria: Because I can't afford Adobe stuff. I mean I (get me) a client when we have a meeting. But I can't use it.

(Cheryl): Yes. And...

Avri Doria: And anything I'd have to pay for as a volunteer I can't use.

(Cheryl): Yes. And this is why I'm really excited about what the boys and girls have released with Wave because it's very much a matter of - you can go and make an independent (unintelligible) and it will interoperate.

Avri Doria: Because I'd probably work with that (unintelligible) too.

(Cheryl): So you know, that's just sort of hits right to my core values. So, I'm not often excited, but I'm excited about this.

Ken Bour: Good.

Avri Doria: I've already sold my soul to Google, so it doesn't matter.

Ken Bour: Well listen.

Avri Doria: I use a Google Phone. I use a G1 Phone.

(Cheryl): Oh fantastic, great.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: Well thank you guys very much. This was great.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: And I'll send a little note around to the - the larger working group team just indicating we've had this session and what we accomplished and that I've taken our little duty here on behalf of the team.

Woman: Mm-hm.

Ken Bour: I think that (Liz) will be happy with that, and we will actually have made some nice progress.

(Cheryl): Okay. Can I just react on Jive? Anything that starts talking to me about social business revolutions and manifestos immediately has me concerned.

Ken Bour: I'm not selling it (Cheryl). I just pass it along.

Woman: (Unintelligible) make you want to stand up and salute and sing the (international).

Ken Bour: There is a lot of marketing stuff that goes into these things that is - leaves me cold also.

(Cheryl): Oh (unintelligible). Bye.

Ken Bour: All right guys, thanks.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Ken Bour: Okay, bye-bye.

Avri Doria: Bye-bye. Bye (Cheryl).

END