

**GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work
Team 24 July 2009 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 **Friday 24 July 2009** 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-20090724.mp3>

On page:

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

Participants present:

Olga Cavalli - work team chair - NCA
Charles Gomes - Registry c.
Rafik Dammak - NCUC
Victoria McEvedy - IPC
Claudio Digangi – IPC

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund - Policy Staff
Robert Hoggarth - Policy Staff
Gisella Gruber-White – Policy Staff

Absent apologies

Krista Papac – gTLD Registrars c.
SS Kshatriya – Individual

Coordinator: The call is now being recorded, please go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Operator. Gisella, would you be so kind to make a roll-call to see who's on the line?

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely. Good afternoon everyone. On today's call we have Olga Cavalli, Victoria McEvedy Chuck Gomes and from staff we have Julie Hedlund and Gisella Gruber-White, myself. Thank you. And, sorry, apologies, we have Krista Papac.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Gisella. Good morning, evening to everyone. Thanks for joining us. And welcome, Julie, back to our group. We've missed you - I missed you a lot. But it's okay that you had your nice holiday.

And I sent the proposed agenda which I changed because I had some comments from Victoria and from Rafik. The last conference call was quite interesting - very interesting. I had to - I went back to the transcript of the call because I think that Rob gave a lot of information that I could hear but then it was very useful for me to reread it again in the document.

And I think it was full of relevant information for our group. And during the last week I think it was mentioned by Julie with the document - about transparency. She suggested additional stakeholder group charter elements to ensure transparency, openness, fairness and representativeness principals.

If it's okay, Julie, did you send it maybe two or three days ago, right?

Julie Hedlund: Yes that's right. I sent it - oh, yeah.

Olga Cavalli: I have a question that I couldn't realize reading the transcript. This is a document that it's already reviewed by staff - by the board. It's a document that it's available for comment. What's the status of this document? That I couldn't realize from reviewing the conference call transcript and maybe what I remember from the call.

Julie Hedlund: Right.

Robert Hoggarth: Julie, Rob is here just in case...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Oh, sorry, Rob, I didn't know you were there.

Julie Hedlund: You stepped in just at the right moment.

Robert Hoggarth: My apologies for being late. I have fat fingers sometimes when it comes to calling in on these calls.

Olga Cavalli: Oh don't worry. Welcome.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you. Yeah, thank you, Olga. That document as I tried to express in the last call, at that point in that call that was more of a concept than an actual document. I recall that I shared that through various discussions that had taken place in Sydney through discussions that, you know, had been months before.

We had identified as staff that there were potentially other elements to add to the debate into the mix because there were constant conversations and feedback from folks as to, well, all these ICANN by-law principals are great but what do they mean?

And that document was an attempt on the part of staff to make suggestions to the community to additional elements that could be part of these stakeholder group charters.

A little bit of history, you know, these concepts and ideas really (unintelligible). I don't know if Victoria is on the call but I think, you know, Victoria, if you're here that there were initial opportunities for people to comment on the existing constituency charters.

And these discussions about these types of issues, membership, reporting about finances and decisions, how meetings are run came up a lot in the context of the constituency discussions.

And, you know, right before Sydney the structural improvements committee decided in its wisdom or through its debates and discussions to essentially do away with constituencies on the contract party house side. You know, they basically declared that those groups are more identifiable as contracted

parties and therefore one of the critical gating elements was you have to have a contract.

And so, you know, the practical effects of that is on the contract party side there will be stakeholder groups. And then, you know, if the board approves the (unintelligible) recommendations this concept of interest groups will be a part of those groups if they choose to form.

And so that created a gap if the board approves that approach that you then have stakeholder groups that may or may not - at least at the present time - have the same sort of protections for their members, the same opportunities for transparency that might exist down the road for constituencies.

And so realizing that the train was leaving the station a number of us thought that it would be good to contribute those thoughts and ideas for potential elements in the stakeholder group charters. And so that was the context of that.

We submitted it in the public forum on stakeholder group charters so that we'd have an opportunity for the community to see those ideas. The intent being that this isn't something that we do in a back room but it's important for the community to see those ideas and have an opportunity to discuss them.

And so they were presentative comments in the forum with the hope that people would be looking at those and share some of their own views or comments.

I must confess that since that forum just closed a couple hours ago that I have not looked through all the comments in that forum to see if folks have expressed opinions about those elements. I recall a lot of comments about some of the stakeholder group charters themselves but I don't know of anyone who's provided some substantive insights about those elements that we're suggesting.

