

**ICANN Cartagena Meeting
GNSO WG Guidelines
TRANSCRIPTION
Saturday 04 December 2010 at 1400 local**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

J. Scott Evans: ...to make this presentation to the GNSO Council. We appreciate that the work team has worked very, very diligently. Thanks to all the members of the team for all their hard work. With that, let's get started here.

So as you all know and are well aware, the Board recommended in its improvement model that we go to a working group model. So in the past we had these taskforces and they generally operated more like in legislative bodies where decisions were primarily based on voting.

And we began moving ourselves into a working group model where they're intended to be more open and inclusive and issues could be tackled and decided on a consensus approach.

So the working group work team was asked by the PPSC to come up the guiding principles and operating rules and procedures for working groups. So in other words, as we get more people involved with working groups and new and inclusive members of the ICANN communities step up and lead, they would have some general principles of guidance that would assist them as they begin to develop and establish working groups.

So the working group work team submitted our proposal called the working group guidelines to the PPSC back in May of this year prior to the meeting we had in Brussels in June. During the - after the presentation, the PPSC

identified that there were still some issues that they had some questions and they - and points that they wanted us to reconsider.

So they sent the document back to the work team with a request that we reconsider the issues that they raised. And the working group work team worked through late September, early October to go through these particular issues and specifically respond to each issue making those revisions where they felt it was necessary and giving an explanation or rationale for those decisions that they chose not to implement based on the recommendations from the PPSC.

So the PPSC is working on finalizing the guidelines for submission to the GNSO Council and that's where we are today. So what I'm going to do is provide you with an overview of what is the approximate final working group guidelines, highlights those issues that are still out there from - that we're dealing with and encourage you to ask questions or raise any issues that you believe that we need to or the PPSC I should say can consider when finalizing these guidelines.

So the guidelines. What are the roles and responsibilities? So we felt like one of the guidelines needed be how to announce the establishment of a working group. How membership should be applied for by members of the community. How to plan for the first meeting. What administrative details should be taken care of to ensure that this is a smooth process as you onboard members of a work team?

How do you select the leaders for the working group? What are the members and roles and responsibilities for the particular members? One person we have is a liaison that will serve as a liaison and that is a member of the GNSO Council that would serve to liaise between a working group and the GNSO.

And it says there's an outstanding issue but we had a call on December 1 and I believe that that issue has been resolved. We believe that a liaison working group chair should be neutral. That does not mean that they cannot step out of that role and offer their own opinions with regards to issues being tackled by the working team. But in doing their interface between the working group and the GNSO, they are to be a neutral party. We also discussed when it would be appropriate and how to use sub teams.

So then another section in the working group guidelines discusses the norms. In other words, what are the participation levels that are expected? How a working group chair would design a representative group understanding that in certain situations, certain work teams might be primarily dominated by a particular part of the ICANN community only because their expertise is needed and it is something that is very specialized.

What is the process integrity? You know, if there are - if there are administrative or issues problems within the working group, how does that flow? And what are the behaviors and norms that we need to adopt as professionals and citizens of the Internet Society? How do we deal with one another taking in inclusiveness and diversity? How do we behave and treat each other? What are those rules of engagement?

Then we also talked about the standard methodology for making decisions. And on our - there's an outstanding issue on determining the level of consensus. But I believe in our December 1 call we came to some resolution on this. It's going to - there will be some changes to the language that will resolve the outstanding issue on this.

And the appeal process. When someone disagrees with a determination made by the chair or by the working group and pronounced by the chair, how exactly can that be appealed within the system, within the GNSO? What is the outlet for resolving those types of issues?

And then we talked about logistics and requirements and so, you know, session planning, where and how the meeting and logistics occur, what communication and collaboration tools are available.

We tackled the translations issues, briefings of subject matter experts that could be required and how you might go about obtaining those from ICANN staff. And then we also talked about what your products and outputs should be as a working group as a general guideline with regards to this.

Then we also decided that we would also assist chartering organizations. Now this document has been drafted much more neutral than GNSO specific because we believe that a lot of the principles and issues that we had discussed would have applications broader than just the GNSO. ALAC has used a very similar model. Other groups as ICANN in its malleability may change, might want to use these guidelines.

