GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC)
Constituency Operations Work Team
05 February 2010 at 13:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work Team teleconference 05 February 2010 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but **should not be treated as an authoritative record**. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-constituency-ops-20100205.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#feb

Participants present:
Olga Cavalli – NCA – Work Team Chair
Michael Young – Vice chair
Victoria McEvedy – IPC
Claudio Digangi – IPC
Chuck Gomes – Registries Stakeholder Group
SS Kshatriya – Individual
Tony Harris – ISPCPC
Rafik Dammak – NCSG

ICANN Staff
Julie Hedlund
Gisella Gruber-White
Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies
Debra Hughes – NCSG
Zahid Jamil – CBUC
Krista Papac – Registrar Stakeholder Group

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded. Please go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Operator. Gisella could you please help me - the roll

                    call so we know who's on the call?

Gisella Gruber-White: With pleasure Olga. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On

                    today's Constituency Operation's call on Friday the 5th of February we have

                    Olga Cavalli, Chuck Gomes, Claudio DiGangi, (SS), Victoria McEvedy. From

staff we have Julie Hedlund and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. And we have apologies from Zahid Jamil and from Krista Papac.

If I could also just remind everyone to state their names when speaking, thank you. Over to you Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Gisella. Was someone joining when I was requesting the recording?

Gisella Gruber-White: No. The last person to join...

Olga Cavalli: Oh.

Gisella Gruber-White: ...was Victoria.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you so much. Okay. Thank you all for joining today and thank (Michael) for chairing the last call. Although he's not on the call at this one, it could be recorded. And thanks to all of you for the work in this document.

If I understand correctly, and if not please let me know, we should finish our first document that was chaired by (SS) and done by the sub-working team. And we have two languages to discuss or to decide to include. One language is suggested by Claudio and the other one is a consult that was made by Julie to the ICANN staff in relation with part - I think it's Part J of the document.

So if you agree, I suggest that we go through those different languages and we see if we agree in it or we have any change suggested. Is that okay?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. This is Julie. It's actually the language from ICANN leader staff.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: ...to (S).

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you. And the language from Claudio it's in Section - I cannot find it now.

Julie Hedlund: Section 3 Olga. This is Julie.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you very much. I have so many documents open that I get lost. I have a noise in the line. I don't know if it's mine or - and I have an echo also.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: No. It's that...

Woman: ...that Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Now it's better. Yes. Thank you. Thank you very much. Okay. Section 3, Claudio could you be so kind to let us know what's the idea of your language and why you're proposing it? I cannot find it. I'm so sorry.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. Well we had discussed this item on the last call. And, you know, we sort of talked about that we saw, you know, value in the GNSO working group model. I had raised the consideration that I thought that, you know, I saw value in not necessarily mandating a uniform rule across all the different groups on how they reach consensus.

                    You know, based on the fact that they represent different communities, there are different types of constituencies involved and that there would be value in allowing them some room to pick different types of consensus building models or for processes.

And so basically I just proposed this. We had talked about recommending the GNSO working group model. And I had basically just proposed this language to help clarify what I thought we had discussed and still try to put forward that, you know, we think that they should refer to the working group model. That there's the principles there are solid.

And but otherwise I just, you know, wanted to just also clarify that one of the values of this is increased transparency and visibility that I think currently all the groups might not have this in their charters or bylaws and this rules, you know, they are basically encourage them to put it in their charter and bylaws so it's clear to their membership and it's clear to the just community in general how they operate and reach consensus.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Claudio. Any questions, any comments to Claudio's comments?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes I'd like to comment if I could. Could I ask...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Go ahead please Victoria. I hear you very, very low.

Victoria McEvedy: Thanks Olga. I'll try and speak up. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: Would someone be kind enough - I'm afraid I that I haven't seen it on the list. Could someone be kind enough to read Claudio's change?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie Olga. I'd be happy to read the language if...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Yes please Julie go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Right. This appears in Section 3 policy and consensus.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Would the changes to the second paragraph under that section. And so, reads - it would read there should be emphasis on consensus building in group deliberations period. Groups should refer to the GNSO workgroup model period. The use of voting within policy deliberations should be minimized as much as possible period. Then new language, whatever - building model or process a group uses, the group must describe the process bylaws or charters so it is visible and transparent period.

Victoria McEvedy: Thank you Julie. I mean I'd like to say first off that I object strongly to us revisiting the language here because after some discussion last week, I believe Julie you were on that call, everybody was happy with the language we ended up with.

                     I'm not sure we've got all the members of that call on this call, but I'm not happy with Claudio's language at all. And, you know, we worked quite hard and spent a great deal of time reaching consensus on the language in our last call.

                     So I'd be very - I myself am very strongly opposed to this change. And I'd like to hear what other people are saying. But it was the subject of great discussion before we reached a consensus on the language.

Tony Harris: Good morning. Tony Harris joining.

Olga Cavalli: Hi Tony. Good morning.

Tony Harris: Hi Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Victoria you have a - so you're saying that the language that was agreed is the one that you would like to have in the document.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Is there a way that we can find a - it's something that it - that you really don't oppose, that you're opposing in this new language that you don't like or that you would like to change from Claudio's document or...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: No I don't want to...

Olga Cavalli: ...that's what I'm trying to say. Let me finish. I have a horrible echo. I can even hear myself. What I'm saying is that perhaps we can try to find a new language that satisfies...

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: ...both of you.

Victoria McEvedy: Well I don't think so and I think it's actually a waste of our time because what we've got is one member pushing again a point that was decided. So this is being reopened when a consensus was found by everybody on that call. And that was Michael, Chuck, me, Claudio, who else was on the call last week? Maybe Julie can assist us. But one thing, consensus was reached. And this is one minority opinion trying to now undo a consensus where, you know, we were decided.

Olga Cavalli: So you're proposing the text that was before, okay? Is that the consens - is that the consens…

Man: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: I'm sorry. I have horrible difficulties in hearing you because I have a terrible echo. What I'm trying to understand is what Victoria's asking. So Victoria you're saying that the language that was before that - in the document and the wiki is - I can't - I don't know how to say that in English. It was the lang...

Victoria McEvedy: Is retained. Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Right. Yes. Is that the language that you want to keep because you're saying that's already agreed?

Victoria McEvedy: It's already agreed and it's now being reopened. And I believe that probably there's a proper procedural objection to Claudio's - who was on that call and can participated in this consensus, now attempting to reopen it.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Tony you wanted to say something?

Tony Harris: Well I'm sorry I'm late. I had problem getting to the office with the traffic. And I hate to speak out of turn since I haven't heard the beginning of this call. I suppose this is about the modification that Claudio DiGangi has proposed in a text?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Tony Harris: And which was discussed on last Friday's call. I was in a plane. I couldn't attend. I - actually I don't feel uncomfortable with Claudio's suggestion. And I'm not too sure if it does breach procedure. So, you know, I mean I'm open to discuss it.

Olga Cavalli: Who else was on the call last Friday and perhaps Chuck or someone else would like to add something to this.

Claudio DiGangi: Olga this is Claudio. Could I just respond to some of the points that...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Sure please...

Claudio DiGangi: ...Victoria...

Olga Cavalli: ...Claudio. Go ahead.

Claudio DiGangi: Well, you know, we did amend the text on the last call kind of how we've been doing it the last few meetings where we reviewed the text, talked about it and amend it. What occurred after the call was I looked at the language that we've changed and, you know, based on our discussion, I thought that there was a way to improve and clarify what we agreed on to the call which was to change this from the way it was drafted where it was a uniform rule, all groups had to follow it to we, you know, we changed it to basically what I thought we agreed to was not making it a uniform rule.

