

**GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work
Team 11 September 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 **11 September 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-20090911.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/index.html#sep>

Participants present:

Olga Cavalli - work team chair – NCA
Chuck Gomes – Registries
Victoria McEvedy - IPC
Claudio Digangi - IPC
Tony Harris - ISP
Krista Papac – Registrar c.
SS Kshatriya - Individual

ICANN Staff

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat
Julie Hedlund – Policy Staff

Apologies

Rafik Dammak - NCUC

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

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much operator. Good morning, good evening everyone. Sorry for my voice, I have a cold. I hope you can understand what I say. (Lynn), would you be so kind to make a role call.

Glen: Certainly, Olga. On the line we have Olga Cavalli, Chuck Gomes

((Crosstalk))

Glen Claudio Digangi, Krista Papac, Tony Harris is busy calling in again, and Victoria McEvedy

Operator Excuse me, SS now joins.

Tony Harris: Hello. Do I still have an echo?

Man: Yeah, probably a little bit.

Tony Harris: Are you hearing an echo when I talk?

Man: Yes, but it's...

Tony Harris: Okay. This 0800 is no good. I'll call back on the regular phone.

Glen: Would you like us to call out to you, Tony ?

And then for staff ...

((Crosstalk))

...we have Julie Hedlund and Glen de Saint Gery myself.

((Crosstalk))

Glen ...has joined the call too.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you for joining us today. Thank you for the active participation in the email list. I'm impressed of how many documents have come in with comments that with additions from different people from different sub-task leaders and sub-task participants and others that are not participating. I'm really impressed.

It took me some time yesterday night and this morning to review all of the documents with all the comments, and I think we have a very interesting

group of documents. We still have to work on them, but I think we have done a very good job, and I want to commend all of you for this active participation.

Tony Harris: Hello.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, hello. Who's there?

Tony Harris: Yeah, I'm back. It's Tony Harris. Do I have an echo now.

Olga Cavalli: I don't hear the echo.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: Because I tried the 0800 number and that's no good, and now I'm on a paid call, I'm paying for it myself. Are you still getting an echo?

Olga Cavalli: I hear you perfectly.

Tony Harris: Okay. Thank you.

Glen: Tony, would it help if we called out to you so that you didn't have to pay for the call?

Tony Harris: Let's leave it now so we can get on with it.

Glen: Okay.

Tony Harris: Thanks Glen for the offer.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Tony for joining again.

Before going into details about the exchange document. Is (Julia) on the line or (Robert)? Yes, (Julia)'s there, right?

Julie (Julia) is here. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Something that I have forgotten to include in our agenda for the last call, just because we were really focused on our recommendation draft documents, was do we have any new support board activities or something that you want to share with us. Because something that we agreed to have at the beginning of our calls, and I have really forgot to include. Maybe if there is something to share with us or we just move forward to other things.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, Olga, this is (Julie. I don't have anything new to add, not that I'm aware of in any case.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, thank you very much. Okay, we received documents from (SS) with some included comments from I think (Chuck), myself and some others. Then we received documents from (Victoria), and she received several comments from many of us. Then we received a document sent by (Christa), and we still have the document sent by (Julia) about sub-task 1.4.

So I have been reviewing all of the documents, and I would like to go from one sub-task to the other one and see how quickly we organize our job. I think that there is a lot of value in the comments, and after reviewing all of them, I think that it seems a lot of different things, but in a moment I think that they are very similar comments to the same general idea. So I would like to share with you some ideas of how to move forward and how to organize all of this really very interesting comments and edits that all the documents have received.

First, (SS), we have you on the line, right?

(SS): Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: (SS), you received some comments from especially (Chuck) and myself? Do you think that...

(SS): Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: ...and I am not sure, because there were so many documents going on in the list, that maybe I lost if there is a new version of the document. Maybe I didn't see it. When is the last version of the document that you sent?

((Crosstalk))

(SS): It was sent on probably on Wednesday evening, well early in the evening I sent to (Lynn), (unintelligible), I mean at least (unintelligible), if not before

Olga Cavalli: Okay (Chuck), you made some interesting comments to (SS) documents. I'm not sure if he sent a new version of it with your comments or if we could talk about these edit that you suggested and maybe (SS) could incorporate into them. And perhaps, (SS) if you already incorporated them, just please apologize me, maybe...