I hope that...

Olga Cavalli: Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: I hope that answers your question.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, very much. And I checked the forum comments but I didn't have time to go through all of them. But I think that from the working group perspective perhaps we should - some of us we should go through those comments and try to find elements for our work.

By the way I think that Rafik suggested something like that or at least write an awareness about this discussions going on in an email sent to the list during this week.

Gisella Gruber-White: Olga, sorry, Rafik has joined the call now. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Hi Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Hello.

Olga Cavalli: Hello. I was just talking about your comment sent to the list this week about the comments on the forum about the stakeholder group charters and elements.

So I read this document, I didn't have time to go through all the comments sent by the open public but I think there are some elements that are relevant to our working team like for example collecting and publishing active member names and membership category, some issues about finances and working in stakeholder groups that may be relevant for what the work that (SS) is doing and also Victoria in the sub-working teams.

Victoria McEvedy: Could I...

Olga Cavalli: Yes, who's there?

Victoria McEvedy: Are we having a queue or anything? Are we going to - I'm sorry, Olga, I'm just...

Olga Cavalli: I was just finishing and opening the queue so if you want to start, Victoria and who else wants to be in the queue? Go ahead Victoria.

Victoria McEvedy: Well, I mean, Rafik may want to - I know I would appreciate if he would expand on his comments on the list because I'm not sure that I fully understand his point. So but also that was sort of my point and I had some questions so just I understand, I mean, I think Rob's document - it's very helpful, Rob, to have the explanation from you and thank you for that.

But I think it has quite some bearing on our work. And so I just wanted to ask you one or two questions if I can and understand I think that, you know, I understand the explanation that you've given to date.

And I guess that my real question is - my first question is - and I have a few of them - but the first question is what will now happen to this document, Rob, is there a process that will now go on, you know, with this document now sort of getting wrapped up in some other process or will there be a merging of public comments and then a document formed based on this plus public comment or...

Olga Cavalli: Robert, you want to answer?

Robert Hoggarth: Sure. Any number of things, I imagine, could happen depending upon how the SIC wants to treat it, that's the Structural Improvements Committee of the board that's been tasked with a lot of this review work. I imagine there may be discussions among board members.

As I noted I would hope that in the comment forum some folks commented on it as well. And then more, you know, more specifically, you know, I hope this, you know, provides some seed for discussions maybe among this work team as well.

In terms of the actual process, you know, we submitted them as comments to a public comment forum. It's a kind of odd convention but, you know, now I have the responsibility of summarizing the comments and I can assure you I'll work to be very even-handed in that and try to describe all the various types of comments that come in.

But ultimately the board chooses to do what they want to do with those. On one end of the spectrum, although I don't think it's likely, they could say wow, you know, we saw these comments from staff. Those look perfect. We'll adopt them at full cloth.

On the other end of the spectrum they could come in and say wow, that's great, everybody has provided comments. We appreciate that, we're going to go in a completely different direction.

From a practical standpoint if the board were to move forward and say we adopt these elements, we think they're a good idea, they should be applied to ICANN structures. They could conceivably do that.

How that impacts the work of this team and, you know, the efforts of the operations steering committee for the GNSO doesn't really change that because I think what was envisioned by the GNSO council in creating these work teams and that effort is that regardless of what happens in these first phases of the implementation you guys are tasked with looking at the long-term.

And if you look at the...

Victoria McEvedy: Thanks. I think we dealt with it. I mean, you know, you did the - I just wanted to ask you that question...

Robert Hoggarth: Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: ...so you have set (aside) me, thank you. And you did explain quite a picture last week and I think I understood that. So I'm just - please continue if you want to that's - you've fully answered my question there. And thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Great, thank you. Yeah, just the one other thought I was trying to convey was because there are a number of questions about the stakeholder groups and the SIC recommendations one of the important points of it is that on the non-contracted party side the SIC has recommended that the charter documents that they've circulated be temporary or transitional.

And as a result there will be opportunities I think throughout the next year or two depending upon the length of those quote, unquote transitions that the community and work teams will have opportunities to provide further input to the permanent charters for those stakeholder groups.

And so that'll be an important component to keep in mind as well.