When I looked at the text directly following the call, I realized that the text was ambiguous and I thought it was open to different interpretations. It was not something I immediately picked up on when we were discussing it.

And so I proposed this language which I thought basically captured the spirit of our discussion and what we agreed on but just clarified it, put it into new terms where, you know, it was less ambiguous for someone who hasn't really been following the discussion, so.

Victoria McEvedy: Olga I'd like to respond.

Olga Cavalli: Yes Victoria. And also I would like someone, other members of the group that were present in the last call to give their opinions about this text. Go ahead Victoria please.

Victoria McEvedy: Look personally I have to say, I really object to us being wasting time on this call on this issue. Like I said, a consensus was reached. Claudio had a full opportunity to put his views. He's now making a more extreme amendment.

Like I said, we reached complete agreement after long discussion and Claudio had a full opportunity to put his view. And this is just another bite of the cherry. I really don't want to spend a lot of time on this call and I think it's really inappropriate to have another go at what was completely agreed language. And perhaps we need to refer that to both minutes or the transcript.

Perhaps, Olga, I would suggest that we take this issue out of the call today. I just don't think we should waste any further time on it. I would like to refer the group to the transcript and I would like to make my item that's on the list if that's okay.

Chuck Gomes: Olga can I comment? This is Chuck.

Olga Cavalli: Sure please. Go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I think that first of all we should, as a working group, use the consensus building goal ourself. So, whether I agree or disagree with the change, we've come to a point where there isn't as much consensus as we thought we had last week. We should continue then to try and reach consensus.

The notice that the next sentence says, there should be a de-emphasis of voting. Now we didn't take a formal vote last week, but, you know, there did appear to be some consensus last week. We're now finding that there's not.

Victoria McEvedy: You know, one person is withdrawing from a consensus Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: But Victoria, we want to always, the whole goal of the working group model is to always try and maximize consensus. Now if we get to a point where there's a just a minority opinion, then we just include that minority opinion.

But the goal is to always try and maximize the support of the whole group. And I think that's all that's happening right now.

Victoria McEvedy: No, we did that last week. We took into and modified the recommendation to take account of Claudio's minority view. I have to say, I think...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: You're saying that over and over again and I agree with you, but obviously we came to a point after that meeting where we didn't have as strong agreement as we thought. So all we're trying to do...

Victoria McEvedy: No. We've got one person withdrawing.

Chuck Gomes: ...all we're trying to do right now is to see if we can come up with something where there's full support. If we can't, we deal with that, then there's mechanisms for doing that. That's the working group model that's recommended and that's what we should be doing here as well.

Gisella Gruber-White: Olga sorry to interrupt. It seems...

((Crosstalk))

(SS):   Olga can you take a queue instead of this becoming an argument please.

Olga Cavalli: Excuse me. I just cannot hear anything. There's so...

Woman: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...much echo and we hear all talking at the same time.

(SS):   Yes, yes.

Gisella Gruber-White: Olga it's Victoria's behind you that's creating an echo. She just can't go on mute when she's not speaking...

(SS):   Yes.

Gisella Gruber-White: ...and we'll see...

(SS):   Please.

Gisella Gruber-White: ...echo. Olga, did you ask people comment?

Olga Cavalli: I can hardly hear you because of the echo. But I would like to say something...

(SS):   No. I mean...

Olga Cavalli: ...and I think it's (SS) also.

(SS):   Yes. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

(SS):   I'll just. It is too much of disturbance. Please do not speak huh just listen to me.

The system to, are you finding this to speak the difference. In sub count four, there was four primary previews. And notice some (unintelligible). I mean we were asked to put our (manatee) before. Here I find that one man was disturbed, only one man (bought). And he's given so much time that (unintelligible) today. Please just can I proposing is true. I mean not agreeing to the consensus and I mean again coming to the group and forcing discussion. I think Chair has to control this somewhere.

Tony Harris: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes Tony. Go ahead.

Tony Harris: Yes. I'd just like to say that actually I now support Claudio in his position.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Tony.

Tony Harris: So that's two of us.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I would like to say that what my idea is that we all agree in a text. I know that there can be minority reports and that's allowed. And we have done with our subtext one more document. But I think we are not a very big group and perhaps we can find a text that satisfies all of us. What I would like to understand Victoria...

Gisella Gruber-White: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: ...more than the fact...

Gisella Gruber-White: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry to interrupt. It's Gisella. Victoria has disconnected. I believe she's trying - she's probably trying to...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: No I'm on...

Gisella Gruber-White: ...again.

Victoria McEvedy: ...back on.

Gisella Gruber-White: I'm sorry. You're back Victoria. Thank you.

Victoria McEvedy: I just rang in to see if the line could improve.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Victoria I would like to ask you, and I understand the fact that you already talked about this in the last call. And I appreciate all the efforts of all the working teams joining in this calls and all this - the time that you're well you're giving to this work.

But I would like to understand what in the language proposed by Claudio is really disturbing you and you think you could change it...

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: ...or your group...

Victoria McEvedy: Right.

Olga Cavalli: ...proposed something different.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: More than the fact - let me finish please - more than the fact that we have been working on the language, I would like you to tell us, because now we have Claudio and we have Tony that are agreeing with this new text. So perhaps you can tell us why it's that you don't like it.

Victoria McEvedy: Do you know, I'm actually really not prepared to do so because, you know what, it's half past, I mean we've wasted half an hour of this call. I just don't have this sort of time to waste.

Claudio repeatedly, I'm afraid, does this to us. He has another bite of the cherry and he pushes and pushes for his point. I'm not prepared to have a substantial discussion about it again having fully participated in a long call last week. We had a great deal of con - like I said, I would like to refer to the transcript of that call and I'd like to discuss it on the list.

I'm just - I'm just not prepared to waste the time. And I'm so sorry.

Tony Harris: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes please. Go ahead Tony. With all due respect, I think it's up to the Chair to decide what is a waste of time and what is not.

Victoria McEvedy: Well you could have joined the call last week, right. I mean you're reflectively asking us to reopen something when, you know, it was your choice, all of you, not to be on that call.

Tony Harris: Well I could have if I'd had some access in the plane over the Brazilian jungle.

Victoria McEvedy: That's fine.

Tony Harris: I'd be happy to have done it.

Victoria McEvedy: That's fine. But I just - this is hindsight.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: But I just didn't...

Victoria McEvedy: I did give the time and energy away from my practice to spend the time reaching consensus on it. And I'm not really prepared to duplicate my input every time. I just - I do not have the resources or the patience quite frankly. I'd like to refer back to the transcript. I'd like us to take this on the list. And I'm not prepared to reiterate those discussions. So I turn it over to you Olga as Chair to decide how to resolve this.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Victoria. And again I appreciate the time that we all give to this working team. In my modest opinion as Chair of this working team, I'm participant of many other working groups among ICANN and other places. If we have to spend time and time to reach consensus, if I'm the Chair, there will be time for that.

                   And I don't find, I'm sorry Victoria, but more than the fact that you have spent some time and we all have spent some time in this and other documents, could you please tell us why you no like the new language so maybe we can find a better language that satisfies all of us?

Victoria McEvedy: No. As I said, I'm just not prepared to do so. I'd like to note my objection. I'm going to refer back to the transcript and I'll raise it on the list. And I may make a formal, I don't know, objection of some kind.

Man: Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: I'm really not prepared to do it.

Chuck Gomes: Olga this is Chuck. I'll try to make something constructive here.

