

**GNSO  
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Communications Coordination  
Work Team (CCT )  
Thursday 25 February 2010 at 1800 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Communications Coordination Work Team (CCT) teleconference 25 February 2010 at 1800 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-cct-20100225.mp3>

On page:

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

**Participants on the Call:**

Mason Cole - Registrar Constituency – Chair

Steve Holsten - Vice-Chair, gTLD Registries Constituency

Chris Chaplow - Commercial and Business Users Constituency

**ICANN Staff in attendance:**

Ken Bour - Policy Consultant

Julie Hedlund

Scott Pinzon

Glen de Saint Gery

Gisella Gruber-White

Liz Gasster

**Apologies:**

Fouad Bajwa

Coordinator: Thank you for standing by. Just need to inform all participants that today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. And ma'am you may begin.

Mason Cole: All right, thanks very much. Gisella could we have a roll call please.

Gisella Gruber-White: Okay, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. On today's call, we have Mason Cole, Steve Holsten, Chris

Chaplow. From staff we have Liz Gasster, Glen Desaintgery, Julie Hedlund, Ken Bour, Scott Pinzon, and myself Gisella Gruber-White. No apologies noted and we are still trying to get hold of - thank you.

Mason Cole: Thank you Gisella. Well we have quite a bit of staff on the line and I know that...

Woman: We have you outnumbered.

Mason Cole: You do too. And Nairobi is rapidly approaching and you all have a million things to do, so I am going to endeavor to keep this call extremely efficient on your behalf.

So I didn't send out an agenda. I intentionally didn't do that because I think really there's only one thing that we need to take care of, and that is settle on where the document is and then decide whether or not further action on the document is needed.

Ken you've sort of been on point for this. Is there anything else really that we need to address today?

Ken Bour: No sir. I believe that's it.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Ken Bour: Recognizing that - just a comment that you have indeed sent Report 1 on to the OSC and that matter is concluded. Well at least now it is concluded.

Ken Bour: Correct. Right, right, right. Okay, very good. So I just want to ask - there's really only a few of us here on the team on the call, but I just wanted to ask. I found the report to be really with Ken's updates in pretty good order. Is there anything that anyone would particularly like to talk about? Scott I know that you sent your email this morning. And I'm happy to talk about that, but I

wondered if there's anything that stood out from the report that anyone wants to use this time to discuss.

Liz Gasster: Well, it's Liz. I mean you asked a couple of comments on some of the questions on some of the text that I inserted, and you know if we could just go through that maybe and respond to those things.

Mason Cole: Sure.

Liz Gasster: And if there's anything - you know I wanted to - I added a lot of ideas or several ideas. I shouldn't say a lot - a few. And mostly what I wanted to do was just reassure the team that they were just ideas. And you know if people think they are good ideas, that's great. I'm glad they are helpful, but you know they really were just food for thought.

Because if there was one area that seemed like it needed just further creative juices was this whole area of coordination among stakeholder groups. I mean sorry, coordination among SOs and ACs, and then also with the GNSO and the Board, you know, and I've had some thoughts about that. So I just wanted to be sure to caveat or that people knew that my ideas really were just ideas and you know they should feel free to you know challenge or question anything that doesn't seem workable or that would achieve intended results.

Mason Cole: Okay Liz, actually why don't we just lead off with that. Why don't we talk about the comments that you just noted. And then if you want to discuss some of your ideas, I think that would probably be a good use of our time.

Liz Gasster: I think they kind of thought - well let me just answer a couple things specifically. And I've got a heavy cold so I may not (get to) all of this. But you had asked one question. I think it's on Page 6 about the examples that I did about - you know that the GNSO working group convened following word of the (SX). And the only reason that I put that in there was really about how important communications among these SOs and ACs can be. That to be illustrative of you know examples where work of the (s stack) immediately

had an impact on work of the GNSO where the GNSO took work of the (s stack) and you know took it on and went further with it.

Just to make the case that there is a lot of synergy between and among the SO, ACs, and that it was valid. You know a worthwhile endeavor to try to acknowledge that and enhance the process. So maybe you know in the next draft we can make that a little clearer about what those examples are you know intended to convey, but that's all it really was.

In the preceding sentence we talk about much can be gained from improved information sharing, and I think it's instructive that you know things that the (s stack) are working on then become - you know in several cases recently, the GNSO turned to then address them right away.

Mason Cole: Okay, yeah. So the examples are just meant to illustrate that when you do have cross functioning or cross - I don't even know how to term it. When SOs, ACs, or other bodies within ICANN are able to share information, sometimes that leads to collaboration where you may not have - where maybe before it wasn't available.

