

Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Policy Development Process (PDP) Operating Model
Sub-Team

TRANSCRIPTION

Thursday 30 April 2009 1500 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee Policy Development Process (PDP) Operating Model Sub-Team meeting on Thursday ,30 April 2009, at 15:00 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-model-20090430.mp3>

On page:

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

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

Present:

S. Subbiah - Individual
Tim Ruiz - Registrar c.
Caroline Greer - Registry c.
Konstantinos Komaitis - NCUC
Alexey Mykhaylov
Alexei Sozonov

Absent apologies:

Nacho Amadoz - Registry c.
Thomas Roessler

Staff:

Ken Bour
Liz Gasster
Glen de Saint Gery

(Subbiah): Okay. So thank you for attending today. There are several of us on this meeting here, this is the sake of the recording. And I was wondering whether the first item on the agenda will be to finalize the meeting notes that Ken put out at the end of the last meeting. Are there any changes? Anybody consider that final?

Man: It might not be out of the GNSO Policy Council...

(Subbiah): Okay. Going, going, one two three. Okay. Finalized Ken. Okay. All right. Now, next issue is, is there any other business beside what I had on the agenda? Anybody else want to discuss anything at the end of this call? Anybody else have any issues? Allocated for the call?

Okay. All right. So we can go forward. I guess, according to the agenda that I put out and what is expected of us in this meeting is to go through each of the four sections.

I guess I started calling them, you know, 4 (point something) and so on and so forth. And I guess (Tim) has also done the same nomenclature. So I guess - and I haven't checked myself (unintelligible) about to check right now. Has (Tim)'s one been posted on the Wiki Ken?

Ken Bour: Yes.

(Subbiah): Okay. So we have two of them posted right now?

Ken Bour: No, everything's posted.

(Subbiah): Everybody's in there. Because I'm not actually on right yet. Okay.

Ken Bour: Yes, yes.

(Subbiah): I'm about to get on it. Okay. So...

Ken Bour: The Wiki's completely up to date as - that I know.

(Subbiah): Okay. Okay. So can we start with the first section report then whoever's responsible for the first one on that list?

Ken Bour: This is Ken if I might jump in. I did - (Subbiah), thanks to your suggestion, I followed your model and used the sort of numbering system. If we go to the Wiki and start looking where it says tentative structure for operating model, you'll also note that I've added a whole new section 1.0 General, which was not in the outline before.

It's brand new. And I'll take responsibility for it or (Sal) will. But I just wanted to start - maybe I could start with that one and then we can go to...

(Subbiah): Yes, why don't you just do - why don't we just start with that (unintelligible)...

Ken Bour: Yes, when you numbered it 4, your Section 4 there were only - I thought well, you know, he makes a good point there probably should be a Section 1 and that should be like a general section. So I went ahead and created it.

(Subbiah): Okay.

Ken Bour: My first thought on it would be that maybe we'd start off with 1.1 background, citing various references, you know, from the BGC report and the, you know, all this, the background material that lead to the creation of the OSE and this working group team in particular.

Then maybe Section 1.2 would be the purpose of this operating model document. And I'm going to read this one just it's a draft and I recognize it's maybe a little clumsy.

But the concept we've had on the purpose of this would be to assist working groups, optimize productivity and effectiveness by providing a set of guidelines, checklists, templates and other best practice materials that they can consider and or utilize as appropriate in the process of formation and throughout the working group's evolution.

It's (konky) a little bit in places. But the - I just wanted to get that idea across that what we're trying to do here is to create a, a nice broad set of capabilities, tools, ideas, templates, checklists and things that working groups could immediately take advantage of and hopefully make them more productive faster in the process than they might otherwise have been.

And my reason for wanting to highlight that a little bit is that there has been continued confusion both on the other sub-team and this one as to it's like, what are these documents?

Are we writing guidelines for a particular working group or for all working groups in general? And so I just wanted to lay that out. I'm going to - I'd like to pause there and just see if there's any comments about that.

(Subbiah): Let me just say that I myself ran into this with Tom who's not here yet, Tom Roessler. And I took it upon in my section to think that what we were doing was basically coming up with the kind of questions students - I mean even down to, you know, what software do you use, what format do you use and stuff like that.

That a coming in Chair or a coming in committee as it's been convenient would look at it and say look I want to use this - people have thought it through for me already.

What are the things that I might probably need, you know. And I've looked through that and decide this is what I want to use, this is not what I want to use, good thing somebody mentioned this, I'll keep that in mind. I have something else I want to do besides what's on this list.

But that's just basically a cheat sheet list of things to do as opposed to sort of a short document, which is just formal procedures, you know, of what is expected in general of you. As opposed to on top of that a list of things you might want to consider really, you know, mundane things.

So, you know, what I had in mind is perhaps the better called guidelines in a way, guidebook as opposed to just formal - see I, you know, I assumed that was always required so I wanted the details regarding that.

Not meaning that each of these things are things that the Chair has to do or has to be restricted to. It's just a list for them to take a look at to decide whether this - or a thought out list from beforehand.

Now, you know, on the other side of the story it's just a short, it's just sort of a formal procedure document (unintelligible). You know, so I don't know. Does anybody got input into that? I mean which way we should go or - anyone?

Man: Silence.

(Subbiah): All right. I guess, what do you think Ken should we leave it the way you have it right now which is simply one-way - it's kind of both actually, right. That's what you're suggesting?

Ken Bour: Yes.

(Subbiah): It's kind of - it will include both the formal procedures that are part of the (unintelligible) directives of how you're supposed to think about these things. And...

Ken Bour: No, no, I would say it does not contain formal procedures.

(Subbiah): Okay, not at all?

Ken Bour: Not at all. No, that's not the...

(Subbiah): Just basically okay, nitty gritty operational things you might want to think about.

Ken Bour: Yes, these are - and I like - I mean maybe a good suggestion might be to call it Operating Model Guidebook.

(Subbiah): Okay.

Ken Bour: That might actually - that's a nice little term. So maybe you want to, we'll capture that in the - as a possible suggestion. Because that just seems like the way to go with this kind of a thing.

(Subbiah): Okay.

Ken Bour: It's impossible to know any particular working group's needs.

(Subbiah): Right.

Ken Bour: All we can do is make general suggestions that they ought to consider. Okay, now let me just continue. So the third section may be of this general area would be structure, meaning, you know, table of contents, what is actually included in this operating model.

And then I also thought based on some comment somebody else made that it might be nice to have some capability for this document to live and be dynamic.

As working groups meet and as they consider what's in the Operating Model Guidebook or whatever we call it, that there's a process or a set of procedures that they would use if they want to make enhancements or corrections, additions and so forth and so on to it.

And over time it could become quite a really useful model if it has that kind of continual enhancement to it. So that's the general section if - unless anybody can think of anything to add or subtract or change.

(Subbiah): Anyone? Okay, I actually like that last idea personally because I was just involved in a, you know, I guess my kindergarten level, grade level science project with my kids and they had these volcano blowup experiments every year and they get different parents to do it.

And it really helped because when I looked through every parent in previous years who's ever done it adds to that document. They say, you know, don't use 1/2 a teaspoon, use a full teaspoon.

