

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC)
TRANSCRIPTION**

Wednesday, 4 February 2009 20:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee meeting on Wednesday, 4 February 2009, at 20:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

Wednesday 4 February 2009 at 20:00 UTC at:
<http://audio.icann.org/gnsso/gnsso-ppsc-20090204.mp3>
<http://gnsso.icann.org/calendar/#feb>

Participants present:

Jeff Neuman - (Registry constituency) elected chair
Avri Doria - NCA - GNSO Council chair
J. Scott Evans - (IPC)
Konstantinos Komaitis - (NCUC)

Absent apologies
Mikey O'Connor

Staff:

Liz Gasster
Rob Hoggarth
Margie Milam
Glen de Saint Géry

Liz Gasster: Right, so this is social time.

Coordinator: Excuse me. I'd just like to inform all parties that the conference is now being recorded. Thank you.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thank you very much. Welcome. It's February 4. I don't even know what day it is.

Liz Gasster: Wednesday.

Jeff Neuman: 2009, Wednesday of the meeting of the PPSC. And we have myself, Jeff Neuman. We have Liz Gasster and a bunch of policy people from

ICANN, the MDC. We also have Glen and Constantinos, Alan Greenberg, Avri Doria and J.Scott Evans. Did I miss anybody?

Okay. So this call hopefully will be relatively brief. There's just a short agenda to - first, just an update on the status of the PPSC Charter. The second is to go over the two charters of the work teams and, hopefully after this call, to put it out for a consensus call on those two charters.

And then to go over the work team rules and a brief mention of the Mexico City kick-off meeting. Is there anything else anyone want added to the agenda?

Avri Doria: I wanted to ask a question about the last item. So the last item we can talk also about - so we're talking about the kick-off for both of the teams as well as possibly a meeting for the PPSC itself?

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Avri Doria: Okay, great. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. And since Avri's on the call maybe you can - I mean I've heard through second hand, but can you explain what happened at the council meeting.

Avri Doria: Sure, yeah. It was actually rather quick. The motion came up; it was read; it was explained; and it was approved unanimously. So the charter is fine. I mean basically, you know, having mentioned that the same concerns that have been dealt with in the OSC had already been dealt with.

And then, you know, we had already discussed the site discrepancy between the work group rules in the OSC discussion because, you know, they had said well there's were slightly older than the ones we had just adopted. But, you know, they were going to live with it and make it, you know, discretionary.

And I think I pointed out in the call that, yeah, we would probably be doing more tinkering with those rules. Since we were talking about rules for these kinds of things we were more likely to, you know, have an evolutionary set. But, as I say, it was approved without question or issue.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, good. So just to clarify what was approved was the PPSC Charter not the two work team charters...

Avri Doria: No, those weren't even discussed.

Jeff Neuman: Which brings us to the next topics. I haven't seen any comments on the PDP team charter that was addressed by anybody. And maybe, J. Scott, you can kind of summarize the comments on the OSC Charter -- I'm sorry, I'm getting my acronyms mixed up; sorry, different meeting -- on the working group work teams charter.

J.Scott Evans: I posted it both to this group and as well to the list that Glen had set up for those folks that have expressed an interest in participating on the working group team. I received - the list received about seven or eight comments. Some of them duplicative; meaning that they were coming from the same person.

The only person who had considerable comment with regards to the charter was Michael Conner. And he sort of feels that it should be formulated in a different manner to answer a set of questions that he believes would drive the work et cetera, et cetera. He submitted something to several people.

The overwhelming consensus seems to be that the charter I circulated will work for the purposes of setting forth sort of a chapeau document or umbrella document, and that some of the more specific or issue specific questions pointed out by Mike can be dealt with as a group as a whole and should drive perhaps as work plans.

And so I would say that the overwhelming comments and the consensus that I find just - even though I didn't make a consensus call. But the overwhelming support seems to be for the charter as circulated.

And Avri made some comments and others did too, so if you want to chime in from having reviewed comments on the list, please feel free. But that's my take away.

Liz Gasster: By the way, I think that buzzing might be somebody's Blackberry or cell phone too close to the mike, so.

