

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

Wednesday, 26 August 2009 17:00 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 26 August 2009, at 17:00 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-wg-20090826.mp3>

On page:

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

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

Present:

J. Scott Evans - IPC Work Team Chair
Avri Doria - NCA GNSO Council chair
S. Subbiah - Individual
Alexei Sozonov
Graham Chynoweth (joined after roll call)
Alexey Mykhaylov
Cheryl Langdon-Orr
Jonne Soininen

Iliya Bazlyankov (Adobe Connect)

Absent apologies:

Liz Gasster

Staff:

Ken Bour
Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery
Gisella Gruber-White

Coordinator: The recording has started. If there are any objections (unintelligible). Thank you.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. J. Scott, would you like a roll call of who we have on the phone?

J. Scott Evans: I would please.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good evening to everyone. On today's call we have -- and excuse me for the pronunciation of some of the names - J. Scott Evans, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, JOnne Soininen, Subbiah, Alexei Sozonov, Alexey Mykhaylov , Avri Doria.

From staff we have Marika Konings, Ken Bour, Glen Desaintgery and myself Gisella Gruber-White. We also have a apologies from Liz Gasster. And we have Iliya Bazlyankov who is on the Adobe Connect but not yet on the call.

And if I could just please remind everyone as there are quite a few of us on the call today, to please state your name when you talk. This will help with transcription. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: All right. So as I said previously before, we have a draft version of the barter drafting guidelines in front of us that is 21 August.

This is the version that is on the wiki. It is merely textually a duplication of the PDF version and the Word version that is also linked on the wiki.

The only difference between this particular version and those two is that Avri Doria has been kind enough to review and go through and put in her individual comments and parentheticals throughout the document itself.

At this point Marika, I'm going to turn it over to you to cover the sections. And then we can discuss those and Avri's comments as they come up. Are you there?

Marika Konings: Yes. So if we maybe start then with 1.1. I don't - well can I can maybe first go into the section. I made a little change there in moving some of the history of the document of how it was developed to the end of the whole document.

And because I think going forward when groups are reviewing this they're probably more interested in the actual content and the templates than they are in how the document was actually developed.

So you know, my proposal was to move that to the end of the document. So the rest of this section is basically as you developed prior to my involvement.

So moving then to Section 1.1, the announcement of the working group, so basically we put in there several avenues that can be explored, suggested avenues for when a working group has been - is in the process of being created.

So I don't know, do you want me to go through different things or just give people a couple of seconds to read through it and make comments? What would you prefer?

J. Scott Evans: And one of the things, I noticed that in several points throughout the document, Avri had said something, you know, like well there needs to be some sort of standard suggestion.

And I would put to the group here if they do not think if of the bullet points if maybe some of the bullet pointed suggestions for circulation of a call for volunteers shouldn't be required rather than mere suggestions.

In other words, at a minimum that they have to do a call, a volunteer at A and B and then if they want to do additional, some additional suggestions are XYZ.

Subbiah: This is (Sobia) here making a comment on that. I didn't think about it before. But now that you bring it up and with Avri's point, I think personally I would say that at least for that one in terms of a wide call for volunteers giving enough time for people to be brought in, especially a more, a diverse group what I would say would be pretty much of a requirement.

I mean I didn't read it as a suggestion when I would read through it. But now, you know, being pointed out, I suspect that should be a requirement. You know, that's my point of view.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes I had my little agree cheek up as well. Cheryl Langdon-Orr here.

J. Scott Evans: Avri?

Avri Doria: Well I can make the change in the next version basically highlighting that the first two are really requirements. So one...

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...is more an option depending on the subject matter of the working group.

J. Scott Evans: And I think - yes - I think that that's - that would be an idea that I think that at a minimum you're required to do too. And then of course you're not - additional ideas to make it broad and to make sure that you're making it as all-encompassing you should consider and it's suggested and then do the third bullet point.

Avri Doria: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Now Avri, you have a comment here...

Avri Doria: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...about importance?

Avri Doria: Yes. I was agreeing in principle that, you know, in the announcement explaining the what, why, where for -- and you'll notice that the same kind of

comment occurs in several place -- importance tends to be a relative term.
Why it is something important, you know, always includes a and more than.

So I was looking for as I say, I was agreeing with the idea but I was looking more for the motivation, the reasons, the purpose the - that there's any number of other words that keep out things that are possibly value judgments or can be judged as value judgments.

J. Scott Evans: Well I would say that looking at the list that follows after the phrase that is which seems to be explanatory that purpose would be a better word.

So as to the purpose of the activity that is why the effort is being undertaken.