The main instruction is wrong. That kind of stuff, tricks, things that little things that are - so maybe it's a good idea I guess is part of this to say at the end of a working group model the Chair or members of the committee are interested are formally required in some sense to fill out a page saying what was the update to this.

If they wanted to they could leave it blank after their view of the process. That seems like a nice idea to me. Okay. And anyway, okay. So I guess Section 1 we're kind of done with at least in our group here.

Just before we go to Section 2, I just want to say that perhaps (unintelligible) unless people have something else in mind, is that we go through all this now and if there are any thoughts that we have and we want to change some of this we do it now.

If not, people can go back - I know this was only put up in the last 24 hours, can go back in the next few days and suggest any changes before our full meeting with everybody else, right.

And so this won't be the last time to speak up and say you want to make changes, at least within our group, we'll still have occasion on the email list. And, you know, and then some things maybe Ken can adjust it.

And then when we have our full meeting I guess we'll all fully together, those sub-teams will still review all of this and maybe at that point as well there might some input from the other side and perhaps from our own side. I mean that's what I'm thinking in terms of (unintelligible).

So our (unintelligible) two roles and responsibilities. Anyone? Hello?
Anyone want to lead that, the person who was the team that was responsible for the roles and responsibilities. Would someone just walk us through the main key points? Hello?

Ken Bour: Is anybody on the call? I'm wondering if we lost everybody.

Man: No, I'm here.

Alexei Sozonov: I'm here.

Ken Bour: Alexei Sozonov, was that...

Alexei Sozonov: I'm here, I'm here that was just a weird sound.

Ken Bour: Okay, great.

(Subbiah): Okay. Ken did you have the list of who was assigned for what?

Ken Bour: Yes, Alexei Sozonov submitted the roles and responsibilities I believe.

(Subbiah): Okay. Alexei would you like to just work through, just talk through some of the main points, point one, two, three and four?

Alexei Sozonov: Yes. So actually this is definitely not all-possible issue that might be covered here. But what I have found and worked through so far is here. And the key issue here it looks like it is the accountability. So actually everything is in here. So it's better to read just the written English much better than my spoken English.

(Subbiah): Okay. I guess maybe then (unintelligible)...

Ken Bour: Why don't I go ahead and walk us through it real quick (unintelligible).

(Subbiah): Yes, walk us through that or just read along, I'm reading along now.

Ken Bour: Yes. Because I wanted to make a point on the very first item under roles and responsibilities.

(Subbiah): Okay.

Ken Bour: And that was on Section 2.1 which is called checklist for the working group Chair. As I made in my note there, after looking at this element afresh, I'm beginning to wonder if a checklist really belongs under roles and responsibilities. You know, it strikes me that maybe we could move a checklist or a template or something like that to an appendix level.

And it could contain a whole lot of different things that were picked up from all these sections and dropped into sort of, you know, it - I'm thinking of the checklist wouldn't just be about roles and responsibilities.

But, you know, it might also consider things like logistics and session. You know, have you done this, maybe it's a series of questions. Have you done this, have you looked into this, have you checked that? And maybe they'd be organized in topic outline. Does anybody have any thoughts about that?

Alexei Sozonov: That's a good idea.

(Subbiah): Personally, I think it's a good idea too.

Ken Bour: All right. So maybe what we can do here is maybe Section 2.1 should be re-titled Roles or Responsibilities and - well actually we have 2.3. Well, okay, we can come back to this.

(Subbiah): Yes.

Ken Bour: But what was submitted here was to use roles and responsibilities matrix, assign individuals to categories and so forth and so on. Then the goal is the roles and responsibilities, define them. I'm wondering if some of that material that was under 2.1 maybe belongs better under 2.3.

Alexei Sozonov: They are very much interconnected.

Ken Bour: Yes, they really are. Okay.

Alexei Sozonov: Yes.

Ken Bour: So all right, so what I'll do is I'll pick up 2.1, renumber that set of sections and create a new one at the bottom under 5.0, we'll call it 6.0 maybe and call it appendices or something and put the checklist down under there, how does that sound?

Alexei Sozonov: Good.

Ken Bour: All right. So the next section then is Formation, Assembly and Introductions. And there's a - it looks like under Formation Options,

goals, public versus private interest, stakeholders, declarations of interests.

And then under for Assembly Options Alexei really asked - I changed what you had done there. But I think what you were really asking is, is this an overlap with Section 4.1. Same thing with the introduction.

I guess we probably need to spend a few minutes of time thinking a little bit more about what we mean by formation, assembly and introduction. I could tell you what I had in mind at the time.

It was, you know, it may seem kind of silly but - or so obvious that when a working group starts and meets that there would be a point at which everybody sort of introduces themselves, tells people, you know, a little bit about themselves, that kind of thing. I don't know whether that's the kind of stuff we want to suggest here.

So this whole topic around roles and responsibilities was, in this formation section, had more to do with just the act of bringing a group of people together and making them a group. How do you form yourselves, you know, and assemble and then introduce everybody and create kind of a team out of it. That was what was in - that was what I had in mind originally with that.

Alexei Sozonov: (Unintelligible) right?

(Subbiah): If that were the case Ken then as it stands the section formation option there's a sentence there (unintelligible) statements, together with the statement that exists for introduction options it kind of satisfies that goal that you just said Ken. Just as it stands (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Yes, okay.

(Subbiah): Right. With nothing else added to it pretty much covers a lot of it I would say, given that's what you wanted. Does that make sense?

Ken Bour: Yes, but I mean I'm open to other suggestions that we...

(Subbiah): Right.

Ken Bour: ...either A don't need this section, or maybe we title it something else.

(Subbiah): Well, I think it would be necessary. In some level it would be a section that would be needed, right. I mean, you know, I think in terms of what is it that you have to do to form yourself in terms of options. What are the minimal things that you have to do today, right.

Ken Bour: Yes. Okay. All right, good well then...

(Subbiah): This is just nitty gritty things I mean like, you know, make sure you do the declaration of interest, make sure you take care of disclosures, you know, find out what people's skills are, right. I mean, this is not, you know, I mean these are just checklist sort of items that you have to do to get yourself started, right? I mean...

Ken Bour: Exactly.

(Subbiah): ...kind of like overlapping with the charter in some sense is not quite the same thing. A charter basically sets itself up as to the general

bigger idea, right. And this would be the actual nitty gritty of the things you need to take care of before you actually form.

Ken Bour: That's right. Yes. These are things that the charter would largely be silent about.

(Subbiah): Right.

Ken Bour: Okay. The next section was 2.3 the Specific Group Responsibilities. And the suggestion was to define a project team with a - there's a coding system here. A for accountable for successful completion, R responsible, S support tasks and C required communication about the task. Anybody have any thoughts about that classification system?

(Subbiah): Anyone?

Ken Bour: There's also a suggestion of assessing the skills of the project team members as to their knowledge about the topic from zero to two.

(Subbiah): The only question I have regarding that, I it really doesn't matter to me (unintelligible) level. But there may be two options because the question is who decides whether you have any skill level, right.

Is it going to be the group or the Chair as a whole or is it just self-identification of skill sets? I mean, or maybe we should just, you know, leave that option either one, but is options for the Chair to think of.

Alexei Sozonov: In my understanding because I was working for this, so the accountability is the key here. If we cannot decide accountability, so it's really difficult to get job done.