J.Scott Evans: Yeah, I sort of lost everything. It got real silent. My Blackberry's off. Did you hear what I said? And that I said that if anybody wanted to...

Liz Gasster: Yeah, you came through well, Jay Scott, I just wanted to see if anybody could...

J.Scott Evans: Thanks, Liz.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, yeah, I was trying to move everything away from my phone to make sure it wasn't me. It still might be. I'm not sure, although I don't have anything on next to the phone that would cause that. But, I even turned the wireless off on my computer thinking that that might be it. But I'm not sure it's coming through.

Man: But it's (unintelligible) of some sort.

Jeff Neuman: It could be. Okay. So, I'm sorry - so Jay Scott, basically, I mean is anyone recommending any changes at this point or it's more for the work teams when it gets passed down?

J.Scott Evans: One comment was for substantial revision based on a set of questions, but the overwhelming consensus seems to be from those that commented -- and they are members of the working group teams, some of them were also members of this group -- is that the charter as a chapeau document is fine as is and that the delving into the questions posed by Michael Conner can be done by the working group team and would help form a work plan, not a charter.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

J.Scott Evans: I think that summarizes it. But someone else who's watched the list, tell me if I've misstated.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, I'm hearing silence. I mean that's the impression I got too. I've read some of the emails and Mike's email. And it seems to be the case the way that it seems to be going. So I mean I'm just going to just

throw it out there that after this call I want to issue a consensus call on both those charters to kind of get those out of the way for now.

Obviously after the work teams meet individually, they can decide to amend the - or they can decide to propose amending the charter if they feel like it, or the work rules as well. But at this point I think unless I hear anybody object I'm going to just put it out for consensus call.

Liz Gasster: But we might want to just do something different or treat the work rules a little differently than the two work team charters. And the only reason I wonder about that - well first Mike Rodenbaugh, he's not on the call I don't think, but he posted on the 27th.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Liz Gasster: No comments there.

Jeff Neuman: I'm sorry. I meant to distinguish the two...

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: ...just put the two charters at this point.

Liz Gasster: Very good, thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Because we haven't gotten...

Liz Gasster: Right.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, there were some interesting comments with respect to the work team rules. So with respect to the two charters, is there anyone that objects to putting that out for a consensus call of the steering committee?

J.Scott Evans: Excuse me.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, hearing none, I'll send an email out after this call to put that out for a consensus call and so we can put the two charters to rest for now.

And now let's talk about the work team rules. The last draft is available on the wiki. And, Liz, if you want to go and talk a little bit about Mike's comments because I think his were - started the discussion going. Avri also had some comments I believe as well.

J.Scott Evans: Excuse me, but where on the wiki?

Jeff Neuman: The place that I saw it was -- hold on. You go to the PPSC.

J.Scott Evans: Interim working rules, 23 January?

Jeff Neuman: Yeah.

J.Scott Evans: Okay, thank you. Sorry.

Jeff Neuman: Nope, that's okay. So, Liz, do you want to - I have the email here from Mike and I think this is the one.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, that's all I've got. And, Avri, did - maybe if you could start.

Jeff Neuman: Avri had the first few comments pretty much right after our call two weeks ago.

Liz Gasster: Let's start with those then.

Avri Doria: Okay. Let me go find my comments.

Jeff Neuman: I'll find them too. I'll search as well.

Liz Gasstner: Mike - I know he had the issue about talking about consensus. What constitutes consensus?

Jeff Neuman: I got - Avri's first one was...

Avri Doria: Oh yeah, there it is. I even labeled them nicely. Modifications.

Jeff Neuman: Yep, do you want to - yeah, modifications. Do you want to go over that comment?

Avri Doria: Okay, yeah. I think it was just modifications at any time during the tenure of the PPSC work team, the chair should communicate to the PPSC if the PPSC work team believes the changes or clarifications that either regarding the PPSC work team charter, including those rules - these rules.

And so I was basically asking is this a clarification question really. Is this support to relate to the working team charter, the PPSC charter or both? I think we're talking about changes to the working team charter.

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Avri Doria: And I do think we have to be specific about it.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I believe that that was intended.

J.Scott Evans: Where are we now?

Avri Doria: Yeah, we were on modifications under work team rules.