((Crosstalk))

(SS): Yes, no, no, just let me brief you about sub-draft two.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(SS): To start with on draft one, I received an important (unintelligible). They were mostly on the (unintelligible) material. And I think (unintelligible) I have probably incorporated and there are some relatively small changes. Then (unintelligible) from (Victoria) on recommend that I put (unintelligible) on draft two. On draft two there have been some comments. I've have gone through (search) comments. I've gone through, not your comments, but only these I'll touch, so I'll start on these.

But Olga says in one of the (unintelligible), Tony and (Chuck). I mean because they are experienced, I mean (unintelligible) persons. So these comments are really well. I will defer here because they belong to certain constituencies and constituencies have their individual interests. So, there can be (unintelligible) any comment comes from interested parties, they have to view (unintelligible), so it's not really (unintelligible), I mean argument.

There's one part, what Olga has commented. Well I'll come to (Chuck)'s comments. (Chuck) did give a good comment, which is on (Victoria)'s rather input, and when (Victoria) talks, probably, she also indicated that she'll be talking.

Actually, I had gone through with (Victoria) comments (unintelligible) a lot of background material, comments, then this argument she gives. Well I appreciate that she is a (unintelligible) and (unintelligible), that you have to base your opinion with certain solid material which is acceptable.

So, I've gone through and most of the comments I found that they had weight, so I included them into my draft too. Now what I plan to check the first. Well being the friend, having the friend users all the time, but let us look here, because we are now going to find by and put into a single document which will not have a lot of background and a lot of arguments. So, this committee is helping actually working for council. And in this committee, there are some council members so they have a higher interest regarding this, because the purpose is to (GNSO) improvement.

So, if we continue to maintain the status quo, this is not improvement and this type of (unintelligible) will not come all the time. So, first, whatever (Victoria) says, let us believe it and then wait to see if something's really not working. Otherwise, I mean, there won't be an exchange.

So, with this I think actually so I'll incorporate whatever anybody says. But, let us return discussing this. I won't be staying for the full time, but maybe even later on, can somebody, maybe (Victoria), (Chuck) and one more person can join, and give a final thing and I'll incorporate it.

Chuck Gomes: Olga, can I make a suggestion?

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: A process suggestion.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I don't know if others are like me, but I don't have time to be a part of every sub-task group, because it takes too much time...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...and I have lots of other responsibilities, including my regular job. So it would be really helpful if each sub-task group would work together to come up with their proposed document and then present it to the full work team for discussion. I realized after I got involved, I kind of was assuming on all of these that each sub-task group in total was putting this forward and I don't think that was the case in several cases.

So what I would suggest is the sub-task groups work through their differences and where they can reach consensus, make sure that's included in the document. In cases where they don't make that clear and slight minority opinions, or whatever. And then once they have done that process, bring it back to the full work team for consideration.

I spent an awful lot of time in the last two weeks going through individual documents that I'm now learning really didn't have the agreement of the full

sub-task team. And, you know, if I continue to do that, I'm not going to sleep. So, that would be my suggestion for going forward and then once the sub-task team - and this is the working group model that we've been using in the (GNSO) on lots of things, as that has been evolving. So, it's consistent with some of the recommendations to follow the (GNSO) working group model.

I don't have any problem if anyone has a specific question regarding a sub-task document that I'm not a team member of, answering questions. But I don't have the time to keep going through these and participate in every sub-task team. So I would rather have a fairly complete document where all sub-task members have participated before I jump into it and comment.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, (Chuck).

((Crosstalk))

(SS): Olga, I'd like to say...

Olga Cavalli: Yes, go ahead.

(SS): ...possibility on this.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, (SS) I didn't hear that.

(SS): Hello. On (Chuck)'s suggestion, I'd like to comment that this sub-task leader of sub-task one. Now (unintelligible) was that I used to prepare a document and circulate to sub-task team, three persons, I am of course the fourth person there. So, I'll circulate to all three and give them a week's time and if any comment has come, I'll incorporate that.

Now it is only when we started hurrying to get on Olga's suggestions, I started posting to the (W feed). So that way, as far as the sub-task, one is

there. It can be taken, but all of the sub-task teams has worked on that. And there is no difference of opinion, so let's hope for my side it can be taken.

Chuck Gomes: So (SS), can I clarify? So what you're saying is, all the members of your sub-task team supported what you put forward?

(SS): Yeah, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And I don't mean just didn't comment, you know, but they all supported it and that's good to know. Okay? So, I appreciate that.