And so we made them much more generic. And so we talked about a chartering organization, which for the GSNO will be the GSNO Council. But this could be applied, and I believe it was Cheryl Langdon-Orr in one of our discussions mentioned is the same model could apply to cross community work teams such as the Recommendation 6 group which I believe just made its presentation to the Council. So these norms and these guidelines could be used in that model as well.

So we talked about charter guidelines. How do you announce a working group? How do you talk about the transparency and openness and allow participants or potential participants to know that transparency and openness means that a lot of information will be public?

Now the purpose and the importance and expectations of the working group chair and the role as a neutral moderator of the discussion and an administrator of the process. We talked about other important roles within

there and who, you know, would you have chairs, would you have vice chairs? What is the role of staff?

And so and then we also gave a working group charter template that basically lays out things that you need to consider when drafting a charter in a very simple, clear and easy to understand format. Then we attached an annex that was sort of a chair's checklist that a new chair could use in order to make sure that they had followed the guidelines as they were put forth in the document.

So where do we go from here? I owe and we'll be delivering in the next couple of days some additional language to the PPSC that will - that we hope will address some of the outstanding issues with regards to those that were discussed in the December 1 telephone call. Then we hope to finalize the report at the PPSC level and submit it to the GSNO Council for consideration.

We are recommending that the GNSO Council may wish to conduct a public comment form prior to formal adoption. Now you should all know that these guidelines have already been put to public comment and those public comments have been addressed in the drafting of this document.

And then if there are any additional issues that are identified in that particular public comment should you so choose to set forth, we believe it would go back to the PPSC for consideration of those public comments.

So here you have the latest version that you can find of the guidelines. I believe, Marika, correct me if I'm wrong, there is both a red lined version posted and a clean version so that you can see. The red lined version ladies and gentlemen is where you will find the version contained the rationale for changes that have been made and the explanation for changes that were not adopted based on both the public comments and the PPSC clarification request.

And so with that, I would like to open it up to questions.

Olga Cavalli: J, thank you very much. This is Olga. I will open a queue for questions to you. I would like to ask you a question before we start with other questions. You said this document had two public comment periods and that you're suggesting the GNSO open or organizes a public comment forum. So the document will be commented in a forum, not in a public comment period. Would you clarify that at least for me, please?

J. Scott Evans: Okay. I'm sorry if I was - I misspoke. It has only had one public comment. Marika will need to correct me if I'm misspeaking. But I believe it has only been put to public comment one time. And that was prior to submission initially in May to the PPSC. Prior to that being submitted, we put it out for public comment. Took in those public comments, responded to those and then submitted it to the PPSC.

Our recommendation is when the PPSC delivers it to the GNSO Council that the Council put it out again for public comment in its finalized form. Not a forum. It would just go into a 45-day public comment period just like any other documents for consideration.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much J for your clarification. And I open now the floor for questions. I have Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Hey J. Scott. Thanks. I just want to stress there were a couple - the reason why we're asking or recommending it goes to a public comment period is there were a couple things that were made to it that some of which have a substantive impact. They're not huge but they're ones that we'd rather have - make sure everyone's good before the GNSO Council approves it.

The second comment I want to make is I think this is an example where the PPSC and working group work team processes work. It's also I know it's something we'll get into later on at some point. But it's one of the reasons

why I made the comments I did on the non-commercial stakeholder group resolution or motion.

We really do need to treat the PPSC differently than the OSC. If it's certain people have issues with the OSC, they'll have to air those out for the PPSC has worked and continues to work and if it doesn't work, then I'd like to know about it because I haven't heard any comments otherwise.

And so I think that I know Avri may have a comment on that which kind of surprised me since she's in the group but anyway. The point is that the motion that's currently with the GNSO of reducing or possibly eliminating the PPSC, you know, we really need to take into consideration the existing work that's going on and make sure we don't hamper the hard work that's already been taking place and the good - really good recommendations that have at least come so far from the working group work team and shortly from the PDP work team.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Jeff.