Jonne Soininen: Yes this is (Johan) now. I think I agree on that. I mean like the purpose and motivation, I'm not native speaker so I'm not sure of the, you know, difference between those two.

But either of them is better than importance because everything is important. Otherwise it wouldn't be done in the first place.

Subbiah: I'm not sure whether this is a better word but just to throw in the word here significance. I don't know whether that's...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just to add to that, I think the reason why we put importance wasn't really as, you know, more important than others but more in that context of to explain to those reading it why they should care.

So I agree. I mean maybe (purpose is) another word. But I think that was the thinking behind it, not as much that this working group is more important than the other working group but why doesn't matter to you basically.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Cheryl here. Therefore on that rationale in my opinion purpose is a perfect word for that.

J. Scott Evans: I agree. And I think Marika, that purpose and then the list behind it, you know, allow someone to make the subjective choice of why they should care.

Marika Konings: Yes no, I absolutely agree.

J. Scott Evans: So I think that if we've got a consensus from everybody on the call we'll agree that perhaps we should delete the term importance and insert the term purpose.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Hearing no objections I'll ask Marika to make that change in the next draft. All right, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes. Then on the next section I think before there was called something like security or had a different term. But I interpret that as more talking about your transparency and openness and making sure that, you know, everyone can participate. So that's how this section came about.

I think initially this had as well I think a suggestion from Ken to talk indeed about, you know, the importance or are we just talking the purpose and to communicate that. And I think we've incorporated that now in the other section.

So this is a question for the group, are people comfortable what is listed here? Are there any items that you initially had thought of that belonged in this part of the document?

J. Scott Evans: The only thing that I would say and, is there any document within the GNSO or being developed by one of the other groups that should be cross referenced here that covers this topic?

Jonne Soininen: Are we now in 1.2? This is (Johan).

J. Scott Evans: Yes we're on 1.2. I'm sorry (Johan).

Jonne Soininen: My fault.

Marika Konings: This is something we can check. I mean the idea is once we have a more final draft of this to sit together with the other team members working on the other groups to make sure that we have, you know, everything is aligned.

And for some of the items we have already been able to do that and identify items that are being worked on like the template for the statement of interest.

So, you know, the idea would definitely be to make sure that in the end every - all the documents coming together are aligned and, you know, are saying the same thing.

So - if someone - if anyone is aware and is participating in these other groups of anything that should be here, you know, please do speak up.

J. Scott Evans: All right, let's move to 1.3 please.

Marika Konings: Yes. 1.3 is on the purpose, importance and expectations of the chair. And maybe I think Avri made quite some comments. So maybe that's the way to work through the document. Avri, if you want to...

Avri Doria: Sorry I made so many comments.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Avri Doria: I just tend to do that. Yes again, I'm agreeing in principle. The word strong is always a concern to me because we all have different views of what strength

is. And some peoples' notion of strength could be quite harmful to a working group.

You know, I also the word respect is important. People get killed for it. And respect is certainly the word that's prevalent in jails and can cost you your life. And so I have trouble with the word.

And so I'm looking with things like experience, balance, fair, and neutral, informed. There are lots of really important adjectives that don't necessarily have as much baggage.

And so again, I'm sort of agreeing with the idea but I'm worried about what other people might read into the words.

Subbiah: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: What about if we said - I'm sorry, go ahead.

Subbiah: oh just (Sobia) here. I was just going to just say I'm okay with all of that. But I think that initial motion, I mean basically experience, balance, that's all fine. And I think that the - I'm - I mean I'm agreeing with Avri said. I think that this makes sense.

But the - but I think that perhaps the person or the intention perhaps of putting the word strong in there was less about maybe, you know ordering people around and all that. But I think - I'm just trying to read into it myself, you know,

And I'm saying it's probably because the idea of decisive, you know, because I think that's something that a chair probably has to do in difficult circumstances.

So maybe that word might replace that sort of notion that strongly (abroad) and I don't know what do you think Avri?

Avri Doria: Well someone else wanted to speak before me. But I would worry about that too because some people being decisive means making all the decisions.

Subbiah: Okay. Well...

Avri Doria: And so I think experience covers it. Experience meaning...

Subbiah: Okay.

Avri Doria: ...the chair of working groups covers these things. But hey...

Man: Well...

Man: Yes.

Man: ...my only comment would be that I mean maybe we want to base this around is the person's past record right? So, you know, an experienced chair with a reputation or past record of guiding, you know, effective group work will be a key ingredient for a successful outcome?

