

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Working Group Model (WG) Work Team  
(WT)  
TRANSCRIPTION**

**Wednesday, 16 April 2009 14:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee Working Group Model (WG) Work Team (WT) meeting on Wednesday 16 April 2009, at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:  
<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ppsc-20090415.mp3>  
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#april>

Participants present:

J. Scott Evans - Chair IPC  
Avri Doria - NCA  
Tim Ruiz - Registrar  
Alexei Sozonov - Registrar  
Alexey Mykhaylov - Registrar  
Konstantinos Komaitis - NCUC  
Iliya Bazlyankov - Registrar c.  
Tim Ruiz - Registrar c.  
Caroline Greer - registries c.  
Nacho Amadoz - Registries c.  
S. Subbiah - Individual  
Jonne Soininen - Individual  
Graham Chynoweth - Individual  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC  
Greg Ruth – ISPCP – joined the call late

ICANN staff

Liz Gasster - Senior Policy Counselor, ICANN Policy Support  
Ken Bour - Policy consultant  
Glen de Saint G ry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent apologies:

Bertrand de la Chapelle  
Thomas Roessler

J. Scott Evans: He can type in the discussion note section or basically anywhere. And anybody can share their desktop and work space so I would just recommend that nobody do that without announcing it ahead of time.

I'm hoping that I can do all of the sharing from this - I'm actually logged in Ken, as Glen Desaintgery, the first one. The second one is the real Glen and that's because I used her login in order to get things set up.

Woman: Would you like - the recording hasn't started yet.

Man: Yes, that's why I'm waiting.

Coordinator: The recording has started Madame, please go ahead.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you, (Anna). I'll do the role call J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Glen Desaintgery: We have on the call (Alexi Savinov).

(Alexi Savinov): Yes thank you.

Glen Desaintgery: J. Scott Evans, the chair of this group, Avri Doria, Gray Chynoweth please help me with your pronunciation.

Gray Chynoweth: Yes, Chynoweth, and that's great.

Glen Desaintgery: Chynoweth. Iliya Bazlyankov .

Iliya Bazlyankov : Yes, yes.

Glen Desaintgery: Caroline Greer, (Excee), Tim Ruiz, (Maxure Amadas) and (Sebious) and for (unintelligible) we have Liz Gasster, Ken Bour and myself, Glen Desaintgery.

Have I missed anybody? I don't see anybody else in the (Adobe) connect room who is not on the call. Is that right? It seems to be all, thank you. J. Scott?

J. Scott Evans: All right, so we have the agenda. First thing we are going to do is we are going to talk about the sub team reports that have been circulated and I think (unintelligible) has put together a consolidated version of these.

I think also that Tim Ruiz has sent around an email this morning that we should allow him to present to the group in case everyone hasn't had an opportunity to see that.

Then we are going to talk about the next phase and then any other business. So if it's alright with everyone, I would like Tim to kick us off this morning with our first review of sub team reports because he has several points he made in his email this morning that I'd like to get out to the group. So Tim I'm going to turn it over to you.

Man: Okay, J. Scott just before you do, let me go ahead and share that document because I've created a consolidated one and I'm going to share my desktop and pull that up, so Tim if you want, you can address - hopefully everyone will see this now.

And you can make, on your screen, you can go to full screen on that sharing by hitting the Full Screen button and then you will be able to see this very clearly.

J. Scott Evans: I think that's the top right hand.

Man: So how do we - let's see - okay I see.

J. Scott Evans: There's a little window in the top right hand that says maximize pod.

Man: Everybody's got presenter mode so, okay.

Man: Oh wow, okay.

Tim Ruiz: So the first thing that I just wanted to (infernim) I guess is that, you know, like I said in my email, I'm all right with moving on to the next stage, but just wanted to clarify or get clarified something you had said, that J. Scott had said about consensus.

It's just that consensus to move forward as long as I can agree to that as long as it doesn't mean that we're committing to the summaries as their written. And we can probably spend a lot of times on those summaries.

So I guess, I think, they're a good starting point but not the end point. So as long as they're still open to, you know, to being massaged and changed or whatever as we get further into the work, you know, I'm okay with that.

If we're looking at taking these points as, you know, they're sort of written in stone at this point, then we need to move forward with them as written, then I think we need to spend more time on it.

J. Scott Evans: Well, I think your - personally I believe that the stickiest issue we have is going to be the consensus issue...

Man: Right.

J. Scott Evans: ...and I believe that is open. And I had hoped that we would circle back to that after we sort of got through some of the work that I believe was more organizational in nature, which is I believe where Ken is asking that we move to the next step. And then we can come to this consensus issue and inform that when we get to that point within the next level.

So that's sort of how I envisioned it but I'm open to other thoughts and comments. So I guess what I'm saying is Tim, I believe that these are in a working draft form, Tim, that you're correct, as we move forward, could be massaged, they are not set in stone at this point.