Ken Bour: Yes. What I think - what I had sort of in mind for this section originally was in a work, in working groups, you know, there's going to be a role for a Chair, there might be a role for a vice-Chair, maybe somebody has to have (secretarious) duties for minutes.

Or maybe that's assigned. Then there's a staff role, there is potentially a logistics or meeting role. That's - I was thinking more about kinds of suggesting to the working group that they consider a number of different roles that could be filled by different people for different purposes depending on the size of the group. And what are those roles and what are those assignments?

Now these ideas here are interesting, because I hadn't thought about them. But they go a step further and say once you make the - once you describe the roles and their duties and their assignments, you know, maybe there's some assessment process that says, you know, if you were strong or weak or that maybe you need additional training or help or assistance or something along those lines.

(Subbiah): I think my own thing is perhaps to leave it flexible for the Chair in the future or whatever, is to simply say one possible way of addressing that would be just to ask. You know, put all the tasks out there and ask the group, you know, which ones they feel comfortable as experts which of these has a good skill set would like to be matched (unintelligible) normally people do anyway.

And then let the Chair make a decision based on that input and their own assessment. I mean that could be one operational guideline model (unintelligible).

(Tim): This is (Tim). Another thought too is that I think, you know, - what will be needed as far as, you know, experts or specific skills may not be needed. It may be something that sort of, that's decided as the work progresses as maybe the, you know, as the statement of works reviewed and work plans created whatever.

And then if it is decided that certain expertise or skills are needed then perhaps that could be followed up with a separate, you know, statement or additional information from any of the members who might be able to supply that expertise or skills.

Ken Bour: Yes, we're actually going to come to that in Section 4...

(Subbiah): I think Ken is distinguishing here between and I like to say this is just kind of a expertise we're talking about who can operate the whole system as opposed to something substantial like (unintelligible) I think that's what - I think he's basically saying matching people to their basic skills to get the committee going and get done.

As opposed to some high level expertise of subject matter which will be covered in the other section I think. Is that fair enough (Tim)?

(Tim): Yes, I think so. What I'm going to do is I'll go into the Wiki after the call and throw a couple of ideas in for, you know, specific roles, duties and assignments that any working group team might consider assigning somebody to do, you know. And we'll - I'll keep this material in there as well. Is that okay for now?

(Subbiah): Anyone? And, you know, please feel free to chip in at anytime. There is just six of us and we won't be interrupting each other too much, don't just wait for me, you know, just chip in whenever you want.

Ken Bour: Okay, so continuing this Section 2.4, Use of Sub-Teams, the idea here was simply to again, suggest to the working group that it consider whether it needs to work as a big group or as we have discovered in our own team, breaking up into mini-teams in order to get specific things done.

You know, it's probably something that most teams would think of on their own but we were trying to be exhaustive in the list. And then 2.5, Implementing Self Selection Processes, I guess we can take just a second and read what's here.

This question of self-selection, I've been - that terminology existed over on the other sub-teams outline as well and there's apparently been some confusion about what it is and where it came from.

I think it was in the BGC Report itself, they talked about in going to a working group model that individuals should be able to quote, "self select themselves" into a working group, as opposed to the taskforce model, which is every constituency assign somebody, that sort of a model.

So anybody, if a working group is - if a charter is developed and somebody reads the mission of that charter and says, oh I'm really interested in that, they can just self select themselves and say I would like to participate in that working group.

And so the question in my mind was do we need any guidelines both at the charter level and do we need guidelines at the operating level that helps to understand how to work that in, since it's a new concept. And I don't know if anything additional needs to be done there or not.

I see that (Liz) has joined us, welcome (Liz).

(Liz): Thank you, sorry to be late.

(Subbiah): (Liz) you can chip in anytime you want...

Ken Bour: Yes, we've been walking through the Wiki which is now updated with all the input and we're on Section 2.5.

(Liz): Thank you.

(Subbiah): And the view that we're taking here is that we are going to walk through all these Section reports if time permits and then if we have points to make right now, we will say right now and we kind of address it and put it in later or you can edit it too.

But there is also an opportunity in the next few days before the full team meeting, you know, if you - subsequent reflection and you want to change things, we can still work on this as a working document, get your feedback into these things.

And then even in the full team meeting I think we will all be talking about all of this and there will be opportunity to modify not only what the over sub-teams have been doing, but also our own I suspect there has been no time to get feedback in.

So regarding 2.5 my thought is that I'm okay with it except that I have a little problem by reflect on their performance, the first one. This is for someone that is going to be applying in a way to join a committee that is about to be formed based on their personal schedule, I guess.

What does that mean in that context to say, to reflect on their performance? They haven't done anything for the committee yet unless their performance that is being talked about is something else? I just want clarification, I'm not bothered by it, what it is, but.

Does that make sense, my question, I mean?

Ken Bour: Yes it does, this is Ken, it makes sense to me. I'm not sure what it means either.

(Subbiah): Right, so Alexei did you have anything when you were thinking about it, in mind particularly about at that (unintelligible) to talk about their performance, reflect on their performance?

Alexi Sozonov: Just a second.

(Subbiah): I mean it makes sense if it's saying about your own performance, kind of in the background area of this area...

Alexei Sozonov: Well, (unintelligible) prior to the introduction so maybe...

(Subbiah): Oh, I see, I see. Okay, just a language issue.

Alexei Sozonov: Yes, yes correct.

(Subbiah): Okay so it's just an issue of, you know, basically - your past performance in life pretty much or something like that...

((Crosstalk))

(Caroline): (Caroline) here, I took it to mean performance in previous working groups? Ability to prove you were an active participant or you, you know, added to the productivity of the working groups.

Ken Bour: This is Ken, so you know, I'm wondering if the section that handles statements of interest is a better place for this kind of thing to be dealt with and that will probably - I wonder if that will be in the charter document itself.

If it is it'll probably only state something like, the working group members must complete statements of interest and the statements of interest will have these categories, these topics, these questions.

I suspect that the charter document will specify what is minimally required in any statement of interest. The operating model doesn't probably have to go into much detail.

So I guess maybe we can - this one we could probably table until we see what the charter document looks like it's going to contain and then really the operating model just has to deal with, okay, people have submitted their statements of interest, right.

If you're in a working group team, the question is where are they, where do you find them, should everybody read each other's

statements of interest? Is that a norm or is that something that each working group ought to do in the beginning so that they can understand where people come from and what the other teams that they've worked on and what experience they bring.

It's all part of the understanding the skill set of each other I suppose.

(Subbiah): My thought on that would be, you know, in terms of practicality is that basically at some level you have to I guess trust the Chair, right. And basically the Chair makes some decisions based on initial applications.

And then 2.6 will be the critical project that we will need to have an objection mechanism if they feel they were not elected or whatever. You need a mechanism developed for that.

I mean somebody has to develop it. Not us, but I mean the working group I guess, right? Any thoughts?

Ken Bour: Yes, it just seems that maybe like 2.5 and 2.6 belong together and maybe I'll take a shot at proposing something there. Now when you talk about an objection mechanism, meaning that if somebody self selected them into a working group that there would be a process for ejecting them from the team?

(Subbiah): I took it - Alexei, I don't know what you take it to mean, I...

Alexi Sozonov: Actually, it is kind of both, right? Because it's just that both sides is reasonable.

