

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC)  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Monday 24 November 2008 20:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee meeting on Monday 24 November 2008, at 20:00 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-pp-sc-20081124.mp3>

On page:

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

Participants present

Jeff Neuman - (Registry constituency) elected chair  
J. Scott Evans - (IPC) – alternate chair  
Avri Doria - NCA - GNSO Council chair  
Mike Rodenbaugh - (CBUC)  
Konstantinos Komaitis - (NCUC)  
Alan Greenberg - (ALAC)

Alternates

Chuck Gomes (Registry constituency)  
Zahid Jamil - (CBUC)  
Tom Keller - (Registrar constituency)  
Ute Decker - (IPC)  
Olga Cavalli - NCA

Absent apologies

Tim Ruiz - Registrar c.

Absent

Catherine Sigmar (Registry constituency)

Staff:

Liz Gasster  
Marika Konings  
Glen de Saint Géry

Coordinator: All right, today's call is being recorded. Thank you very much. You may begin.

Avri: Okay thank you. Okay I reworked the agenda a little bit after various conversations and also as I mentioned to (Liz) earlier, I cheated.

I looked at the OSC minutes as I've been wanting to do several times and said oh, they did that. Maybe we should do that.

So I put it in the agenda and we can talk through it. The agenda is showing on the Wiki page under agenda. So I have first do the chair, and then at that point I ask any nominees volunteers.

We did have one nominee which was (Jeff) or who was (Jeff). And none others and several people have spoke up at advantage. But we'll come back to that in a second.

The only problem as I said to (Jeff) in a personal mail that while I could support his nomination, I wasn't sure I could support him not chairing this meeting once he got picked.

Then one of the, then I have two other things that were covered by the OSC that I stuck in which is role of alternates. And regular meeting times just talk about this two.

I had put a walk through the Wiki space, which after getting mail from Konstantinos I sort of explained what I meant. Which basically means stopping at the various proposed structures and teams and what other.

And just sort of talking about those. And getting our heads around those. Then decide what to do next. And then I itemized a few things under it.

One of them is still open to us. It's the review of the charter because while the charter was put forward by the counsel, if this group reads it and reviews it and says wait a second. There's something missing.

There's something wrong. There's something whatever, then we can take it back to the counsel to try and get it fixed.

Then there's review slash create charters for the work teams. They're there. We're not obligated to use them. It seems like it might be a good idea. But we should definitely review their charters and, you know, before going on with them.

Then as (Alan) suggested, really figure out what needs to be done immediately before the June transition and what things may be longer-range activities.

And I'm not sure where that line comes. Is there anything I put in there that I shouldn't have? Is there something missing? Is this fine to go with?

(Alan): It sounds fine to me. It's (Alan). But I still can't get to the Wiki. So if there's anyone that could send me a URL, maybe that would work.

Avri: Okay and of course...

(Alan): It's not in my dashboard or in the GNSO working page.

Avri: Okay and then of course at the end should be any other business. But then those aren't complete without any other business. So if there's no issue with that, we can move on.

Okay the next item we had was to choose a chair. We have one nominee. We are in the process of doing anything by consensus because (unintelligible) people probably remember from the planning

team is everything is done by incumbent consensus in one of these groups unless we decide otherwise before doing something.

So unless we decide this is going to be problematic, we want to vote. So at this point I'm assuming that we're working on a consensus basis on picking a chair.

We have one nominee. We have no other volunteers. There was a note from the volunteer saying he was willing. Open it up. Is there anyone that wants to discuss this?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes, Mike Rodenbaugh.

Avri: Yes (Mike).

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well I guess I'd like to, I know of one other volunteer possibly. But I guess I'd just like to hear first of all what the role of the chair is. And maybe I'd like to hear that from (Jeff), what he envisions the role of the chair in this group?

Jeff Neuman: Sure. Okay well I envision the role of the chair as just being a facilitator. I do not view the role of chair to lead any, well I should take that back.

In the sense of, the role of the chair is to facilitate discussions and make sure things are captured, to work with staff. To make sure all ideas are brought to the table and discussed.

The role of the chair is not to impose my own will on the group or my own biases if I have any on the group. It's really again just as a facilitator.

And yes I'm here from the registry constituency. But I am able to separate that out, the registry constituency ideas from those of the group.

And I've been a chair of - I was chair of the registry constituency for a number of years. And as chair your role again is to make sure all ideas are represented, are documented regardless of whether you share them or not.

So I don't know if you have any more specific questions?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Well I guess how are we envisioning this group as going to work? I mean is it going to be all by consensus or is it going to be similar to what we've done in the fast flux and in the IDN group where we went with support, consensus support, or alternative views? You know, how are we envisioning all of that?

Jeff Neuman: Well I wasn't a member of the fast flux or IDN. But I think Avri kind of stated from the outside that you start with trying to achieve a consensus approach.

And but I do think that, you know, if that's not always going to be possible that you do move towards that model of again documenting it. And I'm not sure, it's all what the group wants to do.

Whether we want to use the same number scales or the same scales that have been used for those other prior groups. That's really a group decision.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

Avri: If I can add two things. One of the things is that the most onerous of the chair duties you left out which is coming up with an agenda, a draft agenda first. That's always one of the least favorite things, oh my God, it hasn't been done yet. I just wanted to make sure you had that in your list.

The other thing is the way the planning team was specifically and the way the counsel approved the creation of these is we are supposed to work on vote consensus unless we at some point have come up with full consensus for another method.

And that was specifically written into the design of these committees by the planning team. And I believe approved by the counsel so that we're on full consensus until there's full consensus to do something else.

So obviously if we see something problematic looming down the road, we need to come up with a method of a then full consensus for it before we get mired in it would be my thought.

Anyone else want to discuss the role of chair further at this point? So are there any other nominees at this point that we would need to distinguish between and come to full consensus on?

J. Scott: This is J. Scott. The only thing that I would say is I would think we're probably going to need a vice-chair. Because if the chair is supposed to be a facilitator, you ca - if we're going to keep things moving we need to have someone that can step in the role automatically as the chair should the chair find that they can't meet on a regular, you know, they have to miss a meeting or something like that.