Olga Cavalli: (Chuck), if I may, I think you made a very good point. But let me tell you that in our working team, we are eight active participants and we have four sub-task working teams. So, your suggestion is very good, but in a moment, we have four documents from four sub-teams and then we will have to review.

What I think from your suggestion, I think it's good and perhaps once the sub-task leaders prepare the draft document, already reviewed by the sub-task team, they could also add comments if they received already some feedback from other members of the working team. So we don't repeat our work. I don't know if you understood what I mean.

Chuck Gomes: That's okay, Olga, but my point is that in some cases I'm getting the distinct impression that there was not agreement on the sub-task team and maybe I'm wrong on that...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Can I just - I'm sorry, I'm sorry, (Chuck), I just have to jump in on this. Because I think I addressed this on the list last night. And you know we all made the choice last week of how to proceed in incorporating comments and whether to have a call before the next draft went around. So, you know there is no sleight of hand here.

And while there were new comments come in on the last draft, because I think it's my draft that you're referring to. You know, I did make it quite clear to everyone that we had the choice and we chose to have another draft incorporating written comments, knowing that we would have to make time to reach consensus.

So, I'm slightly reacting to your suggestion that something untoward has occurred. Because it was a deliberate choice made by everyone. You know, there is not necessarily an ideal way to approach these things and we are operating under time pressure, which impacts the choice.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Well we created our own time pressure and I think we've discovered that that didn't work. All I'd like to know when I see these documents, is who, you know, is it supported by the full sub-task team. If there is disagreement, just point that out. It would make it a lot helpful. I don't have time to go through every iteration of these things for all sub-task teams.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I agree and I had already spent hours last night and this morning reading all the documents and all the edits. So, I think that (Chuck)'s idea is very good. Perhaps what we could do on this, this is one suggestion that I'm proposing to you, is each sub-task leader could prepare a draft including all the feedback that they received.

And if there is no agreement from any of the members of the sub working team, just state it in the document. And if there is agreement also state it. And if there is some other feedback already included from other members of the working team, just list it at the beginning, so we know what we have to read and what we don't have to read. Is something like that feasible this way, or what do others think?

Chuck Gomes: Olga, another practical suggestion would be if people would use the comment function, instead of inserting comments in the document itself...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...it'll make it a lot easier to clean up the document at the end.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Krista Papac: (Chuck), this is (Christa), can I just ask a question? So, meaning rather than using track changes and actually typing into the document...

Chuck Gomes: Track changes works fine for a proposed edit, but not for comments.

Krista Papac: And then use insert...

((Crosstalk))

Krista Papac: ...for comments. Okay, I got it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, when you accept the track changes, it'll accept the comments and you don't want that to happen, because those are on the side. So if you insert a comment, it'll be off to the side or at the bottom depending on which format you're using. It's a lot easier to clean up the document at the end and it will save us all some time.

Krista Papac: Yeah, that makes sense. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: That's a very good suggestion, using the comments function. And so as a practical suggestion, let's say that in a week all the sub-task team leaders could prepare a new draft version with incorporated comments and try to find consensus about their own sub-working team. Is that a good idea?

Victoria McEvedy: I would like to speak to this from my perspective, in relation to sub-task 1.2. I mean because the issues are so contentious, I've spent a lot of time on this and (sought out) the arguments and included everybody's comments until the last round. Now I don't want to spend another week, you know, really amending something so large and I'm not really prepared to necessarily put in redline edits to commentary. However, so I just want to put a marker down that I think we need to have some room to move there.

Obviously, what we are going to be focusing on here, is the actual wording of the recommendations. And in relation to sub-task 1.2, I think we're going to have to have a sub-task group meeting, a telephone meeting. Maybe more than one, focusing on the language of the recommendations.

Chuck Gomes: That makes a lot of sense to me, (Victoria).

Olga Cavalli: Okay, yeah and we already talked about that in our last call. Let's arrange that in between the sub-task group, (Victoria). I am not available next week, but we can do this another week or if you want just go ahead without me and then I can read or hear the MP3 recording. But we can set up this conference call, maybe during this week we can arrange it for the other week or next week.

Chuck Gomes: And Olga, I think that that illustrates the sub-task teams are going to need more than a week to discuss. And that makes a lot of sense with all the discussion that's gone on. I think probably they're going to need two or three weeks, but I'll let others speak up on that.