J. Scott Evans: Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

J. Scott Evans: Olga. This is J. Scott.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

J. Scott Evans: Can I just ask for a point of order. I understand that there's a contentious motion or at least a motion that has a lot of opinion about it. But I'm on a very compressed timeline in another jurisdiction.

And if we can just keep the comments to the working group guidelines at this point and then if you all want to have further comment after I drop off the

phone with regards to the motion and implications that are the example or non-example of this team as an efficient or inefficient model, that would be fine.

But I just have so limited time, I'd like to maximize the efficiency and get off this call as quickly as possible because it's cutting into my personal time.

Olga Cavalli: Of course. Thanks for the clarification J. How much more time do you have for this (call)?

J. Scott Evans: I've given you - I have, you know, 30 more minutes here but it's just I don't want to mire my time down with a debate that can take place after I'm off the phone. I'm here to answer question with regards to these guidelines specifically.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you. This is the time we also have scheduled for this session. Any other questions for J? If we don't have any further comments, I think that we can let you go and...

J. Scott Evans: That's very nice. I do want to say to the GNSO Council that great accolades needs to go to our staff; Liz Gasster and Marika Konings have been an incredible resource in - to making sure that this particular workgroup functioned efficiently and quickly and in a productive manner.

I also want to thank the very active members of this work team and that is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Avri Doria, (Yonis Sunnanin) for - and (Sabi) and (Elia) for all participating in a very compressed timeline in moving this forward.

They are shining examples of a multi stakeholder working group and you should all be very proud of the work that they did on behalf of each and every one of your constituencies because they were a pleasure to work with and it made job as a neutral chair a very easy thing to do. And I thank each and every one of them for all their hard work and dedication.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much J. There's applause for you. There's a comment from Avri. Avri, please.

Avri Doria: Yes. Since you were so nice about all of us and such, I really do want to make sure that you are commended for the way you did do the neutral chair role. While we were defining what it meant, you were really an exemplar of what it should be. So thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you Avri. And at that, I'm going to drop off. I wish you all much diligent work. I hope that you enjoy the evening. And I will see everyone Tuesday morning bright and early. So you all take care, be safe and I will see you all soon. Bye.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much J for joining with us. And thanks very much for all your comments and your presentation. See you soon here.

J. Scott Evans: All right. Bye. Thanks Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Bye. Okay guys.

Jeff Neuman: Can we use - is there any other time scheduled to talk about...

Olga Cavalli: We have - the next session is in a little less than half an hour, 25 minutes, a quarter to three if I'm not mistaken. Hold on a second. Let me check. I'm okay.

Jeff Neuman: Is there any other scheduled Council time to talk about that particular motion before the meeting?

Olga Cavalli: Which motion?

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: The motion that was introduced...

Olga Cavalli: Oh if you want to use that time now, I don't know what the others think. Is that okay.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. There's a motion that was proposed by Chuck initially. Wendy had modified it. And then Mary, I'm not sure exactly where it stands, what the current language is but I think we should spend some time talking about that so we can review with the stakeholder groups before the meeting on Wednesday when we vote on it.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Jeff. I would like to know the opinion of the rest if we can use that time for that. And if this is the case, we should need those...

Man: Yeah. Actually that's two motions. There's one made by Chuck and then there's one made by Wendy, which was amended by Mary. So those motions don't specifically say the exact same thing. I'm all for discussing them but you need to identify those motions.

Man: Okay. Does anyone have them available?

Jeff Neuman: Like I believe - so I believe, and people can correct me if I'm wrong, Chuck's was based on the fact that if we don't pass a motion at this meeting extending the PPSC and the OSC, they will expire by their charter. So apparently the groups will expire at the end of this year.

But Chuck had just proposed a motion initially that was well let's extend the charter - the time of the charter for the (unintelligible) to continue to function. So that was Chuck's motion and I don't know if that's - we can easily pick that up. Is that something we can...

Marika Konings: Just trying to find the motion (unintelligible) on the Wiki. I will get them uploaded and (I can show).