Avri: The OSC to borrow from our leaders in this opted for an alternate chair.

J. Scott: Well that's fine. Just so you can see what I'm saying. Just somebody that if an emergency (sic) comes up and the chair is live, that the meeting can go on.

Avri: Yes.

J. Scott: Well I'd like to, I mean I would propose it even stronger than that. And actually, you know, it's just the chair, they essentially agree together on the agenda. And that sort of thing.

And we, I'm just concerned and (Jeff), you know, I mean you and I know each other personally. You're usually pretty reasonable. But, you know, you are from the registry constituency.

And there's just, you know, as we're drafting a new PDP here I think there's just some concern from other constituencies that, you know, we would like a neutral chair really for all of this.

And I know you would try to do that. But I also know you've been working for registries for 10 years. So it's hard.

Jeff Neuman: No I appreciate those thoughts and I would certainly welcome someone from the user side of the house I guess to assist me. And J. Scott, since it was you're idea, how would you like to work together again?

J. Scott: Well I mean, you know, I - that's fine. And I don't have a problem with doing that. My whole point is, you know, I find and I think everyone who is on this call knows that at ICANN what can happen is if somebody like (Jeff) gets an emergency, we can all bog.

The work can just hit and bog down and become just a cluster of dominos at the end of a tunnel. And the best thing for us is if we get it designed. And if (Je) - if one of the things we're trying to achieve also is balance, I have no problem doing that because I am a representative from the user side of the house.

But I'm more interested that we just keep moving forward. And, but I'll be glad to do it (Jeff) because you and I work together fairly well and we've known each other for a long time.

And so I don't think we'll have a problem at all working together.

Avri: Are we talking about chair and alternate chair and vice or co-chair?

Konstantinos: This is Konstantinos from NCUC. And basically I would suggest you talk about chairs and vice-chairs instead of co-chairs. I find that it would be very confusing and it would - it might even make the whole process much more difficult.

J. Scott: That I think nomenclature is, you know, for whatever you all want to do. I just want, you know, (Jeff) I'm here to help.

Jeff Neuman: I appreciate it and I will certainly take you up on that and welcome that. And as (Jay) said, we've worked together for a long time now. And you didn't add, and I hope we have a deep respect for each other as well...

J. Scott: I think so, very much so. I didn't mean to, you know.

Avri: Okay so if what I'm hearing, and if we follow the lead of OSC, what I'm hearing is a notion of (Jeff) as chair, with J. Scott as an alternate chair.

J. Scott: That's fine.

Avri: And is there anymore discussion on that? Is there any disagreement to that? Or can I say we have consensus on Jeff Neuman and chair with J. Scott as alternate chair?

Hearing that and hearing that there is now an alternate chair as well as a chair, so that means I definitely don't have to be the chair for this meeting.

I therefore turn over this meeting to the chair and or alternate chair.  
Thank you very much.

Jeff Neuman: Okay well thank you Avri. And I'll start and if my kids start screaming then I might have to rely on my alternate chair to take over. But so far I think I've managed to make sure that they're sleeping.

So the next item is role of alternates. And I have not been on the other committee page. But I've heard (Chuck) talk about this a couple times.

And, you know, a couple of the groups, not every group if I'm looking at the list, has a primary and an alternate. But for those that do, and I'm assuming everybody's welcome to have an alternative if they're not currently listed there.

But the way that other working groups have worked is that anyone, or both of them, the alternate and the - or the primary and the alternate can participate in the calls.

And only when it comes to a, and I don't like to use this word vote, but in order to achieve consensus you kind of have to get a sense of everyone's thoughts. That only the primary would be allowed to vote.

Now also the role of the alternate was to, you know, there was some discussion of whether the primary and alternate were all allowed on every call.

And I'd like to hear everyone's view on that. My view is that if you don't allow both of them on every call, you're not going to have the continuity that you need if the alternate does need to step up where the primary can't be there.

But do people have thoughts on that?

J. Scott: This is J. Scott. I think that, you know, as much participation as you can get as long as it's not bogging down the process should be encouraged.

Avri: Yes this is Avri. I tend to agree also. And I think in terms of the consensus poll, staying away from the word vote. I think generally it should be the primary if both are in attendance.

But if only the alternate is there, I think the alternate, I mean the relationship between the alternate and the primary should be such that if only the alternate is there, the alternate can participate in the consensus call.

But if they're both there, then obviously it's the primary.

Jeff Neuman: Anyone else have thoughts on that? And I like Avri's term consensus call. I like that much better than vote. So if I do use the word vote, I'm going to try to make it consensus call from now on.

And the other item is that there should be, at least if we do everything right, there should be no surprises as to when a consensus call is coming up. So that, you know, it's not really too many items on a call where we ask for those types of calls. Does anybody else have any thoughts on that?

Okay so (Glen) is this - and (Liz), is this the - and Avri, this is a current list that's up on the Wiki so that the BC has one rep and the IPC has one rep at this point?

(Liz): Well I actually noticed, this is (Liz), that (Glen) you had a couple of additional names that I hadn't captured on the Wiki. Is (Syede) the alternate for the BC (Mike)?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I don't know that actually.

(Liz): I saw your name and then also for IPC I saw (Glen) you had Ute's name. But I didn't have that down. So not sure if maybe they were additions. Those were the two discrepancies I wasn't quite sure of.

J. Scott: This is J. Scott. I'll clarify if Ute's going to serve as a full-time alternate. She did attend the kick off meeting only because I wasn't able to attend (KIRO).

And we wanted to have a representative there. But if she's willing to serve as an alternate, I will clarify that with (Liz) and (Glen).

(Liz): Great.

J. Scott: Okay I'm going to make a note for myself right now.

Man: I'll do the same for the BC.

Konstantinos: I will do the same for the NCUC.

Jeff Neuman: Okay and hopefully we'll get at least one from the ISP. If (Glen), if you could sent out a note to the ISP constituency.

(Glen): The IFPCP or whatever.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. And I know we'll talk about this as another item because it came up, it's on the agenda for whether this working group would handle, you know, combine the two topics into one group.