Olga Cavalli: Well no, my idea about one week, I think it's a short time. It was to just to - sorry, was to just prepare clean documents, draft...

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay.

Olga Cavalli: ...document to start.

Chuck Gomes: Got it.

Olga Cavalli: I don't know if I'm clear.

Chuck Gomes: I think you are now, I understand. I thought you wanted them to...

((Cross talk))

Olga Cavalli: No, no, no, no.

Chuck Gomes: ...come to a consensus in a week and...

Olga Cavalli: No, it's too soon, maybe in one week we can have four documents with some edits already incorporated as clean draft documents from each sub-task leader. And then each sub-task team may review and try to achieve consensus. And then we can agree in doing some conference call, (Victoria), if you want. We already did one and I think it was very useful. And you have received many comments to your document, which I think is a very good document.

And I would like to make a comment to (SS) comments he said before, about one thing that I said that it was good that (Chuck) and Tony commented and their opinions. I think there is value in experience and also I think there is value in division of people like (SS) and myself, that we don't belong to a constituency and we talk as individuals.

And I think that we have to find the balance. I think there is value in experience, because they know how the constituency's dynamic works. And you cannot change that from one day to the other one.

So if you really want to make changes, you have to make suggestions. But also you have to respect the structure of the groups of the working teams, is what are people accustomed to do. Because that is not soon changeable. So this is why I said that the value of (Chuck) and Tony 's comments is there.

Victoria McEvedy: Can I address...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Victoria McEvedy: ...Olga, because I also wanted to comment on that. I have to say I thought your comments - I was disturbed by your comments as well. I think that, you know, we are in a working group, if the commentators respective of equal weight and I think we need to approach it that way.

Obviously, people are informed by their different experiences, but their experiences are different and may lead to different conclusions. And I don't think it's helpful to suggest that some people's opinions are more weighty, important, informed and what have you that particular.

You know I just think, it's not a big deal, but I don't think it's helpful to suggest that some of the members of this working groups' views necessarily are preferable to others. And we're all equal in a working group structure. And that's the basis of the whole, you know, all the work that's being done around, you know, how working groups should operate.

Man: Did anyone suggest that? I missed it if they did.

Man: Yeah, I missed it too, I didn't hear anybody suggesting anything to that effect.

Olga Cavalli: No, it's just only a comment I made that I found-I said thank (Chuck) and Tony for your comments, because you have a lot of experience working in constituencies.

And my point is, and I have been saying this I think in every of our conference calls, I think we all bring value to this working team and I'm totally convinced about that. My point is that constituencies exist, now they will take hold of groups or interest groups and they have their own groups and dynamics and politics and that won't change.

So hearing the experience and trying to incorporate new ideas and that balance will bring really value to our work and our proposal. If we don't include the visions from the already existing constituencies, then we will have a problem. Because the document will be just rejected. And this is why I have insisted so much to have feedback and participation from the business constituency, from the noncommercial user's constituency and this is my point.

I'm not making specific differentiation about, (Victoria), (Chuck), (SS) or myself. I think we all bring value, but I think it's relevant to have feedback from already existing constituencies. Because if we are going to make a document, which is totally different from the reality of what is happening now, then we will bring something which is not feasible. I don't know if you think I am totally wrong or what you think about this. This was my comment, I apologize if it was misunderstood. This is why I commented in this way.

Man: Olga, if I can speak...

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Man: ...I understand your comment perfectly and I think you're quite right. And I think I heard, I think (SS) say something about people from constituencies trying to maintain the status quo. I may have misinterpreted. I think that's a

little adventuresome to make such a statement. We do have some concerns because we have to continue operating the constituencies.

You know, it's not just like everything is decided up in the air, we turn everything around 180 degrees and rush around doing things like mad. We have day jobs, all of us and constituencies operate on a very slim time margin and effort. That's the only point I was trying to make.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. (Victoria), did I answer your concern? And my apologies again, it was not my intention make a specific differentiation in between the different participants of this working team. I think that we have to consider what has been done and because these groups will exist, maybe with another name. Maybe with another frame for participation, but the groups will remain. And their way of working somehow will remain. So we cannot differentiate that much our recommendations from that reality.

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: I mean look, I think my views are very clear because I see that all in the background. But I don't think we're really proposing - I don't think - my own view is that nothing particularly dramatic has really being proposed. And I think we all ought to try and put aside the interests, you know, we ought to be participating as individuals, you know, with the experience that we have informed by it. But, you know, conscious of the public trust function.