Olga Cavalli: Please go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: You know, as I indicated last week, you know, it is the working group model itself is designed for policy development processes specifically. Okay? And the board recommendations, we're referring to that as well.

So I believe it's accurate to say that the just saying that refer, you know, referring to the working group model or function on the working group model and saying that the constituencies and stakeholder groups isn't a perfect fit.

Now I'm fully supportive though of recommending that constituencies and stakeholder groups, you know, follow the principles of the working group model that are intended which is openness, inclusiveness, consensus building, minimized voting, etcetera.

So my suggestion would be that we word it differently and instead cite the principles of the working group model that we want constituencies and stakeholder groups to apply.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Chuck. And this is what I was trying to explain. Let's try to find a text that better suits the idea and what is proposed by different working team members.

Chuck do you have a suggestion for changing this text and perhaps including some Claudio's ideas and some other words already agreed.

Chuck Gomes: Well that's what I just tried to communicate. What I - let me - let me be - try to be more specific. First of all I suggest that we identify the elements of the working group model that we want constituencies and stakeholder groups to follow and that we list those - I named a few just a minute ago.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: That we list those. Instead of saying follow the grouping, working group model or refer to the working group model, say something to the effect that constituencies and stakeholder groups should follow the following principles from the working group model.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: We have to be honest. The working group model was not designed for, you know, a way for constituencies and stakeholder groups to develop their own positions. It may or not be necessary to form working groups specifically that can work. In some cases it may not. So let's really focus on the principles from that model that we want constituencies and stakeholder groups to follow.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Chuck. Claudio any comments to Chuck's...

((Crosstalk))

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. I support that. I think that's a good idea. I think that kind of captures...

Olga Cavalli: Claudio perhaps you could work with this idea suggested by Chuck and prepare a more specific text...

Claudio DiGangi: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: ...for this paragraph and propose it to the working team?

Claudio DiGangi: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: But Olga, I think that's good, but I also think that everyone on the team should participate in identifying the principles that we really want to apply here.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. My - now my idea was that Claudio perhaps prepare a first proposal and then we can add that to our principles that we think might be included. Someone else wanted to talk. Oh I'm sorry. I thought it was Tony. I'm sorry.

But what I'm trying to do is to move forward and to find a text that fits all our needs and Claudio's suggestion. But Chuck made a very good point also. So perhaps Chuck, Claudio you and me and then maybe Julie could help us in drafting this part of the text?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. I mean I'm happy to try to put something together Olga.

Olga Cavalli: And we share it with the list and see what others think - Victoria, Chuck, Tony. Okay? Great. Okay. And then we have some text proposed by ICANN staff. Julie could you please read the text that was - the language that was - that you made a consultations and was proposed by ICANN staff?

I have the echo again. I have difficulties in hearing you.

Julie Hedlund: Certainly Olga. This is Julie. The text is Section 2F, the just text the - in case of un- treatment resulting in the reduction in application or a dispute, applicants may lodge with the ICANN ombudsman period. The process for lodging complaints to the ombudsman is set forth in Article 5, ICANN bylaws, and in the ombudsman framework available at there's the link, period.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Julie. Any comments to that? Do we agree in including this text to the document? Okay. Hearing no objections, Julie could you please include it in the text? I think it's already included, but just take out the brackets.

Julie Hedlund: Right. I will - the original text and insert in caps the new, indicating that is a change that's been accepted.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Julie. And apart from the text about the working group that will be revised, do we have any other parts of the text that we should agree or discuss about this Subtask 1 document? Claudio could we work on that during the next day so perhaps we can agree on the text in the list and maybe find the final text for the next call on Friday.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you very much. So we should move to Subtask 2 document. And we have Victoria on the line so she has been leading this document. How should we proceed? Should we read it? I have really a very strong echo and I have difficulties in hearing you. I don't know if you have the same problem, but reading the document maybe makes things more complicated or I don't know what you suggest. If I read it, you hear the echo?

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes it.

Claudio DiGangi: Olga I'm just going to say it's a pretty - it's a pretty long document.

Olga Cavalli: Yes I know.

Claudio DiGangi: So I'm sure...

Olga Cavalli: But I think we should go through the text and I have several difficulties in hearing clearly. But I will go reading or maybe Julie you want to read and we follow and perhaps paragraph by paragraph?

Claudio DiGangi: Olga could I also make another comment? This is Claudio.

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Claudio DiGangi: Maybe if we could just discuss like, you know, kind of what we're doing now, higher level approach of how we're going to go through this. And I remember Zahid on the west made a comment that there might be value in focusing on the recommendations themselves. I think they're in Part 2. And...

Olga Cavalli: Go directly to that section you're proposing?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Part 2 of the...

Claudio DiGangi: Because Part 1 is really background and...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Claudio DiGangi: ...I think...

Olga Cavalli: For those who are on the call now, any comments about Part 1 general comments? Okay.

Claudio DiGangi: Olga I do have a general - I do have a comment.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Claudio DiGangi: On process issues, and I think there might have been some other parts. I'd have to go back and refresh some of these other sections. But I think I did have some questions or concerns with the way some of the background was phrased. But I'd have to go back and look.

Olga Cavalli: I don't know what do others think but I think we should go through the text because so we - it's not because only of us, because someone else in the group may want to listen to that recording and follow the text discussion. So I know it's tiring. I know it's long but it's our job.

Tony Harris: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: So yes Tony. Go ahead.

Tony Harris: This is Tony. I'm back. I'm just checking. Do you have an echo with my voice now?

Olga Cavalli: No it's great. I hear you...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: ...like (clothes in one S I). Okay.

Tony Harris: Yes. We have great lines down here. I agree we should read the text by the way.

Olga Cavalli: I think it - yes it will be perhaps longer but it will be clearer also. So Victoria could you help me reading the documents? I am sorry. Julie, I'm so sorry Victoria. I didn't want to both you. Julie, could you help me reading the document?

Julie Hedlund: Yes Olga. This is Julie. I'll be happy to do so.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Let me then go ahead and begin with Part 1, 1.1 Introduction. The subtask tem of the work group is tasked with the developing proposals to enhance existing constituencies by developing recommendations on constituency operating principles and procedures. And that piece enhance- yours in enclosed herein (Subtask 1.2).

Members of the group are sealed again these classic comments, Michael Young and (S Tatria) and Victoria McEvedy. The BGC group court at page 43 mandated the development of the following.

In quote, Clear operating principles for each constituency to ensure that all constituencies function in a representative open transparent and democratic manner. Operating procedures adopted by constituencies should reflect common principles and follow these guidelines. End quote.

The BGC guidelines are at Schedule 1 below.

Olga Cavalli: Julie if I may, I would add the - and when the members of the team are described, I would add that Victoria leaded this - the work of this the working team. Victoria is that okay with you? Hello? Julie can you hear me?

Julie Hedlund: I can hear you. Is...

Olga Cavalli: Oh.

Julie Hedlund: I can add that. I thought you were asking for a response from Victoria.

Olga Cavalli: Yes but maybe she couldn't hear me. I think it's fair and she leaded the group and I don't know what do others think but.

Man: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you. Can you add that Julie?

Gisella Gruber-White: So, sorry. Victoria disconnected.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. All right. I think it's fair that she's stated as the Chair of this sub-working team.

Julie Hedlund: Victoria, I mean sorry Olga, I will - this is Julie - I will add that. I should note however that Victoria has disconnected. Are we concerned because we were - we're now discussing changes to her document without her being present. And I thought that I...

Olga Cavalli: Well this call - I'm sorry, this call is meant for discussing this document. And she's welcome to join again.

Julie Hedlund: I see. Okay that's fine. I just asked. Thank you very much Olga. I will continue then with 1.2 improvements.

