

ICANN Brussels Meeting
Open PPSC Meeting and PDP Work Team
TRANSCRIPTION
Sunday 20 June at 0900 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.

Coordinator: Excuse me. The call is being recorded.

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible) we're just waiting for the recording to start.

Coordinator: The call is being recorded.

Jeff Neuman: Good morning. This is Jeff Neuman, Chair of the Policy Process Steering Committee. And this is an important meeting. It's the first time in awhile that we've met. It's (unintelligible) about a year I think.

So we're here to actually formally receive the report of the Working Group Work Team. And for those of you that are here and want to look up at the screen at some point, there - the members of the Working Group Work Team are - or should be listed on that screen.

Okay, so we have representatives from each of the stakeholder groups that - actually this was still at a constituency time so there are stakeholder group representatives and constituency representatives. And so I just want to kind of go through maybe the people that are around the table just to introduce themselves and then we'll get started.

So I'll start over here. Well, (Edmond)'s actually just here for observing, which is fine. Do you want to...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, I'm from the ISP Constituency.

David Taylor: I'm just sitting in, David Taylor.

Tim Ruiz: Tim Ruiz, Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Margie Milam: Margie Milam, ICANN staff.

Woman: (Unintelligible), ICANN staff.

J. Scott Evans: J. Scott Evans, IT.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Mike Rodenbaugh, Business Constituency.

David Maher: David Maher, Registries Stakeholder.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, great. Thank you, everyone, for coming here. This is strictly a working session. Everybody's welcome to listen in and contribute. I think this first part of it until noon or so will be the Steering Committee. The next part will be talking about, starting at 12:00, talking about the PDP Work Team initial report. So that's kind of the agenda.

I'm going to turn it over to J. Scott who is going to give us a little bit of background on the Working Group Work Team report, just kind of a status as to, you know, the process that's been undertaken till now, a little bit about the recommendations.

And then we'll talk about the role of the PPSC now that we've formally received the report and we'll look back at the charter to see how to do that. So, J. Scott, if you want to just take a few minutes.

J. Scott Evans: Sure. As you know, I guess it was May 31, we, in accordance with ICANN guidelines, turned in our final report on a working group set of guidelines and

so it could be considered at this meeting. So the GNSO improvements, of course, according to the board recommendations, ask us to - they asked the GNSO to adopt a working group model.

So this group I think was established in the Mexico City meeting, the (GAC). And in that, we divided into two work teams below this group and one was for a policy development process and one was for working groups. And I chaired the working group.

In the past, we've used task forces that have sort of had a small legislative body where decisions were made and it was sort of a voting model. And we were asked to get away from that model and get something that was more open and more inclusive and to try to use a consensus-building approach.

So we were tasked with develop some sort of principles or guidelines to give working groups so that they would understand the framework that they are supposed to operate under. Next slide.

So here is a list of the members and their participation. I will say that while you see meetings attended, there were several people who didn't attend meetings but monitored the lists and made comments electronically. They had commitments. They - the meeting time that was convenient for the majority was not convenient for them, but they did participate. Next slide.

So let's go to our guidelines. When we initially started, we wanted to develop two guidelines. One was going to be sort of for working groups and one was sort of an outline to a chartering organization to sort of explain what you need to tell a working group to get them started.

And then after some discussions, we decided to develop one document that contained both elements of that approach. We put out our first draft for public comment. We received five comments. Some of them were quite extensive.

Then we went through a period after we - the public comment period closed where we went through all of the public comments, comment by comment, section by section in the draft.

And we made revisions where we thought it was appropriate. And where we didn't, we explained why we didn't make any changes. And then on the 31st of May, we delivered the report to this group. Next slide.

So there are some - the way we set it up, we sort of set up a roles and responsibilities, like what's expected of you and who participates. And it's - again, these are guidelines. They're not mandates because certain work teams could be 35 people or they could be 5 people.

And so we sort of just gave a guideline of you could have chairs, you could have vice chairs. Here's what the advantage is to that structure is if you do. Here's, you know, sort of just the - we didn't want to put a construct in that was so rigid that it couldn't be fluid and adaptable to different situations.

We also put in a - spent a lot of time on norms and how you behave, only because that can be problematic in that - for a team that's being obstructionist, how do you handle that and what the process is in dealing with that. And so we put all of this in - how to deal with one another, how to make decisions.

And we built in an appeals process within that, both within the working group structure itself and back to the chartering organization so - because it has ultimate oversight.

You know, and then we just gave more practical advice like, you know, what do you do at your first meeting? How do you communicate? What kind of tools (unintelligible)?

We reminded them of the translation requirement, that you can request subject matter experts back and work with staff to obtain those kinds of resources, what your products and outputs would be and how those would be expected to be delivered.

We also - each working group we believe should do a self-evaluation at the end of that, so that the council would have - or the chartering organization (unintelligible) to (unintelligible) this broad enough that any group (unintelligible) use these guidelines, not just the (unintelligible).

You know, to self-evaluate so that that information (unintelligible) used because we've requested that the GNSO look at these annually to see if there needs to be any adaptation or revision to the guidelines based on practices or (unintelligible) what's going on in (unintelligible).

And then we also did a charter guidelines which sort of spoke to the chartering organization about the elements that a working (unintelligible) in order to function properly, the direction (unintelligible).

And then we gave the chairs, because chairs can be two individuals, a checklist of things that they would want to go through in order to make sure they're hitting all the proper elements to get the group started. So it's all there for everyone to see. It's a public document.

There has been some discussion that perhaps this document needs to be taken and a non-Working Group work team member, maybe a member of staff, but somebody needs to review it and then maybe put together a frequently asked questions document that would sort of a do high level of this.

But we think it should be someone who was not involved in the process because they would bring to it a fresh set of eyes that would bring to it

answering things that we probably are - we think are intuitive that aren't necessarily intuitive to those that are reading it for the first time.

And it would inform the frequently asked questions or the - how to sort of guide someone through what (unintelligible) meant to be in a more informative way than one of us that drafted it because we're so married to it, we're afraid that things that we think, oh, well, that (unintelligible) obvious, might not be that obvious and so a fresh set of eyes to do that.

And maybe do a flow chart also that would show in graphics because there are people who understand and do things much better from reading and there are others who graphically, especially if they're speaking (unintelligible) language, it might be better for them to see it in a visual format. But we are suggesting is that that be someone outside of this group (unintelligible) that.

Man: Sorry. Just a clarification just so that people around the table - this is for any working group regardless of whether it's part of a formal PDP or just a working group that the GNSO council wants to establish.

J. Scott Evans: The way we tried to draft it, because we had input from the ALAC, was that it would be a model or guidelines for any working group. And we tried to refer to, rather than GNSO, it - we - the only time I think we refer to (unintelligible) they are the ones that are going to review it yearly.

We tried to say chartering organization as the overseeing body and the working groups as, you know, the group that this speaks to so that - because we know that the ALAC is using this - these guidelines in their draft form to inform how they do their work. And if the ASO wants to use it, they certainly can in their group.