Tim Ruiz: Got it, okay.

J. Scott Evans: They would be part of - what I think we need to do is drive forward a little bit in the process and then come back and see how the next stage of the process will inform these summaries and then at some point, jibe everything together into one work product.

Man: And just so that I'm - I apologize for my naivety if I'm asking an obvious question, but the summaries we're talking about, the connection between the, I guess the comments versus the summaries are the bolded in that consolidated document?

Ken Bour: Yes. The items one through nine are bold just as they were in the original charter.

Man: Okay.

Ken Bour: Or model.

Tim Ruiz: So J. Scott, I agree with that and I think that's a good way to move forward so I don't know if you want me to go through my...

J. Scott Evans: I think you should go ahead and go through it so we'll know where your thinking is and if anyone has any strong positions at this point, we can discuss them.

But I think basically we should just have those in mind as we move forward, as this is an issue we're going to need to circle back to. I will tell you at the - and I think Tim you're on the PPSC as well, this is a very important issue, even at the PPSC level and is one that is going to require very in-depth consideration.

Tim Ruiz: Right, right. So let me just - my thinking right now and of course my thinking can change, I'm sure as everybody else's can, as we go forward and discuss these things more thoroughly.

But what I was trying to get to was something that is simple, that's clear, can be easily understood, that can be reported on, you know, very clearly as well and can be demonstrated.

By showing support of the various members for different views or positions with the idea in mind that when this report finally comes back to the council, you know, the council's role is one of the management role.

But they clearly need to understand, you know, what each of the views were and what those positions were in order to know, you know, how they might want to move forward.

Or, you know, in some cases may want to come back to the working group with questions or perhaps requests for additional information or work. So with that kind of thinking in mind and of course being on the council, thinking, you know, these reports are going to - I'm going to be one of the ones having to look at these things.

But I had seen was four basic thresholds that could be reported on it or that could be determined. So the first one would be full consensus, which is just, you know, everyone is in confirmed agreement, it's 100%, there's no descent.

Two would be rough consensus where it can be demonstrated by showing support of the various participants or members of the working group that more than 50% of the group is in agreement with a particular view or position. Then no consensus would be that there is no consensus for a particular view.

In other words, there may be multiple views or positions and not one of them has more than 50% agreement of the group. And then a minority view then of course would be any view like that. So any view or position that has 50% or less of the support of the group would be considered a minority view so to speak.

But in the reports, regardless of what each view or position, what level of consensus it contains they should all be included in the report showing what level of consensus they have and then that level

demonstrated by showing which of the participants are in support of each view or position.

And then I feel that that gives then the council the information they need to make decisions about moving forward on particular recommendations or physicians reviews or whether they need more information or feel more work needs to be done whatever.

So that's kind of what I would like to see at least at this point just given what I know today or what I understand today that's kind of the way I feel about it.

Ken Bour: This is Ken Bour, I'm sorry Tim I was pointing the group towards sub team Group A, Elements 1, 2 and 3. You were addressing your comments it sounds like to a consensus position, which is a different number

Tim Ruiz: Yes that was, I think was probably the Group B, right, 4, 5 and 6 or something.

Ken Bour: Okay sorry about that. So I was not pointing to the right place.

Man: I was trying to look for that.

Tim Ruiz: Yes they're just kind of related as I look at the summary that's my, that's probably, you know, on my list of concerns that's number one and so that's why I wanted kind of to point that out specifically.

But based on what J. Scott has said about how we're going to move forward and which is what I kind of figured that these things aren't in



stone that it's still open for, you know, further discussion and refinement.

You know I'm fine with not, you know, to date (unintelligible) and decide what we're going to do today. But I just wanted to get another view out there.

J. Scott Evans: I agree and I think this is going to be the most significant debate. And that's the reason I agree with Ken and Liz. We sort of need to move to the next step and sort of get a framework together of practicalities and then come to this difficult issue as a rounding off point at the end.

The one thing is that I would say that I see in these comments -- and I also see in your email Tim that it's going to be difficult, and I (want) Avri if she would to speak to this -- is they both seem to sort of lead - tangentially refer to voting or some sort of voting.

And it's my understanding that the whole idea of a consensus model or the working group model is to sort of get away from headcounts.

Tim Ruiz: Right, you know, I don't completely disagree with that and I tried to avoid the term voting. But the issue is, is that, you know, we're not, this isn't the IETF for example where we're putting together, you know, what we're going to end up with the work product is an RFC that sets a standard that may or may not be adopted.

It's not necessarily enforceable on anyone certainly, you know, some may be adopted as standards by various entities, but in this regard what we're doing as the GNSO is we're, in many cases we'll be

determining policy that will be enforceable contractually upon the contracted parties.

So we're setting regulation, in the sense and for - as a contracted party, for me I want to be sure that the consensus is there, that it isn't left to -- no matter how experienced or, you know, well trained a chair is or other participants -- that it isn't left to, you know, a single individual. As to, you know, what has consensus and what doesn't, without anything to back up clearly what does and what does not.