(Subbiah): I see, both for ejecting and if you're upset that you didn't get in you would like to be able to...

Ken Bour: Well yes, yes. So at this point. That will be an interesting one to talk about - to draft.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: We are talking now about some kind of working group process, is it consensus based, voting based. So to put this into stark terms somebody on this team wants Ken Bour off the team...

(Subbiah): Right, right.

Ken Bour: And we're going to - we would write into the operating model some procedure where, you know, maybe it starts with any one of the team members objecting to...

(Subbiah): Right.

Ken Bour: ...the participation of Ken Bour on this team?

(Subbiah): Right, that's true.

Ken Bour: And, then, the Chair would be...

(Subbiah): Sure.

Ken Bour: You know, is this the kind of thing we're talking about writing in here?

Alexei Sozonov: Well, I think, no. My...

(Liz): (Unintelligible).

(Tim): Isn't some of that covered in the...

(Liz): Go ahead, (Tim).

(Tim): ...in the working group principles or whatever that we put together for the (PPSC) to work under, that there was an objection mechanism and I thought that looked fairly decent.

It might have been more in the purpose of it might have been more for, you know, objecting to a Chair's call of consensus where they're just - they're out.

(Subbiah): Right.

(Tim): But, I think it could be applied similarly. I mean that, you know, within the working group, it could be a much simpler process where you just appeal to the Chair.

(Subbiah): Right.

(Tim): The Chair can make a decision based on, you know, the consensus of the group, but, if that doesn't, still doesn't, satisfy the person's objecting, they would have another process that they could follow that goes up to the council level.

(Subbiah): Right, sure. Good, so I was thinking that, what we need it, for the purpose of this document at this stage, is just bullet points on there. Whether it's Section 2.5 or 2.6 together, two bullet points. One of the bullet points will be simply to say, hey, there are two forms of objections.

One, is just that if the person just didn't get in and they want to say, look, I would like to appeal and the other one is that they didn't want them in, that the group didn't want somebody or somebody didn't want somebody else then. So, all we need to do is to put the two chapter titles on it right now, is that correct, (Tim)?

I mean, you don't have to actually delve into how to actually implement it in some way. Later on, we'd have to do that later when we draft it up, perhaps, along as to what (Tim) has suggested. It seems reasonable to me, but is that correct, Ken? So, we just need to identify the two subchapter headings right now.

Ken Bour: We need to, yes.

(Subbiah): And you just collect...

Ken Bour: Yes, I think I can take care of that. I do use it. This is a good discussion because we definitely have to think about whether it's in the charter or it's in the operating model. There has to be a place somewhere for...

(Subbiah): Correct.

Ken Bour: ...handling of an individual who's being obstructed.

(Subbiah): Ken, correct.

Ken Bour: And your question, the second part of that, which is what do I do if I didn't get accepted. It never even occurred to me.

(Subbiah): Correct.

Ken Bour: It didn't occur to me that a person could be denied the opportunity to...

(Subbiah): Correct.

Ken Bour: ...participate in a working group (unintelligible). You meaning that if he did anything wrong.

(Subbiah): (Unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Maybe you could be denied just because the team is too big and they can't take any more or I don't know.

(Subbiah): (Unintelligible).

Ken Bour: That those are good questions. I'll get that popped in there.

(Subbiah): I can see that a lot of, many of, these things that we have discussed so far, operational things, that people got (unintelligible). Our group, in its self, would be pretty flexible about drafting something that's compromised and so on.

But I think certain key issues will turn up in this whole document and that everything that we're doing as a team where it'll be critical and there will be more debate.

And I think that one of the ones that we saw was the one where the boarding threshold and the consensus, what does consensus mean. I suspect that this issue will also be something like that, where we would have to spend more time later on drafting some proper procedure how to take of the in or out issues.

And I think we should just, in the interest of time, just flag that as sort of two chapter headings unless anybody else has any chapter, subchapter, headings there, you know, and move onto the next section or put, at least, the sections regarding everything in Section 2 right now. Is that fair?

Ken Bour: Yes, that sounds good to me.

(Subbiah): Anyone else? Any views on all of Section 2? Okay, then we're going to norms. I think it's (Nacha), isn't it? I'm not sure.

(Caroline): (Unintelligible).

(Subbiah): Can you walk us through?

(Caroline): Yes, no problem. So, if I take it section-by-section, (unintelligible). I just want an interpretation for the meaning of good participation and we thought to include some sort of wording or lines for participants committing to being active participants on the working group once they've signed up and that they should.

If they'd like to contribute in a way that is respectful to the other working group members and doesn't cause offense in any way and we thought that we should leave it to the discussion of the Chair to set minimum attendance participation levels.

We kind of left it discretionary because I think (unintelligible) and the scope of the work, the working group and the guidelines to meet, et cetera. And, in any case, participation data should include at the end of a working group report and, as an example, I referenced the (unintelligible) working group reports, which lists a quite comprehensive participation data at the end.

I happened to think, I was on that working group and I know a couple of other people on this group well as well and I think it was very well organized and that's why I slotted it in as an example.

Ken Bour: Great, a best practice.

(Subbiah): Okay.

(Caroline): Are there any comments on that (unintelligible) section?

Man: Now, I...

(Caroline): I think that what I was struggling with, personally myself, was, you know, where do you actually recommend something or where do you make something mandatory in a working group and where do you leave something to the discretion of the Chair, you know?

Ken Bour: Yes, I think that's exactly that's a tough question - this is Ken. That's a very difficult question and I would suggest that we are out, in most situations, if we went as far as just listing all of the things that might be considered, even saying, you know, what we would recommend that you establish some kind of minimum criteria around participation.

For example, you know, without having to say, it must be 80% of attendance or you get kicked out in the third meeting or the second, you know.

(Subbiah): Yes.

Ken Bour: I think as long as we create the kind of some flexibility there and then, they can easily and, if there's good practices already out there, we can cite them and I like what you've done here.

(Subbiah): Yes and I think, certainly, you know, I mean I like that example, (unintelligible) and I mean definitions like that will have to be discussed, but, in the next level, when we get to the full team and so on and so forth.

But, the fact that it's an example to the people at the beginning to think in terms of numbers at least, you know, I mean that's fine and, you know, and I think and, in fact, a possibility would be down the line.

Instead of insisting just 80%, one could say, it is expected that you attend 80%, but if you fall below 25%, you could, you know, then, you know, you could be, blah, blah, blah, right.

I mean, you know, so it sets the threshold really low, but expectation high. You know, that may be a way you might want to be able to do later, but, again, that's all numbers that we don't need to really look into at this point, right.

(Caroline): Yes.

(Subbiah): Anybody, any other thoughts on 3.1, so anybody else before we move to 3.2?

Ken Bour: Yes, this is Ken. The other one that might be a little tougher to deal with is contribution. You know, is there or are there any guidelines around as to what a reasonable, minimal contribution level is? I've been in groups myself, you know, where there's always the question of airtime, you know.

Are certain people monopolizing it and are others able to get in edgewise and maybe there's some things we could say around that. If for no other purpose than to just make Chair's aware that that could become an issue and it might be under the surface and something that could be discussed.

(Caroline): Yes, I think, firstly, the kind of people here are just so called lurkers in a working group and, you know, aren't there to contribute or participate in any shape or form and, you know, that's the opposite of the problem you've identified, Ken.