So the whole point was to make it sort of generic so that anyone can refer to it in order to have sort of a uniform structure on how, within this group, ICANN as a whole, a working group would be perceived and understood to operate.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Because - a question I have on that, because I'm discussing with (Ken) on the document itself, (unintelligible) I think the idea ultimately is to actually integrate that (unintelligible) and make it fit with all the other elements that are being done.

(Unintelligible) because when it would go into that document, it would actually start referring to (unintelligible) council more specifically. Rather you would have then as well (unintelligible) document that would be more neutral in terms of (unintelligible).

I'm not really sure how that - those two would work together or run into issues (unintelligible) one another so something that might (unintelligible) how that would work or that still (unintelligible) other (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Tim.

Tim Ruiz: Yes, I would agree with that. I think that, you know, having to - if I understand you correctly, Marika, having it as the base document but we extract a copy for the GNSO use that we might modify and change separately.

I think I support that simply because what the GNSO does in many cases is develop policy that's basically regulating (uncontracted) parties for, you know, regulations that affect Internet users, registrants.

Other supporting organizations, the work that they do isn't necessarily that restrictive or, you know, not necessarily regulation so to speak. But I think we could see a divergence between the way working groups might actually operate within the GNSO versus other supporting organization.

Marika Konings: If I understood Tim correctly, I think his suggestion was (unintelligible) take out those elements, for example, the introduction (unintelligible). Those things don't go (unintelligible) different captions that would move into (unintelligible) and be numbered and according to all the other elements that are out there.

You know, you (unintelligible) how that would look (unintelligible). It wouldn't change any of the content that's in there, that's (unintelligible) added or changed but (unintelligible) start working on the basis that that could then be voted upon by the council as (unintelligible) element that needs to go into (unintelligible) like all the other (OSC) elements (unintelligible) in a certain way and (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Okay. I'm going to go take a comment from Avri. And then after Avri, I want to go back to (unintelligible) explain and go over what the PPSC's role is with respect to this report now that we have it and then talk about, you know, kind of get back into some of the discussion that you've kind of started.

Avri Doria: Avri Doria. I was a member of the Working Group. I'd actually like to put a comment in both about its relevance to the (PDPD) which was asked and the idea of merging it in place in terms of the council's working group or working model. I'd actually like to argue for it remaining a standalone document that's included by reference in any other document.

Part of what we were striving for is that as the notion of working group starts to expand across ICANN, as we start to bring in people in all working groups from a wider participant body, from a wider community than just the GNSO, that there should hopefully be some uniformity of what you could expect within a working group and how it would act, how it would behave, what the roles are and such.

So including it by reference allows it to change in one place and be seen by all. Now in terms of the way it is included when discussing charters, one discuss that anything that is specific or special or needs to be done in a

working group above and beyond those guidelines would then be included in the charter.

That the charter - that the working group behavior will be based on that document. However, A, B, C and D, you know, conditions would be special. So in other words, the charter can always lay on top of this document by reference.

So that was an intention - those were two intentions and which were written in terms of the PDP. It was written with that in mind. I think it tried to take sort of the maximum approach to what would be needed for a PDP, make sure the guidelines were in there, with the understanding that any charter could overlay other requirements as the individual case required. So that's sort of an argument for including it by reference but not by slice and dicing.

J. Scott Evans: We understood that just in the last year the GNSO has had working groups and the board has had working groups. And so we wanted to make sure that this was a document that no matter who constituted it, that they would sort of have this basic fundamental guideline so that a participant could understand that when it - when you said the term working group, what the parameters, not rigid, but what the general parameters about a working group were and how that would be.

And that's the approach we took, rather than trying to make something rigid because there's just too much fluidity and things change too fast that if you don't have a fluid document that allows the charter to overlay on it more specific, then you're never going to be up to date. You're always going to be one or two versions behind in your guidelines for what reality is.

So we - that's the fluidity we wanted to offer this group is, you know, enough guidelines that there was a general understanding for how it would work and sort of a skeletal framework that meat could always be laid on that by charter or by practices as time develops.

Jeff Neuman: So and then last question, at least from me on this before we go to the next, you know, what our role is and you may have answered it with just - with what you just said in terms of it being guidelines, but I assume that there's - in reading it, there were no recommendations to actually change any kind of bylaws or anything more formal than really (unintelligible) maybe the rules of procedure of the council, maybe as a standalone document.

But there's no recommendation in there that would affect a bylaw amendment for example.

J. Scott Evans: No. We don't think that that's necessary. I mean to our understanding, it completely complies with the bylaws of the day. Now should they change, that could be something, but this is just basically - we probably had one of the easier tasks while trying to put it down. We were just really codifying the general practices that have been occurring over the last 24 months, maybe 36.

We were just codifying the way things have actually operated and putting some common understanding around that, which took a little bit of negotiation but not much because basically everyone has a general understanding. This is not so much for people who have participated in the process as it is for newcomers who have never participated in the process.

And we're trying to get involved that you could hand this document to a new chair or a new person on a chartering organization drafting a charter to say, here's something that you - a frame of reference that gives you general guidelines for what you - what is expected.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thank you, J. Scott. I think the report is well received. I think we're glad that the work's done and you all did a great job. And now what I want to do for a few minutes is to talk about, okay, you know, so now let's - we haven't

met in a year or so but - as the PPSC. Now that we have this report, what is our role?

So if you go - it's kind of hard to read up there. But essentially what it says now is that, you know, our responsibility at PPSC is to - essentially to look at this report, make sure that the sub-team has done its job, make sure it's reviewed the public comments and has addressed all of the public comments that were received.

And J. Scott has provided an explanation and in the report it does go through the comments. It does explain why it did or did not adopt some of those comments or how they worked it in.

And then our role essentially - what it says here, is that we're supposed to combine this report with the PDP Work Team report. Now, as we've come along and as J. Scott said, you know, what they've done is codify existing practice. The PDP Work Team is a little bit behind that. There's a lot more issues that the PDP Work Team's been dealing with.

So the question, you know, becomes - what it says in our charter - and I guess if they were to change the charter we'd have to go back to the council - but what it says in the charter is that you combine those two reports into one and send it to the council.

So one of the things I'd like to talk about is, you know, how the Policy Process Steering Committee views that. I mean I think there's a lot of helpful things in the Working Group Work Team report, things that could be used right away as a guideline, you know, the next time the council or chartering organization creates a working group.

So our charter doesn't say that we can submit that alone to the council, but, you know, we could always make a recommendation to the council to change

that in the charter or to just forward it up to the council to see if they would consider.

So one of the things I want to ask J. Scott is, do you think this document, absent a combination, is something that should go to the council after we've all reviewed it and made ourself comfortable, or do you think this actually should be - should wait until the PDP Work Team's work is done and combined with that?

J. Scott Evans: A couple comments. One, while it says we will combine it, it doesn't say we cannot. It says what we should do, but it doesn't say what - that we could send it up separately. It says we should combine it, but it doesn't say that we cannot send it up separately so I would say we certainly could.

I think that there needs to be as quickly as possible an understanding of what working groups are and how they operate. So the quicker we can get that up to the council for them to review and decide if it needs any tweaking or needs any changing, the better.