The BGC earns to reduce entry barriers, active participation and constituencies including the, begin quotes, unacceptably high information costs, end quotes, of joining a constituency and the difficulty of penetration and the lack of basic transparency and disclosure of interest.

The goal then is improved and simpler and easier to understand constituencies that reduce process fears and increase transparency of process. The BGC solution was minimum in common operating procedures while recognizing some variation as acceptable.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Let's pause...

Tony Harris: Olga?

Chuck Gomes: Let's pause there. Go ahead Tony.

Olga Cavalli: Tony, yes?

Tony Harris: Yes. No I just want to confirm. There is something here which is in highlighted in italics and in quotes. It says in excessively high information costs...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Tony Harris: ...of joining a constituency. Is that part of the BGC document or is it a comment made by the - by whoever wrote this?

Olga Cavalli: Julie could you check that because I don't have the document open in this moment.

Julie Hedlund: I do not have the BGC document open, but it is in quotes as though it is a quote from the BGC report.

Tony Harris: Well it would be important to confirm that because otherwise I'm not comfortable with it.

Olga Cavalli: It's - what is strong language?

Julie Hedlund: I will have to get back to you on that. I...

Tony Harris: Okay. That's just a comment I have. If it's BGC language that's fine otherwise I'm not comfortable with it.

Olga Cavalli: I think it's a good comment Tony. And Julie we can check that.

Chuck Gomes: And Chuck wants in the queue too please.

Olga Cavalli: Sure please Chuck. Go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: I don't understand the last sentence, the speech of that paragraph. The BGC solution was minimum in common operating procedures while recognizing some variation as acceptable. That sentence does not make sense to me.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Me neither. And is this a reference to this link at the end or?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I don't know what those are.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Those are end note links. That's how they appear in - when you bring them in to the wiki from the, you know, from the...

Tony Harris: Olga?

Chuck Gomes: You mean the White House?

Tony Harris: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Chuck hasn't finished I think.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: Oh I'm sorry...

Chuck Gomes: I just want to know - well I'm questioning what are end notes? Does that mean footnotes?

Julie Hedlund: I believe their end notes Chuck. This is Julie.

Chuck Gomes: I don't know what an end note is.

Julie Hedlund: It comes at the end of the document Chuck. These are all at the end of the document.

Chuck Gomes: End of the document. There's a whole bunch of them in this paragraph.

Julie Hedlund: I understand that. I have to scroll to the end of the document to get their reflected there.

Olga Cavalli: I'm just checking the end of the document.

Tony Harris: It is pretty much like a footnote.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay. That's all I was trying to clarify.

Olga Cavalli: Well there at the end but it says west - I'm not sure if they're the same.

Chuck Gomes: I say they probably are. That's all I was trying to clarify. That's fine. We'll fix those later.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. But Julie anyway we should check with the BGC reported this language is from there. And if it's instructed like exactly text it's okay. Tony you wanted to say something.

Tony Harris: Yes. Actually getting to this sentence that Chuck has just addressed, I notice above from what we read before from the BGC report at page 43, they say operating procedures should reflect common principles. But it doesn't say that the operating procedures should be common. It's talking about the principles not about the operation. That's just a comment.

Olga Cavalli: So you're proposing a change?

Tony Harris: No. I'm just noting that I can see why Chuck is surprised by this sentence.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I think what Chuck says is it doesn't make sense to him.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: Okay. I'm saying...

Olga Cavalli: Am I correct Chuck?

Tony Harris: ...I'm saying that it doesn't correspond to what the BGC report is quoted as saying just above.

Chuck Gomes: And you may be right on that Tony. I'm not even sure what it says. So once we deter - it needs to be reworded so it's clear in terms of what's being said. And then I think we'll get to what you're asking.

Olga Cavalli: So I think we have...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...two issues. Reword the sentence and then check if it should be included or not. Am I correct?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That's a good conclusion.

Tony Harris: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Um-hmm.

Olga Cavalli: Some proposal for rewording?

Chuck Gomes: Can I...

Claudio DiGangi: Olga this is Claudio.

Olga Cavalli: Yes Claudio go ahead.

Claudio DiGangi: I think what - well Victoria was getting at here was if we add any to the word principles following the word minimum.

Olga Cavalli: So could you read this last sentence how it would be?

Claudio DiGangi: It would read the Board - the BGC solution was minimum principles. And actually, you know, it doesn't fit in exactly with the sentence. But I think that's the idea. It would read the Board, you know, the BGC solution was minimum for decibels in operating procedures.

Olga Cavalli: The BGC solution was minimum principle. Is that what you're proposing?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That's still not very good English.

Olga Cavalli: No.

Chuck Gomes: So.

Olga Cavalli: I'm sorry I can't say that but it sound weird.

Tony Harris: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Tony go ahead.

Tony Harris: Yes. Perhaps you could say the BGC solution called for a minimum principles etcetera, etcetera.

Chuck Gomes: Minimum common operating procedures maybe or operating principles or whatever. Yes. That's getting better.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Did you get that language Julie?

Tony Harris: If you don't have principles in, we're talking about operations, right? And the BGC is talking about principles.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I agree with that.

Julie Hedlund: Yes Olga this is Julie. I've captured the language.

Olga Cavalli: Oh great. Thank you. And if we have this new language for the sentence, do we like the sentence?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. It sounds a lot better.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, open a different document. Okay, sorry, trying to refresh. I closed everything. I closed my document. Julie so if the change is made, then we agree in having - I'm sorry, I closed the document without one thing. I have to reopen it again.

Could you keep on reading Julie if we agree in having this new sentence. Do we want to keep the sentence?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: No comments. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Sure.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Go ahead Julie. And I have closed my document but please go ahead and I'll reopen it.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Olga. This is Julie. I'll continue. I'll begin with the sentence that we have modified to make sure that I have it complete. The BGC called for minimum principles in common operating procedures while recognizing some variation as acceptable.

Tony Harris: That's fine.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Continuing to the next paragraph. The key issue that has informed the working team is the warning from the BGC colon, begin quote, our goal is definitely not to create a new layer of bureaucracy as we've heard concerns about the - about at the San Juan meeting period end quote.

It was this (unintelligible). I'm sorry. It was this that drove recommendations for more standardizations and therefore simplification at the constituency level. This concern is now resolved for contracted parties who have only the one layer.

While there is some expectation that constituencies may become less significant in future, certainly at this transitional stage this is not the case. And currently (Janice)'s old Council seats are still tied firmly to constituencies in the non-contracted houses period.

Chuck Gomes: (Greg) that's now I'm having trouble with that last part. Let's see. While there is some expectation that constituencies may become less significant in the future, certain - probably should be a comma there - certainly at this transitional stage is not the case. And currently (Janice)'s old Council seats are still tied firmly to constituencies in the non-contracted house. Now that's - it sounds like that sentence has become outdated.

Olga Cavalli: I think this is - I would take it out. I don't know what you think but it - I think it's not relevant now.

Chuck Gomes: It seems that way to me.

Tony Harris: I agree.

Claudio DiGangi: Olga?

Tony Harris: I'd take it out.

Claudio DiGangi: Olga this is Claudio. Can I make a...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Claudio DiGangi: ...comment on...

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Go ahead.

Claudio DiGangi: I also - even in the first paragraph I just - I don't agree with - and I've, you know, I've raised this on the - on our little subtask team - with the description of the BGC recommendations. Let's see if I can...

Olga Cavalli: Our goal is definitely not to create a new line of bureaucracy. And we heard concerns about a...