So I think to some extent it's going to be pretty tough to get completely past the headcount kind of thing when we're talking about things like, you know, enforceable regulation upon contracted parties.

(Sebious): This is (Sebious).

Tim Ruiz: It's going to be difficult for those contracted parties to accept, you know, that moving forward with that idea unless there's some way to determine beyond doubt that yes this was the consensus view whatever.

J. Scott Evans: Okay I agree. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes.

(Sebious): This is (Sebious), I wanted to say something.

Avri Doria: Two points, I had my hand up and it actually works.

J. Scott Evans: Yes you do. (Sebi) if you will go down, if you want to be in the queue in the bottom left-hand corner you see the little man down there

(Sebious): Yes I see it.

Man: I see Gray Chynoweth has done it, (unintelligible) and then you've done it so we've got Avri, then Gray, then (Sebious).

Avri Doria: Okay yes and I know we don't want to talk about this now, so I'm really just flagging the issues. Because I don't, I feel uncomfortable calling it a consensus point without having flagged (unintelligible).

One, I think we can deal with the we're not supposed to vote working group meetings without having (unintelligible) and we're not like the IETF because the mandate is that we have to somehow move beyond voting in most cases.

But I would also say that we can probably have numeric guidelines without having to have a notion of voting. And certainly I'm not trying to insist that we be IETF like if anybody thinks that we are. We have staff people, IETF doesn't, no staff people so we'll never be like IETF.

The other point though that I wanted to make which is we have a notion of consensus now, a strange notion of consensus in ICANN that says it's a 2/3 threshold.

I feel uncomfortable defining rough consensus as a 50% guideline mark and would think that more rough consensus corresponds much more to our consensus to find a 2/3 point that we have now.

And so we may need a fourth point called looks like most people, majority or whatever and those are the two points I wanted to make.

J. Scott Evans: Okay thank you Avri. Gray?

Gray Chynoweth: Yes I guess my question was am I supposed to have comments, I have comments on this. Are we really going to talk, are we going to continue to go into depths on this now or are we going to move on to a new point. So that's point of personal privilege to ask a question I guess at the beginning.

J. Scott Evans: I think that we're just flagging this we're not going to have an in-depth discussion at this point because as I said this, we're already 25 minutes into the call. I think that some points have been raised that we need to consider.

But we to move on to the next work knowing that this consensus issue is one that we are going to deal with after we do the other two things that are on our agenda. After we get that work done we're going to circle back to this consensus issue because it really is the heart of the matter.

But it's going to be very complex and I want to get the things I think we can accomplish first out of the way and then circle back to this unless there is great disagreement with that plan.

Gray Chynoweth: No I would then, I'll withhold my comments until we get to it on the agenda and suggest that we move to the other points as you suggested.

J. Scott Evans: It's not going to be on the agenda again today it's probably going to be on the agenda at a future call.

(Sebious): Hello.

J. Scott Evans: Hello.

(Sebious): (Sebious) here.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

(Sebious): Am I, yes.

J. Scott Evans: And I would ask all of you after you speak you need to go down to your little man and clear your status. It takes your little man off.

(Sebious): All right. Sorry, this is (Sebious) here and since this point particularly concerns the Team B statement that we put together. First I'd like to say that probably the best thing we should do given that, you know, it's been a couple of weeks and we're all busy I guess.

And we can't get to the point my suggestion is that after this call, any of the points just like the one that Tim raised, you know, any of the points out there that is left that people in particular think is going to be an issue for them.

I mean not necessarily that detail what it is, maybe they can flag it on an email to all of us, so we kind of know at least those are the ones we need to pay more attention for the next meeting or something. That's just a suggestion.

Secondly regarding this consensus (unintelligible) I actually I think what (unintelligible) put together there is pretty much in line with at least the part that Tim described in his email was his number was 50%, suggestion there was 40% although I think that what Avri says 2/3 is probably a better one.

But, you know, we just came up with something in the draft. But, I don't, so and the other thing is that the only other things that it included was the issue of a quorum that she intended of some kind.

But anyway, I also believe that, I just wanted to make sure that perhaps that at some point down the road when we do circle back after having flagged some issues and discussing it that we come back and discuss these things in depth.

I think clearly we would have to go point-by-point and, you know, just ask whether there's a rough consensus or whatever consensus is decided on for each of these points and if there's certain issues that are tricky then we'll probably need to take some kind of vote.

I mean, so, wait for that point. No problem.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you. All right, Tim can you put back up the agenda?

Tim Ruiz: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: All right, so, I, as pointed out the tables the discussion with regards to these summaries, understanding that they are a place holder for us for

further discussion and we're going to move to the next phase and that is we're going to develop two drafting teams.

One's going to work on a model for working teams and one that's going to work on guidelines for working teams to use when drafting a charter. So, what I would like...