So I would suggest that it be sent up maybe as a draft to be used in the interim until the final report, but I think some answer around this offers to newcomers - and that's who I think we're most concerned with - presents a reference for how this process works and I think it would be beneficial to go ahead and send it up (unintelligible).

Man: If I can jump in, I - that makes sense to me. I think that would (unintelligible) fine if that - and I'll leave it up to the PPSC to whatever you want to recommend but I would see no problems with that.

Jeff Neuman: I'll go to Tim and then (Philip).

Tim Ruiz: So you see the PPSC's role in this as just being a rubber stamp on what's being produced by these work teams? It's - two concerns I have. One is that I

think that the PPSC Steering Committee should be doing a more in-depth review of the Working Group report - of the reports that are being produced by these two different teams and discussing those as a Steering Committee, you know, for concerns or issues that the Steering Committee might have before it goes to council.

And secondly, that if we don't wait to combine these two reports, I think one could be reliant on the other. I mean, I don't - I haven't see the, you know, any, really read in depth the initial report of the Policy Development Process Steering Committee - or Working Team.

What I'd be - myself, I would like to do that before I make a judgment that we didn't need to combine these two or that there wasn't some relationship that we might need to be aware of.

You know, (unintelligible) the PDP Work Team aware that we weren't going to wait to combine those two reports? I mean is there anything that they're doing that might be reliant on that is what I'd be concerned about.

Jeff Neuman: So, Tim, I think that's a good question. I think - I wasn't trying to suggest that we be a rubber stamp. What I would like or recommend to this group is that we don't take the PPSC as another opportunity to dive into things that the Working Group has already addressed, you know, kind of starting from scratch.

So to the extent that we as the PPSC feel like certain issues haven't been addressed or that, you know, there weren't enough participants or there, you know, whatever the thing is, you know, I'd rather us look at the process by which the Working Group Work Team had made its recommendations and rather not use this as an opportunity to dig into individual recommendations.

I think there was a public comment period. I'm not saying we can't do that. You know, and obviously, hopefully, would be done well enough that we have

received comments on everything and could assess whether they've been addressed but, you know, it's open to this group. There's nothing in our charter that says we have to do one thing and not the other.

So let me just get J. Scott to weigh in on that and then I'll sort of - if this part's done, then I'll go to (Philip).

J. Scott Evans: Well, I remember our conversations on the phone in January of 2008, only because of where I had to take the calls. And we've already had this discussion.

And the discussion we had at that time was our role was to review as a manager of the process is (unintelligible) make sure that the work team functioned as it was supposed to function, that it answered the questions that it was asked to answer and if it didn't do any of those, to send it back to the work team.

Our role was mainly just to make sure that the process operated as it was supposed to operate and really not have any substantive - if we thought something needed to be revised, it was like we feel this. Go back to the work team to fix that. I think that's what we sort of agreed in our conversation that our role was necessarily.

But - and so - and I - but I do believe that we agreed that we had a duty to review it to make sure that there weren't any unanswered questions, that there weren't any things that were left or that weren't - that it didn't somehow jive with the other work team, that there were - that would leave unanswered questions or ambiguities.

I think that's our role, is to make sure that all of those are answered before sending it to the council.

Tim Ruiz: Yes, this is Tim. And that's all I was suggesting. I - that we didn't just pass it - that we need to at least take the time to review it in that regard. But right, if we felt there was deficiencies or things weren't addressed, that that would go back to the work team.

That was my (unintelligible) but that we should at least take the time to review it thoroughly. I think just the discussion today raises a few questions that I have and that's why I want to make that we have that.

Jeff Neuman: Okay and so I know Mike just raised his hand. I'll go to - I'll go to (Philip).

(Philip): Thanks. It was just - this (unintelligible) in his capacity as chair of the (unintelligible) group, the (OSC). The questions you were asking are ones we asked also. And the way that we took our work practice and our role I think is similar to what J. Scott's just been describing.

We felt that the (GRSC) we were a fresh set of eyes where we saw things that (unintelligible) clarified (unintelligible) change the intent, we made a simple change. Where there's substantive question, we sent it back to the work team to answer until such point as we saw a report.

And then we also decided because of the nature and the length of the process, which is work team, steering committee, council, public comments, potential loop back in terms of what public comments might contribute, which could even go back as far as the work team if they're substantive, we felt it was useful that each time any element of our work was done, shove it forward.

So it goes through the process. So ultimately staff can stitch it all together when they have a whole that's there. So that was simply just to let you know the way that we addressed some of these problems and to leave it to your choice as to whether or not we were wise (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Thank you. Mike, do you want to - okay. You know, so one other question that was in the report - or not a question but a comment that was made that there was a reference to one of the OSC teams and you had put that in as a placeholder.

If you could just go over what that item was and, Marika, maybe you can help to see, you know, what we need to do with that particular recommendation.

Marika Konings: That's in relation to statement of interest and disclosure of interest. That is language I think that is in the process of being finalized but not finalized yet so what the Working Group work we did is (unintelligible) placeholder there and (unintelligible) noting that once that group finalizes its work, it will be updated.

And that brings you back to the point of, you know, whether it should be in the GNSO operating procedures or not. Because one of the arguments are in discussions with (Ken) would be like at the moment that that information would be integrated in the GNSO process would just include it by reference because all that information would already be in another section of the GNSO operating procedure so we'd just have a reference in there to the relevant section.

So and just one last item for the discussion and I don't have a specific opinion there, but one of the other reasons I think why, in (Ken)'s view it would be good to move that, for example, in the operating procedure is that you have a body actually responsible for updating it.

One of his concerns is if you leave it a standalone document, who would be responsible at the end of the day to make sure that it's updated over time while it is part of the operating procedures and linked as well where you have different elements that are linked that it might (unintelligible) consistent.

But again, I completely see as well why you might want to have it as a standalone document so it's easier for other bodies within ICANN to pick it up and use it in their respective (unintelligible).

Tim Ruiz: Just - can we - this is Tim. Can we figure out a way - you think there's a way we can do both? I mean, somehow link it into that operating procedures but leave it as a standalone to kind of address the issues that Avri raised?

Marika Konings: Why don't we just require someone to make sure that once operating procedures are updated that that document is updated as well? That's the only thing that you haven't documented and just someone who needs to make sure then that those two remain the same, gets updated.

Avri Doria: I have a suggestion. I mean you could attach it as an exhibit to the operating procedures and then just have it in the body of the document. Reference the, you know, the latest version is attached as Exhibit A but be updated from time to time. So you just need to have clarification in the actual operating rules.

J. Scott Evans: I mean anybody that does form documents does that. I mean it's not a crazy thing. Anybody who is in a large institution that does form documents, the fluid documents are always attached as exhibits because they always change. And so that's probably the safest.

With regards to the cross-reference, we say disclosure of interest. We say statement of interest in the document. What we don't do is we don't lay out what those entail because those are being designed by another group and we say we're waiting on that work to be completed to tell - to inform what that means and what that requires you to disclose.

Man: So is there - is it - it's your intention to basically take that work and just plug it in...

J. Scott Evans: Absolutely.

Man: ...or did you want the work to review that at all?