But, you know, at some point this list right now only has the constituency members and the nominating committee appointee. But it does not have anybody else from the community on this list.

But certainly I would think, and we'll get thoughts on this. But, you know, we want to encourage as much participation from the community as well.

And actually I'm looking at the Wiki too. And (Alan)'s name is - okay, (Alan)'s name is on here. We don't have someone listed from the (GAK) yet.

(Liz): I just added (Alan) while we were talking before.

Jeff Neuman: Oh okay. So my - I was about to say it wasn't on here. So you tricked me.

(Liz): I'm sorry.

Jeff Neuman: I thought I missed something.

(Liz): I'm trying to be efficient. I was hoping (Alan) wouldn't notice.

Jeff Neuman: So then do we, I guess we should send another notice out to the (GAK) and ask if they would like to have someone on here, or remind them. Did we ever send a formal invitation?

Avri: I don't know if we sent anything. This is Avri. I don't know if we sent anything formal. We certainly did notify them. By in large, they have

trouble assigning liaisons. And it always ends up the same person who is unable to do a lot of them.

But it's worth trying. There's certainly no requirement that they have one. But it's certainly a good idea I think to invite them again.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Man: Given that we're defining the new PDP process, or probably will be, it might be worth highlighting that as a reason for at least having an observer in the meeting.

Avri: Yes that would sound good.

(Liz): So (Jeff) do you want to send that note? Would you like staff to do that however?

Jeff Neuman: (Liz) why don't I work on that note with you off line.

(Liz): Great.

Jeff Neuman: And we'll send that out.

(Liz): Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so I think that takes care of all the different groups, at least as according to the Wiki. Is there anyone else I've left off or - that we should be talking about? And (Liz) you're the primary policy staff rep?

(Liz): Right. We've been sharing a lot of work assignments. I will try not to let that be confusing. I am the primary person. But, you know, we have been working closely as a group.

And I also asked (Marika) to sit in on just kind of listening and contributing to this one distinctly because she's really doing, with me, most of our policy development work at the moment.

So just bringing the actual, you know, real time expertise in terms of staff support for working groups and PDPs to have that available to you as well.

But yes, I'm the primary.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Woman: (Jeff) just so you know, I just put a check beside your name for also being enacted on the Wiki.

Jeff Neuman: Oh thank you.

Woman: You're welcome.

Jeff Neuman: I'll have to get a tutorial on that. In fact I noticed that on the survey that was released on the constituencies, that training for pair of working groups is on there. So I'd like to take advantage of that.

(Liz): Jeff just on the staffing, you know, as you see staffing needs arise feel free to, you know, come to me and we can work on that.

Jeff Neuman: I will. I will certainly do that. Thank you (Liz). Okay, I think the next item then is regular meeting time.

So I want to ask everybody about this, let's first talk about this time of day. Does this time of day generally work for the people that are on the call? Is it good, bad? Do you need it earlier? Do you need it later?

(Alan): How often are we planning to meet?

Jeff Neuman: That's another very good question.

(Alan): Because I have conflicts at this time on some weeks.

J. Scott: Yes I can tell you that this time, Pacific Time, like Tuesday is a conflict. But I can change it if I have too.

Jeff Neuman: But you said on Tuesdays?

J. Scott: On Tuesdays.

Jeff Neuman: Okay today is mon - how about Mondays?

J. Scott: Monday's at noon Pacific Time I'm fine.

Jeff Neuman: And I was talking specifically about Mondays.

J. Scott: But I can change mine if I have too.

Jeff Neuman: Okay and that was I'm sorry, was that (Alan) before...

(Alan): It was (Alan) yes, sorry.

Jeff Neuman: How about everybody else on the call, how about the time of day in general?

Konstantinos: Hi, I'm fine. This is Konstantinos. I am fine with this time.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. How about anyone from Europe, it's kind of - it's a little later there.

Avri: When I'm in Europe I love this time.

Konstantinos: Hi, I'm in Europe as well and it's okay.

Jeff Neuman: Okay and do we have anyone from Asia on this call or in this group? Okay well I think so we have a time of day. And now the question is which day.

And (Alan) you said there were conflicts. Was that another ICANN group?

(Alan): I have two different ICANN groups that meet at this time on some Mondays.

Jeff Neuman: On some Mondays. So they, are they regular like every other week or?

(Alan): I believe one is the last Monday of the month. And I think the other one is, I'm not sure, but I think the second to last Monday of the month.

Jeff Neuman: Oh so they're monthly calls.

(Alan): Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. J. Scott said Tuesdays are not generally...

J. Scott: But I can change that. Don't let me stand in the way. I can change that.

Jeff Neuman: Well let's see, so there's always Wednesday's right?

J. Scott: Wednesday are, I think I have nothing scheduled on Wednesdays typically.

Jeff Neuman: Okay how is everybody else on Wednesdays at this time? And I don't mean every Wednesday necessarily but in general.

Man: Yes, it's good for me.

Jeff Neuman: Okay anyone on the call is it not good for?

Woman: I can probably handle it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay so why don't we plan Wednesday at 2000, how do you say it? UTC time and then the question is and I think when we discuss how much we have to do in such a short period of time, we'll decide whether it's weekly or every two weeks or on whatever basis people think is appropriate.

Is there anyone that's got any thoughts on that? I mean, I personally think there is a lot to go through. I think we could start with every other

week but as we get closer towards, you know, in January and February that we might need to make it more often.

Man: I agree.

Woman: I think that depends on how much is being done in the work team. If the work teams are the ones that are meeting and doing most of the work, then every two weeks as a checkpoint or whatever is fine. If this group itself is doing the work, then you may find you need.

Man: Yeah that's a good point. It goes back to the charter of the group to a discussion that I think we'll have in a few minutes. So why don't we, at this point, just tentatively agree every other week so the next one would be if I'm looking at this correctly would be the 10th of December.

Woman: That's correct (unintelligible).

Man: Okay and then we may have to play with the one after that because that would be Christmas Eve so we'll have to discuss on the 10th whether to do one on the 24th or make it a different day just for that week.

Man: Yeah.