Victoria McEvedy: That's a new development is it, Rob, the - is that essentially some quite a major policy shift that no one really - does it derive from a sense that perhaps the consequences of some of these structural changes will be anticipated and so a transitional period is based - I know that was the suggestion of the commercial cycle of this group.

I mean, that's now moving over to the contracted side is the way forward as a policy issue?

Robert Hoggarth: Yeah, I mean, I think, you know, this is ICANN so nothing is ever permanent right? There's, you know, this concept of continual review of ICANN structures and that period is currently every three years.

Of course the irony is that this GNSO improvements review process is taking nearly four and still has probably another year of implementation. But there's that sense that things are constantly subject to review, comment and opinion. And I think we're seeing that in the context of the stakeholder group formation.

I mean, this is a completely new structure to ICANN. And I think board members as well as various community members, constituency groups and the rest are struggling with what this looks like over the long term.

And in trying to I think finally forge a compromise or closure on this step of the process the structural improvements committee said in Sydney that they weren't comfortable, you know, in, you know, in very short order of completely changing the game plan and making that permanent.

And so their sense particularly on the non-contract party side was to accept the recommendations of the CSG, as you know, to look at it from a transitional perspective. And then I think they saw as they were trying to grow the NCSG side of the house that it was also important there to have a transition.

And I think that, you know, that's somewhat lost in the current debate but that was clearly their intent that they expressed in many of the meetings in Sydney.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Robert. Any other questions for Robert? I think Robert...

Claudio Digangi: Olga, this is (Claudio), I joined the call a little late, sorry about that.

Olga Cavalli: Hi, (Claudio), how are you?

Claudio Digangi: Hi.

Olga Cavalli: I would like to really stress something that Robert said that the discussions and the comments made to this document could have some interesting elements (unintelligible) for discussions for our team because we - apart from the process as it's going on of a new GNSO and the restructuring we have to focus on some guidelines for the long-term.

And I wonder if - I would volunteer with someone else, not surely to finishing by this next weeks because I'm traveling, but I would like to review all this comments and try to find this (fit) for discussions. And maybe perhaps Julie we could do that together?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Olga, I'd be happy to.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Robert Hoggarth: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Another thing to keep in mind too and maybe Rob can give us an estimate, staff and I think he said it's himself - is going to prepare a summary and analysis of the comments that will probably facilitate that effort. That doesn't mean that there's still not value in looking at the comments directly. That way we can keep Rob honest, right?

But, Rob, can you give us an estimate of when the summary and analysis might be done?

Robert Hoggarth: I am - it is my top priority today because board members have said, we see that it's closing and that we have a meeting in a week. And so they wanted to have that - the benefit of that for the community and for their own deliberations as soon as possible. So that's the first thing on my agenda when I hang up from this call.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Robert Hoggarth: I don't know how many comments came in last night but there were about 40. A typical ICANN proceeding has about five so it'll take me most of the day and probably into the weekend to produce a final document. But I hope by early next week you guys from my work team perspective will certainly have something.

The other thing I'd just like to quickly note - and this was an email that was circulated overnight by Bruce Tonkin, a member of the board. He did send around the...

Olga Cavalli: (Unintelligible).

Robert Hoggarth: ...final agenda of the ICANN board. And on that agenda are stakeholder group charters, board seats 13 and 14, new constituencies and changes to bylaws. What's not clear is what the precise action if any the board is going to take on those. They could be informational discussions, they could choose to move forward with an actual decision.

We'll all know that better, you know, at the end of next week.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Rob. So I would like to propose the following, Rob, if you could share with us the results of this board meeting in our next conference call in two weeks. And then if you have this document available for us are we able to review it? I think so, right?

Robert Hoggarth: Certainly.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Robert Hoggarth: I mean the summary analysis of the comments is always the last document that's posted in a forum. You know, typically the forum closes, no more comments are submitted, and then the summary and analysis document is produced so you've got it all tied up in a package.

But I'll also forward that document to Julie for circulation to this team so that you guys have it directly and don't have to cruise the ICANN Web site for it.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you and...

Chuck Gomes: And we'll have that next week right Rob?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes, again depending upon how much time I - my family gives me this weekend. But yes I will be getting that all together as quickly as I can.

Olga Cavalli: You have a tough work to do. And the board meeting will be at the end of July - 31, 31st right?

Robert Hoggarth: It's scheduled for 30 July.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Robert Hoggarth: I'm not sure exactly what time (UTC) it'll be.