J. Scott Evans: No.

Man: Okay, (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: We believe that there's a work team working on that. We believe that when consensus is worked in that group, that our job is to merely say that you need to do this and whatever that group has come to consensus on those documents need to entail or disclose will just fit right in. We're not going to reinvent the wheel. We think that that's a waste of time.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Is there any other questions or comments for J. Scott? Mike.

Mike Rodenbaugh: (Unintelligible), it's Mike. Can we talk about the substance of the report or is that for another day?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, what I was going to suggest is because of the time and because Tim has it in and some - other people may not have read the report at this point in time, what I was going to do is two things.

Number one is schedule a call for a few weeks from now so people have had the time to read it, digest it, talk about the substance, look at the comments that were received, make sure that they're comfortable that things were addressed.

And the second part we need to think about which - let me ask it as a question first to J. Scott. With respect to any - was there any decisions or discussion, I should say, on how this would transition into the existing working groups or whether it would just be for newly created working groups, how that would all work?

J. Scott Evans: I think you'll find when you review it that it is basically a codification of what's going on now so as far as what is going on now and I think retroactivity is always a problem.

I think the best thing to do is when it's adopted is have it going forward. I think that you get into a lot of problem and in a group that we can all laughingly say it spends more time arguing about process than it does about policy. The best thing to do is just use it going forward, understanding that it's not a huge (B change) from what is going on now.

Jeff Neuman: Right. So in that respect, it's a little bit different than PDP Work Team which has got some pretty drastic at least recommended changes. Okay so the next action item then is to set up a meeting for a few weeks from now. We'll do a Doodle poll. By that meeting, I'd like everybody to have read the report. Come with questions. I'm going to - Marika wants to say something so let me...

Marika Konings: Yes, I just would like to get - like what do you mean in a couple of weeks from now so we can actually get the Doodle poll out on time and make sure we plan a date. You mean two weeks after the meeting?

Jeff Neuman: So I'm thinking probably - trying to think of what today is. Yes, so probably the week - whatever the week after the 4th of July is. The 5th is a Monday so I would say probably give it another week. Give it the start of the - sometime the week of the 12th. Yes. We could do that as well and, again, please have read the report by then and come with any questions.

We can obviously discuss the questions on the list before that call. But it's the hope that we don't really have to send too much back to the work group. I think once you read it, you'll find that they did address the comments they received pretty well. So, yes, Marika.

Marika Konings: And on that note, I'm happy to circulate as well because, you know, it went out (unintelligible) PPSC as the final report. But I'm happy to circulate to the list as well the document in which we actually, you know, the work team went through all the different comments and highlight them and added comments there where they, you know, made the changes or why they didn't make the changes, so that helps the PPSC to look at what (unintelligible) public comments (unintelligible).

J. Scott Evans: And if I can just make one over-arching comment about public comment. There were a lot of public comments that wanted us to drill down and be very regulatory and set out very specific - very, very specific guidelines. And we felt that that was just a recipe for disaster because it is - there's just too much fluidity.

We would - we used some of those specifics as examples of best practices, but you just - the document would be - having to be reviewed every month if that's what you did.

And so when you look at this, please understand that our idea was to give a general, informative framework that had enough flexibility that it could be a living, breathing document and not something that was constantly, each working group having to (unintelligible) gone through and seeking exceptions to make it workable for whatever the work group's job was without being in violation of some sort of process.

So that's the whole point is it's enough fluidity with a general framework without saying, "You absolutely have to do these things." And then you find out you can't or it won't work and then you're constantly going to council trying to get a carve-out just to face practical reality. So I just want to say that's - keep that in mind when you review this document.

It is - I - just a loose, fluid document that has enough structure around it with regards to appeals process and how those work and protocol and how you

greet one another and obstructionism and those types of things are pretty hard - that's where we got a little rigid.

The rest of it we tried to leave somewhat fluid because we wanted to give the working groups the ability to be what they're supposed to be, is open, inclusive and adaptable.

Man: Yes, I think otherwise also you're going to have lawyers and other participants in the group arguing all the time about people violating the rules and we just do not need that sort of nonsense.

Jeff Neuman: On that note - on a note about lawyers, actually what I'm going to ask now is to go to the next part of the meeting which is the PDP Work Team. So if I could have everybody as quickly as possible in the PDP Work Team come on up here to the table because I see a few people back there.

If we can start a discussion on that and - within the next couple minutes, I'd like to get that started. So if we can have people come on up here if there's anyone back there. (Unintelligible) (Liz) back there who's a member of the PDP Work Team, right? Come on up to the table. Okay.

Give a minute for (James) and some other people to come on up. So I know I saw Avri here before. Avri, still in the room? Just for those of you actually listening maybe to this recording, we're just taking a minute here to get some other people up to the table.

Man: I'll just have her start a new file.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Just keep it going?

Woman: Yes, (unintelligible).

Man: I can have her try and break...

Marika Konings: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Okay I'm going to get started again. Now with our initial report after a good year (unintelligible) more of lots of discussions, lots of complex items, everything in the policy process from what it takes to initiate the policy process to the reviews done at the end of a process, not just reviews of the individual PDP but reviews of the PDP as a whole.

The purpose of this meeting today is not to delve into any of the substance of the report to discuss - not to discuss the items that are in there. The report is what it is. We have a workshop on Wednesday that will be going over what the substance of - some of the substance of the report.

And what we're here today to talk about are the - is basically the presentation we're going to give, who's going to be up there and what types of things this group really wants to put out there. You know, what subset of items out for public comment are ones that we are most interested in soliciting feedback live, in person at this workshop.

It's by no means an indication of every item that we want discussed but certain ones where we have, for lack of a better term, punted the issue, either because, you know, there were multiple sides of the issues or just because we really didn't know necessarily where to start on it.

The report for everyone who's read it is about 150 pages or something to that extent, with the first 20 or so pages being just our recommendation. And so what we'd like to do is we sent around about a week ago - Marika sent around a PowerPoint presentation of what we would like to go through at the workshop.

I know I am the chair of this group, but I would actually like it if other people could get up there and maybe stimulate some of the discussion on some of the items that we talked about. I know unfortunately there are some conflicting meetings that are going on at various times during that workshop.

But, you know, I do believe this topic is certainly one that should generate interest and hopefully generate interest at this stage so that in the last meeting we were talking about the role of the PPSC, the Steering Committee, which oversees this sub-team, as hopefully having a much more limited role than doing in-depth analysis into the issues.

So I'd really like as best as possible to make sure that all the issues are addressed here in the sub team as opposed to the full steering committee. So with that said, is there any questions on, you know, generally what we're going to do during this next hour - or I guess 48 minutes now - go over some of the slides and kind of make sure everyone's on board with these are the items we want put out there for comment at the slide session.

So scrolling through the slides, I think, you know, we'll spend a couple minutes at the workshop just talking about the, you know, what our objective was, what the approach we took and some of the goals of the - of the session.

Again, I'm not going to really go through the slides now. If you have any comments on them, submit it on the list if you think we've mischaracterized anything. If you could just jump to - on my copy here - the slide that starts with the new (genus) of (PC) so one more slide.