Jeff Neuman: Right. Wendy's not here, right? Oh, I can't see. I really can't see her.

Olga Cavalli: It's Mary, please, sorry.

Mary Wong: But Jeff if you had a question about Wendy's motion, those of us who are here can try and answer it because it was discussed during our stakeholder group meeting.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah. I mean if we can put it up because I can't remember what it is now with - as it was last revised or amended.

Marika Konings: The only thing that's on the Wiki actually I think is Chuck's motion and Wendy's motion. I don't see Mary's motion there. But I'll put up the text.

Olga Cavalli: (Unintelligible) the text. You may read them if you're okay with that.

Man: I can read the results clauses on both Chuck and Wendy's motion. That might help. On Chuck's motion, the result was the Council extends the terms of the operating steering - Operations Steering Committee and the Policy Process Steering Committee and their respective work teams as necessary through the San Francisco ICANN public meeting March 2011.

The Council directs each steering committee an applicable work team chair to identify the specific targets and benchmarks for their work and to share that information with the Council by 19th of January 2011. The alternate motion, it's short so I'll read that in full made by Wendy. It hasn't been (unintelligible) yet.

I'll (unintelligible) that's not on the Wiki yet. Sorry. Whereas in October 2008, the GNSO Council established a framework for implementing the various

GNSO improvements identified and approved by the ICANN Board of Directors.

Whereas that framework completed the formation of two steering committees, the OSC and the PPSC, to charter and coordinate the efforts of five community work teams designed to develop specific recommendations to implement specific aspects of the improvements.

Whereas the OSC and the PPSC charters expire at the Cartagena meeting result the Council acknowledges the hard work of those work teams and thanks them for providing any final reports they may wish to offer.

So on the one hand there's a motion to extend the charters and on the other there's a motion just saying thank you, you're done, basically if I summarize that. But I hadn't got Mary's edit. So maybe - do you happen...

Jeff Neuman: Well that's okay. I mean if you can - can you just give a - you don't have to read exactly. Just the main points of how that was changed. Okay. Well obviously, you know, I am - I'm the PPSC Chair and I'm only speaking on behalf of - speaking on behalf of the PPSC.

It's I guess my own personal view but I would hope that most of the members of the PPSC who are diligently - PPSC and the work teams below it are diligently working to finishing their product. I don't think any of them want to see or I should say most of them don't want to see their charter expire especially when they're getting close to getting done.

I think - I know there's been some consternation lately with some of the activities that may be going on with the OSC. I'm not really that privy to that. But I can tell you that I have not heard any examples that would seemingly justify terminating the PPSC or the work teams below it.

You heard J. Scott's presentation. And, you know, if everything goes as planned, tomorrow we're going to finalize the text and submit it to the Council. Obviously the Council's got to do some things and may want to send back certain things to the working group work team, maybe, you know, depending on what it does.

Obviously we don't want to see that expire as we, you know, you're 99% done. With the PDP work team, you know, we are getting towards a final work product. And, you know, the hope is to present that to the PPSC early next year with a goal to get it to the Council assuming everything goes okay beginning mid next year.

I'm not sure if the Council let's the charter expire, I think some of us will do the work anyway I guess. But, you know, it just doesn't seem right. It seems very - well let me give the analogy.

When the Board passed a resolution demanding that the GNSO community figure out the whole vertical integration issue by a certain date, everyone kind of got a little big annoyed at the fact that it was this top down ordering you to do something, the Council, on what the Board felt the timeline should be.

I view this kind of thing of ordering the Steering Committee and the PDP work teams without really much background in the issues that are being done to be very top down and not a very effective policy management. I would say that I've never been approached by any of the people that are making this motion as Chair of the PPSC of any issues they've had with the PPSC. And I would hope as - and again (unintelligible).

I could easily take criticism. I get criticized all the time. Fine. But I would think before someone shuts it down because they think it's ineffective, something would have been brought to the attention of the Chair.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Jeff. And I have Mary that she has the wording - the new wording for the motion. And I have Avri and I have Wolf. Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks Olga. And Jeff, I know you and I have had a conversation already so let me just say for everybody else and for the record that I don't have issues with the PPSC or your or anything else.