We are trying to improve the (GNSO). It's been criticized by, you know, some of these basics do need improvement and if we can just all of us, I think avoid sort of kneejerk reactions and try to focus on specifics. You know, what would really be hugely of benefit and what wouldn't. You know, and rather than perhaps taking policy positions, I just think we'll probably make some real progress. But thanks Olga for clarifying. I really appreciate it.

Tony Harris: Olga, can I get in queue and speak?

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

(Claudio): Can I get in the queue too, Olga, this is (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Okay, Tony was first?

Tony Harris: Yeah, I'd just like to respond to what's just been said...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Okay, go ahead Tony .

Tony Harris: ...I think it's a very good proposition, (Victoria). My proposition would be, rather than making this report sound like, I think you have all seen movies where internal affairs goes into the police department and makes everybody very unhappy.

Perhaps we could attempt to give the report a constructive, let's say approach, which proposes some solutions for improvements, without, what in my probably mistaken opinion, I mean it's a report that sort of says, "This is a disaster" and, you know, I don't think it is a disaster. I think it needs to be improved. But the way we're saying this is telling everybody, "Look what's been going on. This is terrible." And I don't think that's the situation at all. I think our improvements can be suggested in a constructive manner without making it look as if, you know, this has been in the dark ages for the last eleven years.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Tony . (Claudio)?

(Claudio): Yeah. I had just a couple of comments. One was just a process question. I know when there is like a formal (PDP) launched in the (GNSO) at certain points, the work will go out for constituency comment. And I was wondering at

some point, maybe not when it's within our work team, but maybe when it gets up to the next level, whether or not that was going to happen with these reports? I was just trying to understand the process of how this was eventually going to get to the council.

Olga Cavalli: (Chuck), would you help me...

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: ...with that question which is very good from (Claudio)?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, absolutely. This work team - keep in mind these are all of the (GNSO) improvement teams right now are implementation work teams, tasked with developing implementation plans for (GNSO) improvement recommendations made by the board governance committee and approved by the board.

So, this team will come up with a set of recommendations and they will go to the operation steering committee for first review. And that review then, they will either pass it on to the council. Or maybe come back with some questions are asked for some clarification or whatever. Once the (OSC) feels like there is a set of recommendations that can be forwarded on, it will go to the full council for a council review and at that point, (Claudio), it would be asked that there be full constituency involvement on those recommendations. And that's what the council always does before the council takes any vote on approving it.

Once the council then has approved a set of recommendations, they will go to the board for approval, in terms of implementation. And one of the goals, like Olga said very well earlier, was to get as much involvement from the different constituencies, interest groups and community as possible at the working team level, so that when we get to the end, the various concerns have been grappled with and some decisions made that should make approval at the end much more easier. Did that make sense?

(Claudio): Yes, it does. Thank you, that was very helpful.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, (Chuck).

(Claudio): And then just a few comments on just what was said recently, and I think if I understood (Victoria) correctly, I think she said that she didn't think that these were really major, substantial recommendations that we're putting forward. And I just wanted to comment that I think they are. I think they really go to the heart really of how different groups operate and potentially represent the stakeholder groups that they were formed to represent.

Especially, I think, when you're dealing with issues of membership and other issues dealing with representation, I think it has an extremely large impact on a group's ability to represent its particular stakeholder group. So I do think that what we're putting forward here is our very substantial recommendation.

And I also agreed with Tony's comment, that I think whatever recommendations we put forward, I don't think we need to do an expose, basically sort of critiquing the constituencies or the stakeholder groups. I just don't think it's necessary for basically putting forward the recommendations.

I mean we want to justify why we are saying a particular thing, but I think that could be done more from giving affirmative reasons for why the recommendation makes sense, and sort of just keep it affirmative rather than saying, "Well, you know, this constituency has this problem and we're looking to fix that problem by putting forward this recommendation." So, I just wanted to throw that out there.

Chuck Gomes: Olga, can I get in the queue.

Olga Cavalli: Sure Chuck, go ahead please.

Chuck Gomes: And I think we have a plan for dealing with these differences of opinion on this. The sub-testings are going to go back and work through their documents until they reach a point where they want to pass it on to the full working team. And then the full working team will grapple with some of the issues where there is not agreement, as well.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, (Chuck). Thank you, (Claudio). I also agree that we have to be constructive. I think that if some of us have found maybe problems in the dynamics of contingencies or working groups, could make proposals from the positive side, trying to make a change, and we should focus on constructive proposals.