Man: But then we would skip over New Year's and go into the 7th so I think that would work. So we'll add that for the - as an item for the 10th to talk about the following meeting.

Man: Okay.

Man: Okay. Sorry I'm just taking notes as we talk as well. Okay walk through wiki space. So I'm going to ask, I don't know who would be the primary author of the wiki space, whether it was (Liz) or Avri but if you want to do a quick walk through on the wiki space, that would be great.

Woman: (Liz) I guess that's (unintelligible).

(Liz): Hang on let me just get there. So there's one primary page that currently states the overall purpose of the policy practice steering committee. Most of the documentation that's in here was excerpted from various other documents in this particular piece and the sections below it were copied from the (unintelligible) improvement implementation plan final that the planning team agree to and the council approved.

So the, you know, just outlines the purpose of the steering committee. The description of the steering committee which is having responsibility for reviewing the processes used within the (unintelligible) for developing policy and recommending changes and also looking at the working group process.

And looking at improving aspects of the working group process so the working method for the PPSC is defined there on the wiki. The membership in the PPSC as defined by the planning team, the current members that we have as well as the alternates today and we'll update those when we finalize those names.

The other participants that we have in the PPSC including the liaisons and the policy staff that I mentioned before. There is a section here for goals and milestones for the PPSC that would be determined by the

group and approved by the council. The decision-making for the PPSC which we discussed earlier is, you know, unless otherwise determined by the group to be made using a full consensus process.

There was the idea in the discussing the planning team that this steering committee consider creating two work teams. A team to focus on the PDP and a team to focus on working groups. I think that is for the group to discuss and decide but there were some rationale for that suggestion. Most particularly I think the amount of work and detail that might when you start to peel back what would be considered by each the volume of work associated with that. But definitely should be a discussion point for the group. And you can click on more detail there.

There is background on the PPSC. We did a extract of expectations and recommendations that the board approved related to enhancing the policy development process and the establishment of a working group model, an enhancement of the working group model. And the summary of board expectations and recommendations are provided there. There are all the references from the board governance committee working group report which is of course subsequently approved by the board on working groups and then on the PDP.

And then Avri put together slides for the kickoff meeting in Cairo, the useful external documents link has links to those slides to the (unintelligible) improvements implementation plan that again the planning committee approved on the 16th of October. It links to the other wiki pages including the meeting agendas. Pages that have been developed for the PDP work teams and for the working groups work team assuming that we go with that approach.

And then overall just a link to the overall policy process. It's described as standing committee here because that's technically the name of the link. But it is actually been renamed the steering committee so that might be slightly confusing.

And that's about it. There's links at the bottom to the wiki work space for improvements and then for the overall (unintelligible) wiki work space.

Man: Okay. Anybody have any questions for (Liz)? I know (Liz) you gave me admin privileges, is it - do people think it will be helpful to have a link to, you know, Avri has mentioned a couple times the other steering committee.

Would it be helpful to have a link to that just to see what they're working on? Maybe if there's timing things that we need to synchronize it might help to see the work that they're doing. Or do people think we should kind of be in a silo and do the work separate and apart from that?

(Liz): I think silos should be avoided. I think having a link, I think, as long as that site is set up which I expect it is that nonmembers can view but not edit, I think it should be easy to put one in. I expect that it's set up for world view.

Man: Okay.

(Liz): And but if that's set up (unintelligible).

Man: I think that would help. I know it would help me personally and I think it would help the others in the group.

(Liz): (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay. And then the other thing that I'll put a link up to or we can put a link up to is the current PDP bylaws.

Man: Yeah, excuse me, there is a link to the OSC wiki from the GNSO wiki page and it's open and readable to all.

Man: Okay so it would be kind of double-clicking through it. Yeah if we could just put a quick link.

Man: Yeah and I'm just thinking it works as it is so it should work from our page too.

(Liz): Just so you know that the way this one is set up, and I expect the OSC one is set up the same, it's marked as public read and comments only. So anybody can see the work space and they comment. There's that little, you know, add a comment to the bottom thing but only privately invited members can edit so everybody that's on this list can open up any of the pages and make edits. But those are the only people.

And what being an admin, having an admin bit (Chuck) for you means you can add and delete members or could change the configuration of the space if you really wanted to. But really anyone can edit that's in this group.

Man: Okay and then we'll be able to create sub, well I mean...

(Liz): Creating a new page is trivial.

Man: Yeah. And that other people will have access to so if we do have a PDP team and a working group team or even one combined team that involves other people from the community, they'll be able to edit that page but not this one?

(Liz): Depending on how we create it, yes.

Man: Okay.

(Liz): It could be created that way if they're created as separate work spaces then that can work. It's the access control list of this particular wiki method is not as flexible as I would like, but it works.

Man: Okay. Anybody else have any questions on the wiki? Okay well the sub item that's in here is a discussion of the proposed structure being the work teams. And I guess it's also kind of in the next agenda item full item which is to review/create charters for the work teams.

So I saw a note from (Tim Erweese) which I should continue a discussion that was in Cairo as to whether we need to form two working teams because it was kind of apparent from the people in Cairo that it seemed to be that it would be the same people that would be working on them.

On the two different teams. But I want to open it up and have a full discussion on this because I think it's an important item and, you know, we also need to keep in mind as someone on the list we need to make

sure we get volunteers and others from the community. Or whoever wants to participate to get them involved as well and not just limit it to constituencies.

Are there thoughts on that? Avri you were involved, do you want to go through the rationale as to the why there are two different work teams?

Avri: Yeah certainly. I mean, I think that probably I bear a certain amount of responsibility for the two of them being separate. And one of them is because I sort of see them in a almost a micro/macro just position to each other. The PDP is the whole process has to do with coming up with processes with timing, with how it goes through the various process from, you know, the moment as is fairly well known.

We have the issues report. We have the timings. We have the do we start a PDP? Do we not start a PDP? And then how do we go through an end gain where we go out for constituents comments? And we treat those comments, etc. so there's many many steps in that process, many senses of timing, many different decision points.