Ken Bour: Yes.

(Subbiah): I guess, there's (unintelligible) I mean.

Alexei Sozonov: (Unintelligible), sorry (Subbiah), but I think that's sort of 3.2 sort of addressing those issues, sort of.

(Subbiah): Yes, I guess in the sense that if you define a group as down to one person, than it certainly does, right. Actually, it says, individually but, it does. Sort of.

Then, perhaps, you might want to just put a statement, somebody, either Ken or I that somebody adds that and say, look, essentially something to the extent that Chair's be aware of that, to look out for things like this, flag, you know, that someone's taking too much time or someone lurking you know.

Just to say to look out rather than just give any recommendation or what to do about it. Right.

(Caroline): Okay, so looking on, Section 3.2, which reading it again, I don't know if it would sit more comfortably in the charter. But, in any case, (Constantine) suggested that we add in wording around having principles of justice and fairness and ensuring that no person or, I guess, sub group would be likely to dominant any decision making process or discussions.

And, I mean, he mentioned in the concept of, you know, alliances being able to form within the work group, but that it would be up to the discretion of the Chair to put a close to that if those alliances were in any way proven unproductive. Any thoughts on that section?

(Subbiah): Anyone?

(Tim): Well, yes, this is Tim.

(Subbiah): Yes, go ahead, Tim.

(Tim): I guess that it'll just depend on the - on how we flush it out, I guess. I think that the fact that alliances, I think there'll be participants coming into the working group with alliances already formed.

But, no doubt. But, I think that that's going to happen, to be expected, to some extent. So, I guess that I'd just be kind of interested in how a Chair might have discretion to limit that. You know, what the examples would be, where we would limit that, or (unintelligible) to limit that?

(Constantine): Sorry, (Tim), (unintelligible). My thinking was (unintelligible) the alliances are already formed. Yes, that should be expected, but these alliances, if, for example, any individual or any subgroup wants to join them, they should not be exclusive and by no means should they determine the course of the discussions or the decision making processes.

And I think, because we're talking about norms and everything and I'm taking care of the lawyer, everything establishes non-(unintelligible), a certain amount of levity, I think that we need to ensure that at the minimum level (unintelligible) there is some sort of mechanism to provide a balance between the participation of all of the parties.

(Subbiah): That's right. Okay, I think that I have a good example to what (Constantine) is saying. If a group is formed and, yes, there's an alliance within it, it becomes obvious that it is (unintelligible) to the

Chair and if it turns out that there's a sub team being formed on a general issue.

Now, if it turns out that all of the people from that alliance are identically matched in the sub team, there's nobody else extra in there, you know, people from the sub team are the only ones handling that particular general issue -- I mean, you know, from this alliance -- then that would be a lack of balance on that issue, right.

I mean, so, perhaps, the Chair might then say, look, in that sub team, you need to have somebody else who's not part of this alliance in there. Does that make sense, (Constantine)?

(Constantine): Yes.

(Subbiah): Does that sound right?

(Constantine): Yes, that's right.

(Tim): Perhaps, I think too that's part of it and I can see some other issues too, I guess, now that, after listening to that example. So, that I think that that's why, ultimately, you know, it's important that, you know, the statements of interests are collected.

So that, at whatever level that the work product is reviewed, do we just, you know, consent this or are different viewpoints or minority reports or whatever can all be viewed with an understanding of what, who the participants were and what interests they might have represented, et cetera.

(Subbiah): Yes, I think so. And one of the things that could be also fed back into this plate is that in case alliances are upset that this is happening to them because the Chair's, you know, act of discretion and it's instituting some changes - they still have the, you know, they can still go back and appeal through the general appeal process if anything's unthwarted, right.

I mean, if in some general appeal process, it would make for all of these different things up the chain.

(Tim): Yes, right, if nothing, the Chair should obviously have the ability to, you know, take the initiative to counsel as well if necessary...

(Subbiah): Right, right.

(Tim): ...for advice or help or whatever.

(Subbiah): And so, language should be introduced, perhaps, then is to just tell the Chair or the committee that, wait, you know, if these things are going to happen, there's stuff you can do both ways and then, the Chair and so on can try to limit it.

Meanwhile, the people that are being limited have the option, the shot, of going, you know, appealing, but the fact that if some language is there that this is all possible. That it is possible.

Ken Bour: Yes, this is Ken. You know, my suggestion is and I've captured some of the thoughts that have just been expressed, some of this, I think, might be better placed in Section 2.4, sub teams.

So, that, in addition to whether the working group considers the use of sub teams, a second consideration is how they are formed, who gets on them and ensuring a reasonable balance among interests on sub teams.

Those are the kinds of things that I'm hearing being discussed and I'm wondering if they might be better expressed under sub teams than they would here under norms and behaviors?

(Caroline): Yes, I think that they could sit there equally.

(Subbiah): Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay.

(Subbiah): I think that you might just want to flip that you know. I mean that addresses most of the (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Some of what we had in mind in this Section 3.2 and an idea that I have, you know, is, ICANN has a Code of Conduct and it talks about things like, you know, respectful listening and so forth and so on.

Maybe, it's just a good idea to replicate that Code of Conduct right in Section 3.2 somewhere and then, over time, as working groups evolve and behaviors manifest themselves, people say, be careful of this, watch out for that.

And, you know, in terms of norms, you know, I was even thinking about things like, should a work group have, think about, things like, hey, if

you want to speak, you know, here's how you do it or don't talk over each other.

You know, do you raise your hand if you're in a (Dolby connect), there's a little mechanism and that might be going into a little bit more detail than we want to go at this point, but all of those are norms as well.

(Subbiah): It seems okay to me since we do have too. Being part of ICANN, we cannot just call it the ICANN general rules, right, so.

Ken Bour: Would anyone object if I tossed the ICANN Code of Conduct into this section?

(Subbiah): I mean, yes, I think that we - if, I mean, there's the point is that, if we did have our own stuff here and it turns out along the way, somewhere along the line, someone doesn't like what's in there, but likes what's in the ICANN Code of Conduct, they can still appeal way above us at the Board level, correct?

I mean because of the ICANN Code of Conduct, so I think it's some (unintelligible) of what we have anyway. So, I think, in de facto terms, it's included, right? I mean that we - so, therefore, adding it is not going to make any differences. I mean, I think you should, that's what I'm trying to say if it's (unintelligible).

(Liz): Ken, it's (Liz). What you might do is just post it for review by the group and...

(Subbiah): Sure, that's a good idea.

Ken Bour: That's what I meant.

(Liz): And see if it looks consistent with, you know, working groups as opposed to, you know, with an employee organization. If any tweaks are appropriate, it might be helpful as a, you know, useful tool to extrapolate some, but I don't think we should feel at all required to adhere to it exactly.

(Subbiah): Okay.

(Liz): (Unintelligible).

(Subbiah): And, perhaps, our lawyer, (Constantine), can take a look at it too.

(Liz): Yes.

(Subbiah): Right?

(Constantine): Yes, I agree with that.

(Subbiah): Okay, all right, now, my problem is this, it's eight, well, it's six minutes to the end of the hour, okay. I can say that, although we're only about 1/2 way through, we're making great progress compared to the other sub teams.