And hearing the process that we have to go through with (unintelligible) and so on and then to the constituencies, we have to be constructive, and if not our document will be not approved or not considered. So, any other comments?

Victoria McEvedy: Olga, I'd like to make a short comment.

Olga Cavalli: Sure, Victoria, go ahead.

Victoria McEvedy: Under my views, you know, I have different views, and it is the tone of my report that people are talking about. So, I mean I hate to say, but I think the fact there has been so much resistance, that there is a strong preference to maintain the status quo, and I think to some extent we have to be honest and resistance to accept the fact that there is a problem.

I have certainly raised these issues in my own constituency and nothing has happened. So, you know, I think while it is all very well to put things in construction, I perfectly agree, you know, once we end up with recommendations we can reflect the level of support that there is exception on the level of unity.

The reasons for the support, the reasons for the dissent and what have you, in the normal way, but you know, we've met enormous resistance in this working group to accept that there is a problem, and that's with really basic things like publishing decisions of committees or the fact of committees. I mean, very, very, very basic stuff. I didn't have a vote in my constituency, which I think is astonishing.

I mean, there are problems, so I, you know, I apologize if people think it's too critical. I perfectly accept and take that onboard, but I do think that we, you know, that it's necessary, there's a resistance to accept that there is an issue. Otherwise, these things would have been approved voluntarily a long time ago, and we certainly wouldn't be fighting every step of the way now.

Tony Harris: Can I respond to that, Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Sure Tony , go ahead.

Tony Harris: Thanks Victoria for your comment and understanding. As to probably why this was not addressed before, I think it could be due to the fact that we have had rather a lot to do with first of all the development of the new (GTLD PDP), which was three years of hard work. And all the running around we have had to do with the form of the (GNSO), which is still going on. And that has stretched the resources of time and manpower in all of our constituencies to quite an interesting limit. So I think that is probably the reply to the last point you made.

Victoria McEvedy: Thanks, Tony .

(Claudio): This is (Claudio). Could I make a comment?

Olga Cavalli: Sure (Claudio), go ahead.

(Claudio): I wanted to address something that (Victoria) said. Because about voting constituency, because I know it's something that is a concern of hers and she has faced it a couple of times on the (unintelligible) and within this group. And I just wanted to share my views on it to give others, I think some context or perspective to her claim that it's astonishing that she doesn't have a vote in the (ITC).

I believe the (ITC) was the only constituency historically to allow (visual) members participate, and currently they participate as observers. And the idea behind that I think was to encourage participation, allow people to join the constituency, contribute, have a voice to what the constituency does, and so that's the rationale there. And it could be spun to say, "Well it's somehow a discouraging participation." But that was the idea there, to basically allow larger group participants to join and get involved.

And so the (ITC) settled on this particular voting structure to insure that basically it was still representing the particular stakeholder group that it decided to represent. And I think that is something that is, as I commented on the list, I think you see that in different origins of ICANN where you have nonvoting members. And so I just wanted to just mention that as my views on the issue.

Chuck Gomes: Olga, if I can jump in.

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: The voting issue is a very good one for us to be grappling with. I think one of the general assumptions - or one of the general issues that we need to come to grips with, and this is my opinion, one-size-fits-all doesn't work across this very diverse stakeholder groups and constituencies that we have.

Now that doesn't mean there can't be some principle that all groups should follow, but if we try to make a one-size-fits-all for every stakeholder group for

example, it won't work. I think I gave some very specific illustrations in my comments, now only to (Victoria)'s document but also to (SS)'s. Where, you know, for example allowing individuals to vote in the contracted parties doesn't work, because by definition a member is a contracted party, which is an organization. That doesn't mean individuals can't participate.

But, anyway, and now is not the time to talk about the specifics, because the subtask groups are going to do that. But I want to point out that, you know, everyone of the issues we're grappling with we should grapple with and then we need to come up with a recommendation. But my main point then is, let's try not to fit everybody in the same box, because we're in very different boxes.

And that doesn't mean that the status quo, everybody is pushing for the status quo. I disagree with that statement made by both (SS) and (Victoria). But we do want to examine the issues. If we do suggest changes, we need to make sure that we carefully evaluate the impact and whether it works.