When I proposed this motion at the consultation with the NCSG membership, it was to facilitate the wrapping up of the implementation process. And the intention was not to shutdown the teams but rather to encourage the teams who are still working on their respective charters and whatever the task was to complete it by the San Francisco meeting.

It may well be that your and J. Scott's updates this weekend might involve some changing of the dates or moving forward by the specific work teams, right, depending on the updates you're giving us this weekend. That's fine. So - but the broader intention was not to shut anything down or to denigrate from any of that work.

So with that, let me read the proposed amendment. And it's really - there's two result clauses that I'm proposing. The first deals with timing and the second deals with the standing committee.

And the first result clause reads resolve the Council acknowledges and thanks the OSC, the PPSC and the five community work teams for their hard work and directs each steering committee and applicable work team chair to identify for the council any remaining targets and benchmarks for their respective work by no later than 19th of January 2011.

With a view towards final delivery to the Council of any remaining work items so identified by no later than the San Francisco meeting." That's the first (adopt) clause. And again, like I said, the date's late, we can talk about that.

The second (adopt) clause reads, "Further resolve a standing committee to monitor implementation of GNSO improvements already established no later than the 19th of January 2011. The standing committee will work with the Council to review, and if necessary, convene relevant work teams to refine and streamline the effectiveness of GNSO improvements on an ongoing basis.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Mary, I have Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you, yes, and one of the reasons I put myself in the queue is because I was specifically mentioned as a member of the PPSC who couldn't possibly have anything against closing it - in favor of closing it.

I'm actually not a member of the PPSC. I'm the second alternate. And my reasoning for being very supportive of closing down both the PPSC and the OSC, but not the working teams that are still doing work, and I don't think it was ever my understanding that anyone was talking about closing down the working teams, but just finishing them, is that you almost had a carrying resolution on these steering groups for the last couple of meetings.

Every six months, or whatever, they run out, everybody says, "We're not done yet," everybody raises their hand, they go on another six months and here we are again.

Now I participate in both of them. In the OSC I'm a member, in the PPSC, as I say, I'm a second alternate. Our last meeting was a wonderful meeting, there were four people at it other than the staff (shepherds).

So yes, it was a good meeting, we had the Chair, the Vice Chair, one second alternate member and Tim who was invited in because he had issues to be discussed.

So what I'm saying is that in the first place, both the PPSC and the OSC they did amazing jobs at the beginning to get all this work done, to get through the first 80% of the work, and got it done. I'm basically arguing in support of this motion that their work is essentially done.

Yes, PDP has still got a fair amount of work to do and that you'll have your hands (with) for a while, the working group work team is essentially done. I was going to mention earlier that I'm not - I was one of those that didn't quite see doing yet another (containment) period, but I'm not really against it. They're kind of like apple pie. Sure, community comments are good but every time you run through it you use an extra couple months up.

One of the reasons that I want to argue in favor of moving these things first to Council, for Council to get a really good idea in its managerial role, but where everything's at, to the standing committee that's looking at implementation. You're already starting to have implementation issues.

The GCOT and the DOI which has been such a fun topic of late, the DOI has a different set of problems in working groups than it does in the Council. So when you look at the demise of DOI you have to take into account how does it work within working groups versus how does it work within Council, and that's two different (things to) me.

So basically with some of these things, as you start to get into implementation you start to get into combinatorial effects and that's where a new standing committee, which you've already sort of laid the groundwork for, seems the right place to sort of take the work that needs to be done, combine these two groups into one ongoing standing committee and let the other groups that have essentially finished their work be done. Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Avri. We have Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thank you. As I'm also a member of diverse groups here, standing committees and - not standing, steering, sorry, and working teams. So I was thinking also because after some working teams have delivered the first approach or some results, so then also I got the impression then it started a little bit too - to (unintelligible). It means that because the process to the steering committee, up to the Council and back and forth, it's not optimal to my view as well.

So I was thinking also was how to improve that, and I'm optimistic so because we are for the basic (what) we had to do in the working team, we are almost - I would say almost at the end of that.