Jeff Neuman: So that's - I'm sorry. I'm going back to the document itself. That's the very last paragraph.

J.Scott Evans: I'm there.

Avri Doria: Yeah. So I think that was just a...

Jeff Neuman: And in fact someone had put that in. Liz I think inserted a parenthetical in that.

Liz Gasster: I did. I actually in the revision I included Avri as well as I could at least. My intent was to include all of Avri's different things. What I didn't do I think was include Mike's latest.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Liz Gasster: I think there were some earlier things.

Avri Doria: Okay. Oh yeah, that one seems fine. The next one I had was just a trivial one that I think people accept. I set Socialtext wiki and I

recommended we change it to a wiki supported by ICANN just in case they decide to upgrade to some other wiki. It just doesn't make sense for us to say, "Yeah, we got to use Socialtext."

Jeff Neuman: Right. And I believe...

Liz Gasster: I adopted that too.

Avri Doria: Yeah, so you probably got all mine.

Liz Gasster: I think I did.

Avri Doria: I haven't reread it, so I was just going back to my comments.

Jeff Neuman: Liz sounds surprised, but I'm not surprised about that. All right. So then Mike wrote...

Liz Gasster: I can't keep up with myself.

Jeff Neuman: So Mike wrote about - had a couple of comments. The first one was he wanted to clarify on the difference between the judgment calls and the decision-making paragraph.

J.Scott Evans: Where are his comments?

Jeff Neuman: So he submitted his comments on the 27 of January, at least Eastern Time it was 12:57 pm.

J.Scott Evans: Okay, thank you.

Jeff Neuman: And so his first comment is he wants to clarify the difference between the two possible judgment calls. And the decision-making Paragraph 1 says, "Rough consensus position where a small minority disagrees but most agree and strong support but significant opposition."

And that's if you look at the charter that is in the decision-making paragraph which is probably halfway down the first page. And it says, in producing the PPSC work team report, the chair will be responsible for designating each position as having one of the following designations: One is unanimous consensus position; second one is rough consensus position where small minority disagrees but most agree; and the third one is strong support but significant opposition; and the fourth one is minority viewpoints.

And Mike's question is, "How does the chair decide between the second and third one?" And maybe I think there were a couple - there might have been a couple replies to that. Let me see how people responded to that.

Tim Ruiz said, "I agree with Mike on his clarifying - on his points about quantifying terms like small minority, significant opposition and strong support." But he doesn't think that merging rough consensus is strong - he doesn't think that you need to merge those two different bullet points because that was one of the suggestions Mike made. And then it says, "It depends on how we decide to quantify the mentioned ambiguous terms."

Avri Doria: Jeff, if I can.

Jeff Neuman: Yep, Avri.

Avri Doria: This has always been one of those how do you make the judgment call without resorting to (unintelligible), and because as soon as you start resorting the counting, you're in some form of voting whether you want to admit it or not; it becomes a vote. I think that there's a problem in trying to go for - to a finer degree. I think full consensus is obviously recognizable. I actually - and maybe it's just because of ITF - you know, 20 plus years dealing with ITF.

I think rough consensus or, you know, wrong support being relatively the same is fairly recognizable because it's one or two voices where everything they want to argue has been understood, has been discussed, et cetera. But still the majority or the overwhelming majority remains where it is.

But to go to any finer degree underneath that then I see becomes a complexity. To sort of say there's some support for something is fine, but some support and minority views look to me very much the same.

Man: Avri, so is the strong support but significant a position - the significant position is it quantatively measured?

Avri Doria: It's kind of qualitatively. It's certainly not quantatively. It's sort of how many different arguments, have they been listened to and how much time have you gone by with it. It's really - you can't. That's why these things always have to have appeals mechanisms to make them work.

Because what makes these calls work other than the justice of the chair and the fair-mindedness and experience of the chair is that, you know, if the next group up looks at it and says, "Wait a second," you

know, that was more than just a small, you know, (unintelligible) small position that was major. It becomes very obvious to people.

J.Scott Evans: Well then I think the answer to Mike's question is that it's a judgment call and the safety valve is the appeals process.

Avri Doria: Yeah. Yeah, I don't think rough consensus works ever without an appeals process. That's what makes it work.