Now one of the basic elements is developing the recommendations themselves but is only one step. That is done within a working group. A working group will have all kinds of methods and procedures of it's own but it's a singular point in that larger process. So my view in terms of separating the two of them is yes they had to be coordinated and that's what this group would/could do. But that you're really looking at the problem at different scales and different scopes when you're looking at the full PDP process. From, you know, from beginning to sending it to the board versus how a working group works.

So that was my original view for suggesting them as separate and for, you know, working down that path in terms of the original recommendation.

Man: Okay. Thank you Avri. Is there - does anyone have - I want to open up general discussion on those. Does anyone have any thoughts on what Avri said? Think it makes sense?

(Allen): Well it's (Allen) here. I presumed the rationale was completely different but ending up in the same conclusion in that the two are really somewhat orthogonal, that is the PDP will make reference to work groups but doesn't really care how the working groups function. And there's no reason not to work in parallel.

Avri: Yeah that's kind of like what I said.

Man: You know, it's been a while since I've heard the word orthogonal used.

(Allen): It's one of my favorite words.

Man: I'm going to write that one down too.

(Allen): I use it even when it doesn't apply.

Man: There's that and tendential and they're - still get the two confused. Anyone else with thoughts on that? I mean, I think that makes sense. You know, even if we do have the same people though, I'd like to get encourage diversity, even if we have the same people it still makes sense to break down the work.

(Dave Scott): Well this is (Dave Scott). I think that it would be I mean we're going to have - there is just so much to do in such a compressed time frame, it only makes sense to divide them up and let them work in tandem. And keep each other updated on what's going on.

Also I don't think it necessarily has to be the same people. I mean out of this group, I think we should divide this group into the two working teams and then as our - as we recruit people on, you know, if they want to serve on both that's up to them. But I think this particular group, I mean I just don't think you'll be effective if you try to take on both. Something will lose - you'll get so bogged down.

Man: Moreover I think the skills needed for these two particular ones are actually quite different so it may well attract different people. I mean one...

((Crosstalk))

Man: One is heavily involved in the whole ICANN process. And the other is really how to work - small groups of people come up with usable output and really without a lot of concern for the ICANN process, for the ICANN structure itself. So that could quite work well together as two different groups.

Man: Okay anyone else have thoughts on that?

Man: Yes this is (unintelligible). My original (unintelligible) was that these two groups are very different so I agree with (Dave Scott) that basically we need to separate the people who are participating from this group and

the separate group and then whoever wants to join both. And by all means do that.

Man: If I could ask - Avri if I could ask you a question.

Avri: Of course any time.

Man: When you set up these - the work teams, you know, one of the goals is to not just involve constituency members so it's okay to divide us up. But how do we generally get other people involved? How does that work?

Avri: Well, you mean how do we do outreach?

Man: Yes.

Avri: I mean, part of it is just making sure that we let people know, putting out announcements in various places. Part of it is stretching out, you know, personally in terms of where we know. I know for example in working groups, there are various people that, you know, for example, I and others know that participate in working groups in other organizations. So it might be good to get to participant.

You know, I know various people in the GAC that I try to get to participate in independent capacity. Outreach becomes another one of our tasks in that we outreach to the constituencies and I think those are always in some sense, the primary outreach. You know, is outreaching within our own world or within, you know, your own world.

And then to do a certain amount of reasoned outreach to other participants. To, you know, people we know from the CT side, from the ASO side, or from GAC from (unintelligible) so. You know, and then perhaps, individually we may also reach a little further than ICANN when we think there's someone or some place appropriate. But I think we do that outreach.

Man: Okay. So we have two pages up on the wiki right now. One on each team. There's the PDP team and I keep jumping back and forth here, and then there is the working group team. So I guess these are the start of a basis of a charter for these groups. Although actually, you know, these are Avri you said these are the charter that if we have changes to this we need to run these by or...

Avri: No. Sorry. There is - the charter for the PPSC which is if we look at it and say wait a second, you know that doesn't quite work for us. The charters for the working teams themselves are purely suggestions.

Man: Okay.

Avri: That were put together sort of places to start the discussion. You know, the ones from working groups may include -- I haven't looked at it recently -- may include some of the stuff that we've been doing as we've experimented with working groups in the council lately.

Because we've put together a couple different working groups. Each one is a little different. Each time we're learning a little bit more. But those charters are really just, you know, starting places so that the planning team wouldn't be basically, you know, handing a blank slate

but sort of saying start with - I mean the group can start with a blank slate if it wishes. But these are just basically starter points.

Woman: And what they really comprise is an (unintelligible) nation of different input that was received at different times. Like there was recommendations in the report itself, the BTC working group report back in February. They are, you know, people get the annex. There's a appendix and it really - what we tried to do is just have almost an index. In some cases, staff did some notes about just, you know, ideas that could be considered.

In some cases, there were comments from the community in the public comment period that were, you know, we thought useful to capture to go back to so that when the group looks in more detail at, you know, what the specific new rules for PDP might be or the principles or the procedures, or each of the steps that they would have in easy reference to some comments and ideas that had already been thrown out.

But they're just, as Avri says, you know, if they're useful to the group for starting points that's great. You know, so be it.

Man: Okay yeah I'm just kind of looking through them now and a lot of them do seem like notes and things I think are very helpful to get us started on drafting these charters.

Avri: I just don't want to prejudice, you know, any creative ideas because they're just simply thoughts. And the timelines that are embedded in some of these appendices were drafted very early on and should just be ignored and I can edit them out.

(Liz): We were very optimistic when...

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yeah I'm looking at some of these notes from April and...

Avri: Yeah we were drinking some Kool-aid back then. We're much better now.

Man: So I think, and I want to hear everyone else but I think one of our first, you know, I don't know if it's too much to ask on whether we think we can have draft charter draft pages completed by, you know, the next meeting. And by completed, I mean just to set a guideline for these work teams.

Because it would seem to me that we need to get these two teams up and running as soon as possible. So December 10 would be our next meeting. Do we think we can, and again I'm throwing this out to the group, do we think we can come up with concrete charters for these groups in the next couple weeks?

Man: (Unintelligible). It might be a bit stretched but if you all agree, then by all means, let's set the 10th of December as a deadline. However, can I suggest something? We first move with the general PPSC policy to see whether we have suggest anything to the board and then we can work with a specific teams charter.