Olga Cavalli: So maybe in our next conference call we could have some idea of what the content of the document and some feedback from the board maybe? And then we could see if it's worth to go through every comment and then perhaps enhance the document with more details that you prepare or it's just okay with your document. Maybe in two weeks we could check that.

Robert Hoggarth: Yeah, I mean right now - I'm sorry, yeah, right now my concept is and what I try to do with the summary documents is group the comments. This is a unique forum in that the board was asking for comments on four stakeholder group charters. Many of the comments that it saw the other day are focused on the NCSG.

And as I indicated earlier I didn't see a lot of comments specifically the suggested elements. But I'll - if there are comments on that I will have a separate section and that's what this team may find most valuable.

I just caution you, Olga, that there may not be a lot unless they all came in in the last 24 hours or so about the elements. I just didn't see a lot of comments on them.

Olga Cavalli: (Unintelligible) saw all the list of the comments. I didn't go through them because I was kind of scared of the amount of comments that were there so I had no time. So let's do that if the team is okay with this idea. Let's review the status of these comments and summary that Rob is going to prepare in our next conference call.

Victoria McEvedy: Can I ask a question?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, who's that?

Victoria McEvedy: Sorry, it's Victoria. This is a question asked on the list. And just so we finish this list and move on I just wanted to ask Rob just very quickly, you know, and it's just for my understanding because I still don't have a firm idea of how these institutional structures work. But I sort of asked the question to Julie, I think in the group on the list.

Rob, I'm just wondering if you can - and this - I'm afraid because I'm a lawyer that I like to see the checks and balances on the system and just understand

how things fit together. And I asked on the list, you know, how - what governs staff - I'm just - I'm interested in neutrality, it's not a personal question to either of you, but I'm interested in the governance of staff in terms of neutrality of document preparation which I know that you do so that can see the neutrality of the face of these things.

But I'm just wondering is there a code of practice or other document to refer to in terms of regulation of the staff? Because there's a lot of discretionary behavior obviously findings and conversations and what have you and then, you know, compilation of information there's a lot of influence. And I'm just wondering how that works - how that's guided and governed in the ICANN structure on a formal level.

Robert Hoggarth: That's an excellent question. The short answer to that is there isn't one at the moment. The little bit longer answer to that is literally in Sydney at the recommendations of I think it was the president's strategy committee one of the resolutions adopted by the board as part of the institutional confidence effort was that the CEO has been directed to develop a code of conduct for the staff.

I can't refer to a specific document that I'm - and I'm not aware of one. And the question you raise I think is one that's come up in the context of not just policy development but implementation of policy, you know, all the discussions about new gTLDs and other significant actions that have taken place in the past.

You know, all I can do is a rather weak sort of assurance that certainly from a policy chain perspective my observations have been that in all the work that we do we try to be evenhanded and look at things in as broad a perspective as possible. This is ICANN and with so many different interests it's just not productive to try to think, you know, about any particular course of action but really trying to look at things as broadly as possible.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah because it's very interesting...

Robert Hoggarth: I don't know if that's helpful but...

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, that's helpful...

((Crosstalk))

Robert Hoggarth: That's how it is right now.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, that's helpful. When I've...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: ...yeah, you sent (unintelligible). I mean the obvious issue obviously is that the contractor parties effectively pay salaries in a sense. So, you know, there's an inherent issue there I would have thought that might have hit structural, you know, some sort of governance valve or something. But, anyway you've answered my question. Thanks Rob.

Robert Hoggarth: Sure. And what I've been told since the first day I started at ICANN is it's the registrants of domain names that pay the salaries of ICANN. But I understand your point.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, that's true. It's true, Rob. You're totally right. So let's do the following, let's review the document that Rob will prepare - the summary and see if we want to go through all the comments or if the document it's enough to have the information for our work. Any comment to that? Do you agree with that?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Okay so that's number one off our agenda. It's done. Rafik, would you like to add something to our exchange of ideas about this document and about the comments? I've heard that you had something sent to the list.

Rafik Dammak: Yeah, just...

Olga Cavalli: You want to add something or we move to the next - is this okay that we review this in two weeks?

Rafik Dammak: Okay in two weeks.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Great.

Chuck Gomes: Olga, we're going to review Rob's document before two weeks...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...right?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, I know. The issue that I'm talking from my perspective. I will have few time in the next - at least in the next week because I will be traveling all the time. So I'm sorry, I spoke for myself. But, yes, we will have the document previous to our next conference call and maybe you have the time to review it. And we can share some ideas. Thank you Chuck for pointing it back to me.