Liz Gasster: That's right.

Mason Cole: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: And certainly to acknowledge that topics of interest to one SO or AC may very well be of interest to another.

Mason Cole: Right and it prevents work being developed in parallel without the other side knowing.

Liz Gasster: Well, yeah. That's just sort of setting the stage in terms of the problem statement. But later on you know when I throw out some ideas, there were a number of advantage I thought to greater intercommunication and

collaboration, and that is certainly one of them so you don't have efforts in parallel that aren't informed by the other.

And I can think of you know a number of other reasons too like there could be input from let's just say GNSO people to - I mean I'm trying to remember what actual topic it was on where there was - the (s stack) was working some issue and forgive me for not remembering which one. And it turned out that the GNSO had a lot to say about the report, but didn't have an opportunity to really comment on it or influence it until it was already in an advisory that was published.

Mason Cole: Right.

Liz Gasster: And so by getting involved in the process earlier or having some consultation, the (s stack) would have the advantage of being informed by the GNSO where you know policy expertise really in the GNSO that could inform some of their technical considerations.

Mason Cole: Got it. Okay. Okay, by the way just as a matter here, Julie or Ken or someone. Are you making notes as we go or should I be doing that?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I'm happy to have the panel thought I haven't quite heard anything yet that would cause me to draft or write anything. I think I heard...

Liz Gasster: Actually Ken the one thing that I think would be helpful is in the one paragraph where I give the examples on Page 6 where I say, "For example." You know maybe that could be changed to say, "The following are some examples of instances where the GNSO had particular interest in the work of the (s stack)," and you know et cetera to make it clear the purpose of those examples to Mason's point that they weren't so clear. That's just one place where...

Ken Bour: Could I - I couldn't quite capture all of that. Could I just copy that paragraph out and drop it in an email to you Liz? And maybe you could reword it and I will drop it right back in.

Liz Gasster: Sure. That's fine.

Ken Bour: Okay, thanks.

Mason Cole: Okay, good. Thanks Ken. Okay, Liz.

Liz Gasster: So you know Ken had some great edits. I think a lot of it is clarifications. I think there were cases where just in reading this fresh; we wanted to be clear for example on this issue about simplifying complex terminology. When I read - Ken and I both had edits to this, and I think it was really - you know the way it was written before it seemed like there were really two points being made. One is that sometimes people use terminology that overly - are unnecessarily complex, which is particularly difficult in a multilingual environment where English isn't everyone's first language. And we should try to simplify language where possible, and that's one point.

And then it seemed like there was a second point being made about you know sometimes we are - in an effort to find consensus, we brush over if you will areas of contention, which could sort of unintentionally make statements ambiguous or oblique and not clear because they are trying to (finesse) these areas of concern. And that might be useful in terms of reaching high-level consensus, but there also could be a downside to that.

Again, I was trying to read into what I thought was not very clearly written before. That by doing so, it could make it harder to identify what in fact are areas of disagreement that should be probed further among the group in order to try to reach consensus.

I think these edits are designed to make both those points, but to clarify why diplomatic (speak) might be a negative thing. Because if you just look at the term in quotations standing alone, it might sound like a positive thing. And often it is a positive thing to speak diplomatically, but you don't want to speak so diplomatically that you lose the kernels of controversy that might ultimately need to be solved.

Mason Cole: Right.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Mason Cole: So in other words, we've simplified the language in this section so that the idea of simplifying language is clear.

Liz Gasster: Right. Right. And hopefully this is what the group was trying to say about the diplomatic (speak). I mean and trying to simplify and put a finer point on what I thought was confusing. Hopefully I've articulated what the group was trying - or approved the clarity of that. And if anyone on the call thinks I've not understood what was...

Mason Cole: No, I think you have. This is my own point of view. I think you have - when we started all of this, one of the ideas was sometimes in the ICANN world people just don't speak directly, or clearly, about a problem they are trying to solve. And if we can just get back to simplification. You know you don't really have to talk like an UN ambassador in order to satisfy everyone in the room when really the meat of the problems needs to be dealt with. And no, I think you've captured that pretty well here.

Liz Gasster: And you know as you go further down in the document like Page 8...

Ken Bour: Before we move on I'm - this is Ken wanting to be task motivated here. I am prepared to accept the changes in 3.2. And in fact, I'd like to get clarity as we go through all of the sections so I could just go ahead and accept these edits

and then we can produce another document maybe quickly and see if we are okay. I will delete the comment. Fair enough.

Mason Cole: Right. Yeah, that's fine with me.