So, you know, what we'll do during the workshop is we'll talk about how we divided the work up and we - into the five basic stages of the PDP, talk a little bit about the rationale for why we did that and what that really means, maybe with a little bit of discussion, you know, a minute on, you know, on how the

term PDP has been very confusing in ICANN world - or I think it says ICANN land, I guess.

How it's been very confusing because we have the same term PDP to describe both the initiation of the entire process as well as the formal creation of the (working).

So with that said, our goal is - and I haven't heard about the research - our goal is to take the next slide, which you won't be able to read anything on here - and hopefully in the room that - I'm not sure where we are - in that room...

Marika Konings: We're in the - in the silver room and normally so we can have on one screen slides and one screen (unintelligible). But of course it will - we will still have as well, and Glen has provided a print-out of the executive summaries for in the meeting, so that it will easier for people to look at this specific overview but also to go back and forth between the different recommendations, like Recommendation 19 that's only put up in the abbreviated version, people will hopefully have an (opportunity) so to document and (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Okay. And I think one of our goals really is to try and make it as interactive as possible. What I don't necessarily want to do is go into too much detail about how a recommendation or, you know, this chart other than to explain general, you know, what the colors mean and why we provided it kind of in this way.

But not to spend all of our time kind of talking without using this opportunity to get some feedback. And so I look to you guys to kind of help as to what you think the best way to do that.

We have - the way we've constructed this slide is you go to the key recommendations - right, this slide here - actually, the next one - so as for example at Stage 1, the planning initiation, these are ones Marika and I kind of picked out as ones we thought would be good topics.

They relate to for example in Stage 1, talking about the time frames. You know, in the council session before the PPSC, there were some discussions interesting on - that came up in the context of both vertical integration actually - and it came up in the context of PDRP or actually the registration abuse office report is talking about timelines, you know, comes up with every single PDP.

So our recommendation, you know, Recommendation 10 was to discuss, you know, the modification of this timeline. And so what I'd really like is for someone other than me to help take us through some of these recommendations.

So I'll - if I have to appoint people I will. But it would be good to have other people - maybe Avri, you would like to present other particular topics. Not necessarily Stage 1 but if there's something of interest.

Avri Doria: My - this is Avri - my problem is that - and it's partially my fault - but I'm co-chairing another (meeting).

Jeff Neuman: (Unintelligible) meeting prior to that.

Avri Doria: Well, I (unintelligible) but I'm co-chairing it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Avri Doria: But I mean if there's specific things that maybe we could fit it in and I could come on over (unintelligible) but I don't know. So I'm not saying absolutely no but I'm saying it might be better know.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. You know, I know there's other meetings here. Anyone else has got an interest I have a feeling this might fall on me. I guess okay, not my preferred

solution. Or I guess Marika and I can help out. I don't know if (James) is here - if there's a topic you want to address.

(James): Always love to help, Jeff. Unfortunately, I'm double-committed for that time.

Jeff Neuman: Sure. A scheduling issue - we need to kind of discuss with ICANN schedulers and see if there's something that could have been done.

Avri Doria: Before going - that's why I said I'm partially responsible. Before going to (unintelligible), I had asked that help from staff in moving that other meeting (unintelligible) it's the one that's been (unintelligible) other meeting for income.

So it's happened because they were being helpful in another instance. I had no notion that I would be involved in speaking. I never heard and I didn't worry about it. But before going explaining so scheduling I asked them to schedule us this way without realizing what I was doing.

Jeff Neuman: Okay.

Avri Doria: So it's my fault.

Jeff Neuman: Marika, you have a...

Marika Konings: Just another question for (James). Is it - is it just me personally for the whole (meet) or does it apply to that (unintelligible) (ALA) meeting that (unintelligible) at like one hour after us? It's just to get an idea of (all) the (charge) that will be there.

(James): I'll have to take a look. I know that just about every moment of Wednesday is already spoken for last night and this was not on the list, so I'll have to take a look and tell you (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Maybe (unintelligible) step up there and improvise. All right. Well, at least I think I'd like people's feedback on the slides, on the recommendations. If there are certain recommendations you think should be introduced, you know, I really do want as many members of the Policy Process outside of the Policy Development Process Work Team available, you know.

As Chair I could certainly discuss these issues but I certainly wasn't advocating one way or the other on any of these issues. But to the extent that we did have our differing opinions, if there are people that could stand up there when - in the audience to make comments on these issues that would be very helpful.

You know, I probably could do an adequate job of representing both sides but I think it would be more effective to actually have those that are advocating certain positions be there for it.

So to the extent that you can come in and out, you know, it would be interesting. I think we do have a big - a fairly big room and it would be nice to see a bunch of people (unintelligible).

What I don't want to see happen is I don't want to see interest on the subject finally appear at the time that it's presented to the council and now, you know, we've spent a couple years working on this and coming up with a good process.

I don't think anyone on this (work team) really wants to see that. So, you know, so these are the items that we've picked out. We may as well just spend a couple minutes just talking about those.

So in the Stage 1, again, the Planning and Initiative Stage, the three recommendations that we probably kind of bring out of the report are the ones on modifying the time frame for the creation of the Issues Report.

We've talked about, you know, the role of the public comment period after publication of the Issues Report. Right now in the bylaws - hello, Marilyn - that's okay - where we talked about our, you know, the public commentary now is in the bylaws it says that public commentary needs to start immediately upon launching of the - the only - the first public comment is not until you've actually launched the formal PDP.

We talked about a comment period on the issues before us as opposed to just having the issues before kind of submitted to the council and the council to - to take its actions. So we talked about doing that.

And we talked about an issue that we - we've talked about having but no one could really put their finger on how to - the work that is kind of a fast track process.

I know, you know, Mike - he's in here from the vertical integration (carried) that. And really there is nothing in place for a faster track PDP. And we've discussed this internally within our group. We haven't had consensus on whether there truly is a need for that, and if there is then how that would work.

We kind of all have in our minds some notion of an emergency but we don't really know how to categorize that, and how that wouldn't be (damned) to try to move things that really aren't that kind of an emergency into that process.

I would argue though, when we did discuss it, it was actually before the vertical integration PDP had started. I think now we may have a - it's possible we may have a test case for a faster-track PDP. So that's certainly an issue that could be debated back and forth. So we can introduce that.

So that's what Recommendation 15 was meant to address, but even if we do create some time lines as to an Issues Report, how can we move faster when the need - or if the need - should arise.

Just first, some of the people that just walked in. What we're talking about now are not the substance but basically what we're going to bring out during the workshop on Wednesday.

Unfortunately, there are a number of conflicting meetings with that, which some of them have a number of our members of the PDP diverted to other areas, which is probably something that we would like to address as an overall issue within ICANN at some point.

So is there anything else from the planning and initiation phase that anyone in this group thought would be kind of good to bring out in our workshop on again, on Stage 1 planning and initiation?

Okay, not seeing any other topics on that, jumping to Stage 2, if Marika can put the slide forward a little bit - the next one. Right now it's interesting if you look at the bylaws right now there is actually no requirements to have a charter.