J. Scott Evans: I think we - what if - this is J. Scott. And by the way, that was great...

Man: Oh yes. I'm sorry.

J. Scott Evans: I'm doing that for the record. (Great).

How about we just say an experienced, fair with strong leadership skills will be a key...

Subbiah: Yes that will do.

J. Scott Evans: ...ingredient? Because it's strong. And that term I think what Marika was looking for or trying to convey was someone with leadership skills.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because strength implies -- sorry, Cheryl here - a number of other characteristics which may in fact be maladaptive to facilitation and openness and sharing.

J. Scott Evans: Right but so how about if we did that, an experienced chair with strong leadership skills is the key ingredient of a successful outcome?

Man: Sounds great to me.

Subbiah: Sounds okay to me.

J. Scott Evans: Avri does that sort of...

Avri Doria: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: And we - I mean we'll have a chance to look at this again and think about it again once it's been redrafted. But why don't we start with that? Marika, did you get that?

Marika Konings: Yes I did.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: J. Scott, Cheryl here. Just as a sidebar on that, I just popped into the chat. But just those who may not be, you know, on the Adobe room but I guess I'll say it for the record. It may be not within this particular document, but as an analogous event at some point it could be used to lecture the ICANN-wide for an exploration and perhaps a little in-service training on what experience and desired characteristics and guidelines for chairing and variety of things including working groups that could be explored. It's certainly something I've seen in other organizations.

J. Scott Evans: And I have made that suggestion to (Paul Twomey) -- I have not made it to (Ron Backstrom) -- that one of the things they probably should try to do is identify the leakers and do a little like use some of the time at the face-to-face meetings to do some leadership.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good heavens above, J. Scott. That'll never work. That sounds like a good plan. Sorry that was me tongue-in-cheek...

J. Scott Evans: I mean I just think, you know, the way you perpetuate getting people involved you know, is identifying, doing self identification and then...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...bringing them on board with, you know, some skills and having some workshops that are outside policy so - but I think that's a good idea.

But I think strong leadership skills. And maybe Marika we want to just say one comment about facilitation in there. And I'll leave that to your drafting.

But that's sort of better define the role and sort of takes it out from a role of control and more a role of facilitation. So if we can maybe put a comment about facilitation in there as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And J. Scott, I'm more than happy to assist in the future planning on convincing the new CEO that that other activity is a worthy one, that it's an organization that works with volunteers really needs that.

J. Scott Evans: Well maybe when we get to Seoul we can pull someone aside and talk about that Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Works for me.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. So is that okay Marika? Did you just may be in that sentence also put in, you know, with strong leadership and - an experienced leader with strong leadership facilitation skills blah, blah, blah?

I just think adding facilitation in sort of better define the role that you're not (controlling) this, you're just moving things along.

Are there any objections to adding something like that in?

Hearing none we will put it in the next draft for everyone to consider.

All right Avri, you had another comment about I think it's another - if I get it's another emotional word. But if you'd like to explain your comment?

Avri Doria: Yes okay. Let me get to it. Sorry about that.

J. Scott Evans: That's okay. We're still in 1.3 for anyone who's...

Avri Doria: Unjustified, yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...joined us or had to join back in because you've dropped off. I noticed that (Johan) had dropped off. So that's where we are. We're at 1.3. We're in that paragraph, non-parenthetical paragraph below Avri's first parenthetical insertion.

Avri Doria: Yes again it's a word choice and I'm agreeing in principle. But, you know, fussing over words. But unjustified requires basically a priority judgment that someone is making an unjustified. And so you have to hear and listen.

So the skill is really that someone should be able to listen, not understand the place an argument has within a discussion.

And at a certain point certainly they have to be able to tell that. But calling anyone's opinion unjustified is problematic. And it immediately put somebody on a defensive.

And that's not terribly productive, whereas, you know, however we feel about something being justified or not, knowing that it has no current place in a discussion or something like that is a much more - is much closer to being objective as obviously there's still a subject making a decision. But it's closer to something that is objective.

So I just worried about, you know, putting in our principle of charters that there are people who have unjustified viewpoints when it may just be that we don't understand the justification, we can't see it from their perspective, they have language problems -- whatever.

And so it's too easy a conclusion to jump to if the word is there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here, here.

Marika Konings: Would we solve it by just taking out the unjustified and just say who raise issues in an effort to block progress?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Man: Well I mean my only concern about that is that you could rate an issue and never (detract) progress but actually be doing inappropriately. I mean there's sometimes when progress actually should be stopped right, because something isn't being done right or a progress - or something isn't an appropriate processes isn't being followed.