((Crosstalk))

Claudio DiGangi: Oh right. Yes. That's right. That was the language. The way I interpret it, the concerns about the layers of bureaucracy was by creating the stakeholder groups, that there might be an actual layer of bureaucracy involved. And I think that's what the Board Governance Committee was referring to.

                  And according to this text, it's, you know, it just doesn't summarize it that way. It actually says that, you know, this concern about creating a bureaucracy drove the recommendations for more standardization and therefore simplification at the constituency level.

I just - I don't agree with that. I also don't...

Chuck Gomes: Claudio, I don't think you're accurate on that and let me tell you why and see if it checks. The stakeholder groups actually were created after the BGC recommendations. And so I don't think they had any idea of stakeholder groups, when they made that statement. My interpretation of the recommendations is I think consistent with what that second sentence says.

They thought there was some value and some more standardization or simplification at the constituency level. But at the same time, you know, they were trying to be clear that hey we're not trying to make this overly bureaucratic.

So I actually am not uncomfortable with that second sentence. I think that's consistent with what the BGC was recommending. Now we could test that with them and find out, but that's my recollection and I could be wrong too.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. Yes. No I appreciate that. And I think whatever information we could get here would be helpful. I thought the - I thought - maybe I'm not remembering correctly. I thought the BGC report said we recommend four abroad stakeholder groups. I thought that was the goal...

Chuck Gomes: I'll have to go back and - I'll have to go back and look.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: They may have, but the - I don't believe - let's assume that's true because I'm okay with that. Even if that is true, I don't think the Board was concerned about the bureaucratic nature of the stakeholder groups adding another new layer.

They - but so, I would still think even if that is true that the second sentence still applies. In other words, they - if they did recommend four stakeholder groups, I don't think that discounts what the second sentence says or there. You know, it was that - it was this that drove recommendations for more standardization and therefore simplification of it at the constituency level.

Claudio DiGangi: Well I just - I just see the - I think the - the way I view this is if you're mixing ideas, there are - this reference is concerned that were raised at the San Juan meeting. And the next sentence refers to, you know, I think maybe what's problematic with this is it's trying to get into the head and the intent of the BGC.

And this - the way it's raised here is, it's sort of - I think it's being presented in a way that this whole kind of process is being driven for more standardization. I think that's part of it. I think in - like, you know, I think there was a quote about the high information costs and that would be reduced if there was more standardization in certain areas.

But in terms of the concerns about the bureaucracy that is being created - and I think it is still a concern in the non-contracted house because there are constituencies in the - and, you know, so if you want to participate, you need to, you know, if there is an extra layer of bureaucracy in the non-contracted house well.

Chuck Gomes: Well first of all, the first sentence just refers to a quote from the BGC. So the question we need to answer then is the second sentence an accurate statement related to that quote.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And it - I don't - I'm not seeing any problem with that second sentence and I'm not opposed to some modifications to it, but it's - from what I understand in the long process and the - that the BGC went through and then their

communications, they were looking for some standardization where appropriate in the - at the constituency level so that it wasn't so difficult for those who want to join constituencies or who want to form new constituencies to do so.

Olga Cavalli: Once a (poulton). What if we take the whole paragraph and we take the last sentence out? What about this concern is now results for contracted parties who have only the one layer. Is that a relevant sentence for this paragraph? Is that true?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I don't know. What is that - let's see. What does that mean the concern is now resolved.

Olga Cavalli: That's my question...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...to the contracted parties. Is that relevant for contracted parties? Is it true or what we are saying here?

Chuck Gomes: Oh I see. I see what it means. For contracted parties because - because the - there is just one - there's - there are no constituencies at the contracted party side, there's just the stakeholder group.

I would point out though that there are provisions for various interest groups within the contracted parties stakeholder groups.

Claudio DiGangi: Olga I would, you know, the first sentence of that paragraph says the key issue that is inform the work of this team is the warning from - it's kind of just phrased that this is the main or this is one of the main issues that informed our work. And it just doesn't seem to me that that's really the case.

Chuck Gomes: Why don't we just say on issue?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. I mean you could - you could...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: An issue that has informed the work of this team is - I must be honest. I don't
                  like the paragraph. I cannot lie. I don't like the whole paragraph.

Tony Harris: I agree...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Tony Harris: ...with you Olga. I would - I just...

Olga Cavalli: I don't like it. I don't see value in this paragraph. I think it...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: I agree with Olga.

Olga Cavalli: And the last part is not true anymore. So I will take it out. That's my proposal.

Tony Harris: I agree.

Olga Cavalli: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: I don't have any problem with taking it out. I suspect somebody wanted it in
                  there though. So it'll probably create some debate.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. But I must be honest, you know, there is something that I can't do in my life is lie. I don't see value in this paragraph and I think it's confusing. Maybe we can...

Chuck Gomes: Well it's certainly not a critical element of the report, so I don't think taking it out causes any serious damage but someone may disagree with me.

Olga Cavalli: Yes of course that someone may disagree with me again but that's what I think. I don't know. Should we put it in brackets and see how the rest of the group reacts?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Tony Harris: Yes but let's propose that it be removed.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. We propose to remove it and of course with the agreement with the rest of the group.

Julie Hedlund: Olga this is Julie. I have put - I have stricken the paragraph and I put it in curly brackets to indicate that it's..

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...provisional.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you very much Julie. Can we move forward?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. One point three case for improved transparency. We are aware of the BGC exhortation to best practice in governance, possibility and transparency.

We are also interest of ICANN's public trust function and that ICANN is accountable for the global community, to the global public at large rather than to any specific member or group of members.

Indeed ICANN's bylaws state that, colon ICANN and its constituent bodies shall operate the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness, Article 3, Section 1. See also its core value of remaining accountable for the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN's effectiveness at Article 1, Subsection 210.

Chuck Gomes: Just one minor edit in that. All this is really just reiterating the BGC thing but think but in that second sentence there it says we are also conscious of ICANN's public trust function and that ICANN is accountable for the global Internet community. Insert an and there, and to the global public at large, just a minor...

Tony Harris: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...edit. Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Great.

Tony Harris: Yes that's missing.

Olga Cavalli: Do we like the last - with this change that was proposed by Chuck we think it's a good paragraph?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: All it is is grammar.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Great.

Julie Hedlund: Olga this is Julie. I've reflected the change and added the word add in the code of records.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Julie. Can - we can move forward.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. One point four methods. The group considered the myriad of diverse practices and procedures currently in use by the constituency. These are collated in table form and their complexity and diversity is evident.

                   We've considered approaches to participation and operational goals by other consensus based multi-stakeholder organizations such as those referenced by the BGC report, i.e. IETF, W3C, (Wright), (Blackness), as well as other governance models such as WITSA and the ICC.

                   A useful independent review of the (unintelligible) main Internet governance entities was conducted for the Council of Europe, link inserted. We also considered other sources such as common corporate practice and Robert's Rule.

                   We were also assisted by the work done on the ICANN working group operating model by the policy process steering committee period.

Olga Cavalli: What's the Robert's Rule?

Chuck Gomes: That's meeting rules for running a meeting, you know, a motion has to be seconded.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: If there's an amendment to a motion, it has to be handled first, those kinds of things.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Claudio DiGangi: Well I think Olga the only thing I would have a comment here is makes reference to useful independent review and then that was conducted for the Council of Europe. I just, you know, I'm not familiar with that document.

Olga Cavalli: I don't know that document. What I did provide to this working team is (Latnic) rules and all the Latin-American rules that I knew. But I cross the others providing information. And thank you for the comment. So you want to keep the document? Review the document? You...