Steve Holsten: I would think - Ken why don't you just fall back on accepting all of these except where we tell you differently.

Mason Cole: Yes, agreed.

Steve Holsten: Because I think each of us probably feels generally quite good about this document except if we speak our mind. I will say a couple points to note for you Ken. One, please clean up the Table of Contents because all of the headings that have now been edited were not reflected in that.

Ken Bour: Okay, thanks for the note. I will be sure to do that.

Steve Holsten: Yes and there's also one small point on 4.1 to jump back there, and we've been talking about clarity and so forth. I think if you delete, "And reducing obfuscation," you will achieve the goal of clarity in reducing obfuscation.

Ken Bour: Reducing obfuscation.

Steve Holsten: I don't think there are many non-native English speakers who know what obfuscation is, and I actually had a logic teacher who had a little note on her bulletin Board that said, "Eschew obfuscation," which is sort of a joke of let's improve clarity. So just a suggestion there.

Mason Cole: Anybody want to substitute a word?

Scott Pinzon: Yes, this is Scott. I want to pile on Liz's discussion on 3.2.

Mason Cole: But wait. I want to get a word of obfuscation first.



Steve Holsten: I think Ken you could just edit that.

Mason Cole: I think you could just pull it out Ken. Yeah, just put a period after clarity and you're good.

Steve Holsten: Increasing clarity period.

Ken Bour: Good. Thanks.

Mason Cole: Scott go ahead.

Scott Pinzon: Well the other thought that I thought might be worth capturing in 3.2 is the other downside of overly diplomatic speak is that often times it's not actionable because it's not clear what it's really trying to say. So besides finessing areas of concern, I was wondering if the group wanted to add you know it unintentionally confuses issues and also can result in recommendations that are not actionable.

Mason Cole: That's fine with me.

Ken Bour: Sure. Do you have a specific edit to give me? Or if you'd like, I can send these paragraphs to you just like I did with Liz.

Liz Gasster: No, you just add, "And they are not actionable," at the end of the sentence that says, "Direct and candid discussion and recommendations that are not contentious issues and recommendations that are not actionable."

Mason Cole: Yeah.

Ken Bour: Yeah, exactly.

Mason Cole: Yeah, I agree with that.

Ken Bour: Okay, I've done that.

Mason Cole: Okay, hold on. I'm going to reorder things here for a second. So (Steve) do you have other points you want to address in the document?

Steve Holsten: No, I'm fine with that.

Mason Cole: Okay, Chris how about you?

Chris Chaplow: No, I am as well. Yes, you know just basically I think almost everything can be accepted. I think it's great that while this work is being done on behalf of the staff as a team and here we've got this document in front of us. That's fantastic. Thanks everybody for that.

Mason Cole: Yeah.

Chris Chaplow: Only one thing. The language section - that's a little bit light. That's about my only comment. Let me try and jump - find that now.

Steve Holsten: Is that the translation issue?

Chris Chaplow: Yes, 4.1(e).

Steve Holsten: Yeah and I agree with that point as well. I still think that that is one of the more important aspects of this communication team is how you get a broader engagement by people who do not natively speak English, and I don't think we cracked the nut of a translation policy.

Mason Cole: I think you are right.

Liz Gasster: Julie is translation included in this group. Is that a task of this group?

Julie Hedlund: Is the translation included in what? I'm sorry.

Liz Gasster: Is the issue of translation overall included as a task in this workgroup?

Julie Hedlund: Gosh, yes.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: That was a recommendation I think that (Helen) and (Steven) (hit on). Didn't that get folded into one of our recommendation documents?

Mason Cole: Yeah, I think it did. Yeah, that was (Helen)'s task.

Liz Gasster: Which one are we looking at right now? Is it 4.1?

Mason Cole: 4.1 Section E. I don't think there's anything else in 4.1 but this. I don't think there's anything else in the document about it. Yeah, Ken I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Ken Bour: As I recall, the discussion you they discovered that there was already an existing translation policy that ICANN had published at the time it was a year back, and it simply - ICANN was not adhering to it. So this recommendation is - it has already been done. ICANN is not adhering to it for apparently budgetary and process reasons.

Steve Holsten: Well I think we ought to make a more clear point of addressing the translation and language issue. Because if we've got to find it and then read into 4.1(e) that that's what we are talking about, you know developing consistent localization policies and multilingual vocabularies of often used terms. I don't see - I don't read very clearly in that all of these documents, policies, et cetera should be translated into various languages.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, I agree with that. And I'm just hesitating to speak about the best way to - because that's obviously a whole category all it's own. I think it was also something that they were looking at in the context of you know PDP and working groups too because that's so much of an issue in our working groups as well.