So what it needs right now is really to hand it over to the implementation phase. And I understand really that the working teams could not take into consideration all cases which could arise. So that's very usual. That's the result of this - of these groups have to be discussed, they have to be mirrored at - to the reality, and then it comes back.

And the question is how it comes back and how it's going to be discussed. At the time being, I understand the process is not optimal, it goes then through the steering committees, down to the working teams, and goes back. That was not intended.

It was the steering committees task we are not just to re-discuss the content what (was give) us by the - by the (working teams), but are then to coordinate more of the work, and taking care about that the work is fluently going to be done.

So - and that was a little bit altered in that sense that some - the steering committee sometimes are going to discuss again what was discussed in the working teams.

So I would say, and I'm really confident that the most of the working teams, and of course we have most of the motions that we got as a result of the working teams are on the table. The most of the working teams are going to finish early next year.

The PDP team is different because it's really a very complex - a bit complex and it may need more time in this. So I would argue in this sense, not just at this status and thus bring more turbulence to that (part of it). That means at this time to delete the steering committees other than maybe after the next meeting or it was intended in January or when the working teams and the steering committees come up with their - or with the deadlines and with the last report of open issues, and then really discuss whether it should be deleted or not.

So at this moment I would say it would bring too much turbulence to the process if we go this time and vote for a - this (setting into) motion at the time being. Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Wolf. We have James, Jeff and Alan.

James Bladel: Hi.

Olga Cavalli: Go ahead.

James Bladel: So just briefly, I'm James, I'm a participant in the PDP PPSC working group. I just wanted to support a lot of what Jeff was saying. Selfishly, I would love to see these efforts come to an expedited conclusion. I would love to have my Thursday mornings returned back to my schedule, but I think we have identified some very complex issues, as Wolf was mentioning and these need to be resolved.

We see them coming up time and time again in new working groups that are being formed because we're referencing some of the work that's being

uncovered, you know, during the PPSC and also in the initial report that was released by that group, so I think to, you know, let this come in for a landing, don't shoot it out of the sky, would be my recommendation.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Well, I'll certainly second and third what James just said. It's a really small group working on the PDP. If we had a few more people who were interested in how ICANN creates policies over the next 10 years or so, it might have gone a little bit faster.

Ignoring that, I'm not sure I understand the concept of disbanding the committee - a sub working team reports to, but it's going to stay floating there and not to or who it gives its' work product to.

I understand the need to simplify things and fix some of the problems we have, but there's an expression in English about throwing out the baby with the bathwater and I think we have to be really careful here.

There is work going on, it needs to be finished and I don't think we want to do things that make it more difficult because the small group will get even smaller if there are frustrations associated with it.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Alan. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I want to echo that completely, I think it is a small group that participates and frankly, one of the things we should be focusing on as a Council is, how do we get more participation in the group? I've come back here several times over the past year saying, "Hey, Council, your guys aren't participating. The ones that you all assigned to these groups, they don't show up."

In fact, I think we have a Council liaison, but I couldn't really tell you who that is. That's a problem. That's a problem with the Council. Let's address our won

problems before we kind of assume that the problems are really of the sub-teams of a steering committee.

Look, the resolution, you know, what Avri said - or I think it was Avri that said, "Well, we never intended to get rid of the work team, we just intended to get rid of the steering committee." Well, how do you do that?

And that's not in the motion, it doesn't say that, so you know, what are people supposed to think? We've got to be predictable there. Procedurally, you know, I think we need to extend this charter because we need to continue work.

I think the points that - Mary - that you've brought up, and I think with extending the charter I think it's very fair to ask for a delivery date and dates that we can accomplish these tasks.

That's great and even January 19th, that's fine. I think the second part of the motion about creating a standing committee and I don't know how we do this procedurally, so I'm looking at Olga and Stefan about if there's possibility of splitting your motion into two and then voting them separately.

Because I think the whole standing committee concept is completely different than asking for deliverable dates of the existing committees and I don't want one to get intertwined with the other. Right? I don't want to have to vote down the motion because I don't agree with the standing committee concept.