J.Scott Evans: You know, we could argue about this all day long. It's a judgment call incumbent upon the, you know, chair to operate in a manner that - and there's a safety value if those views that if they believe it's been misstated to us or to the board or whomever, they can raise an objection. And it can be looked at again by an objective eye. And that's the best we're going to be able to do.

Man: Yeah, what would you think if we added, "But significant qualitative position," because that's my reading of the third, "Strong support but significant opposition." I cannot think of any other case whereby, you know, it has to do with the quality of the argument. And these are two people but really insisting on these then that seems to be significant opposition.

Jeff Neuman: I disagree. I think it has to do also with the size of the overall group. If there are two people out of 100 who completely disagree no matter how good their arguments are that's a minority viewpoint.

Avri Doria: Yeah, but you can't do it on numbers either.

Jeff Neuman: No, no, I'm saying that the argument of a very strong viewpoint makes it significant opposition is broken down by numbers. The corollary is not necessarily true.

Avri Doria: Right because it's difficult. To use an ITF example, we could have people representing 20 companies in the room, 19 of them agree; one of the companies disagrees. It happens to be a company's name starts with a big C and they have 100 participants in the room.

J.Scott Evans: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: And at that point, you know, you have this, "Well, what are we counting then?"

J.Scott Evans: Here's what I think. I think if you add additional words, you just give people something else to quibble over. And I think that if people want to make the argument that, you know, there were - they've gone with rough consensus with a small minority but we disagree because we think it's significant opposition, they can make that qualitative argument.

But if you put that qualitative term in there, you're just opening another can of worms.

Again, we have an appeals process. That point can be made there if someone believes a wrong choice was made.

Avri Doria: If I can add, we also go two steps further; more than just the appeal. We have the attachment of any minority view to anything and we also - I believe we have that.

And I believe what's also important, and I don't know if we have that in there, that every minority view - the chair has to be able show that that minority view was totally explored and that it was understood and still disagreed with.

Jeff Neuman: Right. What it says that, "In all cases a chair will include the names and affiliations of those in support of each position and for participants representing a group of stakeholders" -- and then it's defined what stakeholders might mean -- "will indicate if their support represents the consensus view of the constituency.

If any participant in the work team disagrees with the designation given to a position by the chair or any other rough consensus call, they can follow these steps sequentially." And then it has kind of the appeals process. But it does not say that.

Liz Gasster: Actually, it's just earlier on, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Liz Gasster: Right above that paragraph where it says, "Anyone with a minority view will be invited to include a discussion in the PPSC work team report. The minority view should include the names and affiliations of those contributing to that part of the report."

Jeff Neuman: The comment I would have though is - and just to be a little bit different than Jay Scott is, you know, maybe qualitative is not the right work, but in just reading the paragraph alone it doesn't say anywhere that the - I'm sorry - the number of people is not the element you should be looking at.

In other words, it almost implies the opposite because it starts with unanimous consensus position which is everybody agreeing. Then it says rough consensus position where a small minority disagrees but most agree. And that is more numbers oriented than quality.

And it's only until you get to the third part where it says strong support but significant opposition. But even that could be viewed in a numbers way and then minority viewpoint. So I think all of those without some sort of clarification are a numbers game, unless we clarify otherwise.

Man: I think Jay Scott is right in that if you start trying to define it, then people will take whatever words we use and use it as the argument why the classification is wrong. I think it's a judgment call and we're providing all sorts of processes if you don't agree with it. I can see the attractiveness as per Mike's comment of trying to define it better, but I don't think there's a lot to be gained by doing that.

Liz Gasster: You know there is a certain irony about this conversation of course. Because, you know, certainly the working group team will want to think about these questions and think about even sort of Avri's point about, you know, is the appeal process are the - you know, do we have a sufficient way of recognizing...

J.Scott Evans: Right. I think -- yeah.

Liz Gasster: And so it would be nice, you know, to Jay Scott's point about sort of efficacy here coming up with a simple way to move forward, but recognizing that there is going to be a deep dive here where some nuances that people may think are really important get flushed out.

J.Scott Evans: Well what I think then is we footnote that at the very top.