We would take it for granted now because every working group we've created has a charter. But there is actually nothing in the bylaws for the PDP that talk about actually having one.

So that's something we do want to point out and talk a little bit about, you know, what we've thought about it to the - the working group work team has addressed in their report some of the elements of the charter whereas we were focusing on A, the requirement of having a charter and B, how that charter gets approved by the council which is then not something that's in the bylaws at this point in time.

You know, what is the threshold that's required for the council to approve a charter? Is that the same threshold that was initiating the PDP - or sorry,

same threshold as initiating the process as opposed to should there be some higher ones or not?

So again, those public comments period upon initiation of the PDP, the bylaws do require a formal comment period upon initiation. We've kind of played a little bit loose with that in recent years.

And we actually do a public comment period, but we've tended to do it after the working group has created so that the working group can formulate what exactly goes out for public comment as opposed to just throwing out, you know, here's the topic, there's the Issue Report so discuss.

It doesn't really necessarily provide the most useful feedback for the working. So we've tried over the years - different working groups have tried different models.

Some have - I think the vertical integration was kind of (rolling) it out there because it was so quick without really getting focused, whereas other working groups have thrown out very specific questions, so it really helps the individual working group do its work.

What we did do, which I actually need an update. I know the council actually discussed this yesterday - but I have not gotten an update. I don't know, it might (unintelligible) our liaison.

But what we did is we kind of - we fronted the issue of priority, right. So how many questions that came up during the work team discussions revolved around, you know, what if there are already too many PDPs? What if, you know, what if there is a timeline for proceeding to the next step of a PDP?

You know, how does that correlate or how does that relate to the GNSO's role to prioritize PDP? So my - yesterday during the discussion, is there any kind of - does it look like that process is coming towards a - or is it (Heeter) or

whoever - does it look like that process is coming towards some sort of resolution in any short period of time or is that something that they could use our help with?

Man: Unfortunately I missed the session, but I did get a download afterwards and I think I understand where we're at in the process, to answer the question anyway. The thought was - at least this was (Chuck)'s spin - in that we will need to have another discussion after the discussion that we had yesterday, but that he thought within a month or two that they would - we would be finished with that prioritization exercise.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, I think that's helpful because that's probably about the time we'd get comments back so that they could - and analyzing the comments that we do get. So if that actually comes to push - Marika's got a comment.

Marika Konings: No, I actually have a question. Did he mean with - no, having the whole exercise (done) and decided on what the board just (unintelligible) exercise of having the list of priorities agreed on (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: The latter. Okay, so ours is a kind of a more macro topic, right. It is - and maybe it is something that this work team should delve a little bit more into, which is making recommendations to the council as to how it would go about prioritizing and how it would deal with in an instance where there are already a large number of PDPs or non-PDPs for that matter going on that - how we would recommend dealing with that in the PDP guidelines, whether it's rules of operation or bylaws.

So for example, we could follow the process but if we follow the process in doing the Issues Report in doing all the required elements beforehand, what if there are 20 PDPs now all of a sudden and the council has to deal with all of that?

So (unintelligible) said if we could make any recommendations or want to make any recommendations to council as to when it should vote or even if it votes - okay, one second - so even if it does vote, you know, what other guidance we can give? Let me go over to Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Jeff, thanks. And my name is Marilyn Cade and a individual member of the (reference) group. And I'm just going to make a comment about what you said in terms of our terminology, that I think it's going to have to emerge but we're not at yet.

And the reference is with the changing role of the council, where the council manages a policy development process. I think the resource issue - so in theory there could be 20 working groups all running at the same time.

So it's not going to be a huge demand on the council, but it will be a huge demand on the community and on the staff time, right? The question of - there is of course, an ongoing management role for council, but I think we might just think about that when we go forward in our work on making sure we're making those distinctions.

The council still needs to make the prioritization but the - it's really community-wide and community resources and staff resources, not just council that's going to be affected by 20 PDPs at the same time.

Jeff Neuman: I think - okay, let me go over to Mike.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I think what Marilyn says is certainly true, but I think that we've got to be careful, because Olga's chairing another group that's dealing with the prioritization process, and I don't - I don't think that that was necessarily part of this group's charter or mandate or particularly even an (expense) for us to deal with that.

Jeff Neuman: So I guess what - the way it comes up in our group and we did actually an initial report punted to part of the prioritization exercise. The way it comes up in our group is if we sent rules for example that said that upon x days after the Issues Report is - excuse me - is received by the council, they have to decide whether or not to formally initiate the PDP.

And if after x number of days after they formulate the - or have a decision to go with the PDP, then they have to start the working group and they have to do all - so everything kind of plays on this timeline.

And what we're planning on doing is being much more flexible as to what that timeline is - make it more realistic. But in the end there's still going to be rules in place that require forward moving progress. And so I understand what you're saying, but it's not beyond the purview of this group.

We need to have it flexible enough to take into consideration an ability for council to prioritize but also at the same time make sure that when the community feels like a PDP should be done, that the community is actually - or that the council's responding to the community in an appropriate way.

And that may all be addressed by Olga's work, and that's what we were kind of hoping when we punted it to that exercise. That's kind of how it correlates if we're going to set some timelines and things for the work group.

So that's actually a good, you know, topic for discussion at the workshop, and I'm sure, beyond. But Marilyn is absolutely right that it is - one of the things this group did emphasize, it's not the council's resources alone.

It's the council, the community, the staff - all of them that needs to be considered in moving forward, especially if we do have timelines associated with this. Even if they're not the most rigid timelines.

And then - so going on to the next stage, Stage 3. Issues that we thought we would bring out for comment and - or discussion at the workshops are - there was a reference to one of the topics of linking policy development with strategic plan and budgeting. This relates to the resource issue.

So that is - you know, if something is going to, for example, if there is work that's going to be or needs undertaken, let's say it's WHOIS studies or whatever, that's going to require some budgeting allocation above and beyond what was considered in the yearly budget, then how do we deal with that? How does the whole timetable - how do we deal with that? Things - you know, other issues, you know, on implementation, right.

We spent a fair amount of time talking about (when) working groups development of this policy. And historically, there have been - historically in some working groups there's been a division of, "We're here to determine what this policy is or should be." But then it's always - in some instances it's been kind of punting to the ICANN staff or to maybe even another group, but it's punting the issue of implementation.

And so we've had lots of discussions within the group as to, you know, is that really the case? Should that be the case? Should the working group actually do some of the work on implementation to the extent it can?

Should the working group be soliciting the input of maybe contracted parties on - you know, is it really feasible to, once we have this policy, how would you implement it? And so that's been the subject of some of our discussions and there are recommendations that we have in the report on that.

And to - you know, the last one is - we've talked about - there's something in the bylaws at this point - no, I'm sorry - there are two elements of - in the bylaws currently on what a working group must produce.

It's an initial report and a final report. But through the years, we've certainly noticed that there are lots of other elements that don't fit into an initial report. That don't fit into a final report. But they may be issues that we want comment on. They may be issues where we want a survey to do, for example.

There's lots of different elements that we talked about within a PDP. Again, you know, pointing to vertical integration. You know, we have something, and Margie knows this full well, we've had something that we were talking about.