Well first, I do agree we should have a cross-reference to the translation policy, and actually, I'm hesitating. Is that a public translation policy? I think it is.

Steve Holsten: And I think that suffices, Liz. I think that's a good idea and we should encourage adherence to a broader translation policy because we as a communications working group trying to improve the GNSO are but one portion of the ICANN community. And yet, certainly to improve communication within the GNSO, which should be - it should be in multiple languages accessible to more of the world.

Liz Gasster: You know one thing we might do here - I don't know if people like this idea or not, but it strikes me that this - we have a new public participation director. We have a translation policy that I think the GNSO actually uses and the policy group uses perhaps more even than other departments within ICANN. I think there's an initiative to look at this more and perhaps we should also talk to a public participation manager.

This might be something that we acknowledge needs more work in the community and suggest something like - that based on efforts that are underway right now, that the GNSO make a point of looking at this in a year's time or something like that to reevaluate in a year's time or some you know appropriate timeframe. How the implementation is going, how effectively it's reaching you know under accessed communities, and what kind of enhancements might be made you know for an example budget for the future.

The other thing I'm thinking is that we're coming up on a point where you know we are asking the community for input on the budget for Fiscal Year '11, and of course translations and all of this kind of localized language support is expensive, but very important to the community.

And it also strikes me that a recommendation could come out of this to urge the GNSO Council, other councils, and constituencies to weigh in on the importance of translation, you know adequate budget for translation for - you know to describe the way people - you know to make their opinions known, their viewpoints known about the need to budget adequately for this. Because I think it's timely given the budget that we're soliciting viewpoints from the community on the Fiscal Year '11 budget right now.

Mason Cole: Okay, so I think I heard a couple of recommendations in there. One is there's not a lot wrong with what we're seeing right now, but we need to make more explicit that ICANN needs to adhere to its current policies on translation. And in a year's time, we should review translation in light of the - help me with this Liz. We should review the whole idea. Not the whole idea, but we should review the status of translation capability in light of budget priorities.

Liz Gasster: The effectiveness of it in reaching under served communities or you know under accessed communities.

Mason Cole: Okay. Okay, does anybody object to having that addition made?

Liz Gasster: And then the (unintelligible) of this recommending a budget that we encourage the GNSO Council and you know other interested stakeholders to recognize you know when they are - if they are providing feedback on the budget. If that's an important issue for them to identify that as an issue and what they think the need is. There would be three recommendations out of that.

Mason Cole: Okay. Okay, does anybody object to having those recommendations added?

Chris Chaplow: Chris here. That's fine.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Would it be okay to add that paragraph to your list? You seem quite articulate and I think - I don't think I could do justice to it.

Liz Gasster: Oh, sure. Yeah, you might be able to pull it off the recording too just because I don't know if I will get to it today, but tomorrow I probably can.

Mason Cole: Okay. Okay. All right, let's see.

Chris Chaplow: Can I bring up another point?

Mason Cole: Yes, Chris. I was coming back to you. Yes, go ahead.

Chris Chaplow: Yeah, it's actually the final one - the very last paragraph of the whole document, which is great, but I think we should make it a bit stronger as a recommendation. Page 14. Perhaps the Council might consider some form of follow up and tracking, et cetera.

Mason Cole: Okay, do you have a suggestion?

Steve Holsten: Where is this?

Mason Cole: Page 14 - the very last paragraph.

Steve Holsten: The conclusion.

Liz Gasster: That's a good idea.

Chris Chaplow: Because if there isn't any follow up, then the danger of this just you know I think happening really is - or the threat of follow up.

Mason Cole: True.

Liz Gasster: What you would say is something like you know the CTT feels strongly - is strongly committed to the idea that there are very good opportunities to enhance communication and coordination both with the Board and with SOs and ACs. And you know we view it that - urgency may be too strong, but that there be compelling benefits to implementing these recommendations as quickly as possible.

Reaching out to the Board and to other supporting organizations and advisory committees to implement these recommendations directly. Or maybe it could even be that we - that you recommend that staff takes - I'm making this up as I go. I like this.

Chris Chaplow: I'm thinking more about the recommendation that there be some form of review in 6 or 12 months or in the future to sort of crosscheck.

Liz Gasster: Right, so it could be both of those, right. Direct staff to implement post haste with other SOs and ACs and suggest that the Council assess the status of that progress and also the overall state of communications in a year's time. I like both of those (ideas).

Chris Chaplow: Yes.