Man: I think we should take a vote on which way to go right now.

Liz Gasster: Funny, funny.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Well I think a note is - all I'm saying is maybe a footnote saying that these are not measured by number alone - numbers alone.

Jeff Neuman Not necessarily measured.

Man: Right, not necessarily by numbers...

J.Scott Evans: I think that that's fine and you could put a footnote after rough consensus. (Unintelligible) basis of rough consensus; meaning all points of views should be discussed with the chair, blah, blah, blah, blah, footnote.

Liz Gasster: So it would say, "Not necessarily measured"...

Avri Doria: By numbers alone?

Liz Gasster: By numbers alone?

Man: By numbers alone.

J.Scott Evans: Yes.

Man: Where are you putting that?

J.Scott Evans: I would put that after the first sentence in decision-making.

Jeff Neuman: Right. It says, "The PPSC work team shall function on the basis of rough consensus."

Man: Okay. Got it. Got it.

J.Scott Evans: And the reason is, is that's a chapeau statement; meaning that it applies to all of those bullet points.

Man: Yep.

Jeff Neuman: I got to say this, Arvi...

Man: I hadn't seen that rough consensus. That's why I was confused.

Jeff Neuman: I got to say that's the second time during this call that Jay Scott used the word "chapeau."

J.Scott Evans: Well, that's when you do legislative drafting, that's what it's called.

Avri Doria: Obviously, he's been spending a lot time in legislation and politics.

J.Scott Evans: I have.

Liz Gasster: At the international level.

Jeff Neuman: That sounds like the word of day. I'm just going to write that down.

J.Scott Evans: Well, just write it down. It's recorded for posterity anyway.

Liz Gasster: Can you spell it correctly?

Jeff Neuman: I couldn't do that. I'd have to have someone send that to me. But it does sound French.

J.Scott Evans: It is. It's "hat."

Avri Doria: And Glen and I, we're always writing chapeaus because we don't know what to write back.

J.Scott Evans: That's right. Glen will get it right because she knows her French well.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, Liz, so you got that footnote there?

Liz Gasster: I did.

Jeff Neuman: You understand? Okay, great. So let me go back then to Mike's next comment. I'm sorry, let me - I got to find it again here. I've like 20 emails opened up here. Okay, his next comment was - actually, wait, all his comments may relate to the same thing.

Okay. "Following the bullet points that we were just talking about the text indicates the chair will also state whether participants' views represents the consensus view of their constituency.

Assuming the chair will consider the participant's view on that question, this is problematic since it can take three weeks or longer to get anything like a consensus view of my constituency under the rules of our charter." I guess that's the business constituency.

"I believe most other constituencies have formal processes before declaring a consensus view as well. So it probably does not make sense for the statement to be necessary as to every position unless we're going to build inadequate time and process for going to our constituencies periodically."

Does it just go back - what's he's commenting on it says - I think I read it before. "In all cases the chair will include the names and affiliations of those in support of each position and for participants representing a group of stakeholders (for example constituency stakeholder groups or other groups) will indicate if their support represents the consensus view of their constituency."

Man: Well, that's fine. If it doesn't indicate a consensus, you would (unintelligible) that.

J.Scott Evans: You don't have to say anything.

Jeff Neuman: Right. The chair's not just going to put that in there unless the person speaking says, "Well, the business constituency believes," or there's a

written statement that says, "The business constituency believes,"
blah, blah, blah, blah.

J.Scott Evans: And the reality is most constituencies have a consensus position that they come in with to any policy development worked.

Jeff Neuman: Right. So I think...

J.Scott Evans: I think it's fine as is.

Man: I think I was the one who inserted those words. And all I was saying is if it is backed by a consensus view of - by the strength of a consensus of the constituency, it should say so.

J.Scott Evans: Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

J.Scott Evans: But it's not mandatory, it's only if it is then you do.

Man: And the chair's not going to be the one deciding whether it is or isn't.

Jeff Neuman: No.

Man: It's the person who presents the viewpoint. I think we could just respond to Mike on that one.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. And I think that's the substance of his comments. Let me go to Tim Ruiz and make sure he didn't have -- oh, well, Tim's answer to that question was, "Regarding the chair stating whether participants' views

represent the consensus views of the constituency, that should be based on what the participants tell the team or claim."

