GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work Team 28 August 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 **28 August** 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-cowt-20090828.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#august
Participants present:
Olga Cavalli - work team chair - NCA
Charles Gomes - Registry c.
Victoria McEvedy - IPC
Claudio Digangi - IPC
Krista Papac - gTLD Registries c.
SS Kshatriya - Individual
Tony Harris – ISP

ICANN Staff
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat
Gisella Gruber-White - consultant
Robert Hoggarth - Policy Staff

Absent apologies
Rafik Dammak – NCUC

Gisella Gruber-White: Now that the recordings have started, good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's call we have Olga Cavalli, Krista Papac, Claudio DiGangi, Chuck Gomes who's only able to stay on for 30 minutes, S.S., Victoria McEvedy. From staff we have Rob Hoggarth, Glen DeSaintgery, and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. And apologies from Rafik Dammak. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Gisella. Good morning, good evening everyone. I'm really happy and impressed about all the progress that we have made with our recommendations. I have just checked the email sent by S.S. I'm sorry I

didn't have the chance to see it before S.S. I just saw it. I didn't go in deep through your document, but I think you did a great job.

I'm sure that we will have the chance to review each of us with our groups and constituencies. Also, Claudio made excellent comments in relation with the document sent by Julie and Chuck. Some of them I think are very good, interesting, and maybe should be included in the recommendations.

Also Claudio made excellent comments to the document sent by Victoria. And Krista and myself, we have been working on her recommendations. And Julie and Chuck I've already sent them. So I think we have a very good background and base documents to start thinking about how to build together a final draft recommendation.

But I would like to go through the subtask leaders one by one, and hear some comments about the documents that each of you have drafted, or will be drafting and sending to our list. This is why I didn't send specific agenda for the call today, as we - we're going to review our progress. You think this is a good idea to proceed? Any comments? Great.

S.S. Again, sorry I didn't go in detail reading your document. I just saw it this morning. I have been engaged with some of the things I had to finish yesterday. But I think you did prepare some recommendations, and perhaps you could tell us some outline of your document and some comments so we can give you some feedback during the next week.

S.S. Kshatriya: Okay, S.S. here. Now the one document which I sent hardly an hour ago, well I don't expect much from members because they would have hardly seen it. And as I mentioned email, that it could be viewed the next week and then we could discuss. But still I'll give them that.

But before that I'll come back to the - that membership, I have (unintelligible), and so far I've not received any comments. And believe we could - if there

are no comments, we could make it as I mean final. I'll request Julie to amend (to put into the) - this (Wiki), this one.

So if any still some comments out there, they can follow in the next few days. I'll come back to the document, what I circulated just now. Now this is - I picked up membership clause and made recommendations.

And this I based on like this stuff, analysis, and what all year we have been talking about in this GNSO requirements. So I'll read one by one, this is about A to I subsections out of there and back. I'll - shall I read one by one?

Olga Cavalli: Let me check the time. Yes, I think if you go - yes, it's not a long document. Just go ahead, yes. Why not, yes.

S.S. Kshatriya: So for my brief description I call this the stakeholder group and constituency in this my document as group. So a group shall form rules and procedures for at least some departments of an interested party, as a member in clear and simple terms. Such rules and procedures shall be part of this charter - or bylaws, whatever they're called, but most of the people I found, they call it charter.

B is as far as possible there shall be uniform team membership. If there is more than one class of membership, reason for this shall be clearly stated. I found that some of the constituencies, they have more people - class of members. But it is left to them depending upon. But then there'll be some explanations so people know to reach class - I mean which slot they form, so - I mean while applying for membership.

C is the group in clear and simple terms shall list the rights, duties, and responsibilities of its members. This was one of the recommendation - staff recommendation. It simply is a (form of) device for membership, and it shall be publicly available in the group's Web site. I found in one case that this is very simple, just half a page of it and that could be just sufficient.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

S.S. Kshatriya: (Unintelligible) new application and admission decisions shall be publicly
                   available. And then applicants shall be kept informed about it. That's what we
                   have been talking about. This is covered in my (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Hello?

S.S. Kshatriya: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Oh.

S.S. Kshatriya: In this (unintelligible) in case of rejection, an application or the dispute, the
                   applicant shall have the recourse of appeal to a neutral third party. The group
                   shall constitute such a neutral third party in consultation with or under the
                   supervision of ICANN. This is what the (one plus two) clause I suggested in
                   the last document…

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

S.S. Kshatriya: …and the (unintelligible) think about it.

                   G is every member shall remain in good standing. It is about throwing out a
                   member or finding it (unpalatable). Every member shall remain in good
                   standing until the group has decided otherwise. In such an event, the
                   member shall be given an opportunity to be heard. There shall be - and I
                   think there's some - this is probably grammar mistake there - will be made
                   clearcut simple rules for such an eventuality.

                   The affected parties shall have right of appeal to a neutral third party. The
                   group shall constitute such a neutral third party in consultation with, or under
                   the supervision of ICANN. This is the same repeated from that last one. I just

lift off members and their contact details shall be publicly available in group Web sites.

All members, unless otherwise stated, shall be eligible to participate in the (beingness) of the group and have equal working rights. This is until otherwise stated, because if a constituency have more than one class, then probably there'll be different rules.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

S.S. Kshatriya: If group - a group (unintelligible) enable members (shall be) in keeping with the (tapestry of) its members and group's budget. Such fees could be (divertible) in the general body of its members. So now the group could (see if there's) something more and...

Tony Harris: Hello.

Olga Cavalli: Hello?

Tony Harris: Yes, this is Tony Harris joining. Sorry I'm a few minutes late.