Mason Cole: Yeah, Chris does that get at what you were driving at?

Chris Chaplow: Yes, that's exactly it. Thank you.

Mason Cole: Okay, good. (Steve) any thoughts on that?

Steve Holsten: I concur. That is good.

Mason Cole: Okay, thanks. All right, anybody else.

Scott Pinzon: This is Scott.

Mason Cole: Yes, Scott.

Scott Pinzon: Along those same lines of trying to you know draw the lines in ink rather than pencil, should we take up the notion of asking for readability checks on documents?

Mason Cole: Yeah, the issue you brought up. What are folks saying about this?

Steve Holsten: Can you give us - I happen to have up on my screen the affirmation of commitment for example in a Word document. And so you'd go to Tools, Spelling & Grammar, Options, and what do you see from there because I see all kinds of checks that say Check Spelling, Always Suggest Corrections, Show Readability.

Mason Cole: Yes, that's it.

Steve Holsten: How do I get the readability statistics?

Scott Pinzon: You just enable it by you know putting a checkmark in that box. And whenever you do a spelling and grammar check when it's done, it throws up this little box that tells you what the readability is. It starts out with the word count. Then it's really interesting because it also tells you...

Steve Holsten: How do I get that? If I check the readability statistics, then how do I actually do the readability check?

Scott Pinzon: It cannot be done independently as far as I know. It becomes a second result from your normal spelling and grammar check. So when you tell it to spell check the document at the end...



Steve Holsten: How do you do that?

Scott Pinzon: That would be Tools, Spelling & Grammar.

Liz Gasster: (I don't see it either).

Mason Cole: You don't have it either Liz.

Liz Gasster: I don't even see Tools.

Scott Pinzon: Tools is in the menu at the top - the horizontal menu across the top of Word.

Mason Cole: Scott Pinzon, Microsoft Navigation Expert.

Liz Gasster: Liz Gasster, Total Abject Failure because I don't even see that.

Scott Pinzon: Do you have Word open?

Steve Holsten: I'm raising the example just so we can see how it actually works and how hard or how easy it is.

Liz Gasster: Obviously, that's a very good idea.

Mason Cole: Yeah.

Scott Pinzon: If you know how to spell check your document, it will show up at the end of the spell check once you've enabled that option.

Mason Cole: So Scott let's just talk about this conceptually. You know the idea of doing this would help ICANN how.

Scott Pinzon: Instead of just saying, "Gee, everything should be easier to understand," that's a very subjective measurement. And someone who has written a very

incomprehensible document could say, "Yeah, I'm doing better now," and we don't really gain anything. So if you have something objective that measures this at the end, it says what grade level you have to be to understand the document you've written.

Mason Cole: Right.

Scott Pinzon: And if the team wanted to, they could pick some grade level they feel is appropriate and say you know you recommend that documents be checked. And if they come in higher than -- I will just pick a number -- and 11th grade level, that they be revised until they are understandable you know at that level.

Or another possibility is - another statistic it throws at you is how many words per sentence you are using.

Mason Cole: Yes.

Scott Pinzon: Journalists target 15 words a sentence in order to be very understandable. Our current document by way of example averages 27 words per sentence.

Mason Cole: Yeah.

Scott Pinzon: So another way you could go is you could request you know that the average words per sentence not exceed 25, you know. So all I'm doing is trying to suggest the possibility of objective measurements so that people who embrace what we are saying will also be equipped with a tool to tell whether they are compliant with it or not.

Liz Gasster: So I see this more as a suggestion than a mandate, right, because things might be just impossible to express that way or you know be too burdensome or not work you know if it's a legal document or you know a technical document.

Mason Cole: Yeah, or a particularly technical document.

Liz Gasster: But I see this as a useful tool. And I think it's something that since none of us are really familiar with it, lots of other people aren't going to be familiar with it either. And also, I'm having trouble actually. I'm getting closer to getting to work, but not - I'm not there yet. So I think it would also be very useful perhaps as an appendix to maybe provide the instructions or...

Mason Cole: Yeah, I agree with you Liz. I mean again, my own point of view is I think it could be a useful tool. I agree it should be maybe put in as a suggestion you know that if you strive to make things particularly readable and understandable that you certainly don't have to conform to a particular standard, but this is a tool that could help you ensure that whatever you're producing is understandable by the widest possible section of the community.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, I like the idea of putting it in generic terms because I don't know for example on a Mac is - you know not Microsoft. Is there a similar...?