Man: Okay. That's just what we just said.

Jeff Neuman: And that's his comment. I don't think we've gotten any other comments on the rules. I didn't notice any from the mailing list.

Avri Doria: I don't think so. And I just captured the first - the change that we made for Mike's issue, "Rough consensus is not necessarily measured by numbers alone." And I can post that as today's update unless there's anything else.

Jeff Neuman: I mean do you want to respond to Mike's email and tell him what we did and that we addressed his questions and this is what we put into the draft?

Avri Doria: Oh, sure, I'd be happy to; especially if you don't need it today.

Jeff Neuman: No, I don't think we need it today. But what I want to do is then put it out for a consensus call after that.

Avri Doria: Right. Sure. And I'll also encourage him to listen to the MP3.

J.Scott Evans: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry, Jay Scott, you?

J.Scott Evans: Well I just wanted to know as the interim chair now that we're - as soon as we have a consensus on this which I assume will be by mid-next

week, we'll know what the consensus is based on the consensus call, Jeff, is that what you're thinking?

Jeff Neuman: As of, yeah, probably by mid-next week we'll know that there's at least consensus from the steering committee on the rules and on the charters. And then, you know, I think at that point the work teams will be ready to begin.

J.Scott Evans: Okay. To that end, is Glen on the call?

Jeff Neuman: She is. She muted her line because it was really loud.

J.Scott Evans: I just wish if she could, kind of let us know whom that has indicated they would like to serve on a working team has submitted their statements of interest. Is that what they're called?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

J.Scott Evans: So we'll just know so we could - as we gear up we can maybe - I could as interim chair, at least on the working group team, ping those people that have not and say, "We're getting readying to start, you need to get these in."

Liz Gasster: I'll follow-up with Glen on that generally. And she is definitely keeping track I know.

J.Scott Evans: Okay. Because I'm going to as soon as we have consensus, I'm going to try and get the ball rolling.

Jeff Neuman: Now are those statements of interest posted up on the wiki or any site for everyone to kind of see?

Liz Gasster: All the email traffic posted to the list is posted on the GNSO Web site under the archives for each of the work teams.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Liz Gasster: And that would include the PPSC.

Jeff Neuman: Well I'm just saying do we want to call it out separately and have a separate area?

Liz Gasster: We could. And that's up to you all.

J.Scott Evans: I suggested that each one be - there be a section on the wiki for the work team that has that information.

Jeff Neuman: Actually I agree with that as well. Does anybody disagree with that? Yeah, I think we should. So why don't we plan on designating a separate area.

When the statements of interest went out, is I guess a question for Glen. Do they know that that information is going to be made public? I mean they know because it's a public mailing list, but I...

J.Scott Evans: Well most people have replied just publically to the list.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Liz Gasster: But it is - I think that is the expectation. And I think she makes that clear in her communiqué expressing that requirement that they complete the statement of interest.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So why don't we create those separate areas, Liz.

Liz Gasster: Sure.

Jeff Neuman: And then we'll post what we have. And this way, Jay Scott, you can actually see which ones have been - rather than going through all the email archives...

J.Scott Evans: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: ...you can see and I can see for the PDP work team. So let's get to the next agenda item. And Avri maybe can give an update because I know that she's working (Chuck) and some others to schedule time...

Avri Doria: Right.

Jeff Neuman: ...in Mexico.

Avri Doria: Okay. What we have set up this time is - I mean you all probably know that we normally have full day meetings on Saturday and Sunday. Well what we've arranged for this time because of the these groups and because of some of the other drafting teams, working groups, PDP groups, et cetera, we've actually arranged for two rooms for all of Saturday and Sunday.

Now some of the time obviously will just be using - we'll probably just be using one because sometimes Saturday and sometimes Sunday - probably afternoon on Saturday and morning on Sunday we'll be doing new GTLD and IDN discussions with staff. So while there may be some group that says, "Oh, that's not what we care about; we'll do other stuff," I expect that's not the case.