Olga Cavalli: Tony, good morning. Welcome. Thank you very much, S.S. I have a question, and we can open the queue if there are some other comments or questions to your document. What did you - what you mean - maybe it's the limitations of my English. It's - oh I lost it. Every member shall remain in good standing, what is that?

S.S. Kshatriya: This is like - there is (unintelligible) that is one clause some constituencies have. Good standing means there is no complaint against a member.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, okay.

((Crosstalk))

S.S. Kshatriya: I mean the term used by the constituencies.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Just a clarification, just I didn't know the expression. And also in the last one, a group may levy reasonable membership? What does it mean?

S.S. Kshatriya: That is a membership fee. Annual fee some constituencies levy. So that should be not exorbitant. And it should not be left to the (unintelligible) committee alone, members should have their (say in this). That's what it is.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you S.S. for the clarification. Any comments? Any questions to S.S.'s document?

Claudio DiGangi: Olga, this is Claudio.

Olga Cavalli: Claudio? Go ahead.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes, I was just curious. S.S. did you send the document to the list?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, but it just arrived maybe a half an hour ago.

Claudio DiGangi: Oh okay. Because I'll have to - because I got your email Olga, but - that references the email.

S.S. Kshatriya: Yes, but it just hardly one, one and a half hours ago. And really I didn't expect that this would be here. But it's very good (that we have started). So you could…

((Crosstalk))

Claudio DiGangi: Okay, thank you.

Olga Cavalli: I can resend the S.S. document to the list, it's not a problem. We can have it two times, that's fine. Any other comments, questions to S.S.?

Okay thank you very much S.S. I think it's a great document. I commend you for doing this job. I would like to - all of us to take a look in detail of what S.S. has prepared.

I would like you also S.S., if you could add it in the document on the background - all the background documents that you used. Or if you talked to someone as the background information, when we prepare our final report that will be sent to the OSE and then to the council, and hopefully in time to the board.

I would suggest - you may disagree, but I think that Julie and Chuck did a great job in their toolkit services recommendations document, where they put an introduction, a background, and then they go to the - directly to the recommendations. We perhaps could use that format to have that in mind for preparing our final draft document.

And if you could, S.S., include in your document the background maybe. The group knows it, but we - it's good too for letting the others know where is the background for our outcome. You think that's fine?

S.S. Kshatriya: I'll agree, Olga, with you. So I'll give references for this document. Now let me tell you this is just part of the Subtask 1. So once I have prepared all the parts, I'll put into one file. And there I'll give all the introduction, background, and all that. But in each case I'll give references.

Olga Cavalli: Great. I think could we have this more complete document maybe during the next week, S.S.?

S.S. Kshatriya: I'll hopefully - I'll complete all of that in next week. (Unintelligible) several days are not on my side. But I do feel that I should complete it quickly.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you very much for your effort. Any comments to S.S.? Should we move to Krista? Krista you're on the line?

Krista Papac: Yes I'm here.

Chuck Gomes: Olga, this is Chuck.

Olga Cavalli: Chuck, good morning.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry, I was on mute. I wanted to thank S.S. for his work. It seems like it's a good start. I haven't had a chance to read it yet, but I appreciate him going through the details of it.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Chuck. I also agree with you. He did a great job. Sorry Krista, I interrupted you.

Krista Papac: Yes. Sure, sorry. I thought we were going in order, so I wasn't quite ready to be called on.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes, why are we not going in order?

Olga Cavalli: Oh I'm sorry. No, you're totally right. So sorry. It's Victoria that's for the next one. I'm so sorry, my apologies. Victoria, I must confess I didn't have time to go in deep through your document. I just saw Claudio's comments, which are really very detailed. And thank you Claudio for sending this feedback. And perhaps you can tell us what's the status of your practical recommendation?

Victoria McEvedy: Well Claudio's the only person who's commented, I'm afraid. So I was hoping to have all comments in from the members of the subtask group. So I think Olga, are you a member of the subtask group?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I am. I…

Victoria McEvedy: I think you are. So I'm waiting for you.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: People aren't obliged to comment, obviously. But I think that - so we're waiting for you, who else is on the subgroup?

Chuck Gomes: Rafik I think maybe.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes right. I think that's it, isn't it? Okay. And Michael you said you were gonna comment. Is Michael with us?

Chuck Gomes: I don't think he's on the call.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, fine. So I think what we need to do is - what I was thinking - and perhaps people can let me know their views, is I was thinking we need to put a deadline down of next Wednesday for comments to come in. Because then I want to basically rework the report to reflect all the comments.

And then we need to perhaps meet within the subgroup to see if we can form a consensus, find areas of agreement, work out what is and isn't contentious, and see if we can take these things forward. So if it suits you Olga - Olga could you work with a Wednesday deadline?

Olga Cavalli: I would say that perhaps Tuesday could be fine. Because...

Victoria McEvedy: Oh, that'd be great.

Olga Cavalli: It's my - I really have been very busy this week and didn't have the time to review it, and it's - I'm in your subtask working team. So I will provide during this weekend some feedback. Claudio did his and maybe we can among the sub-team and the whole team make comment also. Perhaps we can set up a

due date by Tuesday, because we hopefully would have a draft document by the end of next week.

Victoria McEvedy: That's right. Like I say, we haven't had the comments in yet. So I mean first of all they need to come in, they we need time to digest them I think, and then I'll need time to work them in. And I'm practicing as well. So, you know, I mean I need a little bit of time to get to things I'm afraid and to turn them around.