And my comments really, I think, for the most part, were geared that way to provide examples of where, "This needs more definition" or "It won't work in this situation, I don't believe," so that we get it right when we come out with our final recommendation.

Victoria McEvedy: Can I just add to that. It's a great comment, (Chuck). Could I just jump in?

Olga Cavalli: Sure (Victoria), go ahead.

Victoria McEvedy: I think that's a really good point there that you make, (Chuck). And I think, you know, it comes back to everything we've been talking about. I mean rather than looking at pure status quo or change, I think we all need to engage with the real detail of the recommendations on the table.

And, you know, if the exact proposed recommendation doesn't work, we need to work through the possible alternatives, you know, and I mean I think that's the only way we're going to make any progress, sort of taking a very sort of perhaps analytical approach to it.

You know, so I think, I just raised that, because I think it's going to be most helpful, we're going to make the most progress if people come back with very precise comments, do you know what I mean? Factually based, they give examples, I mean sort of general, "Don't like it" or "It won't work," sort of thing just won't help us try and iron something out that everyone could live with.

So, I just urge people to - I know it takes a lot of time to try to think those things through, but now that we've got some - you know, working with the precise language of the recommendations, we ought to be able to do that.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Totally agree, (Victoria). And, of course, that's one of the reasons why you heard me complaining that, "Hey, I don't have time to do all this." Because when you do go through it in detail, it is very time consuming, but frankly, that's what we're going to have to do to end up with documents that we can support.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Anyone else want to comment on this point?

Man: I'd just like to - I'm not too clear on the way forward, Olga. I mean this subtask is going to do the wording on this, but I think there are things out there which we as a general group are already inputting into, right? And I just heard that we should be specific. I would be happy to do that, sending some comments on this draft, which was presented yesterday, with as (Victoria) correctly suggests, substantiating the comments with some analysis and factual data.

Olga Cavalli: Let's do the following. Let me summarize some proposals of organizing our work that we have received from (Chuck) and from some of you. Let's start working team leaders should try to repair draft documents maybe in one

week, a new draft person somewhere I think all the inputs that they have received.

Not trying to bridge consensus among their sub-working contingents, but just have a new draft version, including what was already commented, which I think has a lot of value and other comments sent this week. Is that feasible? Do you think that's a good idea. One new draft document in approximately one week, send it to the list again, but then they should reach consensus among their working team.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Is that feasible? Who is this, (Victoria).

Krista Papac: (Christa).

Olga Cavalli: Oh, (Christa). Go ahead, (Christa).

Krista Papac: I think I might be confused, because I thought that, I understood half of what you said. The first part being that there was going to be another draft for each subtask group created. But that that was going to be for internal group or the subtask team, as you will, to review and reach consensus on, not for the entire list to review.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Maybe I expressed myself wrong. Yeah, the idea is for each subtask working team to have their own new draft, but including all the exchange of ideas that has been done this week, which is very good. So each subtask working team should try to reach consensus and we could discuss which is the proper timing for that. It could be maybe for the next conference call, or if that's too soon. What do others think? I think that the level of agreement in between the different subtask working teams is different.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Maybe I'm wrong.

Victoria McEvedy: Could I comment, Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Who is - (Victoria)?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

Tony Harris: And then me joining here.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, certainly I can work with that timeframe, but everybody said if, if, as I said earlier. I mean I'll read all the comments that have come in on the full report, but what I would like to do, because I think it will be most productive for subteams, I'm going to recirculate the recommendations only. We are just going to focus on the recommendation. We can come back - once we've got some consensus or made some progress on the recommendations, we can come back to general commentary in the report, right? This is particularly for my subtask.

So I'm very happy to incorporate comments and get in further comments perhaps by Wednesday just on the recommendation, and then perhaps have meeting this week or very beginning of next week with the subtasks. That works for me if it works for the rest of the members of the subtask. I don't know if it's going to work for other teams, but they might be different issues.

Olga Cavalli: Tony ?

Tony Harris: I think that's a good suggestion and I support it.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Olga, a practical question.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Man: I'm going to ask (Julie). (Julie), if any of the subtask leaders needs a little bit of help getting this going in terms of integrating comments or whatever they decide to do. Do you have any (bandwidth) to help them?