Is this an initial report? Not enough for an initial report? Because if it is an initial report, at least in the bylaws now, we've got to start (explaining) to get comments.

But if it's not an initial report, then we can't necessarily go to the next stage to a final report. So just things that we've talked about and made some recommendations to some best practices, or at least guidelines on some of these topics.

Going to Stage 4. If anyone has any comments, I'm kind of going through this quick, because I know I stand in the way of lunch. And if this were in my company, people know exactly how I feel about other meetings standing in the way of lunch. And not a positive thing.

So Stage 4, you know, we talked about. So - and actually, this is something that's going to come up time and time again. The working group puts forward a report to the council, and it's got 20 recommendations, 10 recommendations, whatever it is.

You know some believe that the council should be able to pick and choose which of those recommendations, and then forward those to the board. Some believe that the council's role is to forward their report as a whole to the board. So there's kind of a mix. And we need to talk about that more.

Our recommendation out of this group in the initial report was that action and indication from the working group that things must be considered together, that the council does have the right to pick and choose its recommendations.

But when the working group says specifically, we don't want these to be considered independently, this is really a - to use an IRT term from a year ago, this is a (tapestry) of recommendations.

That if you pick and choose, you're going to weaken the entire thing. And so if you don't want to go with a couple of recommendations, it shouldn't (benefit) the board, but maybe send it back to the working groups to kind of resolve how you deal with that.

There have been recommendations - so that's what the initial report says, and it's not fixed in stone. It's kind of our recommendation that we're soliciting input on.

But that has been a fairly controversial topic in a number of PDPs going way back to things like - that I can certainly recall in 2006 when we did the (unintelligible) PDP. It's come up with pretty much most every PDP.

And there are some that are not happy when the council picks and chooses certain recommendations. And there are some that aren't happy, frankly, when the council wants to forward the entire report.

So I think on both sides there's definitely good arguments. We do have a recommendation that we've made, so it would be good to get some feedback on that.

Certainly, a topic that's generated a lot of discussion in our group is the board report. Right now what happens is the GNSO council, after they approve the -

whether it's one recommendation or multiple - right now it goes to the board with the staff writing another report on top of it.

So they get - so what happens is that the board right now gets a staff report, which at this point in time is never made public. So we don't even know what the staff report says.

But that's piled on top of the final report. And the final report has an executive summary, and then, you know, the hundreds of pages of not only the explanation as to why we - how we got there, but all of the comments and all of the everyday (as contributed).

So we certainly spend a fair amount of time on discussing, you know, whether staff should basically use the executive summary and forward that directly to the board, as opposed to rewriting it.

And - or whether, even if it is a separate document -let's say the executive summary is like our executive summary in the initial report, which is 20 pages - whether the staff should really be going back to the council or even the working group to help write that board report.

After all, really, you know, the people that worked on the issue probably know that issue just as well if not better than the staff that we're helping out. That's been a very controversial topic and one that, you know, we'd like to get feedback on.

Voting thresholds. We did discuss this. You know, there - when we went to the bicameral structure, there were certain voting thresholds that were set. We had discussed, are those still relevant, are those still the right ones?

And frankly, there are additional ones where things come up like voting on the charter, like voting on a number of different items. So are those still the

right ones? And if - you know, did we get it right in what - in our recommendation?

What does it mean for the board to act? This is also another controversial one that comes up. Where it says at the end - in the current bylaws what it says now is that if there is a (stupor) majority, the board has to do certain things and may only send it back to the working - or to the council under certain circumstances.

But there's an interesting provision in the bylaws that says, but if there's a majority of the council, then the board can act. But what does that mean? And that's been a subject of debate.

You know, so some of the contracted parties have said - or some of the contracted parties have said, "Okay, yes, the board can act, but it can never be a consensus policy," instead of the board can act and it can say, "Yes, we endorse this, but it couldn't be binding on contracted parties if they didn't have the majority."

But the non-contracted -some of the non-contracted parties are, you know, "Wait a minute, it says the board can act, so if the board acts, then it is binding on the contracted parties. So which one is it?"

And we've kind of discussed those items, and, you know, it's never been interpreted by us - or it's never been interpreted for us by the board or the ICANN general counsel or their staff.

So, you know, this is actually - it hasn't really emerged yet in a PDP, but you certainly imagine that if there is a PDP on a topic where that has got some resistance, but the council was able to get a majority, but not two (for) majorities, you know, you certainly will have people that don't want to implement it arguing that the board acting is not binding on the contracted party. So we want to be prepared for that, if that happens, so.

Marilyn Cade: So I just want to - Marilyn Cade speaking - you just said that it hasn't happened before but in fact it has happened. You mean it just hasn't happened recently because we have had policy approval that we didn't have.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so which one was - remember? PDP 06...

Marilyn Cade: The hard spot we're going to override the General Council.

Jeff Neuman: Well, I'm not talking about (filth) now.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: This is on recommending, you know, after its full PDP, right...

Marilyn Cade: I see, okay, I was just trying to...

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Because I was - I think it is important to plan - my point is I think it is important to plan for it.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Marilyn Cade: And - but I don't think in the past - at least when we were on the council that we stopped at let's see, well our preference may be consensus policy. That we understood that there may be instances we're at least getting to a standard but still a good step forward.

Jeff Neuman: I think that actually that just, I agree with that and I think one of the things that just came to mind - I can't remember, Marika, do we have on a slide, the explanation of the in scope? What it means to be in scope?

We don't. Let's put it in the appropriate stage because I think that is actually a good discussion as one of the other items - as Marilyn was talking that came to my mind is, you know, certain parties have interpreted what does it mean to be in scope to initiate a PDP? Some have said that in scope means within the picket fence.

Some of us have said no, it just means in scope of the GNSO or ICANN and, you know, we have a recommendation on that, so - which is different than what some people believe. So I think that is a good topic to bring up at the workshop.

What we're talking about here, Marilyn, is which I don't believe has happened is that there's a final report, and it's not an issue about scope but it's an issue where there's a concrete recommendation that's been approved by a majority.

What the bylaws say now is that if it's approved by a majority of the council the board can quote, "act" but how that as relates to consensus policy is something that you have differing opinions on. And so that's something that we discussed primarily within the group and certainly something that we want feedback on from the community.

Again, standing in the way of food which is starting to smell kind of good. And I see someone here from my company who knows how I feel about having meetings during lunch.

We - in my company, we call it the Neuman rule. So if there is a meeting that goes on during - from the hour between 12:00 and 1:00, there must be food or I will not attend. And if I am hungry, what they know is if I am hungry, I'm not in a good mood.

Woman: Moving on.

Jeff Neuman: Moving on to Stage number 5. I'm sorry, yes, Stage 5. The topics here to discuss at the workshop include something that we've never really done which is, you know, how do we assess the recommendations after the fact?

So now it's been implemented and, you know, the working group's done. At that point usually the working group sends it to the council. The council does whatever they're going to do and then the working group assuming that it gets up to the board. And there's no issues, the working group just disbands and disappears forever.