Man: Would you repeat the first one again? Would you?

J. Scott Evans: Yes. The first one is to work on a model for how working teams would be formed...

Man: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: ...how they would be run.

Ken Bour: J. Scott, this is Ken. If it would helpful, I wouldn't mind putting a little structure around this section if you...

J. Scott Evans: Go right ahead.

Ken Bour: Hopefully, this will work. I created on the Wiki a section for like the original work plan and I am going to click on it and I think this will open up on all of your desktops.

And I'm just going to click on that and then hit Browse and please let me know, anybody, if it doesn't fire up some kind of browser where you can see this page.

Man: I think on mine, if you have a pop-up blocker, I think it just blocks it.

Ken Bour: Oops. Okay, well you can on your own, you can click that, the link was, let me just pull this down, under Web links two, Work Plan PPSC Deliverable and if you click on that and then hit down where it says Browse To, it should take you there. I hope.

Man: Did you just post in the chat section, could you just paste in the link?

Ken Bour: The browse, if you just go to the browse section you can simply copy it right out of there.

J. Scott Evans: Yes. I am there.

Ken Bour: Okay. The link is there.

Man: All right.

Ken Bour: Okay? What we had done originally when we built this Wiki is to create this page, I don't know how many of you have had a chance to look at it, but it was a, okay, everybody's link - all right, okay, I've got three of them open now.

I guess this is one reason why everybody being presenter might not be the best idea. I've got four of them open now. Hang on. Yikes. Every time somebody else opens it in the Wiki, it opens another one for me and everybody else too probably.

Man: And for me.



Ken Bour: Okay fine. Let's see, the original - what we had thought this team might ultimately do is to produce two different documents. And you'll see that in this page there's a scope, a paragraph about deliverables, which refers to section one, which would be a charter guidelines document.

And what we had originally had in mind was to develop a set of sort of working procedures or templates, if you will, that the GNSO Council might use, when it's drafting a charter for a real working group.

And it might include, and this list, by the way, right now you just see a whole series of bullets. These are some of things that we thought would go into a charter guidelines document.

And then in a second I'm going to actually show you a one attempt that sort of organizing into something more meaningful. But for the, and in fact, if we click on the Charter Guidelines link right in that first paragraph where it says one, it will actually take you to that page, but let's don't just do it, just a second.

So, the charter guidelines document would have things in it like, you know, what are the naming conventions that working groups ought to adopt. Things about how they get announced and advertized and then, of course, important things like what is the mission?

And this group, I would hope, would develop guidelines for the council, so that when its writing a charter, that it has very specific ideas about mission and focus that it needs to include in those charters, right.

So, this would be and you can go through and look at all these various categories that might be in the charter guideline. And the second

document, scrolling down a little bit, to where it says number two, would be a model for how any working group, once its chartered, would actually behave and operate.

And that would have certain sections in it like, how to deal with member disclosures and statements of interest, all of the formation, assembly introductions, logistics, maybe even building some kind of checklist for any chair, so that the chair's would know various things that they are supposed to do right off the bat.

Some of that stuff could be easy. Then there's a whole lot of things surrounding how to plan sessions; how frequently are they going to meet and, you know, what's the agendas, who's going to take the minutes and where are they going to get posted and mailing lists and all those things.

So, we would build a model that would contain all of these various headings and chapters that would instruct, if you will, a working group, what it, how it should behave.

It would, instead of having them sit down in the first seven meetings and say, okay, you know, what should we talk about? Are we going to have, how are we going to do drafts and are we going to use sub-teams and how, all that kind of stuff have been pre-thought out for them so they can get right into the mission that they have been chartered to do.

So this was the first structure that we assembled and I don't know if you, J. Scott you want me to stop here and see if there is any general consensus as to whether this is a good approach.

Man: (Unintelligible). I cannot get much help in the queue. I don't see the Web

J. Scott Evans: Okay, go ahead.

Man: So, in general I think that having a template for the working groups and for the charter going through some of the initial kind of decisions in a way that it doesn't have to go be gone through then when the working groups formed and people will then be then kind of confused and stuff like that.

And also, using business tools to see how well thought the idea is, kind of like, having people - all their T's crossed and so on before they form a working group that is not too easy to form a working group either.

But one thing that what as balanced it at is it has to be a little bit, maybe thought in a way that not everything is thought through. Like use (unintelligible) sub-themes or stuff like that might be something that the need arises during the work and might not be known before the work or start, actually.

And that those things should be that the toolbox of tools, if you will, should be available also where the (unintelligible) after the working group has been created and not just during the work group creation.

J. Scott Evans: I agree. I think that the structure needs to be flexible enough that it can be manipulated as the work informs the structure that needs taking place. So, as I understand your comment, is that what your saying is, that there should be a toolbox of a set of tools that are generally

outlined, but you don't have to decide on your first call that you are going to do A, B and C.