Man: So I'm sorry to suggest things to the council?

Man: Yes I mean if the general PPSC charter - if we think that there is anything that needs to be amended or proposed.

Man: Right. Okay. So we do an internal look at our own charter first. Make sure we're all comfortable with that. And then also then focus on the work teams' charters.

Man: I think that's what he was saying.

Man: Yes.

(Avri) One suggestion that I might have is that if we - you know, in terms of drafting these charters, if we've done the first cut ourselves at who wants to be part of which group, we can form drafting teams that would work on those charters based on our interest in participating in one or the other.

(Jeff): You beat me to the punch, but...

(Avri): Oh, so sorry.

(Jeff): Oh, no, no - good suggestion.

(Avri): I'll stop thinking (unintelligible).

(Jeff): No, no, no, that's - so - but I think Konstantinos brought up an excellent point as well that we all need to kind of go back, make sure we're all good with our current charter; see if we have any suggestions. So I'd like to set that out for December 10 as well is to submit any comments that we have on our own charter.

(Avri) when's the next GNSO Council call?

(Glen): It's 18th of December.

(Jeff): Eighteenth great. So if we came back by the 10th with proposed changes, could we add that to the agenda?

(Avri): Most definitely that would be in enough time for a motion - you know, a discussion and a motion. No problem.

(Jeff): Okay. So I think our first assignment is for everybody to go back and reread our charter...

J. Scott: Which I take it is this overall purpose, summary list? Or is that found in another document?

Konstantinos: No I think that's...

(Avri): I believe that's it from the - that was included in the plan that was approved overall by the Council. So I believe that's it.

J. Scott: Okay, so...

((Crosstalk))

...and you can go back to the implementation plan and look at it there as well.

(Avri): Yeah.

J. Scott: Okay. I've reviewed both. I just wanted to make sure...

(Avri): Yeah.

J. Scott: ...I'm not missing anything.

(Ari): Yeah, the formal one - if one of them is a formal reference it's the one that's in the plan that the...

J. Scott: (Unintelligible) cover...

((Crosstalk))

(Avri): ...Council voted on.

J. Scott: Okay.

(Jeff): Great.

J. Scott: I was just making sure I get my documents correct.

(Jeff): And (Liz) and I will go through and make sure that everything from that improvement implementation plan -- the final one -- is actually on this page.

J. Scott: Okay.

(Jeff): But I think (Liz) has got it all.

J. Scott: Okay. I think she does too, but I just wanted to make sure.

(Jeff): Yep. Okay, so...

Konstantinos: (Unintelligible) the following sections were copied from the GNSO Improvements and Limitation Plan Final, 16th October, 2008.

(Jeff): Right.

(Avri): Yep.

(Jeff): Okay, So that's the first assignment is then to make sure we're good - we're all good with this so that by the 10th we can come to a consensus. We'll have a consensus call on our own charter or if there is any changes. And please use email between now and then so we can make sure we have all the notes captured.

And then as (Avri) suggested, is to kind of gauge the interest of the people on this call and in this group -- for those that aren't on the call -- to see which side of the house everyone is interested in participating on a drafting team; whether it's the PDP drafting team or the working group drafting team. And if we have a good balance then that will be great. If not, we'll have to figure out another approach.

So why don't I go down the list, to put everyone on the spot. If you're not sure yet, you can say - or if it doesn't matter you can say it doesn't matter and I think that will also be helpful when we balance out.

I'm just going to go in order here. (Mike), you're first on the list.

(Mike): I'm not sure because I need to figure out who else in the BC is going to be participating, but my inclination is to work on the PDP group.

(Jeff): Okay. And then J. Scott, you'd be the next on the list.

J. Scott: It doesn't matter.

(Jeff): Okay. All right then we have ISPs is no one at this point, so Konstantinos?

Konstantinos: I'm not sure as well, but I'm inclined to go to the working group.

(Jeff): Okay. I'm the Registry; I will defer to see where the balance lies at this point, although I would prefer - if I have my preference it would probably be on the PDP one. But we'll wait to see where everything lies.

(Tim) we'll have to get on email. (Avri)?

(Avri): Definitely the working group. Besides that's sort of something I'm fairly passionate about.

(Jeff): Okay. If I've missed any of the alternates that might be on this call - I don't know, is (Olga) on this call?

Man: I don't think so.

Woman: No.

Woman: No, she's at the OSC call...

((Crosstalk))

(Jeff): Okay. And then we have (Avri) again for GNSO Council so we already know where you stand. (Alan)?

(Alan): I'll probably do the PDP and try to get someone else for the working group.

(Jeff): Okay. And we don't have anyone from the GAC. Did I miss anyone that's on this call?

(Avri): I definitely have an idea for someone I can try to recruit from the GAC for the working group one later.

(Jeff): It seems like we have a fairly decent balance if we have (Mike) and myself and (Alan) for PDP, and then we have (Avri), Konstantinos; working group, and J. Scott who is indifferent.

(Jay) do you want to choose one or the other or...

J. Scott: Who me?

(Jeff): Yeah.

J. Scott: No I'm fine. I'll stay with working group.

(Jeff): Okay.

J. Scott: (Avri)'s nice and Konstantinos sounds like he can handle me.

((Crosstalk))

He's got a (unintelligible) strong constitution; he should be just fine.

Konstantinos: Yes, I think we would be able to, you know - we'll be okay.

(Jeff): So I think we've got the makings of our - or at least the first initial people on the drafting teams. I think we also need to send a note to the other people on the list so we should send a full - a note to the full memberships of the PPSA and make sure where people stand. But it seems like at this point if it breaks down in the same fashion we should have our drafting teams fairly well balanced. So why don't we do that, okay.

So just to recap...

(Alan): I suspect there will be other people from both Council and the constituencies who will have an interest in either of those topics even though they're not on this group. So I think we're probably in good shape.

(Mike) If the idea is to just have balance from this group on those two groups, but for each of those two groups to be pretty broad, correct?

(Jeff): Correct. Well this is actually just a drafting team for the charter.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Sorry, I missed that.