So let's start with the Tuesday deadline, and see how many comments we get in. And we could (unintelligible) on the list. And as I said last week, anyone is welcome to comment. But if everyone could follow the Tuesday deadline, that would be great.

Olga Cavalli: Great. I totally agree. Again, my apologies. I will do my job, and again as I told S.S., perhaps Victoria, you - I don't remember right now if you already included in your document, but having the background documents and background associations, and (where you get the information)...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: I did, Olga. It has a full background of its own. And the issue - the focus is slightly different from Julie's. So I think - my own view is that people should feel free to have their own background, because the points that you want to reflect in your background are not the same for each issue.

I mean the points that you want to get emphasis to. So it already has a very, very full background. But if people want to add comments for consideration in terms of the background as expressed, they could do so.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, so you could then add that, and have the feedback, and then perhaps we can review. You can drop the recommendations, and we can have that part of view for the whole document.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

Victoria McEvedy: Sorry, can I ask you a question? You're not - you're participating from a non-(con) perspective, is that right? In terms of the subgroup. Not as the chair as such.

Olga Cavalli: I am. Well that's a good question. I don't work inside any constituency, so I have kind of a outside view, which I don't think is good or bad, but it's what I have. And from the community perspective perhaps. So this is - this would be my perspective of my comments.

Victoria McEvedy: Great.

Olga Cavalli: So any comments, any questions to the document that Victoria had circulated? Or anything that you want to add or tell her? Okay, we have this Tuesday due date to send Victoria comments to her document. Claudio already did his homework, I will do mine. And we welcome your comments.

And if not, Victoria it's okay. And once you have your - our comments on Tuesday, then you can move forward and include all the background and all that in your draft document. Thank you Victoria very much. Now Krista, I'm sorry I missed - I changed the order. Krista, go ahead.

Krista Papac: No problem. I was just confused. So Olga, thank you again for drafting sort of a...

Olga Cavalli: My pleasure.

Krista Papac: Putting a framework together for the recommendations for our team. I mean it's a work in progress. Unfortunately this is a really bad time for me from a

work perspective. We're planning 2010 and I'm just knee deep in that. So the deadlines that we are trying to work towards are quite challenging.

You know, with that said, one of the questions I think I have - we did - to your point, not everybody's seen this, so Olga this is just me commenting on what you sent. But recommendations - Action Item 1, recommendations for database architecture and alternatives.

As I understood it - now that I read this again, I feel like it says what are we recommending for the architecture? And my understanding was more that we were providing sort of high level recommendations. And this is something that I discussed on the call I think July - in early July that we had? Mid-July?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, yes.

Krista Papac: Basically, you know, Ken (Border)'s (sic) feedback - Bauer's excuse me, feedback with us was, you know, you can do whatever you want. We talked more about the architecture having permissioning - various permissioning levels so that these privacy concerns that people have could (be drafted), etcetera etcetera.

So I just want to make sure that - I mean I don't know, Tony is a lot more smart about these things than I am, or a lot smarter about these things than I am. But I don't know a lot about database architectures, but rather putting recommendations out there that address the concerns of the community, not the actual architecture of the database. Is that (correct)?

Tony Harris: Hello. Yes, this is Tony here. From my recollection of what we discussed in Sydney, that was going to be resolved by a staff proposal. I may have understood that wrong, the subject of the architecture.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Well this is why in the draft document I sent you yesterday I just - my question was should we ask about this architecture recommendations to the ICANN staff or to the IT people in ICANN.

Krista Papac: So let me do this. Let me follow up with Julie, 'cause she was with us. You might be right Tony. I'm sure you're right and I just don't recall. But Julie - if that was the case, that would be something Julie was helping us with anyway. So let me follow up with her and then try to work that in here. Or if that's not the case then figure out sort of a Plan B.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck, can you hear me?

Tony Harris: Yes, we can hear you Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I'm gonna have to drop off after this, but let me make one comment. I think what Tony said makes a lot of sense. I think everybody understands, it's not our task to design the architecture. But we certainly can recommend - requirements need to be fulfilled by the architecture.

                  So working with IT and staff is a good idea. But it's up to us to make the recommendations in terms of what the requirements that the architecture needs to fulfill. Anyway, I'm sorry I have to jump off for a conflicting call. But have a good rest of the meeting.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Chuck.

Tony Harris: Okay, bye Chuck.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you for joining us. Bye.

Tony Harris: Jumping on what Chuck just said, I think he's right on with that. Basically what would give us an idea of things we need to ask for would come out of the results of our - what we discuss with all the constituencies about, you

know, their willingness to have their members listed, and any qualifications or restrictions they want added to that - to the implementation of such a list.

Krista Papac: Yes, which is the sort of - exactly Tony, that's the part I mean about the permissioning and things like, you know, addressing these concerns that the constituencies, you know, mentioned in the various conversations we had with them.

Tony Harris: Because there is an underlying concern about privacy. I mean I just caught - was able to quickly read S.S.'s document, which does have a mentioned of, you know, the constituency members should be listed with their contact details, and that's put in as a recommendation. And S.S. - I don't know what his first name is, but it's S.S. I think.

And I'm not too sure if all the constituencies - I didn't get the sense when we - at least the ones I talked to would be happy with having their email addresses publicly exposed. They have no problem with, you know, their name and affiliation being listed, but their email or telephone number is something completely different.

S.S. Kshatriya: This is S.S. Well I'm not going into detail, but I did find that some of the constituencies, they have given contact details. So maybe that we could elaborate what details would be given. Or it could be left to the constituencies what details they want to give.

Tony Harris: That's faire enough, yes.

Krista Papac: Could I...