So sometimes stopping progress is actually - I mean as strange as it sounds is sometimes it's appropriate if the progress that is getting made is in an inappropriate direction or happening in an inappropriate manner.

So my suggestion would be that it's - I mean it's really a distinction between either effective or - I guess I'd say like appropriate reasons for dissent or constructive reasons for dissent. For who are offering constructive dissent and those who are offering, you know, unconstructive or inappropriate commentary or - but that's the distinction that I would make, is between people that are trying to raise things constructively and people that are trying to raise things not in a constructive fashion.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here J. Scott. If I could just respond to that.

J. Scott Evans: Please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: One - at this point I just want to bring in a little bit of anecdote and experience specific to this point. And I'm coming down very firmly on the side of just removing the word unjustified.

I hear what you're saying about sometimes there are (I mean) justifications for things not going forward.

But in fact I'd argue against that being pardon the pun, the only way forward. Let me give you an example.

In the communication consumers work we've done late last year regarding mobile premium services which is a hugely emotional subject both for those who end up paying huge amounts of money and for those who end up making huge amounts of money in the system, our government required us to make some (formal) industry self guidelines effort.

And as you might imagine we ended up in very much a similar situation whereas the consumer into the spectrum felt we would not go forward on a few points and the industry side of the spectrum felt quite the opposite.

It was in fact far more useful for us to go through that process under proper due diligence, have all of the necessary steps in our established guidelines and agreements for developing policy go through. And then write our letters of dissent to the regulator pointing out why on points A, B and C the community of consumer representatives dissent on it and this is why.

And that was actually a more powerful outcome. And in fact the regulator inserted the codes, the sections of the codes and it did actually become a regulation then that we would still have been in rooms fighting with lawyers over. It was actually more expedient to not stop the process and the progress to use your example.

J. Scott Evans: Yes guess what my only comment back would be that I think to me that isn't blocking progress. That's facilitating progress.

But someone might say hey, you know, this - we can't send this out. This wasn't, you know, we didn't reach the consensus that we were supposed to reach right?

And so I guess you're saying that even if you're not following your own procedures it's better just to go through with the procedure than have the person say at the end of day that procedure wasn't followed?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It would need to have (dissents) and do that rather than end up (taking three), to do something where you have a three month, you know, endpoint can be much more valuable for all parties.

J. Scott Evans: Okay.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika if I can just add something. I mean saying the word progress, you know, can have different meanings. I mean progress can mean moving forward but you can make progress as well by just digging into the

issues and maybe taking a step back and looking at them again because a new point of view has been brought forward and then continuing.

So I think your progress should really be seen as, you know, someone that doesn't want to move any direction basically or that's your only objective to really just block the progress - block the process.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's more of an obstruction than a progress.

Marika Konings: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's lack of progress, yes.

Subbiah: Yes. This is (Sobia)...

J. Scott Evans: Yes (Sobia).

Subbiah: I just I think even may be visiting some of these points again there are similar things along the way (there are) one or two along these lines.

I think ultimately in any working group, you know, there are going to be instances of people trying to block things or unjustified. I mean there are going to be and however you define them in terms of these things are going to happen.

But ultimately the way if it works out that some group or party is trying to actually stop it or it's unjustified. I think the only outcome there is either the group as a whole basically just says no to the person or the chair steps in or if that doesn't work out it goes to the appeals process. I mean that's how these difficult situations would probably be ultimately taken care of anyway.

So from the perspective of the document that we are writing right now, the catchall is there, the - if there's a problem how that will all get taken care of.

So in all these places where we'd write it, we might as well write it with the best of intentions, you know, where we don't single out somebody for being unjustified or anything like that.

In the document itself when we write it, we write it with the best interest of everybody thinking that the best things are going to happen.

The catchall is already in there if things don't work out right? I mean in my - I hope I'm making sense in my...

J. Scott Evans: I think were coming down (Sobia).

Subbiah: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: I think your point is well placed. I think though that - I hear now with Cheryl's examination, explanation to (Gray) about using the appeals process that we have come to consensus we'll just remove the word unjustified?

Subbiah: Yes, yes. I think that would work.

J. Scott Evans: Everyone?

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. So Marika, we've got that. And then we have this sticky point Avri...

Avri Doria: Yes?

J. Scott Evans: ...regarding...

Avri Doria: Opening, reopening.

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Avri Doria: Yes and I agree completely with not reopening issues with nothing to add. But I think that, you know, sometimes someone will join a group because they heard that, you know, a certain decision has been made without hearing a point of view.

We definitely have to require them to have listened to everything and read everything.