So going to our agenda, number three, I again refer to the subtask work and how it has evolved from our last conference call. We don't have (Effe) in the call I guess, he was traveling to the interior and he wasn't going to be well connected through this day so he apologized some weeks ago.

He's not on the call right? No, okay, Victoria, would you be so kind to tell us your progress in your subtask? I sent you some information. I had no official feedback from my regional (RAR) which is (Latnik) but what I did is I

investigated their bylaws and all the documents that they have available. And I prepared a document and I send it to you, is that okay? You need more information from us? Is that enough to move forward?

Victoria McEvedy: Right. So where we are is, yes, apart from - Rafik has yet to come in with a submission but - and I had asked (Claudio) for more detail though I don't know if that's going to be forthcoming or not. But basically most people have done their homework and we have examined some other models.

I have a draft report. What I planned to do was to now merge all the comments or reorganize that material and submit it back to the subtask at which point we have sort of policy, you know, we need to have sort of - we need to sort abstract the level of discussion and look at some policy issues, you know, and then examine the models that we have before us and their possible applicability and start to work towards recommendation.

So the next step will really be for me to now produce that document.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you very much Victoria. So just share it with us in the last once you have it. Any questions to Victoria?

Claudio Digangi: This is (Claudio). Victoria, I'll get you some more details on that.

Victoria McEvedy: Thank you, that's great. Thanks.

Claudio Digangi: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, (Claudio), thank you Victoria. I think Krista is not on the call. She apologized, she's traveling. And do we have (Tony) on the call - (Tony Harrick)? I don't think so. So I would need to have the three to let them know us about news in the email list.

And Julie, do we have some feedback from the letter that we sent to constituencies about ICANN staff to board and toolkits?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, I've not seen any feedback yet. And I guess, well what we discussed I think on one of the last calls I was on, you know, that was close to Sydney and, you know, we had I think asked that they give feedback in July. So we had a little bit of time, you know, was letting people come back from Sydney.

So I guess what I was wondering is whether or not it's timely yet to send a reminder. And, Chuck, I didn't have a chance to discuss this with you but what would you think about that?

Chuck Gomes: You know, I'm okay with that. I have come to the conclusion that we're not going to get any.

Julie Hedlund: And I have to thank you by the Chuck has sent me a document that I haven't had a chance to review with some ideas for recommendations. And I think that probably jives with what you just said, Chuck, that we may need to move forward in absence of responses.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And that's not all bad in the sense that I think that the 12 items of possible services that staff included in the survey were pretty comprehensive in terms of what we might expect of services that constituencies or stakeholder groups or interest groups might be interested in.

And so I'm fairly comfortable with that. If that hadn't happened I would be much more concerned but that was done the end of last year and summarized and analyzed earlier this year and so it provided a very good base for us to start with and therefore gave Julie and I somewhat of a head start on our work.

And so I think we're - Julie, you and I are ready to, you know, come up with a first cut on some possible recommendations that we can share with the full working team for their feedback.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, Chuck, I think you're right. I think that, you know, we've asked the question, we asked it in the survey, we got responses, we asked it again and we didn't get responses. I think you're right, I think we can go ahead, you know, unless other work team members have some suggestions, with going ahead between the two of us and coming up with some recommendations.

Olga Cavalli: I agree with going ahead and not sending a reminder. What do others think? Are we okay with that? So great. No I totally agree with you, Chuck, maybe you didn't have a response just because of the letter has all the information that's needed. So I think that we have to move forward and thank you for doing that good letter.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah and Olga just to let you know, in the registration constituency I don't know how many times I have both on the list and in meetings brought this up and encouraged feedback and have received nothing any time..

Olga Cavalli: I know, I know.

Chuck Gomes: ...so that's another reason why I'm saying well, okay, people are satisfied.

Olga Cavalli: That's perfect. That's perfect. So I agree and it seems that our working team also agrees in that. So thank you for that. And any other things Julie that you want to tell us about the Subtask 4 apart from this feedback on the letter?