Tony Harris: I don't disagree with your recommendation by the way. I think people who are active in the Internet should be identifiable. But there are other considerations unfortunately, such as identity theft, things like that that are going on.

S.S. Kshatriya: Can do that in many ways.

Tony Harris: Yes, yes.

Victoria McEvedy: Could I just make a comment as well. I know that a lot of work was done on privacy issues in relation to the slightly different, but in the Who Is context have been a huge process within ICANN. And so perhaps the individual members, you know, there are concerns that aren't necessarily as applicable for corporate members.

And it may well be with having a look at some of the reports done by the - I think there've been about four Who Is working groups, and there's been a lot of work done about - I know it's highly contentious. And it may well be that some of those issues are appropriate.

But I also noted in the staff recent comments that there's a new recommendation made by the staff that constituencies should not have - that no individual or no member can be a member of more than one constituency, which is a brand new recommendation. It may well be we should formerly incorporate that into our work somewhere.

But if that is to be the case then it's very important that people can't join the same - that there can't be duplication through other means I suppose, and that may become an issue in terms of how would you know this unless the information's publicly available. I just raise it in case it's relevant.

Tony Harris: Well actually I was on all four of the Who Is task forces, since the year 2000 actually. And I can tell you that there's never been agreement. And there still is no agreement on the question of privacy and publication of contact details.

As to this thing you were mentioning, I'm not too sure I'm understanding. Are we going to recommend that people cannot be a member of more than one

constituency? Is that something we are going to be writing into our recommendation?

Victoria McEvedy: The staff have already recommended that. Maybe Rob can speak to that; it's in his document I believe of the 15th of July.

Tony Harris: Well what's the reason for that? It doesn't seem to make sense to me.

Rob Hoggarth: Well if I can clarify the recommendation if I'm remembering correctly the one you're referring to Victoria was not to limit joining multiple groups, but to make sure that if individuals did do so that they only exercised the vote in one of them. So I guess - and that's where a database would be important to ensure that people weren't casting multiple votes in multiple places.

Victoria McEvedy: Right, yes. It's just a footnote, so that maybe needs to be fished out. I think it was just a footnote wasn't it, somewhere?

Rob Hoggarth: That may be right, yes. I'm sorry, I just don't remember at the moment.

Tony Harris: Well that doesn't seem like such a good idea. Because I mean in a large corporation such as Microsoft they would probably have interests in participating in several constituencies for entirely different reasons. And I mean why shouldn't they be able to do that?

And what I understand is being restricted so far, at least in the lift of the DNSO and the GNSO, both incarnations, you are never allowed to have two council members belonging to the same commercial or corporate interest group. But they could - you could have a corporation belonging to the business constituency, the ISP, the IPC. I never heard there was any restriction about that.

Victoria McEvedy: Hang on, I found the exact reference. And perhaps I am overstating it. It's actually in the by-laws, it's in that - it's a footnote, Footnote Number 10 to the

by-law amendments that were posted for public comment. And what it says is rationale. Hang on. Hang on, just read the reference for you given that we're on the issue. Ten. No individual - well, hang on.

Oh no, it's been deleted. No, it's come out. It was in the by-laws. No individual or entity shall be excluded from participation in a constituency merely because of participation in another constituency. So you were allowed to join, but that's been deleted.

And as Footnote 10, rationale. Staff recommends deleting this text. In its role of reviewing stakeholder group and constituency charters, the board should ensure that membership and voting procedures are designed to preserve (unintelligible) while minimizing undesirable consequences that might occur due to multiple members.

Okay, so maybe an entirely different point, mind that. Although the original point was related to an individual entity participating in more than one. Rob, does that help refresh your memory?

Rob Hoggarth: It helps a little bit. But I wasn't working primarily on the by-laws. I'll be more than happy to take the ticket though to get back to Margie Milam to get further clarification on that.

Victoria McEvedy: Pretty important.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, and I was gonna be sharing with you guys anyway the fact that the board did meet in the last couple of days, and did approve a final set of by-law documents. There was some active discussion during the meeting, and so I think Margie's putting together that final package to release to the community along with the board's preliminary report. And so at that point we'll see what the definitive languages.

Tony Harris: Okay. I'm not - I don't want to make a big issue out of this, but if it's going to go into our report, it did seem something that needed to be thought out.

Rob Hoggarth: That's a very good point.

Krista Papac: So this is Krista. I'd like to go back to the privacy discussion if we're done on the multiple voting and multiple stakeholder group topic. And on the discussion that I gave in the July I think 11th call, let's go back to this privacy thing and say that the discussion that we've had both with constituency (unintelligible) power of ICANN IT and then again on this call was that people's details could be in the database.

They can put as much detail or as little as they want, but there would also be these sort of access and permissioning levels. And as an example I remember the registrar constituency or stakeholder group is what it's either called right now or gonna be called very soon. And people within - as a point of example, people within my stakeholder group can see my contact details or not by me allowing that.

They can certainly see my name and maybe my company name, but maybe not my phone number and email address, depending on what I choose. And then you can go to the next layer, which is maybe at the GNSO level, and I can choose to give people certain access, so on and so forth.

And so, you know, to kind of address Tony's point and S.S.'s point, I think that people aren't necessarily precluded from putting this information in there, as long as they've got the ability to pick and choose the types of members of the community that can see those specific details.

And depending on what we find from - in Rob's next report, you know, maybe it makes sense to make sure that we have a field in there that annotates whether somebody is a voting member or not, if that becomes a relative topic.

Olga Cavalli: Great Krista. Could it be possible if you can add that information to the brief document that I drafted with you yesterday?