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. Yes that's what I'll do.

Olga Cavalli: ...want to check that Claudio?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. I'll just - I'll review that.

Olga Cavalli: Oh. Just check that and give us some feedback about it. I don't - why we are saying the last sentence? We were also assisted by the work done on the ICANN working group operating model by the policy. But that policy - but that poli- but that work is still - correct me please Chuck if I'm wrong.

                                We were also assisted by the work done - this is what we have used, the working group operating model by the policy process steering committee?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I think all they're saying is that in the process of doing the work on this subtask, they also consulted with what's going on in the working group model PPSC working team which is fine I think. You know, it's not finished.

Olga Cavalli: No. I don't...

Chuck Gomes: You're right. But they I think, you know, checked to see what's being pursued there which is good. That's fine.

Olga Cavalli: No. My only concern is that they are still working so.

Chuck Gomes: Oh we can say that. I mean by the work being done, maybe we say work being done rather than done.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Makes - that's what I was trying to express. Did you get that change Julie?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Yes Olga. I...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Okay...

(Michael):   Olga it's...

Olga Cavalli: ...Claudio...

(Michael):   ...(Michael) I joined the call.

Olga Cavalli: Hey (Michael).

(Michael):   I apologize. I had a conflict that I - it came up - for being late.

Olga Cavalli: Don't worry. (Michael) for your reference we are revising the documents prepared by Subtask 1, Subtask 2 leaded by Victoria. I think you were a part of that working team - sub-working team. And we are in the document in the paragraph - we are revising the first paragraph of 1.4 methods.

                  Okay Claudio so you give us some feedback about that document about - of the Council of Europe.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Olga was it referred to by this subtask team? If it was, the sentence is fine, is it not?

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: I didn't...

Claudio DiGangi: I think it was referred - I think - well Victoria I think, you know, I think she was familiar with this document.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Claudio DiGangi: ...she so.

Olga Cavalli: Any other changes or comments to this paragraph?

Chuck Gomes: By the way, was that one - and Julie I don't know, you probably don't know the answer to this but, was - I don't recall whether that was one of the working group type models that the BGC referred to. I do remember them referring to IETF and W3C etcetera, so. But...

Julie Hedlund: Chuck - Chuck this is Julie. I think that actually that was not referred to by the BGC report but was a report that Victoria was familiar with.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And if the subtask team, you know, refer to that in some way it's okay to say it here.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes that's true. I mean if she, yes.

Olga Cavalli: Well just check it and...

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. That's fine.

Olga Cavalli: ...if you think that's okay, just don't say anything and we keep it there.

Claudio DiGangi: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: And if you find something that it's not the (portenants) just let us know. Great. Any other comments about this paragraph? Great. Julie, can we move forward?

Julie Hedlund: Certainly Olga. This is Julie. We also considered the staff of you of each constituency charter and recertification application and staff comments and suggestions to each constituency and the response of some constituencies. Even master schedule of task (unintelligible) work plan at, and then there's a link.

(Dispasses) you was not concerned as we are with proposing common participation rules and operating procedures that it is still useful. It also complements this team's identification and best and worst practices currently employed by constituencies.

(Daily) and two documents. At its 1 October 2008 meeting, the Board directed staff to develop a formal petition and charter template to assist new constituency applicants in satisfying the formative criteria consistent with the ICANN bylaws.

The temp is at, and a link is inserted. Its contents are a (unintelligible) starting point to matters that this group should make recommendations as to operating procedures, this is in quotes, operating procedures consistent with

the principles outlined above which all constituencies should abide by, end quotes. We also consider staff - considered staff advice to the proposed constituencies.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: One minor edit there in the middle where it says it also complements. I think that should be an E instead of an I on compliments. It wasn't giving them praise right.

Man: That's true.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I've made that change.

Olga Cavalli: And what the last sentence, we also consider staff advice to the proposed new constituencies. Is that okay?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I think so because didn't the subtask team review in the exchange between constituencies and staff in terms of their charters and so forth, staff did come back with some...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...recommendations and dialogue and I think that's all that's saying is that...

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Chuck Gomes: ...that was considered as well.

Olga Cavalli: Perfect. Any other comments?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes Olga, there's a sentence referencing this team's identification of best and worse practices currently employed by constituencies. I think we had talked

about doing that at one point about creating a list of the best and worst practices. I don't think we ever actually ended up doing that.

Olga Cavalli: I don't recall.

Chuck Gomes: I thought I saw a document like that.

Julie Hedlund: Yes there is - this is Julie. There is actually a document and that's what's linked there.

Claudio DiGangi: It - so - but that link - so what is the start of that link? Is it the word data?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. I see that it maybe is a convolute link. I'll have to look back. It's also a document...

((Crosstalk))

Claudio DiGangi: Oh.

Julie Hedlund: ...main page.

Chuck Gomes: Yes that does look a little strange, but I do recall seeing a document like that. Whether we all - I don't - I don't think it's a question of whether we all agree what best and worst practices are but some work was done in that regard, so.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. That's what I'd be curious to see if we had - if there was actually a document.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: There is that Claudio. What I'll do is I'll send the document around - the link around. I think...

Claudio DiGangi: Okay thank you.

Julie Hedlund: It's one that we worked on quite some time ago. So, it was one of the earlier ones.

Olga Cavalli: If you can add that Julie so, but I really must confess I don't remember, but...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I remember it, so, but let's just get the link corrected and...

Olga Cavalli: And check the document.

Julie Hedlund: Well I'll send the link to the document around also practice the link here if it's not working.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Julie. Any other comments to this paragraph? Great. And Julie did you get the link and other changes?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. I Olga thank you (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: And so we can move forward please.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. This is Julie. One point five process issues. We know that steering processes conducted by common membership of the steered and steering groups by individuals also representing and advocating for interested parties is very far from ideal indeed.

We suggest in future a formal channel of communication with the collective steering entity to the collective work group.

Chuck Gomes: Now I don't have a clue what that says.

Olga Cavalli: Me neither.

Tony Harris: Neither do I. It makes no sense at all.

Olga Cavalli: Me neither.

Claudio DiGangi: Olga, I mean I think I have an idea what it, you know, what Victoria was getting at here being on the subtask team. But my view of it is that I don't agree with it and I would prefer just to take the paragraph out.

But I think she's making reference to the OSC and basically the interplay between the OSC and our work team.

Chuck Gomes: And by the way, if that's what's being said, then let's say it.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: I'm not so sure that we want to say it but I would prefer it being direct instead of so vague that no one especially out of this group, and it sounds like most of us in this group don't have a clue.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Are you proposing a change in the text Claudio?

Claudio DiGangi: I just - I didn't have - I didn't share any process concerns with our work. So, and I think that's what Victoria was trying to get at here. So, I'm just okay with just, you know, removing this.

Chuck Gomes: Removing the whole section.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Olga a suggestion for moving forward on this. First of all we probably ought to clarify what's really being said.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And then we need to decide as a group whether we want to even include what's being said. Now my...

Olga Cavalli: Let's do the following. I agree Chuck and thank you Claudio for your comments. Let's ask Victoria for clarification about this service and then we decide. Okay?

Can you mark it somehow Julie perhaps a question to Victoria or in an another call or...

Julie Hedlund: Well did we - do we want to have it recommend removing with clarification or clarifying...

Olga Cavalli: I think that we want to understand first and then decide about removing or not. If we don't get the meaning, we cannot say what we want. I think that's the spirit of the comment.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Yes.

Julie Hedlund: So we want to suggest clarification on one point...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Perhaps Victoria can - maybe she can tell us and then we agree in the text or not.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. I'll note that as an action item specifically...