But the rest of the time I'm hoping that we don't have a unitary schedule, but that we have - so Saturday morning I've sort of set aside for the five working meetings and the PPSC and OSC if they want, but specifically for the five working teams. (Chuck) thought that that morning might not be enough, so I've set other than that morning they'll also be time on Sunday.

Going outside those two days will be beastly difficult, except for groups of people that want to find a table at a bar because the scheduling is incredibly crowded. We've got a new field marshal of scheduling who's very strict about breaks here, meeting there and everything

. So I don't think we'll be able to find a lot of extra time to schedule rooms or anything outside of Saturday and Sunday. But at the moment we do have a fair amount of flexibility there.

As I say, Saturday morning I've basically left it open I believe to this sort of stuff. I believe then we will have GTLD discussions Saturday afternoon. But at the moment I'm playing that juggling game of trying to figure out who to schedule when. So I'm really looking for groups to say, "Yes, we want to a slot." And then (Chuck) and Glen and I can start filling in the spaces. I stopped.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So you asked a question earlier on in the meeting as to whether we would need a PPSC group meeting in addition to the work team. And I think I might have answered it a little bit quickly. I'd like to hear from the group. I'm not sure we need a separate meeting of the full group. And if we do, it might be after the work teams meet.

J.Scott Evans: That's what I would suggest is that the work teams meet and then we circle back as a group at the PPSC level to just discuss the report on the work that went on.

Avri Doria: Well that could possibly be find an hour slot sometime on Sunday and the steering groups having the work teams meeting Saturday morning.

Jeff Neuman: Right. I'm not sure though - the question I have about Saturday morning is I'm not sure how much of the work teams will be there on Saturday morning.

Avri Doria: Well there's also remote. I mean, hopefully - and Glen has been doing this. She put out notices basically telling people that, you know, GSNO's stuff was happening all day Saturday and all day Sunday. Both rooms were set up with remote communications.

So I'm hoping those that wanted to participate and stuff face-to-face are getting themselves there for Saturday. Other than that, you know, we'll have remote participation.

I don't want to say, well, people might not get there until later; therefore, we should leave Saturday morning blank because I can't. I just don't have, you know, that much flexibility beyond the weekend. And I say, I know I can't schedule stuff against GTLD time.

Jeff Neuman: Right. Okay. I mean if that's, you know, the time that we're allotted. I mean do you know exactly what time those will be at?

Avri Doria: I got all morning Saturday dedicated to it. We could start as early as 8:00. We could start when we want. There will be coffee brought in. There will be lunch brought in.

J.Scott Evans: But I thought Glen's note, Avri, said 9:00.

Avri Doria: Okay. I think we could - okay, then 9:00. Sorry. I thought we could start earlier, but 9:00's cool.

J.Scott Evans: Well I think that time is ticked because of the affect on other time zones.

Avri Doria: Yeah, that makes a lot of sense. So, you know.

J.Scott Evans: I'll be there.

Jeff Neuman: Obviously, I'll be there as well.

Avri Doria: All things being equal, I'll be there. Actually, I'm not going to say the planes get there on time, but I'm scheduled to come in the night before.

Jeff Neuman: The other thing about that meeting is it was pitched as a take-off meeting of the work teams. I don't know - Jay Scott, you were talking about maybe trying to have a meeting before that with your work team?

J.Scott Evans: Yeah, I mean, but I can refer back to that message in my message to the list that said in the interest of moving things forward why don't we have our kick-ass - kick-off meeting -- kick-ass.

Liz Gasster: Right, that could be the kick-ass meeting.

((Crosstalk))

J.Scott Evans: Or kick-off meeting remote and then we'll circle up in Mexico City to continue our work.

Avri Doria: Right. Yeah, I don't think there's any need that they be kick-off meetings. I mean, obviously if you can get your team together to do a phone call then, you know.

Liz Gasster: Well one thing that's nice about doing the kick-off meeting in advance, although I don't want to be accused of rushing too much, is that you can get maybe some of the administrative stuff out of the way.

Make sure people know where things are on the wiki, give an overview of where we area with the charter and the fact that both charters, they have -- you know, I know we've distributed charters already, but maybe the work team rules. I mean we could get some of the administrative stuff out of the way that can be time consuming.