Krista Papac: Yes, absolutely. That's - I mean again I apologize that this is just very bad timing. I wasn't expecting to run into…

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: No that's okay.

Krista Papac: …for recommendations.

And yes, you know, those comments I'll definitely capture in the document. And then I'll follow up.

Olga Cavalli: Also I think it could be very important if you can add as a background the thing that I mentioned to S.S. and to Victoria, at the background who did you meet with, all the constituencies and all the people that you had the chance to meet in Sydney or virtually, or through a telephone call.

And then we can state also that we tried enough with NCUC and we had no - a lot of possibilities of contacting them and getting feedback from them. So that background information should be relevant for your document also.

Tony Harris: Yes, Krista? If I might suggest, since you're having a lot of problems talking to Robin Gross I understand. Have you thought about contacting Mary Wong?

Krista Papac: So yes…

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Tony, let me interrupt. We did send emails to everyone. And I think that we have to try. But they didn't - Mary was traveling, Bill did not respond, and

Robin just set up some times with Krista but she was late. And I think we tried enough. I mean we should try again? I don't know what you think.

Tony Harris: No, no. I'm sure you did everything you could. And I'm just surprised, because Mary seems like such an approachable person, that's why.

Olga Cavalli: I know, I know. I'm surprised because I find them very approachable. But I think we should focus on recommendations right now, and have - and use the information that we have, and we move forward. We have some contact in time that we already use and we tried. I don't know if you agree or not.

Tony Harris: Yes. Yes sure, let's move ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Let's move ahead. We don't have...

Tony Harris: And what's decided for everybody is decided for them too. It's the same recommendation.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I think it should fit their needs. And...

Tony Harris: Well they've got the chance to comment afterward. So maybe we'll hear from them there.

Olga Cavalli: They have the chance to comment. We are not obliging anyone to use our recommendations, and then they can use their comments here to say yes or no, I like it or not.

Tony Harris: Exactly.

Olga Cavalli: But we have to move ahead. We have a deadline of preparing the document during next week. And I think Krista did - and you did the best that you could, and I also tried to help but it didn't work. So Krista could you add the background information, and all these comments that you have exchanged?

Perhaps Tony, with all the experience you have about Who Is and privacy you could help Krista. It's not my area of knowledge in updating the document and with recommendations.

Tony Harris: No problem, if - I don't know, is it being sent out? I haven't seen it in the last few days.

Olga Cavalli: I just sent a draft document to you and to Krista yesterday, but it's my modest help because I am not a specialist in privacy or Who Is issues, but you are.

Tony Harris: Okay, I'll look for it. I haven't seen it yet.

Victoria McEvedy: I'd like to - do you mind if - can I join your - sorry I'd like to comment on - because I know quite a - well I know a little bit about privacy law.

Olga Cavalli: Sure Victoria, go ahead.

Victoria McEvedy: But I wouldn't mind being on the - if you have a sort of subgroup list, I wouldn't mind being included. And I'll try and spend some time on that. Because I think that - I hear what you say Tony, I know that no agreement was reached on the Who Is issues, but I think there are some really, really crucial issues that someone should be raising in this context.

And if the NCUC aren't focusing, then I'm perfectly happy to look at that from a perspective of Internet users. I mean I think that should be an interest for all of us.

Tony Harris: Okay. I have no problem with that, welcome.

Krista Papac: So I have another question about Number 4 Olga. Coordinate with OSC communications work team. So I did speak with the chair of that team, and said these are the things we were thinking about, Mason Cole, he said yes

that sounds great. I don't know what - like to what extent should I be coordinating?

They have a massive undertaking that they're working on, and I'm just not quite sure how - I realize how they overlap, but I don't know to what extent we should be in our recommendations talking about this coordination.

Olga Cavalli: I would say if they are also doing their job at the same time, perhaps we could focus on the other points of your subtask. And then they may comment on our recommendations. I don't know if this is a good idea or not.

Rob Hoggarth: Olga this is Rob. My suggestion would be because Ken Bauer seems to have a foot in a couple of the different teams, it might be helpful for us to have a conversation with him, and he can help sort of coordinate those efforts, at least providing the information about team to note where there may be some potential overlap. My sense has been that that's been managed pretty well up till now.

Olga Cavalli: So if they - I have another question Rob. If they are handling these issues, if maybe - if any - there may be overlapping of our work in there. Perhaps we can focus on the other subtask issues and leave this one for them? Or just we should coordinate with them before, not to leave something not attended.

Rob Hoggarth: I'll chat with Ken about it. I think, you know, with all the other work that you all are doing both work-wise and volunteer-wise, the last thing we want to do is create any extra effort. And, you know, it may be a case where as you've stated Olga, they do or finish their work and you guys comment on it or vice versa. But probably the case for the steering committee to coordinate so that both aren't working on the same thing.

Krista Papac: And maybe I can just forward, you know, Mason's the chair of our constituency, so I certainly have the direct line to him.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Krista Papac: Maybe I can even just forward - when we get closer on this to him, and just say, you know, how does this fit in with, you know, what you're doing, and see if, you know, that facilitates coordination.

Rob Hoggarth: That sounds great.

Olga Cavalli: You know, but that's only one point of all your subtasks. So we can focus on the other ones. And Victoria, just for clarifying, we - it's - I'm not part of the subwork team, but just joined Krista to help her. It was not a special drafting team. So you're welcome to join in this effort.

Victoria McEvedy: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Julie are you on the line?

Krista Papac: No she's not here.

Rob Hoggarth: No, I'm a poor substitute for Julie today.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry. Okay.

Krista Papac: Sorry, I do have one more question Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Yes sure, go ahead.