It may be that you have this toolbox and as the work flows along, you realize you need to pull out sub-teams and that structure is sort of explained on how you might do that, but it's not a rigid structure, its a malleable structure.

Man: Exactly. However, of course, there are some tools that are kind of mandatory, like having a maybe a mailing list done and things like that, that have to be set up before time and they have special where, like meeting documents and the work group documents go.

Those are important; already set-up beforehand. But, those are kind of default set-up tools, but tools beyond their default set should then be available also later on.

J. Scott Evans: Well, what we need to do today is to decide if this is the way to go forward and I personally, I'm a neutral chair, I think that this is great, it gives each group something to start with, it is a suggestion and discussion point to start the groups, the two groups work.

And I want to thank Ken and the rest of the staff for helping put this together. I do think the group should know that this doesn't mean that they can't go beyond this, or pare this down, this is just a starting point for you and what we need to do is to decide who's going to serve on the two groups to consider these issues.

Gray Chynoweth: And I guess I tried to raise my hand there...

J. Scott Evans: I don't have that screen up because I've got this...

Gray Chynoweth: I'm sorry. Somebody's got - somebody is having some fun with the discussion notes.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, now I'm back and I see - is that Gray's hand is up?

Gray Chynoweth: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Go ahead Gray.

Gray Chynoweth: I would just like to - I think this is a great - essentially what this says to me is that we're going to give two groups of people things to really think about when they're doing stuff.

We're going to give the people who are forming the working group a list of criteria that they really got to think and work through before they form something.

And then I think that we're giving the (unintelligible) working group at its outset a list of things to really think about before they get into the actual work that they're doing.

And I think that to me, that would be the most important thing about kind of how we're conceiving of these things and especially at the working group model level, which is that we're not telling anyone on any working group what to do in too much specificity.

We're really just suggesting that they think about, you know a series of questions about how they're going to operate and provide suggestions,

you know, when they - about how to resolve those questions that they're going to have.

And I'd be happy to serve on the, or I don't know, to work on the charter guidelines if now as some people start to volunteer.

J. Scott Evans: I would like people to start volunteering. I see that (Sebious) has raised his hand.

(Sebious): I guess there's a Doodle on this (direct). I had volunteered to be on the working group model issues itself (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Yes, this is Ken. In fact, I can simply click on this Doodle link and it's in the Web links, the Doodle selection results. I had hoped to just bring this up for everybody so you could just see where we are...

J. Scott Evans: Yes, that would be great.

Ken Bour: ...and I just did that, okay. Okay, everybody else is clicking on it. And so what I would recommend is if you haven't already voted in the Doodle, please do so and then we'll have everybody's ideas to where they want to go.

J. Scott Evans: Right and we're going to need to balance these. So I'm going to take the chair's position to say that if it isn't - if everybody signs up for one or doesn't balance out, I'm going - before we confirm these in stone.

I'm going to contact some folks to see if I can persuade to move if necessary. Because we can't have one group staffed with everybody and then two people doing something with the other group because it's

just overwhelming and doesn't bring in enough perspectives, I think, to the process.

Ken Bour: Well right now, we have six on the operating model and we have three on the charter guidelines.

J. Scott Evans: I see that. That's why I made that comment.

Ken Bour: Yes, okay.

Man: I just joined the charter group so it should be - if you refresh, it maybe six and four.

Ken Bour: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: So, yes I see, all right. And I'm not sure if - how many of our members can (desist) now take into account.

Ken Bour: One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten and I would have to jump back to the Wiki to see what are total list is. We've got ten up there?

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Ken Bour: And let's see, it looks like we have 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12...21, about 1/2.

J. Scott Evans: All right. So...

Ken Bour: We know that (Thomas) wasn't here today and then (unintelligible) was also not here today and I don't think they voted.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, but what I would like to do is to Ken send out another email to the list identifying those that need to go to the Doodle and vote and then hopefully by close of business on Friday, be able to constitute these groups. And then those groups have a call next week. Is that workable for everyone? I see (Sebious) your hand is still up, do you have...

(Sebious): Sorry, no.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Liz Gasster: J. Scott, it's Liz. The only challenge the staff might have is that we're out of pocket most of next week. We can still do a call, but it probably need to be early relatively speaking like - early for us because the meeting is in L.A. like this same time.

J. Scott Evans: I mean if we need, you know, we're burning time fast.

Liz Gasster: Right, right. We can accommodate it, we just need to work on the time of day.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, well that's fine. So that would be my plan is to have the teams constituted by the end of this week and then have those teams charge with having a call next week.

Gray Chynoweth: Sounds good.



J. Scott Evans: And then...

Glen Desaintgery: It's Glen. So there would be three calls next week?

J. Scott Evans: ...no, we're not - this group would not have a call.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay, only two calls?

J. Scott Evans: Only two calls and because the teams will not be constituted of the same people, everybody will only, you know, each group will just have a call, so you'll only have one call as your responsibility with regards to this overall working group team, you'll just be subdivided into one of two groups. So if we could do that, I think that would help us.