But if a certain perspective is missing from the consideration, and perhaps, you know, there needs to be a process of explaining this to the chair first -- I don't know -- but just an absolute prohibition from bringing in new evidence is something that I'm concerned of.

And I have seen it happen in groups where there's a - you may not reopen issues but there's somebody there with something to say that's never been considered. And that has to be allowed I think. Otherwise we end up with a defective result.

Marika Konings: Would it be a suggestion to add then something like unless there is support in the working groups to revisit issue in light of the new evidence or in light of new information?

Man: Yes that makes sense.

Subbiah: I think that would work. It's (Sobia) here. But I think you could make what Avri's saying a bit more wider by just not limiting it to the person who's joining newly.

I mean it could be somebody in the working group already if something absolutely new, a new piece or thing, information has been discovered there should be a way to go back to revisit for even some who's participated all along.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There's epiphany from time to time. Sorry, Cheryl here.

Avri Doria: Avri with another comment. It may be reasonable to put in, you know, I worry a little bit about saying that that group has to agree to reopen it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The chair.

Avri Doria: You know that means then they have to understand that it's something new.

But certainly, you know, perhaps something that requires someone with new, not just a new person, but with new to have cleared it with the chair.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Jonne Soininen: Say something with the - well kind of like with - this is (Johan) by the way, with the appropriate support or something like that. But it's just not one person coming in explaining to have new information, the re-opening old issues but that there's some kind of support that this is a new issue and it should be looked at.

J. Scott Evans: So Marika what I would suggest we do is we handle in a separate sentence the opening previously decided questions, come up with something that applies to both new members and current members and then leave the sentence regarding making sure that new members are up to speed as is.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: Okay? And then we can consider how that drafting is done in the next draft for the one sentence that applies to reopening, issues, previously decided issues.

Because it - you know, the reality is at some point you're going to have to say we're moving on, you know, so somebody's got to make that call.

All right, Avri you had another point?

Avri Doria: Yes. The next one had to do with the chair...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...basically stating an opinion. And I totally agree that a chair should be able to give her opinion or his opinion on the subject.

But what I think needs to be added is that they can't become an advocate for the (position) and that anybody that has the need to be an advocate should not be in the chair.

So it certainly is reasonable for, you know, J. Scott in these environments to say, you know, I think that this wording, you know, does this and this and this and then back off and let the rest of the people talk.

But it's when a chair not only states their opinion but then constantly is driving the argument that it becomes problematic. So that's why I would add but not be an advocate, a phrase, you know?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sounds like we're writing that manual for the chairs on the side again.

Avri Doria: I agree.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I thought that a lot.

J. Scott Evans: Yes I think that that should be an additional sentence after ruling as the chair that states that point. That would be what I would suggest. What do others think?

They just take the - not ruling as a chair but then also make the additional point that you can state an opinion but you're not to advocate an opinion.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well because it's a most common failing that we see developing in the heat of argument on an important point I think it's well worth stating, yes.

Man: I would agree.

J. Scott Evans: Okay Marika?

Subbiah: Yes that sounds - I'm for it.

Marika Konings: Yes, I can put in some language so that the group can review that in the next draft.

J. Scott Evans: Super, great. All right. Now we've got the appointment of co-chairs.

Avri Doria: Yes, my point in this -- this is Avri again -- is a little flip. But it's basically working groups stop function when their chairs disappear.

Now yes the vice chair can often take place. But with co-chairs basically, you know, they coordinate among themselves. It's not really a - it's just a play on a point. It's not a serious, you know, principal like some of the others might have been.

Marika Konings: I can try to include some language about absent of the chair or something that, you know, can either be vacation or illness or whatever to highlight your point if that's okay.

J. Scott Evans: You may say could be considered and is encouraged.

Jonne Soininen: Yes so this is (Johan). I think this is just - I actually mentioned this to Avri briefly as well. Here we use co-chair. Later on in the text we use vice chair. And I see that - them as two different things.

Because when you have a vice chair you have a clear chairman and then you have a kind of secondary.

And however as Avri says, a co-chair is somebody who's your - who's the chairs peer and should be on the same level as the chair in the sense that - or the question is actually that if there are no chairs, if there are only co-chairs like what we have in IETF, there is no kind of ranking between the chairs. It has the benefit that they are all up to speed when that is kind of needed.

But if - the question is that do we have somewhere kind of like decided that we have one main chair then chairs that are kind of a not underneath the chair or do we have chair - or are all the chairs on the same level?