And then maybe in Mexico City, think of it as sort of the official first work session, concentrating hopefully more on the substance and how the groups want to approach the substance of the work they have to do and less on the minutia. But that's just a thought.

J.Scott Evans: And I also think that - at least looking at my list of current participants, there are several that have already stated they probably wouldn't be there. So it makes it look more inclusive to those who can't be there. So, you know, that's how I - I would like to go ahead.

Avri Doria: I think going ahead is a good idea. The sooner we get this stuff done.

J.Scott Evans: June's getting here soon.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, you're right. Okay. So once the - just to recap then, we're going to issue a consensus call on the two charters, post a response to Mike Rodenbaugh's comments and take a - hopefully a consensus call on the work team rules, at least at the PPSC level.

And then once that's done, hopefully by, you know, another week and a half, two weeks at the most, we can then start - at least have a kick-off meeting of the two work teams and then continue to work in Mexico City.

J.Scott Evans: Yes.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Is there any other questions?

Avri Doria: I have one. Will there be any problem having our - the work teams at the same time? I know for example I'm on both mailing lists, but I don't intend to participate in both. And I'm just wondering if that will work out for people.

J.Scott Evans: Well, we told everybody that they should only pick one.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay.

J.Scott Evans: And I don't think we should try - I think we should do them at the same time.

Avri Doria: Okay, great. I just wanted to make sure.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I agree.

Liz Gasster: Are you talking about on an ongoing basis or just in Mexico?

Avri Doria: I'm talking about in Mexico.

Liz Gasster: Okay, good.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I think...

Liz Gasster: You know, on an ongoing basis I worry a little about the staff support. Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. No, I think the work teams are going to decide when they want to have calls or if they want to have calls and when.

J.Scott Evans: In fact, if you're included and you say, "Well I can't because I've got another call," that's a conflict just like anybody else.

Liz Gasster: Well, thank you. But I mean we can definitely spread out and accommodate Mexico easily. I was just thinking about ongoing, because I want there to be some redundancy.

That's what we're kind of - you know, we're going to back each other up. It's worked kind of well in some of the other recent working groups to have some redundancy and also some opportunity to bounce ideas off each other too, so.

Avri Doria: There hasn't been a new staff member for months, you should be fine.

Liz Gasster: I know, that's right.

Jeff Neuman: Do we want to have a call? Do we need to have a call in two weeks of the steering committee? My recommendation is that we probably try to use that time to have maybe a call of the work teams or we keep it reserved in case something comes up, maybe from Mike Rodenbaugh or anybody else on the work team rules.

J.Scott Evans: What's two weeks date wise?

Jeff Neuman: Well we have -- oh, date wise? That's the 18th. So we generally have - I mean we've generally reserved every two weeks at this time to have our call. But if there's a consensus call and both the charters and the work team rules get approved, I'm not sure we need to - as a steering committee - meet on the 18th.

J.Scott Evans: I agree.

Man: I agree as well.

Jeff Neuman: So why don't we just keep it reserved on people's calendar...

J.Scott Evans: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: ...to make sure it's there in case something comes up during the consensus call that we need a short discussion with respect to the charters and the work team rules. But if everything goes as planned, then we'll probably end up cancelling it.

J.Scott Evans: All right.

Man: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Okay?

Man: All right.

Jeff Neuman: Anybody else have any questions or comments?

Liz Gasster: Sounds great.

Jeff Neuman: Great. I appreciate everyone's time. And I will - if I don't talk to you before Mexico - well, I probably will talk to most of you in some way before Mexico. But if not, I will see you all there.

Liz Gasster: Yep.

J.Scott Evans: Safe travels to everyone there and before then.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Same to you.

Man: Enjoy Mexico. Bye.

J.Scott Evans: Bye.

Jeff Neuman: Hey, Liz?

Liz Gasster: Yeah?

Jeff Neuman: Can you - do you have my cell number?

Liz Gasster: Yeah, give it to me. Well, let's see. Do I have it? Hang on.

Jeff Neuman: I'll send it to you in an email.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, okay. Great.

Jeff Neuman: I'll send it to you on email.

Liz Gasster: Okay, thanks. Bye.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, bye.

Man: Bye.

END