(Jeff): Yeah, sorry.

J. Scott: Now (Jeff), to make sure I understood, I thought that (Avri)'s point, and you had endorsed, was that you would serve on the drafting committee for the team that you eventually wanted to serve on. Is that incorrect?

(Jeff): I mean I think that can be correct but doesn't need to be correct.

J. Scott: Okay.

(Jeff): I mean if it breaks down that way that's great. I think at this point I'm looking more towards the immediate of let's get these charters together...

J. Scott: Okay.

(Jeff): ...and if people want to stay in the group that they're on the drafting team, I think that's great. If they, you know, want to move off to the other one then we'll see where that falls.

J. Scott: Okay. All right, that sounds good.

(Jeff): Okay, so I'll confirm this by email, but I have for the PDP group, just again is (Mike), myself, and (Alan) so far. And for the working group I have J. Scott, Konstantinos, and (Avri). Great.

(Alan): Okay, and if we're talking at this point primarily about the charters I don't think, from my point of view any way, I don't think I will try to recruit someone else to work in the group for the charter.

(Jeff): Okay. We will need to recruit someone from the Registrar constituency, so (Tim) and which one else - ISP if they appoint someone. We'll try to get them in and hopefully it will balance out four and four and we'll be great.

(Alan): Okay.

(Jeff): So with that said, I don't want to intervene on how these drafting teams are going to work in the sense that it would be great if the - after I send the note if everyone - if the three or four of you on the drafting team could contact each other and figure out a good way forward to hopefully have your comments in by the 10th.

(Alan): Okay.

Man: Sure.

(Avri): (Unintelligible) it's convenient that each one of them has a chair or an alternate chair on it.

(Jeff): I knew you were going to say that so I will take responsibility for the PDP group drafting team, at least for getting (Mike) and (Alan) together and anyone - and if there's a fourth person.

J. Scott: Yeah, I think the first thing we need to do is we need to make an goal that we will wait until at least Friday of this week to see what (Tim) and the ISPs have to say. We shouldn't - these groups shouldn't meet until we hear back from those people or at least give them a deadline of Friday and then meet if they're going to meet after that time.

(Avri): I'm not big on the holidays, especially since we're about to fly to India. But given the holiday you might want to give them until Monday.

J. Scott: Okay. My whole point is I don't want us to come right out of the gate and then feel left out. I'd like to send out the invitation to say, you weren't there; what do you want to do, who's going to be - and then say, because we have a deadline by Monday when we're going to start setting up meetings.

(Jeff): Okay, I will send out that note and ask for a Monday end of day, whatever time zone they're in, to let us know. In the meantime I want everyone to just start thinking about, you know, looking at those pages on the Wiki...

J. Scott: Yeah.

(Jeff): ...and just, you know, they're a good starting point as (Liz) and (Avri) said. You could scrap those completely, you can use them as notes; you can do whatever you want as far as drafting those charters. But again, I'd like to set the December call as one to hopefully have the final...

J. Scott: And we also need to look at the main PFPF...

(Jeff): Correct.

J. Scott: ...charter as well, correct?

(Jeff): Right, that's the first work item is to look at our own charter, have some comments by the 10th. The second one is to work on the working group team -- sorry, that's the name of an actual team -- to work on the initial PPNC team charters.

J. Scott: Okay.

(Jeff): I think we're all going to get tripped up over the number of terms that are in here.

J. Scott: It's ICANN. That's one of the first things the (unintelligible) does is they say now how complicated can we make this with acronyms and duplicate names.

(Jeff): Which is really what takes people so long to actually learn; it's a learning curve for a lot of people. Maybe we can figure out how to shorten that learning curve.

(Avri): That's just because they're not comfortable referring it to the which if there's a what. I mean if you get comfortable with talking like that it's really quite easy.

J. Scott: That's right.

(Jeff): So in looking down the agenda, it looks like we've come to the what needs to be done immediately before June transition. And I think I asked the question during the Cairo meeting if we wanted to work backwards from the, whatever that transition date is in June.

Well we actually before that, we need to discuss and we need to look through everything to see what needs to be done immediately when we break up into two houses in June or what items could actually be left for later. But that might actually depend on a lot of the -- as I'm kind of talking myself through this -- might depend on a lot of the charters and things that we're...

J. Scott: Yeah...

(Jeff): ...going to be seeing in the next couple of weeks.

J. Scott: ...that's what I'm thinking too (Jeff). I think that that needs to be an agenda item for the 10th.

(Jeff): Okay.

Konstantinos: Yeah, I think it only makes sense.

(Alan): Well wouldn't the charters of the two groups break down what they have to do in the very short-term and what they have to do in the long-term?

J. Scott: We certainly could make that an action item for them (Alan).

(Jeff): There you go.

(Alan): I would think that would make sense.

J. Scott: Okay, let me make sure I get that down.

(Jeff): Yep me too.

(Alan): Now we may not have the definitive answer by the 10th, but there should be the two sections.

J. Scott: Okay.

(Jeff): So there was one thing that would be helpful is if you go backwards in the things that need to happen in order - for the transition, there are items that would need to go to obviously the Council to be voted on and things that would need to go to the Board...

J. Scott: That's correct.

(Jeff): ...I would assume. So we need to kind of work backwards to see, okay the Board needs X amount of notice and the Council needs to vote by a certain date. And if they need to vote by a certain date, when do they need the materials.

(Alan): Okay.

(Jeff): (Liz) and (Avri) does that sound like something you guys could help me with?

(Liz): Definitely.

(Avri): Of course.

(Jeff): Because I'm assuming that June transition date would probably then push a lot of things back into April.

(Avri): Although to a certain extent, while I think these things need to be in place by June, some of them going in to place sooner will be no problem. So we shouldn't necessarily - and for example I know with the working group stuff, I have (unintelligible) including every time we put together a motion for a working group, have been putting a little, what is a working group in the middle of its charter simply because we have nothing else.

So in terms of some of this transition, we're already in it. We're already doing working group and we're already really messing with the PDP process. And we're following, except for timing, kind of to the letter of the - rather to the spirit of the PDP.