J. Scott Evans: I think...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: Well as I read the document it look like you could - you - we suggest you have a vice chair. And this point is that you could consider having co-chairs.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here J. Scott. I think the encouragement for consideration of co-chair particularly at situations where it's going to be extremely useful. And I

think most people, when they're setting up this process can do a little bit of crystal ball gazing and guess that this is the type of topic that they are about to head into, or the workgroup is about to head into that co-chairing would be advantageous.

I think to make it mandatory is faulty. Because what you end up with is all your best talent working themselves to death in the volunteer world, and in fact not making - wrangling the policy development processes very effectively, but not contributing to the processes where their communities or constituencies may have actually headed them towards ICANN to make specific import as opposed to helping others do so.

So I think it's a recommendation state. And again it's one of those things that can come into that in-service training as well.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I think Marika with those comments you can craft some language we can look at.

Marika Konings: Okay.

J. Scott Evans: All right, 1.4.

Subbiah: Well just before that J. Scott I have actually a point to the very last paragraph of 1.3, just a clarification. This is (Sobia).

J. Scott Evans: Sure.

Subbiah: You know, I mean I read through the whole document and that was the only thing I (kind) of spotted. And unlike Avri who seems to have picked up a lot of stuff with her evil eyes, the point that I had was the sentence just above 1.4 says the charting organization working with and staff.

Avri Doria: It should be the.

Subbiah: Yes I guess that's, yes correct. That - yes. First of all I think that's - yes, it's a grammatical issue. But also I was not clear whether there's - whether was independent role that staff could do this or chartering organizations could do it or together they have to be able to choose a professional facilitator.

Marika Konings: I guess the reason why staff was added there that is of course as well a budget question so I presume there and as well the staff might have information...

Subbiah: Right and that's fine. So I guess it will be working with the staff, that would be the language then?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's a wonder that grammar check will let that get through because I hadn't noticed it. You know, your mind just reads it sometimes as you expect it to be. Nice pickup, well done.

J. Scott Evans: Yes so it's the two of them together.

Subbiah: Okay. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: That was J. Scott. 1.4, other important roles.

Marika Konings: Yes just to add one thing here because it doesn't come up in the wiki version. I think it might've moved to the end.

But one of the questions that, you know, we're asking here is on the role of the liaison, should there be any kind of restrictions there on - or, you know, how liaisons can participate? Should they be able to state opinions and advocate for certain issues is a question.

And I think Avri's already put some...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...her opinion there. But the question is for the broader working group, should that kind of restriction be put in in charters?

Avri Doria: Okay I must have missed that when I was transferring the files in. Sorry.

Marika Konings: Yes I mean that's one of the issues with the wiki that you - some comments might have - I think it's move to the end. No, no, no problem. That's why I'm highlighting it now to the group.

Avri Doria: And the comment I put in because it came in italics without spaces is hard to see.

I honestly have a strong opinion.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: (Unintelligible) about putting some sort of restriction on the role of the liaison? In other words a liaison's role as I understand what Marika is saying and looking at what Avri has said is not really a member of the working team, the working group and not really an advocate for any position but more serves as an interface or between the chartering organization to handle sort of administrative issues and do reporting. But it's not an advocate.

Marika Konings: This is Marika if I can maybe add something. Because, you know, just to point out that it's not the current practice or at least, you know, in many of the working groups I'm responsible for, you know, liaisons take quite a proactive role often as well because they are subject matter experts or they're the ones that as well have raised the issue in the council. So they have a particular interest in the issue.

And so I think that's well - why, you know, they might have volunteered for the liaison role because they were planning anyway to take on that role and, you know, it's not always that council members participate in the working group.

So I thought we could take into account, you know, if such restriction would be put in place would it be more difficult to find volunteers to take on this role? And, you know, just to sit on the calls and not being able to actually state their views or engage or, you know, should that be - how it should be in the future?

Man: It seems to me like there's kind of three - there's three types of roles, right? There's one which is kind of the most minimal is an observer role where you don't actually express any opinions.

The second one is more of a chair type role which is that you can express opinions but not advocate for them or provide information about an advocate for a particular position.

And then third is a fully participating individual. So I guess the question is what - I mean, I guess we can either suggest that it's just clear what type of role the person's playing.

Because it seems like I mean I can certainly see why there would be real value to allowing a liaison to provide information and you can advocate for a position.

Avri Doria: This is Avri if I can get in the queue on it.

J. Scott Evans: Okay Avri there's no one else in the queue.

Avri Doria: Okay I think that it's not necessarily an observer role. I think it's an informational role is indeed a valuable role for a liaison to provide.