And then at the end of those calls next week, if either staff or whomever decides to lead the charge with regards to these two teams, could inform me of where you all are. Then we can decide if on the week of the 27th, is that's correct, which is the week after next, if this full team should have a call or if the sub teams should have another call and put our call off until the third week.

Was that confusing enough for everybody?

Gray Chynoweth: I think just about.

J. Scott Evans: So what I'm suggesting is next week, the two sub teams, the charter sub team and the working, you know, those two sub teams - the two groups that are identified, would have a call.

And at the end of that call, someone would inform me where they are in their work and we would either the next week, the week of the 27th, have an additional call of the two sub teams with no full working group team call. And then - so there would be two working, two sub group calls before we have a meeting of this entire group again on the third week.

(Unintelligible) in writing, so it would be less confusing. Okay. I see Avri is still confused about the difference between the two groups. We want to go back to the Wiki page.

Gray Chynoweth: Yes. Well, yes, we can go the same one or - yes, let me hit that one.

Avri Doria: Yes, I guess I just don't understand the difference between a model of how a working group works and guidelines for how a working group works.

Ken Bour: This is Ken, let me take a shot at it. They are not both for how working groups work. The charter guidelines would be developed to help whoever the drafters are of the working group charter.

So the question is, what goes in a working group charter, you know, what kinds of things need to be written into any working group charter whether it's for the council, whether it's for the policy development or maybe anything else?

It could be a generic set of things and it would contain such things as there should be a mission, there should be a scope, there should be

issues around budget, there should be sections that deal with this, this, this and that.

And again, not hard and fast requirements, but guidelines that a council drafting team for example, could use in writing its charter to create a working group to do some particular task.

Then once the working group forms, it needs a set of operating guidelines that help inform it, you know, what to do. Now you might have a very experienced chair that knows what to do and that's fine but, you know, in the case of a team forming.

There would be all kinds of guidelines and helpful suggestions and things about norms and establishing norms going to be. And what voting is and isn't going to happen and of course referencing the charter itself and statements of interest and other - and that's what we've tried to do is to break these things up.

Avri Doria: Okay I think I understand now is there difference in weight between something that is a model. Is a model a very good thing where is a guideline is sort of a - so in other words did you intentionally pick working group operating model versus working group charter guidelines?

In other words because models sometimes you have to stay within a model, as opposed to it being a guideline that gives you guidance, but not strict control. A model tends to be stricter at least in my understanding.

So was there a reason why you picked that one of them is guidelines and one of them is - one of them is operating guidelines and one of them is operating charter guidelines? Or is there some significance?

Ken Bour: There was no intentional significance I don't think to using the terms model versus guidelines. In fact initially we I think we were - we just called it working group charter.

We didn't even add the word guidelines and then I think based on some internal staff calls we decided why don't we add the word guidelines. In terms of operating model it's just that it's a model it's not intended to be a prescription for a specific anything.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks, I'm not confused now.

J. Scott Evans: So that's our plan.

Man: Jay Scott just let me - before we move too much further I wanted to point out to the group and I'm going to click on another link. In the Web links you'll also see that there are two. One called Working Group Team Operating model and one that says Working Group Team Charter Guidelines.

I'm going to pick the charter guidelines first and just browse to it and hopefully everybody can get there. And this is the same work plan all the bullets except that they've been grouped into what you might call chapter headings.

Again just suggestions, but it might be a little easier to see. So again if we're writing a charter guidelines document that a council or someone

else - a drafting team might use. One whole chapter might deal with mission purpose and deliverables.

And then another chapter might have to do with formation staffing and organization of the team. And then rules of engagement and it seems to me that the charter would specify certain rules of engagement right because - and other rules of engagement might actually occur in the operating model.

So for example under rules of engagement, you know, we have, you know, decision making methodologies. That might be a place where in the actual charter it talks about what consensus should be and what unanimity means and so forth.

What relationships the council has versus a working group or whoever the chartering body is and so forth and so on. Now I'm going to flip back to and click on the other link, which is the operating model and we'll browse to that one.

And does everybody have that? So a tentative structure for the operating model might look at things like group norms. So what does it mean to be in good standing in this group and issues concerning your commitment participation, attendance and contribution levels.

These are sort of norms that would exist inside of a team that wouldn't be prescribed in a charter document. And then there might be issues that the group wants to deal with concerning behavior and other things of that type.

How to indicate support or objection and what abstention rule should apply. So these are all the things I would think that the team that's working on the model would want to focus in on to help a particular working group with its deliberations moving itself toward its ultimate products and output.

Now those are both Wikipages one for the model and one for the charter. And I just simplified them for the headings and you can get to those pages from either the working group main Wikipage.