Krista Papac: You have a question in here, ICANN will provide infrastructure and services for this list, for Number 3.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Krista Papac: CNSO discussion list. I guess - are you - maybe I should just make the statement, I think that that's a given, that the database and sort of all the architecture for this would be provided by ICANN.

Olga Cavalli: Well we should, yes. So that's a given. But that was my question, I didn't know.

Krista Papac: Okay. I just wanted to make sure I wasn't missing something else there. So that's...

Olga Cavalli: No, no that's fine. Any other questions, comments for Krista?

Tony Harris: Yes I have one. I may have missed this. Are we recommending that this list actually - that the BM - general GNSO may list the set up? Is it something we are recommending is the question.

Olga Cavalli: I think it is, we already have it. I don't know - I don't - I didn't get your question Tony.

Tony Harris: Well it's - it was listed as one of the things we should recommend. I'm talking from memory now. But this really - it would be a reincarnation of what was known as a general assembly, where they had a mail list that anybody could post to. We're thinking of - this will be an open mailing list for anybody to participate in, is this correct?

Olga Cavalli: I don't think it should be open, I don't know.

Tony Harris: Well you would sign on as a member of the community, I forget how they did it, but anyhow. When we did this many years ago it was an absolute nightmare, because what happened is you had four or five chronic posters just sending - each of them sending 30 mails a day and arguing amongst themselves, and it was absolutely useless for any ICANN community purpose.

Krista Papac: But Tony, the conversation that we had in Sydney with Ken and yourself and Julie and I was not that it would be an open list, but rather similar to what we have today, which is - or more similar to what we have today, which is again the different lists that are specific to different stakeholder groups for instance and communities, again with permissioning.

And that if - I'll use my own constituency, or let's use your constituency, the ISP constituency has a discussion list that their - people can't just join it, that there's again this permissioning so that only maybe - I don't know how your constituency is structured, but your executive board, or your secretariat or whatever can add or delete people from the list. And so that you again, you don't just get sort of rogue people posting on your discussion list.

Tony Harris: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: That was my idea. I never thought about it until you openly said. I totally agree that they are total nightmares, and two or three people capture them, and the rest of the people get just - don't want to participate any more. And I have experienced that with other groups. So I didn't think of an open - totally open list. I agree with the comment that Krista is making.

Tony Harris: Okay, fine.

Claudio DiGangi: This is Claudio. I'm just trying to understand the comment that Krista - because if it's - if you're limiting it to, you know, if you're talking about a constituency then you could say, you know, it's - you need to be part of that constituency or part of that stakeholder group to join.

But if you're - I'm not sure how you would limit it. If it's supposed to be for the whole GNSO, and you know, with the working group model, and basically, you know, allows anyone to participate. So how would you limit who could join the list?

Krista Papac: So I guess what I'm saying - and sorry for not being clear Claudio, is that, you know, the - to answer Tony's question, no the recommendation is not to have an open GNSO discussion list...

Claudio DiGangi: Okay.

Krista Papac: ...for one and all. The recommendation is to maintain something very similar to what we have, if not, you know, what we have today where there's different levels. It should tie back into this, you know, overall database of information, and at least have a tie to it so that you can limit the different discussion lists to the appropriate members, and that there's somebody who has control over those lists that can add or delete members.

Claudio DiGangi: I see, okay.

Victoria McEvedy: Is this covered in - I'm sorry, I mean this seems like really important, and I haven't seen anything in writing, so I haven't - I can't really intelligently add to this discussion. But is there a proposal on the table that we're actually looking at.

Krista Papac: So no, that's the thing I'm working on. And as I said, I did discuss this in quite a bit of detail on the July 11 call, but no there is nothing in writing. And that's the document that I'm working on.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, sorry for that. I just hadn't been paying attention. I have to say my preference, just given that we're having this discussion, is that they should be open and publicly available. I don't see the need for (unintelligible). But then I haven't been focusing on this discussion. But I just want to put that down, and I can comment in writing when I see a written proposal.

Olga Cavalli: Victoria, Krista has been working on the document with me and Tony, and she will be circulating a new version once she has put all these comments in writing, and you will have your chance to...

Victoria McEvedy: Right.

Olga Cavalli: ...add your opinions. Very good.

Claudio DiGangi: Thank you. I have three minutes left. Julie is not on the call. Claudio made some very interesting comments about Julie and Chuck's document. I would like to ask Julie, and I will ask her in the list if those comments that Claudio made could be included. I don't know Claudio, if you want to say something about it.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. I mean basically one of my comments had to do with having an option for providing funding to the constituencies or stakeholder groups. If (Jeff) wasn't able to provide one of the services, for whatever reason, that there would be basically funds available for the groups to use to get that service that they wanted.

And basically Julie and Chuck responded back that they saw some implementation questions involved in that, and they asked for some further feedback on exactly how that would work. And then I just made a few other comments about one of the other service options had to do with assembling background information for the working groups. I just - or if that really belonged in this.

Because it seems to me like that was something that was for the whole community, and not really tied to a constituency or stakeholder group. So I just (unintelligible) purposes recommended out. And then I suggested also the possibility of including option for staff to help manage the financial records - the stakeholder groups or constituencies.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I thought your comments were very good. They responded, and my question to Julie - or maybe to Chuck, but they are not here, is that if they can produce a new draft document so we can review it with your comments. So I'll send her this comment. I don't know if you agree with my idea, but perhaps they can produce a new draft document and we can review it with your comments.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes, that's a great idea.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Krista Papac: I have a question about...

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Krista Papac: ...the recommendation about staff managing financial records of the constituencies Claudio?