They're the ones that have context of what's going on in other groups. They're the one that can often provide answers, quick answers to, you know, thinking within a counsel within other groups. They can certainly go back and forth carrying questions and clarifications.

I think a problem when they become an advocate -- and I can see actually not having to put more restriction on them than you have for a chair -- that they have to be neutral. But certainly they can add input, but that they can't advocate is because that person actually carries -- and I know it sounds silly to say it -- but they actually carry additional mental power.

You know, they are a part of the group that is going to, you know, approve or disapprove something. So their utterances whereas the working group chair doesn't really have that. They, (sort of) the working group chair has ability to declare a consensus in that, but they're not going to be part of the group that's later making a decision on what the working group does and whether the working group followed due process and all of that stuff.

So the liaison really has to be extremely careful not to abuse that power. Now one way of looking at it is saying no council member can be a member. And in some places that may be reasonable though I don't think we can say that.

I think it would be a reasonable thing for this new counsel in its new managerial role to understand that when they become a council member -- and it's easy for me to say because I won't be there -- but that they're taking on responsibilities that are administrative. And that they are expected to act as liaisons for groups, but not the ones that they are champions of.

And it just it seems to be part of the responsibility. But also one has to be careful of the power you carry by being one of those that decides on the recommendation later.

Marika Konings: Would a suggestion be to include some language something saying like ideally the liaison should have, you know, informational role neutral and some of the characteristics so we, you know, make it a strong suggestion but not, you know, an absolute requirement.

Because I think it will probably require a bit of transition time before we probably get to that kind of stage where the liaison takes a more neutral role.

Subbiah: Yes this is (Sobia). I wanted to add another point that I just realized when Avri spoke. If the liaison is in, I mean if the liaison is (liaisoning) to somewhere right, so it's from some other group that they - in some sense represent.

Now if the liaison decide to take an advocate position on a particular topic the question then becomes is that advocate position being taken on behalf of the person, the liaison, the person, the singular person themselves or for the groups that they represent? You know, how do we know that or is it something that one needs to consider?

J. Scott Evans: I - as the neutral chair I would like to state my opinion.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well done.

J. Scott Evans: My opinion is this. I think that the liaison should only serve an Internet for informational role. Because they may be involved in some dispute resolution around consensus and other issues I think they should be more ministerial.

It's not advocating a position. And so I think every effort should be made to say that they are monitoring, they are taking reporting back to this - the chartering organization that they, you know, that's their role.

Their role is not to be an advisor on the underlying subject matter. It is not to advocate on the subject matter. It is to assist the chair and the chartering organization with staying informed on task and resolving any dispute.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Guys got Cheryl Langdon-Orr here. Just to coming certainly behind that set of principles and bringing some CCTLD experience specifically to policy development and how we do it here in Australia.

In the first six years of AUDA's life, any board member could not have anything to do with our policy panels. And in fact when I was elected to the board I had to quite literally give up a policy development process mid stream because, you know, never the twain should meet.

Through experience we've found that we've come back to exactly this role, where we actually appoint a liaison quite restricted in what purpose is from the board from both supply and demand. Remembering that here we are the chartering organization as the board (share) the policy panel, and how much that helps in our boardroom when we are discussing the outcomes of an at arm's lengths policy development process, if I can't begin to tell you how useful it is. So definitely agree.

Marika Konings: And Marika. To (Sobia)'s point I think we need to distinguish here between the liaisons that, you know, specifically represent organizations and their views and hear the more administrative...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And the chartering organization.

Marika Konings: Yes. Because I think if you talk about, you know, liaison from the GNSO to the CCNSO they have a different role than I think what is envisioned here. So, you know, maybe we need to discuss here.

J. Scott Evans: What we're talking about...

Marika Konings: ...group liaisons.

J. Scott Evans: Maybe we need - I mean if you want to categorize liaisons. But as I see the document here it's only talking about the chartering organization. I don't see...

Marika Konings: Correct.

J. Scott Evans: So that's the role I'm talking about now. If a member of a working group is "a liaison from another advisory council or something" they have - this would only apply to a member of a chartering organization.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Subbiah: From the perspective of the chartering organization liaison I am - I think I can really support what J. Scott's suggesting.

Marika Konings: So I can write some draft language there based on the discussion here for the group to consider in the next version.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, and what you may do is to just for the point of clarity with the language is put chartering organization liaison and other liaison.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: As long as they don't use the initial CLO. I can't have that. I can always use the things down to their letters and I'll - that's my common law trademark. You can't have CLO.