But I - obviously we need the charter to be need - we can't let it expire. So we need to figure out a way to do that procedurally and I know it's less than eight days, but I think this might be something we can probably agree to.

Olga Cavalli: I have Avri and then Mary - Stefan, you want to comment?

Stefan Van Gelder: No.

Olga Cavalli: Stefan and Jaime. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you. Couple of just brief things. One of them is, I understand, closing down a committee is probably the hardest thing in the world for any group to do. Committees basically self-perpetuate and have a good reason for continuing for a long, long, long, long time.

Definitely, as I said before, nobody was talking about throwing out babies. Basically, the - if I understood Mary's motion, it was to move those work teams either under the standing committee or under the Council's direction itself. Like a working group is directly under the Council, but that wasn't particularly difficult to do.

And in terms of staffing, I total - I mean, getting people to actually participate in the committees, I wholly endorse what Jeff has to say, in fact, in my experience staffing one committee is easier than staffing two of them and if you look at who's participating in the committees, you basically find that pretty much you got the same people doing two of them in what I consider a confusing way.

So - and, oh, and the delivery thing. If you look back at your previous continuing motions on these committees, you've done that before.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Avri. We have Stefan.

Stefan Van Gelder: I just wanted to have a stab at answering your procedural question. If I understand it, you're saying Mary's motion should be split into two. If that's the case, I think you have to propose a friendly amendment and see if it is accepted as friendly, but that will not split the motion into two, obviously.

So I would hope, for the motion's sake then, that you would be able to propose a friendly amendment that would allow to get the result that you

want. The alternative is to redraft another motion, but that would take another motion being proposed.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Stefan. We have Jaime, (Bill), Tim, Jeff and Mary. Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: As I understand, the aim of Mary's motion is either to put some pressure or in the group or, it's not - I hope is not to raise suspicion, is only to put some pressure into (agreeing) for some timeline compromise from the both groups.

But I think what hurt Jeff is - but that is - that's lacking is not a pressure, but is lacking sometimes it is participation from the - those. But with the - and I have a question to Jeff.

With the kind of participation you have now, which I know is not sufficient, do you think we - you could meet this time - the schedule proposed by the - Mary's motion?

Jeff Neuman: I think Mary's motion is just that we have a set of deliverables that we deliver to the Council by the 19th with a goal of getting it done by the San Francisco meeting. You know, I think that we could certainly get a list of deliverables by the 19th. If it has to go through a PPSC before it gets to the Council - if the PDP work team stuff has to go through the PPSC stuff has to go through the PCSB to get to the Council probably not by San Francisco. But I think participation is a - let me go back a step. I don't think we need any more pressure. I think my employer puts enough pressure on me to get this stuff done that I've been doing for two years, and I do not want this committee to continue.

Put that aside, this is not something I want to be perpetuated. But I really do believe that we need to have a Council start pressuring our own stakeholder groups to get people to attend. We will finish this work product. My biggest fear is that once we finish it we're going to have people coming out of the

woodwork basically saying, "Oh, well, did you consider this? Did you consider that? I don't agree with this. I don't agree with that."

Stakeholder groups will have, you know, they'll be making comments and then we'll all look at each other going, "Where have you been for 18 months? We've been trying to get you to come and now you're making comments." So do I think the process is going to be done? No, because I think people are going to wake up, they're going to see the recommendations and then go, "Oh, wait, I guess now we need to pay attention."

That's my big fear. So do I think us as a small group with, Alan, myself, Avri, Alex from the non-commercial stakeholder group, and James and Paul Diaz, David Maher, yes, we'll get this done, but that constitutes a great - the best cross-section of the community? Probably not. And so I don't want people to later come in and blow it up.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Jeff. Just a small point of order. We're out of time.

Man: Just one point of clarification.

Olga Cavalli: We have a queue.

Man: No, no, he was asking a question and it's not clear. With the present group, do you think that by the San Francisco meeting, yes, or no?