Claudio DiGangi: Sure.

Krista Papac: Is that something that's been done in the past? Or what - and if not, what's the sort of thinking behind that?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes, I don't know if it's been done in the past. I mean I don't think it has. But I think just the thinking is if it's just record keeping, and like an administrative task that, you know, it might be useful to the constituencies, since it's not really, you know, directly related to the purpose of a constituency.

Krista Papac: Meaning it's optional for a constituency to use staff to manage their financial records, or mandatory?

Claudio DiGangi: Exactly, yes.

Krista Papac: Got it. I was just thinking that some might be sensitive to not wanting, you know, staff managing their financial records or whatever. So that makes sense.

Tony Harris: Well as far as the ISP constituency, we've always done that ourselves. Whatever funding was - belonged to the constituency was handled, and all the records were kept by the secretariat, not by ICANN.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Tony, thank you Claudio.

Claudio DiGangi: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments? Great. We are on time. I will write right now an email to the list, and remember to send each of you your documents to - for the rest of the people to comment. I will do my best to answer as soon as I can Victoria's - comments to Victoria's document.

We should try to make a draft document for the rest - for the end of next week. I can draft it perhaps with Julie using the format that Julie already used for her document that she prepared with Chuck. I think it's a great format.

If you agree, I can start thinking about a final draft document with that format. So I need the backgrounds of your documents and your draft document so we can share them, we can comment them. And we talk again next Friday, and we keep in touch through the list.

Victoria McEvedy: Excuse me Olga, you're not gonna call any other business? I'm sorry, because I was waiting for it.

Olga Cavalli: Oh I'm so sorry, it's just we were running out of time. Do you want to say something Victoria?

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, yes I did. I'm sorry, I wanted to ask Rob because he spoke so briefly so we didn't get the - I didn't get the information that I wanted from him about what's going on in the (unintelligible) that we discussed last - in the last meeting.

Olga Cavalli: Oh you're right.

Victoria McEvedy: And so I just need very quickly to find out that background. Because Rob, just to update you, Julie told us in our last meeting that there was going - that you were going to be - I think the stakeholder group charters have been approved by the board I believe as of the 30th of July.

And I think that - was it by the 30th of September you were gonna be having discussions we believe - or she explained this week I believe with constituency leaders about constituency charters.

And we are obviously concerned about the overlap with our work and the timeframes. And I don't know if she updated you, but we discussed on our call last week trying to complete our work quickly so that you will have the benefit of our work when you have those discussions to be completed by the 30th of September.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, thanks Victoria. And I was actually writing down notes suggesting to myself that I'd have to write you all a written report because the call ended without us having a chance to talk about that.

In just a minute's briefing, we have reached out to the various existing constituency leaderships just to provide them with some recommended language for how they could update their existing charters, the bare minimum necessary to conform with the new stakeholder group structures that the board has approved, and the by-law amendments that are, you know, gonna be created.

We didn't have the benefit of a final by-laws package. What we've shared with them has been language focusing purely on structural matters. You know, there are charters that refer to constituencies that don't reference the stakeholder group. In the case for example of the commercial stakeholders group, you know, now the decisions are being made at an executive committee level about the (unintelligible) of council representatives and the rest.

So the purpose of this outreach is merely to get the documents consistent structurally. We provided through them the old staff analyses that you guys have seen to say, you know, please keep this stuff in mind.

But we also reminded them that you guys are continuing your work, and it might be a more efficient use of their time not to continually reopen and close their charter deliberations, but just to do the bare minimum right now. Because your work recommendations will be produced in the not distant future.

Victoria McEvedy: Great. Thank you very much Rob, I appreciate that update, and also the content of it. Because it was gonna be the follow-up question, whether or not we could footnote to them, you know, that our work is coming, and keep that to the presence of anyone's mind during this process. But you've already done that, so thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: My apologies Victoria for not asking if there were any other business in the call, just (unintelligible).

Victoria McEvedy: No problem. Can I just one more comment Olga, to what you said earlier.

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Victoria McEvedy: I mean I think we - perhaps on the next call we can discuss the format of the final report. But rather than my own - I have a proposal myself and maybe other people have suggestions about how we go about preparing the final report to avoid duplication. I would hope that we could discuss it on the next call.

Olga Cavalli: I don't think that we have the time. Rob correct me if I'm wrong. When should we have the draft document to be sent to the OSC?

Rob Hoggarth: That's something you should discuss directly with Chuck and whose capacity is chair of the OSC. In terms of timing for Seoul, I think that if a council has - and this is just off the top of my head, so I apologize, I'll correct record if after further deliberation I think I have the timeframe wrong.

But I think if you guys have something by the end of September, that they'll have the opportunity to have some OSC discussion, and perhaps be something keyed up for the new council in Seoul.

In terms of work team efforts that are going on right now, the only real gating project that, you know, of primary importance is the work of the constituency - I'm sorry, the GNSO council operations team, and their work on operating rules and procedures. That's, you know, that's a critical must do by Seoul. I think that...

Olga Cavalli: Rob, sorry to interrupt you. In the last call - I don't know if you were in the last call last Friday. We are doing a special effort in preparing some recommendations to be considered by the board in their call in September 30. That's - this is why I'm asking you if we want to have this document reviewed by the OSC and by the GNSO, and then sent to the board, this timing I was asking you if you think that we have more time than the end of next week.

Rob Hoggarth: Probably not.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, that was my question.

Rob Hoggarth: And the only reason - yes the only reason I say that is because the board will expect all the papers that they need to have for preparation of their 30 September meeting by around the 16th or 17th of September.