(Liz): Okay.

(Subbiah): It's, okay, so that and I think it's all very good and it's all, you know, part of the stuff that we will have to discuss later on anyway, go back to all of these things.

Now, I'm kind of responsible at this point because (Tim)'s not on yet. I think he was supposed to join us, but I don't think he's here yet. (Unintelligible), so at (unintelligible), Ken and I have discussed a little bit about what on the logistics and requirements in which I kind of (unintelligible) and then, Ken and (Tim) mortified.

So, you know, I know that we're about to go into the sequence (unintelligible) in the meaning of consensus and that's going to take some time (unintelligible), right.

So, I have to leave in several minutes and so, I was thinking, since I would be required and I assume, unless Ken wants to handle the logistics and requirements part, that I could take kind of like Section 3.4, the meaning of consensus and 3.5, form requirements, (unintelligible).

(Caroline): It's 3.3 as well that we need to go into.

(Subbiah): And 3.3 as well and then let you guys come back, circle around and discuss that and then, (Tim) can discuss the stuff at the end, you know, assuming we have time.

And I'm going to go, you know, and I guess if it turns out that even after I've gone that there's still, actually, this thing drags and it takes a lot longer, then I'll leave it up to the group and the new Chair what it's

going to take from me to decide whether or not we can't actually finish going through all of this today.

And we just have to say, okay, well, let's do - tell the full team that, well, that's as far as we got. Okay, that's my take on it. So, is that okay if I could just jump in and start on Section 3.5? It's a lot easier to go through that and I think that it's pretty much just (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: You now have five minutes.

(Subbiah): Okay, all right, is that okay?

(Tim): That's okay with me.

Man: All right, (unintelligible).

(Subbiah): Okay, all right. Okay, thank you. I'm just going to go ahead with 4.0, Logistics and Requirements. This is meant just as a big checklist of things of mundane, nitty gritty things that are, you know, just like I was appointed Chair or something last week.

And I had to figure out, okay, what's required of you to do, you know. And I knew that I had to put an agenda and I had to do this, I had to do that, well, ICANN is trying the working model for the first time in a sense or any Chair that will be chairing (unintelligible) will be somebody that can, actually, probably not having done a working model before.

So, from that point of view, then there'd be a lot things that (unintelligible) he needs to be told (unintelligible) to use, do you

remember the phones, do you remember this stuff, we had that kind of stuff, so that's the view that was taken in detailing a lot of the stuff.

It was just throwing it there so that he can just remember to make a choice about these things, you know. So, General meeting logistics, the work environment and work mode, you know, that there should be the stuff that should be put up, should be standardized and available before the section itself, right.

And anything for a meeting, okay, should be available earlier, that's the point that he's trying to make and then, it talks about different meeting options, there's first in teleconference and what are you going to...

And available before the section itself right and anything for a meeting okay should be available earlier only and that's the point that it's trying to make and then it's off to different meeting options at first in teleconference.

What are you going to actually do these are nitty gritty things that have to be decided by the group itself. Are you going to do video support (unintelligible) these are things that people have to define early on within the group itself and the Chair of it.

Teams can move faster and be more productive, you know, and make sure that everybody is on board. And (Thomas) view was that, you know, (Thomas)'s view was that we were going a bit into to detail because he felt that - see his view was that this was less of a guide book and more of a formal procedure kind of thing.

So his view was that this should be simply left to the staff and let them decide and so on. And so I think was his thinking coming in, so my view is that it is indeed - if it is a guidebook then perhaps it's okay to just remind all these different - the kind of mitigating decisions that have to be taken by the Chair committee.

And if this is not the place to put it in the fore point one then perhaps as Ken talked about put it into these - is has to be in somewhere the check list for the possibly for - according to the Chair and the committee how they want to go about it and select.

Maybe the place to put is in the appendix that Ken is talking about.

Ken Bour: But let me just jump in. I think that (Thomas)'s point really had - was - once he understood what we were doing with the guidebook I think he was okay with that. I think...

(Subbiah): (Unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Hang on. Where his objection was is in having worked on many working groups is that working groups can often times get bogged down into details that will (unintelligible), you know, they get themselves tangled up in knots.

And they have these like discussions about like well should we do Skype or Jabber. And everybody's got their favorite tool and I think his point of view here which is why I added is that, you know, even in a guide book we want to be careful not to suggest to working groups that they take on things that will - that others might do for them.

And I think in his position is staff ought to make these determinations, they ought to pick best of breed tools, set them up for the working group and not leave it to the working groups to decide on their own.

Now I don't know whether that - everybody agrees with that, but that's the point that was trying to be captured here.

Man: Okay. Perhaps then - I'm okay with that as well. I mean but perhaps the point will be to say that, you know, we would - that the staff working with the Chair would figure out what the appropriate thing for that committee and that the committee should be given - I mean they don't have to be in the decision making process.

But they ought to be able to at least make some comments about it, you know, if something is totally inappropriate they should be able to say look this doesn't work for us or something.

That fair enough? Okay any other thoughts on the matter? I mean a lot of this stuff going forward is going to be stuff like that basically. Anybody else what to make a comment at this point?

Okay and then the issues of, you know, the next one is regarding time a selection of time for the length and duration of the meeting, establishing expectations, frequency, what kind of frequency upfront, you know, what is the duration of schedule is it 6 month 12 month.

Okay. I mean it may be in the charter as Ken points out. But the point is somewhere we may have to address these things so that people are upfront all these nitty gritty things. So that hopefully before even applying (unintelligible) something they know hey you know, this is

what might be expected of them at least roughly, you know whether they, you know, how many times a week, you know, whether it's a physical meeting.

Rough ideas (unintelligible) physical meeting whatever beforehand. It may change along the way but people have the real - understanding of what they want to get into.

And then make sure the going agenda is, you know, we've got to decide whether its one day or two days in advance or whatever, but some draft language needs to be created as potential advice to the Chair and committee about what are norms that might be thought of as terms of agenda.

And (Thomas) pointed that the minutes are very important and they needed to be archived. He stressed very much that and that, you know, they should happen in a certain amount of time and (unintelligible) should be highlighted, you know, as minutes and so on.

And I think those are all there and I think unless people have objections or at least thoughts on that seems all reasonable. And I - again coming back to the draft schedule as Ken points out it might be a old subsection perhaps for that and a couple of other issues.

Meaning the idea of pre figured out draft schedule before even the whole section starts. Any thoughts (unintelligible) points one in general the items in there? Anyone? Okay I'll go to 4.2 the EZS communication.

We're talking about meeting list with - just, you know, nitty gritty about our meeting list regarding, you know, silly things like the Chair meetings. Please don't add attachments more than 10 megabytes. You know whatever the number but something for the Chair to think about or the committee to think about.

Make sure upfront that maybe the staff is the one that will (unintelligible) as (Thomas) suggested. But somehow, you know, all these nitty gritty things are taken care of early one and I guess Ken is suggesting that the abusive behavior stuff should be put into as part of the other section and that's perfectly fine too.

And then of course decision making on collaboration tools. What are you going to use? Is it Adobe or Word? Or you know dumb things that, you know, screw us up along the way I couldn't open the file and this and that.

If it was all presorted out by somebody whether it was staff or Chair working together or some committee input that would all be very helpful. And also data format right? Format the data.