Jeff Neuman: By that point in time the PDP work team will have a - I'm hoping we'll have the - yes, we'll have the final report out. We'll have - there'll be some other comment periods, because it's subject to changes. What's that? Draft final. Right, then it's got to go to the steering committee. That part will not be done.

Man: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. I have (Bill), and Tim, and Mary.

(Bill): Thanks. I don't think - just to be clear, I don't think Mary's motion was in any way indicating any desire to pressure people or any disrespect for the efforts to people. It's just I think that we made a decision at some point that we thought it would be better institutional design in the standing committee.

And we agreed to do that and people are saying, you know, in (comparative) terms, I mean, leaving aside all the stuff that people feel led into a process that they're now involved in and they feel like they're being harassed or something.

If you just want to (put) it in more neutral terms by which model did it seem better in terms of managing these processes going forward? There was a view, previously within Council, that the standing committee be (sensible), number one. And so I think the feeling then is, "Well, then why don't we try to do that."

Number two, you know, when we talk about the (support) Stefan used the expression, "fresh eyes" a number of times. Jeff, you've made the point (repeatedly) that we haven't been able to get enough people engaged. And I admit I haven't participated.

But maybe if we were to launch with a new mandate, a new body, that was approaching these things in a more integrative way, maybe some more people would feel compelled to come in, bring new energy, bring new ideas, bring new perspectives on things, that would help move things along. So, I mean, the point is it could invigorate the process rather than making it more difficult to finish.

The last point I would make is if the concern is with the working teams, you said, well, the motion doesn't say it preserves the working team. We could change the language to make that clearer if that's what you - you know, if you wanted language that specifically says the working teams continue on for (a

specific) period of time. But I think that she's trying to address that middle layer to say, "Let's do what the Council agreed to do."

Jeff Neuman: (Thanks) really briefly, I'd be - I promise to be very brief. One of the recommendations of the PDP work team that I believe will make it all the way through is that a standing committee is created. I think this motion is a little premature. There will be a standing committee, at least that's the recommendation. So let's let it follow its course.

As far as fresh eyes, once the final report is delivered, if you want to eliminate the PPSC out of the PDP work team process we can talk about that, and that may be a good motion for the next time. But that may be valuable. But at this point let's just extend the charter, let's figure it out for the next meeting because I don't see it's so urgent that we have to solve this problem with a new standing committee at this meeting.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Jeff. I have Tim. We are past the hour, past 2:45 and we have two other issues, very important ones to talk about. So - and I need three minutes to go to the restroom. So, I have Tim, I have very briefly if there is Mary, Alan and Marilyn if you can - no? So I (caught up) with Alan and - no, you don't need to talk, Tim? Thank you very much, Tim. Mary? Alan?

Mary Wong: Very brief as a response to some of the questions and comments. And first, let me - I'm sorry, and if I had time and Olga did not need to go to the bathroom I would emphasize again, that this in no way, shape or form was ever intended to put pressure or light a fire under anybody.

So that was not the intent at all. The intent really was to streamline the process, bring it directly under the Council and get on with it. And hence, in terms of the standing committee issue, it's - I saw it as a related point that the standing committee would then come in and help the Council review and wrap up the process.

Olga Cavalli: Alan, you're the last one.

Alan Greenberg: A couple of good points. Regarding pressure, no one could put any more pressure on than we put on ourselves right now. And so I don't think pressure is an issue. The work is going to continue regardless of what anyone says, and I don't really see the pressure of having this motion at this point. The PPSC and the OSC are not a really active group taking up a lot of time, and I think we can defer it and get things in good order.

In terms of more volunteers, I'm not sure we want them now, to be honest, getting people up to speed at this point probably would not be the best thing at all.

And lastly, in regard to the request to split the motion if there's an insistence that a motion be given, my recollection is there's precedent both here and in the Board for having separate votes on different resolves within a motion. I think that's been done here before and other places, and that's an option, although I would like to see the motion off the table and something nice and clean put forward at a future meeting.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Alan, thank you everyone for the constructive discussion. We can take a three minute break and we have the two motions for Wednesday and then we have two very important topics to talk about if Jeff and vertical integration. So we meet again in three, two minutes, thank you.

END