J. Scott Evans: You can't - and by doing that you get over this (problem) that somebody joins and their title from their group is liaison when in fact they're not reporting back to the supporting organization, the chartering organization.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: So if we could do some clarification around that to say that this new neutrality, this informational role is solely limited to the chartering organization

liaison. I just think that that would make it more specific. That's just a suggestion from the neutral chair.

Marika Konings: Okay.

And on that point I would just like to encourage everyone. I'm not sure that everyone had a chance to really review this document either. If you have any specific language suggestions feel free to either you know track changes or just send them an email and, you know, I can incorporate them.

So if people feel very strongly on, you know, how they would like to write a certain thing, you know, that they should feel free to suggest that.

J. Scott Evans: Okay so next category was expert advisors and consultants.

Marika Konings: I think this is some language that I think was already there. And, you know, the next point the roles that are developed here, I'm not sure (what) - I actually put it in the note again. But this is based on what the PDP work team has developed or has assigned as staff roles.

Because they had a discussion as well that staff, you know, often fulfills different roles depending on where in the organization or where - in which department you look.

So this is a breakdown that was developed by the PDP work team. So again to, you know, make sure that we align the language and categories I've imported that through here.

J. Scott Evans: All right I see that we are coming up on the hour. And what I would suggest we do at this point because the next section is very detailed...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Got a lot in it, yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...is that we break the call at this point and have another call next week and we go over the Section 2 and hopefully 3 because 3 is very short.

If you have any additional comments with regards to Section 1 you certainly may feel free to put them in comments to the group. This is my suggestion. And if anyone disagrees please speak up. But I'd like to keep these to an hour if possible.

Man: I appreciate your diligence on that point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here, here. Cheryl here J. Scott. Can we discuss Marika's point on moving a future meetings...

J. Scott Evans: I'm going to have to ask everyone's indulgence, if you want me to chair the meeting, we need to do the call next Thursday rather than Wednesday because I am on a plane on Wednesday.

Marika Konings: And I think Thursday there's - is our council meeting Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes it's our council meeting.

J. Scott Evans: I can do it Tuesday or Thursday. We don't like to do Friday for Cheryl so...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The one off doesn't matter J. Scott. (It isn't about). That's not a problem. One off occasionally doesn't matter.

J. Scott Evans: So why don't - is Gisella, are you on the phone?

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely I'm here (J Scott).

J. Scott Evans: Why don't you send a (doodle pole) for Monday, Tuesday and Friday of next week. We will try to in the next couple of days decided on a time based on responses we received (whole).

Woman: Monday's through (Friday)'s fine.

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: It will be an hour call next week. I apologize. But if we're going to hit Marika's time with her children I'm on a plane right in the middle of that time. And so I can't...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Marika's...

J. Scott Evans: And it's - I don't think they have - they'll let me talk on the cell phone.

Jonne Soininen:v You can try always.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But not as yet they won't let you yet.

J. Scott Evans: So is that okay do we have that flexibility for next week everyone?

((Crosstalk))

Man: That makes sense for me.

J. Scott Evans: It's Monday, Tuesday, and Friday.

Woman: Not Thursday?

J. Scott Evans: Not Thursday because there's a council call.

Woman: At 2100 UTC.

J. Scott Evans: I think we'd like, yes, that to go an hour to an hour and a half - let's see what are we 1700 UTC for this time?

Man: Yes.

Woman: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: So as I understand Marika...

Marika Konings: I'm fine anytime after 1800 UTC so...

J. Scott Evans: Okay so if we could do 19, 20 or 21, UTC...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: ...is our choices on those days.

Jonne Soininen: yes just as your information - this is (Johan). I'm not able to make the call at anytime next week. I'm going to be on vacation. But I'll try to provide some comments or at least do another review on this.

J. Scott Evans: That would be absolutely...

Jonne Soininen:...before we we're back.

J. Scott Evans: ...wonderful if you could do that. And there are - there's - there are several versions of this that you can use. And if you want to send them to me (Johan), I will make sure that they get presented to the group.

Jonne Soininen: Sure.

J. Scott Evans: Any comments you have I will just be your voice next week.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible) talk but I think I'll go with that.

J. Scott Evans: So all right everyone. I would like to thank you all. We can sign off now. We'll have a (doodle poll) coming out in the next day or so that we'll try to resolve and get a meeting notice out. I appreciate everyone for helping out and Marika especially you for picking up the heavy load so quickly and deftly.

And Ken, if you're still on the call for assisting Marika in the transition to both of you, thank you very, very much. And we will talk to you again next week.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye all.

J. Scott Evans: Bye.

END