And also I guess in that context, document versioning because, you know, right now for example, I mean although we are trying to use the DKM we can't (unintelligible).

A lot of us are still depending on all these emails that go through us there is lots of email floating around so to find a document we have to go back and find them and so, you know, perhaps there is some methodology.

I mean perhaps what we're doing with - could be the way that it's suggested for the next Chair or whatever for the next general thing and that's there as well. Any thoughts on that? On 4.2.

(Caroline): There is a working group on communication I believe. I wonder if the cross section was what they are doing? I don't know whether they are more focused on external communication and this is more, you know internal working group communications?

(Subbiah): Ken?

Ken Bour: Yes that group is - yes the communication is more externally focuses and intergroup rather than intra group.

(Caroline): Okay.

(Subbiah): I have a thought actually Ken based on what (Thomas) is saying, maybe I know it's asking ICANN staff to do work on the other hand it might turn out a lot easier for ICANN staff down the road which is to see a lot of these kind of detail nitty gritty stuff in software and all that stuff.

I can develop essentially a package essentially what you like to do the staff let's pick this, let's pick that and have it as sort of a selective package offering to the Chair working model. And then they can decide whether they want to deviate from that but it exists. Does that make sense Ken?

Ken Bour: Sure.

(Subbiah): Yes. Maybe we should - maybe that would be a way of collapsing this - all these years, you know, into that basically saying - and then in the committees are free to deviate from that if they want, but it's something off the bat there is something already available as their system.

All right then 4.3 training subject matter expertise and translation the interpretation. I think basically what is met here is all three are viewed as experts. I mean it just repeats actually that point.

Whether you need somebody to come in and train you or whether you need a subject matter expert because it's some really beefy technical stuff and we all need to understand about it. Or we need get to a translator to get into product because that's needed.

I think the issues that decided to address here is that upfront within the first sort of maybe convened meetings. What we'll do for meetings people need to identify either before in the first two meetings the committee, the Chair, the whole have to identify what is needed.

The charter also identifies the people already that may well be the case. But the fact that these people should identified or the need to be identified and a cost figured out and, you know, tentatively approved submitted, you know, so that we have that early going in.

And also if there is to be any - to take off on a point that (Tim) brought up if there is to be any training or subject matter expertise to come in it should happen earlier.

I mean in the first month or whatever so it's done with rather than, you know and then we can begin with the work and that's what this section tries to capture.

And additionally since this is undoubtedly (unintelligible) cost extra money, then if people putting together the Chair of the committee coming up with the notion of, yes, we need this, not only could they figure out what the cost (unintelligible) idea, but also have a good idea of really a tracking mechanism put into place.

That is, what are the objectives? You know, is there going to be training? Or there's expertise, are people attending it? Are they actually taking, you know, (unintelligible) expertise (unintelligible) that nobody turns up? You know, you're paying for this.

And additionally, make sure that the objective and the success measured, you know, at the end of it. On top of all of that, in case you find out, at least think about finding out, what the overall budget will be under the (unintelligible), let's say down the road they decide they need another expert or something, you know?

Would there be money for that already for that, you know. There's an overall budget as opposed to us approve what the overall possible budget and that maybe useful for the Chair to know before going in.

So, these are the kinds of things that I try to capture. But (unintelligible), at this point is that if the group, if the group is itself allowed to figure out who the experts are or who the training partner is, then the group could just spend all its time, you know, (unintelligible)

and stonewalling, you know. Just saying, look, we need another expert and nothing ever gets done because it's just going forward.

And one way of trying to address that was to say, look, all this has to be done pretty much upfront and there's a timeline for it and a schedule. That means that training expenses would all be gotten (unintelligible) charter or by the Chair, before the meeting could be, at least within the first two meetings of the committee itself.

The main area in which all of this should get done and decided, you know. There actually may be an opportunity to go look for an expert much later, but it should not be a very easy process to (unintelligible).

That is that most of it needs to be done within the first time period timeframe. Anyway, that was kind of a general sort. Any thoughts on this? Anybody?

(Caroline): Nope, we can move on.

(Subbiah): Yes, go ahead.

(Caroline): I think we can move on?

(Subbiah): Okay. Move on. Sure. Okay. One other point that I think I forgot, (Thomas) has brought up the point that if people keep asking for training, then somebody's got to be able to (unintelligible), you know, (unintelligible) people can ask for it.

Then they can say no to it. Someone should say no to that request, okay. So who's going to say no to that request? I mean, that's a good question. I suspect there'll be two answers to that.

One is the budget will say no from the top. The other no is perhaps the Chair, you know, in conjunction with the committee's itself and that's the kind of Chair discretion, you know. I don't know, that's a thought. That's (unintelligible) reason I can think of to address that issue.

Besides that, I'll just move on and I'll just go to 4.4, which is (unintelligible) support and what I tried to capture here which generally seems to be okay with Ken and (Thomas) is that we need, this is kind of critical because, again, involves money.

So an upfront early on in the game the Chair, does the Chair really coming up with a draft and then, perhaps, working with the committee itself to finalize it, is that one needs to estimate (unintelligible) in terms of what is it about the number of (unintelligible) time you need at the beginning product process.

Before even the meeting convenes, what is the end because even after the meeting (unintelligible) is a reporting process and a lot of other (unintelligible) to report to the other board and so on and so forth.

So, that's the one of thing at both ends and then on a routine basis routine meetings, every monthly meetings, you know, and setting up for a physical ICANN meeting, those routine things in between.

And the two types of - first you need to figure out what the total (unintelligible) days are required, I need some number working at ICANN staff.

And the other thing is the - also then (unintelligible) to divide that into all the different skill sets that are required. As we need somebody to help us with setting up phone calls, and we need somebody to help us setting up with a physical meeting with different skill sets, who can do translation, who can do consulting writing, you know, writing a report.

So, not only figuring out how much total staff units and time and cost it will be, but also what are the different types of skill sets we need. How much of each, you know, at least a rough pass at it, so that people with a very good idea as - before to much - things don't get too far ahead in terms of operation, okay.

And so, are there some thoughts about that in terms of how to do that and what kind of skill sets to look for? We tried to put in as many skill sets as we can think of in there, the Chair can think of, software used, writing report production, meeting with (unintelligible) coordination, (secretarial).

If anyone can think of any other skill sets that should be in there. Maybe mediation? I don't know (unintelligible). Ken is doing a good job. So, you know, somebody, you know, you might want to include any other skill sets for, you know, to put on the cheat sheet for the new Chair. Any thoughts on that?

(Tim): Yes this is (Tim). The way, I guess I don't see that this would start at the working group level and maybe that was the intent, but it seems to

me that some of this would need to be initially done up front by the council.

The council is charged with, you know, the management of the process and so I think even before, you know, a working group is formed that the council should have some understanding of what kind of costs are going to be getting involved in (unintelligible) et cetera.

So, I think of this as more as, a refinement of that once it gets, the work groups gets formed and actually realizes, you know, what might be involved (unintelligible) participating, et cetera.

(Subbiah): Right, I agree. The charter will probably predefine a lot of things and we might even have the same mind in the background but may not have chosen one yet.