We did talk about okay, that's maybe not the most effective thing to do. Shouldn't the working group review the results, make sure that it's in line or how to improve with that PDP, how to improve that individual PDP but how to improve the PDP process? And then I am really trying to jump ahead to some other issues that we've talked about.

These are kind of what we called overarching issues but now we call other issues because of the term overarching is usually used now in terms of the new TLD process and we don't want to create any confusion.

So the other issues we talked about - the reason these are others is because they permeate through the entire PDP process from beginning to end.

Things like timing, issues of timing, issues of translation, voting thresholds, how to make decisions and ultimately in the end the hardest thing to do is to try to figure out now that we've got this new PDP recommendation, how do we transition to it?

What do we do with the existing PDPs, and so how does that whole thing - whole thing work? So those are generally the topics to talk about at the workshop.

I really would like to see most of the PDP work team members there to answer questions on this. Again, I could certainly respond to these questions but I'm not an advocate on either side of these issues. I am, you know, neutral in this.

So I'd prefer not to bring up either side or sound like I'm advocating on one position. So to the extent I could have others from the PDP work team in the audience that I can, you know, point out.

Certain issues I know are hot buttons so if we could have Avri there for part of the time to the extent Marilyn's there, to the extent (James) is there for any part or Mike. I could turn around and say, you know, you want to address this? Or I could assess what both sides have said kind of like I've done in this meeting.

With that said, any questions on the workshop? Okay, so before we close this meeting, you know, I do want to talk about next steps. So we're going to have this workshop. The public comment period is ongoing right now. The comment period ends July 20, 21st, somewhere around there.

I do realize that there's a lot of comment periods that are ending - not that I want to extend the public comment period. But I just have a sneaking suspicion that most people are going to be focusing on some of the items up for comment including the draft applicant guide book and others.

So I highly anticipate asking for an extension of that time period because I do feel like this topic is important. I do believe - maybe I'll turn it to (Chuck). I don't where this topic comes out in the prioritization exercise that's going on. I know that within our own stakeholder groups this was pretty high up. Sorry, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, just to know that this is not a public comment period that it's mandated by the bylaws so working, in my view the working has its flexibility, or working

has its flexibility to extend that if it feels that if you would like to receive more comments or allowing (extensions).

Jeff Neuman: Oh, because this itself is not a PDP.

Marika Konings: No, that's why I say the only ones that are mandated by the bylaws. I think normally we do on like a 30, 45 day public comment period but those have been extended as well .

Jeff Neuman: Right. So, (Chuck)?

(Chuck): The priority came out very high. I think it was that the end result was a six I believe out of seven. So it's right up there as high. Probably there's two that I think were high up, maybe three that were up in the six, seven range. So, it's very high.

Jeff Neuman: So that's good news for us, I guess. But also lends credence to the fact that probably we'll make a recommendation to extend this comment period just because I want people to have time to focus on it and it is a long and dense report.

There are a lot of recommendations. There's a lot of esoteric kinds of recommendations and things that kind of make your head spin. So to - not that they're that controversial, they're just very in depth.

So probably we'll extend it to the next step is once those comment periods have been received to then start working on those and incorporating those. There are a number of elements that are specifically in the report saying we need to work on these.

So I think what we'll do with the PDP work team is give people a couple of weeks after the meeting to kind of decompress and possibly call a meeting.

Again, I'd like something the week of the 12th to have a meeting at our normal time so - with this work team to discuss some outputs of the workshop and to start working on some of the elements that we did sort of punt it to a little bit later on.

(Chuck): Jeff, just one suggestion, this is a personal suggestion, so take it as personal.

Jeff Neuman: I should take it personally.

(Chuck): No, no, no. What I mean is it's coming from me personally. Now, I want to talk about the chair.

The - I think it's intimidating for people when they see these huge reports. And so one thing that we might want to consider is making the reports more concise and including links or references to a lot of supplemental information because I don't know.

Like I said, that's a personal view and that may be something we want to consider in the GNSO as a whole because there is this overwhelming amount of information that people are confronted with and sometimes people don't need all of the background details but that they know where it's at could be - that could be there, the references.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, (Chuck). I think we internally debated that as well. I know - Marilyn, do you have a comment? Yes, please.

Marilyn Cade: I do, and my comment may also be personal, but it's going to probably disagree with not the intent but your suggestion and I want to explain why. I think that ICANN is increasingly relying on links. And if you travel remotely and your access is narrow band or you live remotely and your access is narrow band, it's actually - it gives two problems.

One is going out and finding a link and then trying to go back and forth is actually very difficult to read a document. But maybe we should be thinking about a different approach to organizing the reports and to have a standard approach to annexes, appendices and to have a standard for what could go into that.

So then you have an executive summary, you have a main body, and we try to come up with a practice - and I don't mean to dictate it, but a practice.

I find that that may, you know, that might fulfill what you're interested in but also inspire people that they - that I just find that link reliance just very problematic.

(Chuck): That works fine for what I was trying to get at.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, I see now, (Chuck), how the problem of being left and right down this table so I didn't see (Alex). (Alex), do you have a comment?

(Alex): Yes, thank you very much, Jeff. And everybody apology if I got here a couple minutes late. In - with regard to the three points whether a link, a summary, or a detailed report, my view is closer to Marilyn where you can have a standard way of seeing if you want to get a brief like the same thing they're talking about - the executive summary to whole report.

You can get somebody but if you're on travel or there's some way you can get the whole report downloaded and you put them on your redial - your laptop and download and read them at your own pace, it's more convenient.

So that in case you want a brief report, that's okay. Otherwise becomes very hard to try to keep track of changing a report here and there and especially some of these that have even graphs and a lot of references to be self-contained as it were. So I'm inclined to go closer to what Marilyn says. Thank you, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, (Alex). And I do agree with you. This was such a broad topic. It sounded like maybe when it was initially created, (Alex), you know, the new PDP topic, you know, go with it.

But as we started digging deeper and deeper into all of the individual elements it became a much larger task. Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Maybe the (unintelligible) solution for that is that we (provide) a couple of links to the executive summary. Now we do provide an executive summary, but it's part of the whole document.

Maybe by providing a separate document that is just the executive summary might facilitate that proposal, just having the executive summary and not necessarily having to download the whole document and printing out the pages they want or don't want.

Jeff Neuman: We tried not to make the executive summary too long. I know it is long. But, you know, there's a number of areas in the executive summary where it refers to just numbers as opposed to the actual topic because we didn't want to do too much explanation.

The summary really - the executive summary - may not be able to follow. But I certainly understand exactly what you are all are saying and we actually talked about that for a while.

Any other comments before I close it off and then let the council come back up for their 1 o'clock? No? Okay, thank you , everyone on the PDP work group.

(Chuck): And for those in the room, I just want to make you aware of what's happening next. At 1 o'clock the council will be meeting to plan our joint meeting with the

ccNSO on Monday and the meeting with the board and staff this evening at 8 o'clock.

It is an open meeting so you're welcome to stay here if you're interested in that feel free to do that. The - but I wanted you to be aware that the new gTLD discussion will start at 2 o'clock and it will be in this room as well.

END