(Julie): Yeah, this is (Julie). I can certainly assist. Whatever you'd like me to do, comment, you want to, you know, ask me to incorporate, -you know, various comments and so on, I can do that. I incorporate them as comments or incorporate edit. Sure, that would be fine.

Man: Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, (Victoria), you need to arrange a call in between the group and your subtask group, maybe, when do you think that could be done?

Victoria McEvedy: Well if you're out this week, why don't we do it next Monday, Olga?

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...I'll be traveling.

Victoria McEvedy: Oh, not this Monday, not next Monday but the other one.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, the other one. That's fine, that's fine for me.

Victoria McEvedy: So we try and do as much as we can. I'll recirculate the recommendations and we can try and get more detailed comments on the recommendations, do what we can on the list and then entertain a call not next Monday but the Monday after.

Chuck Gomes: This is (Chuck). I guess everybody is familiar with the Doodle, but it's a nice way to find out a common time for...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. Okay, so why don't we try to get some conclusions or some consensus in between some working teams by the next conference call in two weeks. Do you think that's feasible? I think the timing for the difference of working teams is different. Maybe, (Victoria) then you need more time, which is fine if we need more time we will take it. But perhaps we can review the status of the consensus among the subworking teams in our next conference call in two weeks. Is that a good idea?

Victoria McEvedy: I think it's a great idea.

Olga Cavalli: So the issue about having a draft document and all that I suggested should be internal task of the subworking teams, and try to focus on the small groups and try to reach consensus if possible, and if not possible then we review the situation in two weeks. And (Victoria), I'm happy to participate in the conference call not next week but the other one, and let's try to set up a Doodle, as (Chuck) said and see if the other ones can join us.

And if some other working team leader needs assistance about conference calls or maybe (Julie) can help them, just let me know or (Julie) or express it on your mailing list and so we try to organize our work. Do you think that's a plan?

Man: Sounds good.

Woman: Okay.

(Claudio): Olga, this is (Claudio), I just have a question.

Olga Cavalli: Sure, go ahead.

(Claudio): Are there any deadlines as far as when we're expected to complete our work.

Olga Cavalli: That's a good question. (Chuck), can you help us?

Chuck Gomes: No. Obviously the board wants the improvements to happen as soon as possible, but the (GNSO) improvements committee when they get some of their work, and even the council as a whole, there was general understanding that most of the (GNSO) improvement would be worked - the implementation plans would be developed well beyond the (Seoul) meeting when the new structure takes place.

So there are just a few that needed to happen before that meeting, and most of those are with the council operations teams that (Ray Bassett) is chairing, because the rules of procedure for the council, at least some of those, need to be redone and in place, in other words approved before the meeting in (Seoul). So no, if we need the rest of the year to do this, it is more important that we get it right and that we do incorporate all views and demonstrate that we have had good input and we've come up with recommendations and that we show the level of support, than it is that we rush it.

(Claudio): Yeah, thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, (Chuck). Very clarifying. So once we finish the call, I'll write this small work plan that we have agreed and any other comments?

Chuck Gomes: Just one. Ultimately then, if the board is going to determine whether our implementation recommendation fulfill the recommendations that they make, so they could come back at the end and say, "Hey, you know, you made this recommendation here, we don't think this is satisfactory, we want you to go back and do it." So it will be the board that makes the final task on our implementation plan recommendation.

(Claudio): Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, (Chuck). Any other comments? Okay. It's one hour and time to finish our call. Thank you very much for your participation. I think that there is a lot of value in this discussion and this argumentation to go over different ideas, and I think that we are doing a great job. So thank you very much again for joining the call. Let's keep in touch in the subworking teams and of course in the list also and we talk again in two weeks. And (Victoria), we will arrange the call for our subworking teams.

Victoria McEvedy: Great. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Have a nice weekend.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Olga.

Victoria McEvedy: Thank you.

Glen Excuse me, this is Glen We're going to send out a Doodle for that call on the, I believe it is 21 September, and must it only be for Olga or must it be for the whole team for Olga and (Victoria).

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. (Victoria) can you help me for assessing the subworking team?

Glen Olga, (Victoria), Rafik

Victoria McEvedy: I think it's (Michael) also, and (Mike Curtis).

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: Isn't (Claudio) on that too.

Woman: Oh, yeah, (Claudio), sorry.

Glen: Okay. I'm sorry.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Glen, thank you so much. Have a nice weekend all of you.

Man: You too.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: Bye everybody.

Woman: Bye.

END