Chris Chaplow: Are there other tools - spelling and grammar. If you go to the Options, like I found now on mine. If I click on the Options, then under one of the grammar options shows readability statistics. You've got to check that. And it's great because it's something I've not - I think I saw it five years ago and I'd completely forgotten about it. And it would be good to - because the OSC is asking for something you know a little bit concrete in places, so there's a good concrete thing for us to put in. Again, only as just a mentioning suggestion so that other people can pick it up in the future and maybe build on it. You just plant the seed in the document.

Mason Cole: Scott, what do you think of that?

Scott Pinzon: I definitely agree. This has always been you know in the category of where possible or where feasible because we actually cannot assume that every

person whomever authors something in the GNSO has Word, especially as you know more people from other countries get involved.

Mason Cole: Right.

Scott Pinzon: But I...

Mason Cole: I thought Microsoft was everywhere. Is it not?

Scott Pinzon: Well there are people who refuse to use it on principle.

Mason Cole: I know.

Scott Pinzon: And you have Google members on the Board who will push Google Docs I suppose.

Mason Cole: That is true.

Scott Pinzon: So I definitely agree with your line that it could be included as a suggestion or as a helpful guideline and certainly not as a mandate, but I think you know people would like knowing about this and being able to use it at their own discretion.

Mason Cole: Okay, so I might ask then Scott if you would help Ken by writing something that he could put into the document.

Ken Bour: Yes, if you could tell me exactly what you have in mind and where you'd like to put it that would be great.

Scott Pinzon: Okay.

Steve Holsten: For example, now that you've showed us how to do that, I do see that the affirmation of commitments has a (flesh concave) grade level of 17.4. What does that mean Scott?

Scott Pinzon: Grade - 17th grade where you're like a PhD candidate.

Mason Cole: Right.

Steve Holsten: That's it, yes. Yes, high school, college, and a year and a half of grad school in order to read this thing.

Mason Cole: Yeah, that ought to tell you something. Okay, all right folks. All right, so I left off with Chris and then we went to Scott. Chris, do you have a follow up for me?

Chris Chaplow: Yes, just at the risk of stating the obvious, the date on document one has got to go in 1.4.

Scott Pinzon: Yeah, I put it in already, thanks.

Chris Chaplow: Okay, sorry.

Mason Cole: Thanks. Okay, good. All right, Scott thank you for bringing that out. Anything else we want to cover here - anyone else. The floor is open.

Liz Gasster: So I gather from the reaction of the group -- it's Liz -- that you know the specific things about you know for example creating a mechanism for the you know Council to talk to the Board when there are issues in front of the Board that - you know so there's more of a dialogue and you know the active engagement of liaisons and the specific things that are all in here.

You know I wrote it in such a way that it - you know the CCT thinks this and the CCT concurs with that. And I just want to make sure you know that you all

agree and are comfortable with you know those detailed suggestions. Because I think they are things that staff - you know if everyone is okay with it, we would proceed to try to - you know I mean I know this will go to the OSC and to the Council, but then you know we would be prepared to implement to try to actually make these things work.

And before I do that, I just want to give you a chance to say you know since I'm using your voice here that you are comfortable with these specific ideas related to stimulating more conversation and more productive conversation on key issues between the Board and the GNSO and the other SOs and ACs.

Mason Cole: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: Cool.

Steve Holsten: Seems good to me.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Chris Chaplow: Okay, I concur.

Mason Cole: There. That was easy, wasn't it Liz?

Liz Gasster: It was.

Mason Cole: There you go.

Liz Gasster: You guys need to move over to some of these other working groups (unintelligible).

Mason Cole: We're all about simplicity here. Okay, all right anything else folks.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. We've been jumping around. There is still a bunch of comments I'd like to go through.

Mason Cole: Sure, go ahead.

Ken Bour: Okay, I'm going to just start at the top and make sure I haven't lost anything here. Okay, so I'm going down through Section II. I've tried to accept all of the edits as we've been going along here.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Ken Bour: We have the paragraph in 2.2 that Liz has agreed to help with. And going down into 3, everything is fine.

Now in 3.6, degradations in civility, we reference four sub bullets - communicate online with respect, listen carefully, take responsibility, and keep criticism constructive. And my comment was you know we can leave it the way it is, but it strikes me that there is a connection here to ICANN's standards of behavior. There is a document that exists. Do we just want to say CCT thinks that somebody should start really administering that policy or what is our recommendation there? I guess we're claiming that civility is being degraded, but what is our recommendation? What's our...?

Steve Holsten: I guess we should remind people to review that policy or recommend that ICANN can send that policy out to the community again to remind the community of those standards.

Chris Chaplow: That's a good one.