And so then if you start to back out, an opportunity for the OSC to schedule a meeting to meet, to deliberate and discuss things, they still need to pass it up the - you know, if there are gonna be formal recommendations, they still have to be passed up the food chain to the council. So I think that makes it a very difficult tight timeframe.

Olga Cavalli: It's a tight agenda. So Victoria I understand your concern. But I think we - if there is something that we have to discuss about format, we should do it in the list during this week. This is why I thought that Julie's format of her document - I'm not saying it's the only one, but it could be just an idea of using the same format as a whole background for our document.

Victoria McEvedy: Well I was really just gonna suggest that, you know, our work may actually already be done for us Olga. Because if we complete each report, we can just stitch the reports together. I mean it can be a (compendulum) of four reports, and perhaps we could do a joint introduction and conclusion. So that was really all I - gonna be - just where I was gonna go with that. Because it would save re-drafting from scratch when we can just, you know, seamlessly put them together.

Olga Cavalli: And I can be the one compiling the information, maybe Julie or Rob can help me in doing that. I'll ask Julie if she has some time available. But I can compile all the information, and of course you check it afterwards. But we don't have much time. So next week will be crucial for achieving this.

Claudio DiGangi: Olga, this is Claudio. I just had a question for Rob. You know, looking at the dates that he just was working off of, I understand that the GNSO council, I mean I think they have their own rules for when material needs to be posted to their list so they can consider it at their meetings. And I'm just, you know, looking at the dates.

And I was thinking Rob, I mean can you estimate? I mean do you think that there's - there might be enough time for the council to consider this before September 16? Because next Friday is the 4th of September, and then it would have to go to the OSC, and then it would have to go to the GNSO council.

Victoria McEvedy: I think - excuse me, can I just jump in there? Because Chuck had suggested that could happen at the same time. They always (unintelligible) us not reviewing us. And it was Chuck's own suggestion that it could be contemporaneous, just in case it's helpful.

Olga Cavalli: Claudio if I may, I don't think the OST will take time. I know Chuck, he's not on the call right now, but he promised to deliver it very quickly. And he's attending our call, so the OSC is aware of our work. And in the GNSO my suggestion would be to share it in the council list with a due date, and see if we receive some comments, and insist on that a little bit. And I don't know Rob, what you think about it.

Rob Hoggarth: Well as you know Olga, the schedule for the council is a meeting next Thursday.

Olga Cavalli: I know.

Rob Hoggarth: September 3. Then their next meeting is not until September 24. You know, I'm sure that there could be some flexibility. Of course I can't speak for the board or for the council. But, you know, if you were able to set up and coordinate with Chuck a timetable for a consideration and a vote of the

council at the September 24 meeting, then, you know, something could be shared past the board paper receipt deadline.

And, you know, the board would, you know, have the opportunity potentially to discuss it. You know, as you all know, there are a number of different winds going in different directions on this. There may be some in the community who say, you know, these recommendations are something that the new council should consider, not the old council.

But I think in terms of your specific work and recommendation in coordinating with Chuck, I'm sure you can find something to get something before the council at its 24 September meeting at the very latest. And that may be what you want to look at, combined with your thought about email circulation, dialog on the council list that would help give this a good airing.

Olga Cavalli: Rob, so we should go through a motion and voting process for this document in the council?

Rob Hoggarth: I - you know, the way that the implementation planning process was set up, there was an expectation that work teams would make their recommendations under the coordinating efforts of the steering committee, and that ultimately that the council would have an opportunity to review and vote on. That's the assumption I'm continuing to operate under. Chuck, you know, when you guys get together again on the email list may have a different interpretation. But that's my understanding of the…

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Let's share these ideas with Chuck and Avri, and maybe we can find a way to make our voices heard by the board. This was the idea of doing all this effort right now.

Claudio DiGangi: I just had a thought, this is Claudio. I mean do you guys think it matters the way we present the material? I know Victoria's last suggestion, which I think, you know, makes sense, is to combine all the reports. But as far as when they're gonna be considered, do you think that makes any difference? I mean would it be easier for the council to consider them as we sent them as separate documents?

Olga Cavalli: I would say that if we send the one document would help a lot. If not it would be very much confusing.

Rob Hoggarth: If I could make one last comment, this is Rob, it's just a personal observation particularly given all of the challenges that we've been experiencing with this push to seat the new council in Seoul is that I think more time is always better to complete work, and to have everybody comfortable with the thoughts and recommendations that are being made.

As you may - as some of you may know, there have even been calls that the board should put a moratorium on any new constituencies until, you know, after there's further discussion of stakeholder groups and constituency structures in the GNSO. And so my only caution would be to rush to a finish line and then find that, you know, the documents that you've worked so hard on don't get considered for another two months or something.

And so my thought there is that to really make sure that you do have that conversation with Chuck and Avri to make sure that there's an opportunity to have the dialog.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you very much Rob. Okay let's try to get Chuck's comments on the list, and perhaps then with Chuck and Avri. And - but we try to keep our commitment for finishing something for next week, end of next week. We have another conference call same time next Friday, and we have some - I have agreed in doing some things. We'll detail them in the document, and then email I write right now so I don't forget anything.

And I don't know if anyone wants to say something more? Okay, thank you very much for your participation. Thank you for this special effort that you're doing in achieving this. I'm very proud of our working team, I think we're doing a great progress, and I commend you all for this effort. So let's keep in touch during the week, and let's talk to you - I'll talk to you again next Friday.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Have a nice weekend.

Rob Hoggarth: You too.

Victoria McEvedy: Thank you, thanks Olga.

((Cross talk))

END