Julie Hedlund: I don't think so. I think Chuck and I...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...will just work together to come up with something for the team.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Julie Hedlund: And Chuck and I will do the first cut at that so we'll work on that and have it...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Julie. Number four, we still have this idea of identifying best practice is - and it came to my mind after doing this work investigation for Victoria about (Latnik) that I could - when I have the time I could bring some best (unintelligible) practices from what I know as I don't work in a constituency but I do work very close to (Latnik) in many meetings in the region.

And I know them very well and they were - the way they - oh my English is lousy today - the way they work with the community and among them. I think that there may be some interesting things that I could suggest from them. So I will do that maybe...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: Sorry, Olga...

Olga Cavalli: Victoria?

Victoria McEvedy: Did you not do that for us as part of our subtask group?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, but I think it's a very long document what I sent you. It's kind of a 4-6 pages, I don't remember. I think it's not easy to read not because it's not easy to read itself but it's long. I should extract some key points. What you think?

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Is that okay?

Victoria McEvedy: I think there's some duplication between...

Olga Cavalli: Okay, okay.

Victoria McEvedy: ...because I think, I mean, you and I had - we had agreed on the list that Julie, you and I would merge all the analysis documents. But I'm just concerned that there might be quite some overlap because in Subtask 2 we're planning to look at all those different models and look at the best in (unintelligible) practices of, you know, that fall within the jurisdiction of Subtask 2 and then work from that.

So I'm just concerned to avoid any duplication really and extra work for anyone.

Olga Cavalli: Great, (unintelligible), you're right. So you're totally right that we had a (unintelligible) task. We want to merge the - some documents and like Krista and the documents prepared by Julie and I was going to contribute to that. So once we have agreed in something I'm glad to help you in that task. Is that okay Julie? We didn't discuss this with you Julie because you were not on the last call or the previous one but that's the idea.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, I did see that as a task. And I must say that I - since I'd only just gotten back on Tuesday I hadn't take any actions.

Olga Cavalli: No you're right, that's okay. Okay.

Julie Hedlund: So I did want to, you know, just follow up on this call. I am happy to take what Krista has done, what I have done and what Victoria has done and try to see if I can put together a document and also as Victoria has pointed out there I think are definitely some duplications. We'll try to merge while I can without losing the, you know, specific details that are so helpful.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you very much Julie. And sorry if I duplicate I just wanted to see the momentum of the ideas that we have discussed and we want to do. Any comments? Okay.

Number 5, this came to my mind a few days ago when I was going through our wiki that we seem to be organized about Task 1. We should start maybe exchanging some ideas about Task 2. And I must confess I couldn't find them in the wiki but maybe it's because of my lack of time and I tried to find it there.

So please, Julie, at least for me and for all the working team but I would like to review the Task 2 and see if we can start exchanging some ideas in how to organize this next step of our work maybe for the near future but I would like to review it again. Would you be so kind of point to me where in the wiki is that because I couldn't find it.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. It is in the wiki but actually where it is it's listed in our charter.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: The reason you're not seeing it elsewhere is because we developed a work plan around Task 1 but we haven't...

Olga Cavalli: I know.

Julie Hedlund: ...developed a work plan for Task 2. So Task 2 is simply listed - this is the developing outreach task. And I don't have it right in front of me. But what I will do is add that language to the wiki to the main page, you know, as I post the summary and action items from this call.

And then I think as we develop ideas and exchange ideas on Task 2 then probably the next step would be to develop a work plan similar to that which

we've done with Task 1. And then that would become a separate document on a separate wiki page linked off of the wiki.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Julie. I'm not saying that we are doing all this in the next two weeks but I just wanted to have that in mind and see if we started to exchange some ideas and how to move forward. That was the intention. So if you can do that for us I would really appreciate that very much.

Chuck Gomes: It would be helpful on the wiki if the major tasks that we've been given in this work team were pulled out of the charter and shown specifically. I mean, I'm just talking about a paragraph or a little more so that we keep those in front of us.

Julie Hedlund: That's a great idea.

Olga Cavalli: That's a great idea.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. I'll be happy to do that in fact I can have those listed right at the top and then, you know, as I was going to pull out the Task 2 anyway then I'll list Task 1 in the subtasks just very briefly.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Julie, that would be very helpful. Any comments? Okay I think we have reached the end of our call if we don't have any other comments or business.

Chuck Gomes: I thought we were going to talk about Victoria's issues?

Victoria McEvedy: Oh no I did.

Chuck Gomes: Oh you...

Olga Cavalli: We did at the beginning I think.