Ken Bour: Yeah, maybe I should make a suggestion here and that is ICANN has clearly stated its expectations and then just provide the reference to the...

Mason Cole: I like that. I actually like that better.

Ken Bour: And take those bullets out.

Mason Cole: Yeah, I like that better.

Ken Bour: Okay, fine. I will do - I've got the ball on that. I know how to fix that. Okay, sliding on down, I've accepted everything. And then we've got 4.1(e) and Liz agreed to do some writing on that. 4.2 - Mason there was an edit about the comment there about why the Board is capitalized.

Mason Cole: Oh, yeah. Is that just a style thing or what?

Ken Bour: Yeah, I've always seen it capitalized.

Mason Cole: I don't really care. I was just curious.

Liz Gasster: I actually thought - Scott could be our grammar maven here. But what I actually thought somewhere from you know elementary school was that you capitalized it when it was a specific Board, but you didn't capitalize when it was a generic Board. If you are talking about Boards of directors, you wouldn't capitalize. But here we have the ICANN Board.

Mason Cole: Yeah, if you refer to it as a proper name, then it becomes capitalized. But if it's referred to...

Liz Gasster: It's the shorthand here for the ICANN Board because we mean a specific Board, and that's why I thought it was capitalized, but it's not intended to like elevate their status in some way that's inappropriate or something.

Steve Holsten: I think it's fine to capitalize it.

Mason Cole: I really don't care.



Ken Bour: Yeah, the next comment then -- this is Ken -- is Liz's what does this mean relates to, but many can be I think.

Liz Gasster: No, it was the immediately visible. I suggested alternative language to immediately visible. It's on 4.2, first bullet, and I suggested that we say, "Not all objectives can be fully anticipated," rather than, "Are immediately visible." I mean it was just because I wasn't sure when I read it what the immediately visible would mean.

Mason Cole: Yes.

Liz Gasster: I think I knew what was intended, but I just thought it was terminology that I was afraid would be confusing.

Mason Cole: But you are okay with it as written right now, right.

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Ken Bour: Can we take out, "But many can be," or just leave it.

Mason Cole: No, I want to leave it in there.

Steve Holsten: I think you need to keep that.

Ken Bour: All right. Okay, super. We are done with that. Down under 4.3, let's see. I added this new section. I just asked if we needed any more in the introductory paragraph.

Steve Holsten: Just in that first paragraph make greater G-R-E-A-T-E-R.

Liz Gasster: That's a good catch that spell check doesn't catch.

Steve Holsten: That's right.

Ken Bour: Yeah, I got that.

Mason Cole: No, Ken I think it's fine. I think it's fine. It's simple and direct.

Ken Bour: Okay, fine. Then I'm going to go ahead and accept all of that material and then we go down to 4.4. I think everything is good there. We don't have any comments.

Mason Cole: No.

Ken Bour: And 4.5 is okay, right.

Mason Cole: Yes.

Ken Bour: And we like 4.6 except if we have anything to add from Scott. 4.7 is good. All right, 4.8 there's a comment. "It seems like it would be helpful to provide more content here. We have to be careful that the recommendation is not a violation of itself." All right, so let's see. What does this deal with?

Mason Cole: Is that your comment Ken?

Ken Bour: Yeah.

Mason Cole: Yeah.

Scott Pinzon: This is Scott. I've noticed that many of the working teams now - their charter defines specific questions that they are being asked to answer, and I wonder if we want to allude to that here.

Mason Cole: Yeah, I want to read this again.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, it's like we start to say it in the preceding (steps). "The CCT recommends that working group charters be drafted with careful attention to

the issues or questions that should be considered and the outcomes desired." I'm not sure what more we could say.

Ken Bour: I'm not sure if the point of my comment is clear. It just became clear to me. And that is that we make an exhortation and comment here, right. Somebody should do something, but are we clear about what it is we expect and what it looks like. And so in a sense, the sentences we write are guilty of not achieving what they tell others they should do when writing charters.

Mason Cole: Nice circle we just ran ourselves in there. Yeah.

Liz Gasster: So of course there is a working group charter guidelines document that the working group's team has developed that is in draft form for public comment right now.

Mason Cole: Oh, really.

Liz Gasster: So I actually think that maybe - Ken you can check Marika's draft, but you might be able to simply say here that you recognize that the working groups teams is adding - is suggesting more precision to working group charters and that this group concurs that that 's necessary.

Ken Bour: Yeah, I was just wondering. Yeah, I could do that for sure. I was just wondering you know what our evidence is that charters are badly written and...