And then when the Chair gets given the job, the Chair, it would be in the Chair's best interest and later the committee, to actually review the same thing, again, at least in more detail (unintelligible) cheat sheet, so that they're pretty aware, you know, going in as to what are the limitations. All right.

One of the things we might have to go back and ask for if you needed it really badly.

Ken Bour: This is Ken, I definitely echo (Tim)s comment there. The charter is likely not to be silent on budget and where the charter sponsors have thought through the composition of the team in terms of what skill sets and what expertise is needed, what staff support is needed, that will all be prescribed in the charter.

And I guess, in the operating model, we just need to leave some room in there so that if the charter is silent in this specific area. Or if the working group says, you know, they've assigned me two staff people, but there's a specific set of skills we think we need that weren't included that there's some, there's some methodology and they know how to proceed at that point in terms of getting the extra help they need and that kind of thing.

That was really the general idea.

(Subbiah): Ken, I would be more than happy if you could just take everything in 4.4 and then put a sentence on top of it to say that was the intent of what (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Sure.

(Subbiah): And so, I'm kind of done and I'm about 15 minutes for my other thing and I am done with my (unintelligible) (Tom) responsible for. So, if there's no other thoughts on 4.4, then I think I'll leave it to you guys to get back to - if you wanted to continue with this given the timeframe we're at to go back and look at 3.3 rules of engagement meeting of consensus and form requirements.

My own thoughts (unintelligible) it is to you guys on how you want to do this, but those are going to be a little bit more discussion I would expect. And then what's next is the product output section, which I think it would probably a lot quicker, I don't know, and that's up to Ken, I guess.

And this is to be discussed and if we feel that, if you guys feel that the if you guys feel that this - the phone call has gone too long already and that we're going to have to, you know, review this by email afterwards.

And then maybe, perhaps, even tell the full team that time when we meet, look, we didn't get to a proper discussion of 5 yet we may have to discuss it again all together as a full team, that's also okay with me.

But the key thing is that whatever we've done or whatever is not finished today, we should just go back and have Ken draft it up and modify it based on today's thoughts.

Does anybody else have any other input on any of the parts we discussed? Please, you know, go back and feel free to edit this and then be prepared on, I don't know how the agenda is for the next full week team meeting is going to be, but every section report leader should be prepared to, perhaps, revisit this and present it in some other form at the full team meeting. It may happen, I don't know. Ken, any thoughts?

Ken Bour: Not at the moment on that.

(Subbiah): Okay. I am more than happy if anybody wants to be Chair, I can just, you know, get suggest someone else, or if Ken wants to do it, or, you know, it's okay with me. So...

Ken Bour: I don't mind just walking us through the remaining items, so I'll pick up from where you left off there, (Subbiah).

(Subbiah): Okay and I think in the interest of making sure that, you know, I think the span of 15 minutes has passed the hour that's normally is for this, but you may want to check with others that, you know, (unintelligible) Okay. Thank you. Bye, bye guys.

Ken Bour: Okay, bye-bye.

(Subbiah): Bye-bye.

Ken Bour: On that point, does anybody have a hard stop, or can we continue?

((Crosstalk))

(Tim): Need to be done a little bit before noon because there's another call for the registrar disqualification procedure, I don't want to miss.

Alexei Sozonov: Yes, I have another meeting as well, so I have to leave in 10 minutes.

(Constantine): Yes, I have to leave as well I'm already outside.

Ken Bour: Okay, do we want to let, maybe we ask (Caroline) to just quickly go through 3.3, 3.4,3.5, finish that and we'll handle 5.0 on the list.

Man: Yes that's good.

Ken Bour: Okay.

(Tim): What I'll do Ken on 5 is I'll just send, I'll start it with just a brief explanation of what I can up with and why.

Ken Bour: Yes that's great, I took all your bullets and just threw them in there, but yes that'd be great (Tim).

(Tim): All right.

Ken Bour: Okay good.

(Caroline): Hi.

Ken Bour: You're on.

(Caroline): Thanks, so I can ruffle through this. And 3.3 was engagements what we have was basically there would be two different ways of assessing support or otherwise or extensions or for a proposal or an idea.

That would be either through formal vote process and I guess the other is probably a cross section with 3.4 consensus and or through an informal process whereby the Chair is just simply taking a (unintelligible) really for a proposal or an idea, but not actually not calling for a formal vote.

And I guess probably in terms of the formal vote process I would recommend good record keeping, which records should be presented in working group reports.

That's 3.3 and I'll move on shall I, 3.4 meaning consensus, consensus may be called by the Chair any time and the participant's should be noted for any working group report.

And I noted here that we had some preliminary discussion within the wider group on consensus on different thresholds as we tried to set out the high levels and (unintelligible) we spoke about I don't think we ever actually signed off on that and we probably need to draft it again within the wide group and so.

Ken Bour: Yes let me just pipe in on that one for a second. As (Tim), (Louise) and (Aubrey) and maybe even a few others have pointed out, it may turn out that we will want to have the meaning, the definition of consensus tied down in the charter in more instances than not.

I mean it doesn't necessarily require a sponsor to define consensus, but in many cases we're public or ICANN policy is going to be binding on organizations and groups that they'll want the meaning of consensus specifically defined.

And well what we may have to write here in the absence of a specific definition of consensus in your charter-working group, you know, you know, should then discuss and here are some options to consider. Here's some different ways you could do and so that might be the way to handle it here.

(Caroline): Yes, okay good point. Okay, 3.5 then core and requirements. And we suggest that a simple majority constitutes a quorum and where's there no quorum and a vote is invalid although the Chair has the discretion to issue a re-invitation to vote. And the Chair may also instigate the voting process by email during an assigned period and if he or she has not been able to decide on the votes in a particular meeting. That was 3.5.

Ken Bour: Okay.

(Caroline): That completes that section. Any other comments on that?

Ken Bour: Yes, good, thank you (Caroline).

(Caroline): Thank you.

Ken Bour: Anything else for the good of the lodge. If not I will try to summarize our discussion today and we'll just keep working on the Wiki I would guess between now and 06 May, which is our next big team meeting.

And then hopefully the team leads for each section will be in a position to sort of summarize where we are at that point. Recognizing that if we only have an hour for the great big team then we've got both the charter and the operating model it's not likely that we're going to be able to go through each and every sub bullet like we tried to do today.

So just logistically it's not going to be possible. So I'll have to think a little bit about with (Jay Scott) how to handle that meeting. Great, well thank you all for your participation and for getting your stuff in on time. And we'll keep working on the Wiki and through the email list.

And if anybody has trouble with posting to the Wiki, you know, don't be shy about sending it email and I'll go ahead and take it, take care of it for you.

Alexei Sozonov: Okay.

Woman: Okay so the next meeting is?

Ken Bour: This group is done. This sub team is disbanded unless the big team says it should continue. I mean there is a drafting set of tasks that occur after we start, after the May 6 meeting, but I don't know whether we're going to keep the same groups or we're going to have different ones. So maybe - but this group doesn't have another meeting set up I don't think, right?

Woman: Okay. So we've got another meeting on May 6 for the work group.

Ken Bour: The entire working group team, yes.

Woman: And that's at the same time as this?

Ken Bour: Didn't check.

Woman: Okay.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Woman: Thank you.

Alexei Sozonov: Okay thank you everybody.

Ken Bour: We can stop the recording now.

END