(Jeff): Right.

(Avri): The sooner we get some of that stuff figured out the better, even if some of it's done before June.

(Jeff): Right, anything we certainly can do to improve those processes is...

(Avri): Because the only thing we can't do before June is things that is the threshold voting of the (unintelligible).

(Jeff): Right.

(Avri): But anything else in the process we can change any time we're ready, the Council approves, the Board approves.

(Alan): Except I don't think we want to have six different incremental changes in the PDP process.

(Avri): Yeah, but there may be things that we look at in this, you know, the group that's talking about it will probably come up, but we may look at some of the things that can be changed...

(Alan): Sure.

(Avri): ...in the bylaws before some other things.

(Alan): Right.

(Jeff): The other thing we need to build in to that timeline as well as all the various public commentaries that have to go on when we make these changes. In other words if you're going change or make recommendations to change the bylaws, which the PDP would be a change to the bylaws, there has to be public comments...

Konstantinos: (Unintelligible) to working days.

(Jeff): Well there's commentaries the Council has, but then there's comment periods that the Board will require, and I just think that's just something we need to work through.

(Liz): That's right, that's right. We do want to make sure that there's ample opportunity for the public to have input...

Konstantinos: All right.

(Liz): ...(unintelligible) steps in the process.

(Avri): By and large there's at least two before a GNSR decision on a recommendation and before a Board decision.

Konstantinos: Would we have a timeframe for that (Avri)? What's the timeframe?

(Liz): Well they tend to be 21 days comments periods, 20 days comment periods.

Konstantinos: Okay.

(Jeff): But then you also have to worry about the, you know, when does it hit the Board agenda and things like that. So...

Konstantinos: Mm-hm.

(Jeff): ...that...

(Avri): Well we need to do that work.

Man: Yeah.

(Jeff): ...that's why I was suggesting we could come up with the absolute minimal list that needs to be in place by June and then we don't have to worry about those deadlines nearly as much. We still want to factor them in and try to get everything done by June, but it's not hanging over our head if we can do the first pass first.

(Liz): So I think that would encourage probably - speak to once you have the charters drafted, wanting to convene the work teams as quickly as possible after that.

(Jeff): So I think that all makes sense. So I think what we'll do is - and (Liz) and I and (Avri) will work on for the main page, some general timelines to work backwards from the June date if we wanted to have something presented to the Board or go through the Council, get to the Board, you know, without any substance attached to it but just, you know, these are milestone dates.

That should help guide people on the drafting teams and later on, the work group teams -- sorry, the EPSC teams -- that will help them with their long - short-term and long-term goals.

Konstantinos: Yes.

(Jeff): Okay. Are there any other questions on timing and on the work teams?

(Glen): (Jeff) this is (Glen).

(Jeff): Yes.

(Glen): Would you like me to set up two mailing lists for you to work on the PDP and on the working group?

Konstantinos: If it is possible I think that's a good idea.

(Jeff): Yeah, I think that does - that makes sense. Yes, yes - thank you.

(Glen): Okay.

(Jeff): I was just trying to think of all the - everyone's got all these mailing lists and...

(Glen): Okay.

(Jeff): ...and if people could all - if you could also post to the members the link to the archives if they want to view them if they're not on that team.

(Glen): I'll do that definitely; I usually do.

(Jeff): And J. Scott do you want to be included on both of those mailing lists without contributing, just so you can...

J. Scott: Sure.

(Jeff): ...so we can cover for each other?

J. Scott: That's correct. It's best that we just are both (unintelligible) so we know what's going on.

(Jeff): Okay.

(Glen): Well shall I subscribe for the moment everybody to each list and then obviously you work out?

(Jeff): How does everybody feel about that, is that too confusing? You want to separate it out?

(Alan): I don't think there's any need for it unless someone - each individual if they want to that's fine.

(Jeff): Yeah, why don't we start out with it separate...

(Glen): Okay.

(Jeff): ...and if we feel like on the 10th it would help to have that cross-pollination we'll do that. Except - so if you could put (Mike), myself, (Alan), and J. Scott on the PDP one.

(Glen): Yes.

(Jeff): And then on the working group one it would be J. Scott, Konstantinos, (Avri), and myself.

(Glen): Yes.

(Jeff): And then we'll wait to hear back from (Tim), and if there's an ISP rep, which one they want to be on.

(Glen): Okay, fine (Jeff).

(Jeff): My guess in knowing (Tim) is he'll probably want to do the PDP one, but I could be wrong, but we'll find out.

(Glen): Okay.

(Jeff): Okay, anybody else have any questions and on the work teams? All right, I think that bring us - well the long range goals I think are we kind of discussed...

Man: Mm-hm.

(Jeff): ...incorporate in that, and then we have the last item which is, any other business?

(Liz): Yeah I've got one, I want to thank you two for taking this.

(Jeff): Thank you for the opportunity - thank everyone.

Man: Yes.

Man: I want to thank (Liz) for being here on her vacation.

(Liz): Oh, my pleasure.

(Jeff): Yes.

(Avri): Well actually that's you too (Jeff).

J. Scott: And me. I'm on vacation as well.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: We have some dedicated people.

(Jeff): We're dedicated or sick.

J. Scott: Yeah, I have family who thinks I'm crazy.

(Liz): All our families think we're crazy.

((Crosstalk))

(Jeff): Is there any other business before I ask the operator to - or do we have to formally ask them to stop recording or do we all just hang up?

(Avri): No, we just hang up.

(Jeff): We just hang up - okay.

J. Scott: Okay.

(Jeff): So the next formal meeting of our group is to review is the 10th, and by the 10th the first action item is to focus on our own charter, make recommendations to see if there's anything we'd like to see, to make recommendations to the Council for their meeting on the 18th, and then the two drafting teams will endeavor to complete their charter for the two teams by the 10th as well.

Konstantinos: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott: To all the Americans, Happy Thanksgiving.

(Jeff): Yes, thank you very much.

J. Scott: All right, bye.

(Jeff): Thank you everyone.

(Glen): Happy Thanksgiving.

((Crosstalk))

(Jeff): Bye, thank you.

END