((Crosstalk)

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you. Can we move forward Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Okay. This is Julie. Part 2, compromise recommendations.

Chuck Gomes: And I would stop right there please. I suggest we delete the word compromise.

Olga Cavalli: I agree.

Chuck Gomes: Either we're making recommendations or, you know, we don't need to qualify them.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I agree.

Tony Harris: Yes. So do I.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. This is Julie. I've indicated that compromise is stricken pending agreement. To continue, a rough consensus of subtask members agree to the following recommended minimum operation procedures for constituencies. One, executive committees, colon: A, all executive committees must promptly publish action points, decisions and any resolutions to constituency members. It is recommended that prompt publication means within a reasonable period and a guideline is between 72 hours and one week of the relevant meeting.

B, all executive committees must publish to constituency members their rules and procedures, decision making process and criteria.

C, a limit of two years per term and a maximum of two terms per office being a total maximum of four years in any office hereinafter term limits shall apply to members of executive committees. Members who have served two consecutive terms on the executive committee must remain out of office for

one full term prior to serving any subsequent term as a member of the executive committee.

Two, committees.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry. One question. Sorry Julie for interrupting. Did this week and time or is this - that's reasonable, 72 hours and one week of the relevant meeting, is that okay?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes Olga, I...

Olga Cavalli: I'm acting in the normal practice of constituency and stakeholder groups.

Claudio DiGangi: I think that's an estimate Olga. I think she, you know, was just tragic. I think Victoria was just trying to come up with some numbers there.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. But...

Claudio DiGangi: I'm not sure we need to put in the guideline, but...

Olga Cavalli: I think it's too specific but it's...

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...just a comment. I want your feeling from the constituency daily life.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Well...

Claudio DiGangi: No I think...

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead...

Claudio DiGangi: Oh go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: ...Claudio.

Claudio DiGangi. I was going to say, you know, part of this too I think is related to the toolkit and services if not there would be some support for the constituencies in doing this type of administrative stuff. But, yes, I mean Olga I kind of agree with you that it - I think it's a little too specific and, you know, I think it's fair to just - if we just said within a reasonable period of time without, you know, getting into the specific, you know, three days or five days or seven days.

Olga Cavalli: Chuck you wanted to comment?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I'm okay with A and B. And from a registry stakeholder group point of view and (Michael) correct me if you think I'm wrong, but I, you know, for the most part we're - we've supported the idea of term limits. But I don't think we do it for our executive team. If you - so often it comes down to having people who are willing to serve. And if you've got people who are serving - I think turnover is healthy, okay, so I think it's a good thing to recommend.

The reality matter is sometimes you have a limited number of people who are willing to serve. And so you probab- if you're this specific, I think you need to provide for possibility of exceptions for constituencies and stakeholder groups.

Tony Harris: This is Tony (Travi). Sorry.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry. It's the Tony you want to talk?

Tony Harris: Yes. I support what Chuck just said.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Someone else wanted to talk and I couldn't hear?

Man: Could you put me in the queue please Olga? This is (Mike).

Olga Cavalli: (Michael) go ahead please.

(Michael):   So I think if I recall correctly, we've been working on this document so long
                    I've got a bit of an alternative view to that point that should be down in this
                    document further down. And I think the suggestion I made was that
                    something along the lines an exception condition that the - if the actual
                    working group or stakeholder's group or so forth, agree to, they can make an
                    exception.

                    I think that's important where you have a - you have a constituency group or
                    something where frankly there's not a lot of people volunteering to work on
                    the executive. And everyone's frankly just happy for the volunteer.

Olga Cavalli: I understand. So maybe we can add some language about that exception?

(Michael):   Yes. Let me look on the document and see if I can find where the language
                    was that I had suggested. It should be in here somewhere.

Olga Cavalli: Yes I remember seeing it. And I agree that sometimes it's good to have term
                    limits but sometimes you don't find many volunteers.

Chuck Gomes: Well maybe any - something like this. And (Michael) I hope this is consistent
                    with what you find. But, any exceptions to this policy would require approval
                    by the membership.

(Michael):   Does anyone see in the document where the alternate views are?

Claudio DiGangi: I think Part 3 (Michael) has some and then she put - she also put a line under
                    that section too. Yes.

((Crosstalk))

(Michael): Oh there it is, minority and other recommendations.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Anyway I think it doesn't hurt if we add some text here that clarifies this issue, this text that Chuck proposed or something similar if we agree in that.

(Michael): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

(Michael): Actually.

Olga Cavalli: I think...

Chuck Gomes: As long as there's a provision for an out and the membership approves it so that it's not the executive committee that's perpetuating their life term that should be okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Julie did you get the language proposed by Chuck?

Julie Hedlund: I did. This is Julie. So my understanding is this would be an additional sentence at the end of paragraph C that would read any exception to this policy would require approval by the membership?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That...

Olga Cavalli: Comments? We agree on that?

(Michael): Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Great. And about 1A, if - Chuck I was just asking if those terms were fine. If you think that's okay, we leave it there.

Chuck Gomes: It's okay with me because it says it's a guideline between the 72 hours...

Olga Cavalli: Exactly.

Chuck Gomes: ...and a week, so...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...there's, you know.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes, that's true.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Claudio DiGangi: Olga I just was going to make a comment, the sentence beneath Part 2 compromise recommendations, is that something that we need in there or could we just delete that?

Olga Cavalli: Oh I'm sorry which one?

Olga Cavalli: The sentence that just - that starts off deception and says a rough consensus of subtask members agreed. I feel like it's kind of categorizing the level of support.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. It's the same thing like what's deleting the word compromise. I agree with that. Either these are recommendations in the report or not. And if they are minority positions, they can be submitted.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Okay with the change. Any other comments? Do we agree with that change? Great. Julie did you get Claudio's suggestion?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. I am striking that first sentence following the header Part 2 recommendations and I put that in curly brackets pending any further discussion by those not on this call.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you. Great thank you. We move forward to Point 2.

Julie Hedlund: I'll move forward Olga. This is Julie. Two, committees, A, it is recommended that constituencies adopt a standard set of rules and procedures to govern constituency committee constitution and operation. Whatever model is adopted it should be published to the entire constituency membership and maintained.

B, the formation of all committees should be made known to the entire constituency membership open to all members.

C, the fact a committee has been established and the membership of it shall be published on the constituency Web site and action points, decisions and any resolutions for products should be made available to the entire constituency membership within a reasonable period of any given meeting.

D, it is recommended constituencies publish to the constituency membership and maintain a list of all active and inactive committees and their final decisions, resolutions and final work products.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I'm fine with the content of this but there's a global change not only on this paragraph but probably in the whole document that should be made. And that is it should say constituency/stakeholder group...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...or vice versa because keep in mind there are no constituencies in the contract accounts.

Claudio DiGangi: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: Yes I agree.

Claudio DiGangi: And Olga on B I was going to say maybe if we could insert the word eligible and because it says and open to all members, maybe it should just say...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: In B, all constituencies shall have a published constituency discussion policy. What's your suggestion, sorry?

Claudio DiGangi: It was on B. I think my suggestion is to insert the word eligibility after - so it would read the formation of all committees should be made known to the entire constituency membership and eligibility open to all members.

Olga Cavalli: Any comments to Claudio's suggestion?

Chuck Gomes: So are you saying and eligible to all members instead of open?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine.

Olga Cavalli: That's fine for me. I want to check with you. Other comments? Julie did you get what the text that Claudio's wants to add is a word?