Chuck Gomes: Oh did we cover all those at the beginning? Okay I wasn't sure we did.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: But I would like to share a comment in that regard because I was thinking a lot of what Victoria shared. And what I wanted to point out is is that - and I think Rob kind of hit on this in his comments is is that if there are things going on that we don't think are good practices it's in our purview to make recommendations that those not be continued or that they be changed whether it be membership or anything else.

Ultimately it won't be our decision but it certainly is our decision as a group. If we can come to agreement on some things for example with regard to membership and constituencies or stakeholder groups and participation that we think are valid practices going forward it's in our purview to make those recommendations to the fully GNSO.

So I just wanted to comment on that that that's exactly - and I think that ties in directly to what we're trying to do with the regard to the best practices and the worst practices and so forth.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, I would agree...

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much.

Victoria McEvedy: I would agree that...

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Chuck.

Victoria McEvedy: I would agree with that Chuck.

Olga Cavalli: Victoria, sorry I interrupted you.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, sorry. Yes, Chuck, I think that's a very good point because at the end of the day, you know, I think one of the things that may be on the table for us to discuss later and it certainly occurred to me earlier as well and I'm pleased that you said it was that it may well be that given the change of structure and the lack of, you know, the lack of regulation of interested parties level in the contracted side it may well be that we make some of our - we make a suggestions and it would be no more than that I guess.

But some of our minimums might be relevant at the stakeholder group level.

Chuck Gomes: Yes and in fact that's I think exactly what our task is is, you know, to evaluate the things which is what we're doing and then see if we can come to a reasonable consensus in terms of some recommendations that we would support and then we'll put those forward.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Great. I think it's a very important point, Chuck. And we should keep that in mind along our work in this working team. So Victoria is okay? You want to add something?

Victoria McEvedy: No, I'm good thank you.

Chuck Gomes: And Olga just one general comment from me the next month or so I will not be quite as active as I usually am. I won't disappear but I'm going to have some limited connectivity and hopefully doing some relaxing too.

Olga Cavalli: Oh that's good.

Chuck Gomes: I just wanted to warn you that if you see a little less activity on my part that's why.

Olga Cavalli: I'm glad to know that you're relaxing and that's okay Chuck. Thank you for telling us. I will be traveling the next - all the next week and so maybe I'm a little bit silent because I will be connected but busy with other stuff. So thank you all for your participation. Do we have any other comments?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, yeah, just - I have - this is Julie. I just had one more thing I wanted to add, it's not really...

Olga Cavalli: Yes, let's...

Julie Hedlund: ...it's just an announcement. Just so that you all know as you have known I've been consulting with ICANN since January. As of this - as of Wednesday I have been hired as a full time staff member for ICANN. I will be continuing to support this and other teams, you know, doing GNSO policy work but I also know have taken on a dual role. I am Director for SAC Support so I'll be working with Steve Crocker on the security and stability advisory committee and doing work to support that group.

So I'm very pleased to be joining the ICANN fold so to speak. And rest assured nothing will change as far as my support for this group. And I'll send a message to the team but I now will have an ICANN - I now have an ICANN email address from which you can contact me so I'll send that around on the list.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Chuck Gomes: And that'll be changed on the list as well I assume.

Olga Cavalli: Congratulations.

Julie Hedlund: Yes actually I'm -- Glen is taking that and now that I think about it I probably shouldn't send the email to the list because, you know, that information is usually redacted. But anything you send to the list will go to me. And I will

send around individually to you as opposed to the list my new email address so that you'll have it.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you. Congratulations, Julie, for...

Julie Hedlund: Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: And thank you for sharing this information to us. I think you have a very interesting challenge. I think SAC is a very interesting group to work in maybe because I'm a technician in my mind and I find what they do very interesting also.

And so congratulations really, I'm glad to know that.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: And any other comments?

Chuck Gomes: I would just ditto that.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks very much.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Any other comments from the working team? Okay thank you very much for joining with us. Let's keep in touch during this two-weeks - Julie you're going to send us some minutes, right?

Julie Hedlund: Yes and I will...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: And some action points?

Julie Hedlund: ...as well as the action items and I should be able to get those out today and also up on the wiki.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much.

Julie Hedlund: And as well as preparing some documents prior to the next call.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. Have a nice weekend all of you.

Rafik Dammak: Bye, bye.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Olga.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Bye.

Victoria McEvedy: Bye, bye.

Julie Hedlund: Bye.

END