Liz Gasster: Mason and I are going to think of exactly the same example of where it wasn't adequate.

Mason Cole: You go first Liz.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Ken Bour: Never mind. I went through all the questions.

Mason Cole: No, I'm actually - I'm involved in a work group right now that - and I don't want to be undiplomatic at all because I just don't. But the post-expiry you know team...

Ken Bour: (Petner).

Mason Cole: Yeah, (Petner) that's looking at - it's been wondering all over the map. And you know it's not lack of clarity in the charter, it's lack of execution afterwards. So I actually wrote that you know with my experience on that team in mind. So now that I think about it, maybe it's not that we're not setting proper context. It may be that we have very specific questions that are presented in a charter to be answered, but then they really aren't. You know they become...

Liz Gasster: Well I would suggest calling out folks because I think the quality of working group charters - my own opinion is that they've evolved to be better and tighter since I've been at ICANN.

Man: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: And that you know - so you could acknowledge that charters are already being drafted with more precision and you know the working group's team is codifying that or memorializing guidelines to make that happen. And then you could go on to say this group also notes that part of the success of that is contingent on the chair and the group sticking closely to those charters and ensuring that you know outcomes follow the expectations defined in the charters.

Mason Cole: Okay, I like that.

Liz Gasster: And I mean there's still a question of well what's the accountability mechanism there, but I think that would go back to what the working group charter - like these guidelines of...

Mason Cole: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: For example as a participant in that team Mason how you might present that concern to the chair you know individually or if there's a subgroup that feels that way and then how that gets handled.

Mason Cole: Right.

Liz Gasster: Like for example if you didn't feel you got adequate response from the chair or recognition of that point of view or adjustment of the management of the group that you could like appeal to the Council. You know I mean there is a process there that I think takes us out of the (realm) of this group probably, but which you know is valid number one and you know is worth looking at that working group's charter, which is out for comment and making sure like yourself.

Mason Cole: Yes.

Liz Gasster: Like if you want to file comments on that.

Mason Cole: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: It might be something that you have a particular interest in doing.

Mason Cole: Okay, so I'm going to ask Liz if you wouldn't mind capturing that and giving it Ken because I think you're right. I also want to make a time note here. We have about eight minutes left to go and there's a policy briefing call at 11:00 that I suspect a lot of you have to be on, including me.

So Ken are you good if Liz just supplies you some thoughts on that paragraph?

Ken Bour: Yeah, I think I have a sense of what needs to go there too. We will collaborate on that one.

Mason Cole: Okay.

Ken Bour: On 4.9, I would just do the same thing as before. We would just substitute the ICANN standards of conduct for what's there. And then 5.0, is there a comment? Yeah, I made the comment here that mostly what I picked up here other than some adjusting the language in that last paragraph based on the earlier discussion. It's just pretty much a rehash of what we said in Report 1.

Mason Cole: I'm sorry; you're looking at - which one are you looking at?

Ken Bour: 5.0 conclusions.

Mason Cole: Okay, so you're saying you are okay with - yeah, you're okay with - hold on. So you're saying you want to adjust this after we get 4.0 in shape.

Ken Bour: Just a question; just wondering if the team likes it.

Mason Cole: (Steve) and Chris, what do you think?

Chris Chaplow: Yeah, I don't really notice any problems. I'm just comparing it to number one at the moment - what we said about the last paragraph.

Steve Holsten: I'm fine.

Mason Cole: Yeah, I think I'm okay with it too. Okay, I don't think you have to reinvent the wheel on that one Ken.

Ken Bour: All right, I will delete that comment, and that takes me to the end. Okay, so again I will try to - we've got just a few things to do here. I will - we will see how soon I can get out another (doc). It will be a few days I think before I'll be able to get another clean document out just given other priorities and things going on with Liz. But you know, I would say - what is today? Thursday, right. Yeah, early next week maybe Tuesday. Is that timely enough to get another document out to the team for review?

Steve Holsten: Okay by me.

Chris Chaplow: Yeah, okay.

Ken Bour: Did we lose Mason?

Scott Pinzon: I don't know. This is Scott. I'm going to exit because I need to get on the other call and start recording it.

Ken Bour: Yeah, okay. Thanks Scott.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, I'm going to jump off too, but I will definitely work with Ken on the next draft and appreciate the call and all the great feedback.

Ken Bour: Yeah, just in summary, it looks like we're in pretty good shape.

Liz Gasster: Thanks everyone. I didn't have to lift a finger and I really appreciate all of your help.

Steve Holsten: Thanks (all).

Liz Gasster: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Chris Chaplow: Cheerio. Bye.

END