Or you can get it from the work plan page either way there are links from both of those to these individual pages. And hopefully the teams can actually use these Wikipages to do some of its work, you know, by uploading a documents and adding comments and stuff like that so there is actually two pages there.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. So here's what I am going to suggest is that we constitute these two teams by close of business on Friday. That these two teams each have separate calls next week and the week following.

In two weeks from - in two weeks this whole group will have another call to be informed of the work of the two sub groups. My goal would be by the last week of May for these two sub groups to have finished their work on putting together a proposal to be considered by the entire group.

Man: Sounds good.

J. Scott Evans: And once we have that proposals together and we reach consensus on the two proposals, we will come back and go and work on this

consensus issue. And hopefully take the first two or three weeks in June to work through this and if we still need more discussion, have discussion in Sydney.

And my goal would be by the end of our Sydney meeting to have a report that we can deliver to the PPSC.

Ken Bour: Jay Scott, Ken Bour may I jump in? I guess I should raise my hand sorry.

Man: So that's sort of how I see it. Ken.

Ken Bour: Okay. Yes when I raise my hand, I'm Glen. I was just wondering if you could say a little bit more about what it means to put a proposal together. What are we looking for what should - what should the proposal have as in contents?

J. Scott Evans: Well I think it should consider these points that have been put out and decide if these are the points they want to consider. If they are, then they need to inform those points. So with regards to the working group what is called now work team model or whatever it is.

They would say a level of corium would be X, Y, Z. They would actually inform those points.

Ken Bour: May I make a suggestion that two things. One if each team could actually flush out the outline right. The topical outline...

J. Scott Evans: That's what I want you to do.

Ken Bour: Good. And agree that those are the rights or chapter headings and structures.

J. Scott Evans: That's correct.

Ken Bour: Then...

J. Scott Evans: That's where we want to be in two weeks.

Ken Bour: Okay. But are you also asking them to sort of begin writing the actual sections that would appear under each one of them?

J. Scott Evans: Not until we have this full group call and get consensus on the full group that whatever organization or points they want to consider we have consensus. Once we do that. So two calls to work through the points that you've identified and see if that's the points they want to consider.

Do they want to add? Do they want to eliminate? Do they want to organize them the way they're organized? Do they want to organize them differently? Then we have a group to consider those two positions and see if we have consensus on the larger group.

And then once we do that the two sub groups would then go and write actual proposals informing those points that we would have by the end of May for consideration by the larger group.

(Sebious): So everything needs to be done by the end of May.

J. Scott Evans: That's correct.



(Sebious): Is that correct? Okay.

Man: Well just the outline that's what I mean.

J. Scott Evans: Needs to be done in three weeks.

Man: That's more than the outline correct? That's - we're going to have - we're going to flush out an outline in our calls next week and then we're going to bring back those flushed out and generally agreed upon by at least the sub group outline.

With maybe some - one sentence or two sentence explanatory information and then after there's a consensus at the group level about all of the bullet points being correct and being direct informed by the sentences underneath them. Then we get into the really full drafting.

J. Scott Evans: That is correct.

Man: That's correct.

J. Scott Evans: That's correct and I would see that if I look at my calendar, today is the 15th. There will be a call of the sub groups in the week of the 20th. There will be a call of the sub groups on the week of the 27th.

And then there would be a call of this whole group to consider the flushed out outline with one or two sentence explanations on the week of May 4. After we reach consensus that those are the points that everybody thinks needs to be considered, then that there would be the

11th, 18th and 25th weeks for those sub groups to then begin to put together proposals. And the week...

(Sebious): Glen, what did - (unintelligible) would it be possible if Jay (unintelligible) have this written on a email with a deadline just to have everything, you know, in front of us.

J. Scott Evans: I would send this out to the group as soon as this call was over.

(Sebious): (Unintelligible).

Ken Bour: This is Ken, J. Scott, I will go back and listen to the MP3 recording and actually create minutes, so I'll capture all that if you like.

J. Scott Evans: Well I'm going to go ahead and send it out to the group and have in their calendars.

Ken Bour: Okay fair enough.

J. Scott Evans: First week we would hopefully, the first week of June we would have a rough draft of each proposal fully flushed out by the two groups for consideration by the whole team.

And then we'll circle back to consensus and hopefully then the week of Sydney be able to finalize everything for a, and have a rough draft report for the PPSC. And I'll pin this out in email form in just a minute. But that's where I see us going. Anyone have strong objections to that?

Man: Nope.

J. Scott Evans: All right, does anybody have any other business they would like to discuss.

(Sebious): (Unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: I see she has and so has Gray and Caroline.

(Sebious): Caroline.

J. Scott Evans: So Avri. Okay, I don't see Avri. Caroline?

Caroline Greer: Just a quick one, you mentioned Sydney and I guess some of us are making our travel plans to Sydney already and do you anticipate us meeting the first weekend like we did last time? Or...

J. Scott Evans: That's when we'll probably meet. Glen has asked, but we have not had our call and I believe it's Saturday and Sunday.