Julie Hedlund: Yes I have. I've had it - let me see if I have it correctly though. The formation of all committees should be made known to the entire committee member - constituency membership and open - where does eligible go in? I'm sorry.

Claudio DiGangi: It would go right in after the word and.

Julie Hedlund: And el - okay could you say it again Claudio? I'm not...

((Crosstalk))

Claudio DiGangi: Sure. Sure. It would read the formation of all committees should be made known to the entire constituency membership and eligibility. Maybe we should even say eligibility to participate open to all members.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Claudio. That now makes sense to me.

Claudio DiGangi: Sure.

Julie Hedlund: Wasn't quite sure where that word should go. All right. I have it reflected. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Olga I have a just a - I guess it's a process issue. There are just a few of us that have been commenting on all these changes. Is it fair to assume that others on the call who aren't - I'd like to assume that if people aren't objecting to anything we're doing here that there's, you know, general consent to what we're doing. If that's not the case, I would appreciate someone speaking up.

Olga Cavalli: I - my proposal would be the following. If we - Julie has been marking the text in brackets or as a comment we will draft them next text for the next call. And I suggest that we express in the list that those who are not in the call listen to the MP3, review the document that have been marked and send their comments in the list and maybe we can review some of the proposed changes in the next call.

We have to move forward with our work and I understand people not joining the call, but we have other...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Oh Olga, I'm not talk - I'm not talking about those who are not on the call.

Olga Cavalli: Oh.

Chuck Gomes: I totally agree with that approach. I'm talking about those who are on the call who aren't saying anything. And that's fine but what I'm saying is I hope they will say something now if they disagree with something so we can talk about it. It saves time later on.

Olga Cavalli: Oh yes of course. I'm - yes, that's the idea. So this is why I always ask if we like the new languages - language or the changes. But yes, of course, they are free to agree or disagree.

So about the last word proposed by Claudio, are we okay with the new sentence?

Tony Harris: It's okay with me.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you Tony. (Michael)?

Man: Yes.

(Michael): Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Is (SS) on the call? I think he was at the beginning of the call but I haven't heard him.

Claudio DiGangi: He may have had to drop off at a decent.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Claudio, well you proposed it. Chuck you're okay with that?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. What about Rafik.

Olga Cavalli: Rafik? I cannot hear his voice. Maybe he's on the...

Rafik Dammak: Oh I'm here.

Olga Cavalli: Do you agree with the proposed change by Claudio and the previous changes we made to the document?

Rafik Dammak: To these document or the previous one too.

Olga Cavalli: No. The ones - the changes that we have been talking about in this call.

Rafik Dammak: Just have only one question in the first document about the third party, but it's not so important as everybody agrees about that at this point. So it's okay.

Olga Cavalli: But about the second document, Subtask 2?

Rafik Dammak: The second one. I just have one - only one concern about the first document but everybody agreed so.

Claudio DiGangi: What was your concern Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: It's about the third party, the proposal from ICANN staff about in case you'll be...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: The ombudsman?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. That one.

Chuck Gomes: What was your concern in that regard?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Until he - he should be natural third party. But in practice I think he wasn't. So that's what.

Chuck Gomes: I didn't understand that.

Olga Cavalli: No me neither.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. I.

Claudio DiGangi: I'm sorry. This is Claudio. I understood it and I'm going to try to just paraphrase.

Rafik Dammak: No.

Claudio DiGangi: I think he was referencing that in theory that it's good to refer to the ombudsman but, you know, there's less confidence that the result be the optimal output from that.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry. I'm not following. We're talking about the first document, right?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Which part?

Chuck Gomes: The general Council recommendation on the neutral third party if there's an appeal for membership.

Olga Cavalli: Rafik do you have another text to propose or any additional text to add to that?

Rafik Dammak: No, but...

Olga Cavalli: Would you like to change what is stated in the document?

Rafik Dammak: Maybe just to say that in that case that it's one of the facility third party, but if - I think it is - if every - but everybody agrees so it's not problem now.

Olga Cavalli: Well the idea is to have a text that comforts all of us. So perhaps you want to make a proposal on the list. Think about a text and propose it to the list.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Is that okay with the rest? The...

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: ...if Rafik is send in some comments?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Tony Harris: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Tony Harris: Sounds fine.

Chuck Gomes: And that's Olga why I brought up the process issue that I did. I want to make sure that everybody is expressing their views as we go through because that will save us time later on rather than to go through all of this and then insert them later.

                          Now I know some of that will happen anyway, but to the extent that we could minimize it, we'll be more effective.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Very good point Chuck and thank you for that. How many time we have? I think we have three minutes left. Julie could you be so kind to mark the document what we have reviewed and put a mark there?

Julie Hedlund: To indicate how far we've come?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I would like to summarize our next step and use this last few minutes to organize the next week. We're planning our next conference call for next Friday. Is that okay?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Tony Harris: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I'm flying to Japan in a very, very long flight from South America. I'm not sure if at that time I will be on a plane or not. But as I don't have the ticket yet, I will check with (Michael) if he can Chair the call if I am not available or if I cannot be there. I'm not sure yet because I don't have it.

                   And then with that comment, we have - I have noted some things to be done. Claudio will rephrase or propose a paragraph in the first document. Do you remember which paragraph is that Claudio?

Claudio DiGangi: I do.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. And I'm happy to help and also we can share it with - once it's rephrased we can share it with the list. We will ask Victoria to rephrase the last paragraph of Part 1 of her document. And after that we will ask her for clarification because we cannot understand the well what is stated there.

                   And once we - she's clarifies it, then we decide if we want to make a - propose some changes or not. This is the last paragraph before the second part of the first - the last paragraph of Part 1 of her document.

And we will send a message to the list encouraging everyone who was in the call and who was not in the call to revise all the changes proposed and deletions and additions. So we finally try to agree in a text that will be finalized hopefully soon. Is that a good plan for the future?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Any comments?

Chuck Gomes: A different comment Olga. What time are we going to meet next week? I recall that Krista said she could not meet at this time normally.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. If I'm not in a plane, I'm okay with each of those timings, but I'm not sure yet.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments about the timing? You Chuck, are you okay with which timing, is it earlier?

Chuck Gomes: Well it's - I'm not crazy about the early time but I have a possible conflict that if we don't do it earlier, so I'll deal with it.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. (Michael) are you available next Friday?

(Michael):   Yes. I'd be happy to deal with it. That's no problem.

Olga Cavalli: If - I will be sure about the ticket very soon. But it's a very long flight. I have to go to Australia first and then get the plane to Japan. So I have no idea how many hours would it take.

Chuck Gomes: Several.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Several. That's a long way.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry about that Olga.

Olga Cavalli: That's a long way. Okay. And they have snow there so that will be fun. Okay. If - any other comments? Okay. Thank you very much for your participation. I think we made a very good progress. I hope Victoria can review the changes we have proposed to her document and she can make comments in the list and we hopefully will talk again.

I hope I can meet you next Friday and we have some tasks to do during the week. And what else I will do with Julie is to put a deadline for receiving comments about the changes in the document, perhaps one week or so. Is that okay?

Julie Hedlund: I've noted that Olga. This is Julie.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you very much. And Julie if you're so kind to summarize this next step for me that would be very helpful for me.

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely Olga. I will send around later today a list of the action items and summarizing these steps and links and so on to the revised documents.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you everyone. Thank you...

Claudio DiGangi: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: ...and have a nice weekend.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Olga.

Julie Hedlund: Bye everyone.

Rafik Dammak:	Sure.

Olga Cavalli:	Bye-bye.

Rafik Dammak:	Bye-bye.

Chuck Gomes:	Bye.

END