Caroline Greer: Okay perfect.

J. Scott Evans: ...timing so...

Caroline Greer: (Unintelligible)?

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Caroline Greer: And if you would already start thinking of times on those two days, it would be most helpful.

J. Scott Evans: That's why I'm glad we've had this call, so I will hopefully work with you and we can send that out to the group. But everyone in this group needs to plan to work on Saturday and Sunday, so as you make your travel plans you need to get in there on Friday. Next is, Avri who is on mute.

Avri Doria: Yes sorry quick thing on doing the minutes and listening to MP3, be sure to include the stuff that got written and typed in on this forum too. Because I think a lot of content went here that didn't necessarily get (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: This is Ken I got - yes I'm going to save these discussion notes before I close this meeting out.

Avri Doria: Okay great, thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Okay Gray.

Gray Chynoweth: This is just a question on how the workings - I guess we just kind of loosely read these sub group reports and let those, let that discussion inform what we're talking about when we're finalizing the bullets. Is that the right way to incorporate this commentary into that next stage of work?

J. Scott Evans: You're talking about the commentary of the discussion notes?

Gray Chynoweth: No I'm sorry I'm talking about the consolidated report with the...

J. Scott Evans: Yes you can look at those and let them inform that list. That's correct. You can use it to see if there's anything that's been identified there that you either want to include or you assume it's covered.

Gray Chynoweth: Okay great, thank you.

Ken Bour: This is Ken, just a note there everything that was in Groups A, B and C, all those nine bullets, they're all represented in either of the two charter versus model sections. So presumably you will be able to map those issues back.

Gray Chynoweth: And I guess there was just one other point on that. Do you we - there was missing from the consolidated for comments on nine.

Ken Bour: Right.

Man: Correct.

Gray Chynoweth: And but then I saw someone said looked like there was nine information on nine was actually prepared.

(Sebious): Yes I think Team B actually asked in the last call that had asked a bunch of weeks ago. Actually those emails sent out where we just drafted a few lines around it. I can resend it if necessary.

Ken Bour: Yes this is Ken, I will attempt to locate that email or contact (Sebious) and then get that put into under nine and update the Wiki. That document is linked on the Wiki so I'll post it fixed.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. Next is I don't know who (COO) is. I apologize.

(Cheryl): It's me dear, (Cheryl).

J. Scott Evans: Okay (Cheryl).

(Cheryl): (Unintelligible) why my name's far too long. Just two points, one from the timing of the work group and team meetings on the weekend in Sydney as part of the Sydney meeting planning subcommittee I can assure you there's already an awful lot going on in those two days anyway.

And so if you want to block off a 1/2 day on either the Saturday or the Sunday the sooner the better or we're going to have serious competition including, since very general satellite meetings that many might be interested in.

And I'm happy to liaison on that with organizer with this work group. And the second point is with the work group Wiki, sorry not Wiki, with work group (Adobe) connect room that we have open now.

The ones that I use we normally have access to go back to them at any point in time. The link is live, the thing is recorded and people who aren't at this meeting can access what's going on in discussion and white board regarding any meeting at any time, so it can be a cumulative record to compliment the minutes.

J. Scott Evans: Well I can't speak to that because I don't know anything about it. So you'll have to ask staff or staff will have to ask their technicians because I don't know.

(Cheryl): But if I switch on whatever's required it would be handy.

Woman: (Cheryl) thanks we've been taking our queues from you and enhancing our fluency with this, so thanks for the additional information and we'll follow up on that.

J. Scott Evans: All right with that I'll send out an email...

Man: I'm sorry, Ken has his hand raised. Sorry.

Woman: He does? I don't see it.

Woman: Yes it's up.

J. Scott Evans: Whose hand is raised?

Man: Ken.

Woman: Yes Ken, yes I see it.

Ken Bour: I'll clear it though. May I just make one comment? Jay Scott in an early after Mexico City, we had a group goal to produce a document for the PPSC a work plan by the 21st of March. Just wondering if we still need to do that and...

J. Scott Evans: I think we can take our work plan, as I see our work plan is to just take this mile stone dates that I've just put out and maybe our minutes and draft them down to the bullet point that we can then deliver to (Jeff).

Ken Bour: One suggestion I might have is I could take the charter breakdown that are in the two individual pages, copy those breakdowns into the work plan that's on the work plan page of the Wiki and send that to you and maybe that could be the document you might want send.

It's got a scope and deliverables and we can just add milestones at the end because there's a place for that on that document.

J. Scott Evans: Why don't you do that and I'll take a look at it.

Ken Bour: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: All right, well it's now been an hour and almost ten minutes so I'm going to call this meeting to a close. And we will then send around an email of minutes and once you're on a group then we will hopefully the two sub groups can have calls next week.

Thank you all for your participation and we look forward to talking to you soon.

Man: Thank you.

(Sebious): Bye.

Ken Bour: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye.



END