

**GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work
Team 22 May 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 **22 May** 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-20090522.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>

The action items arising from the call can be found at:
<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-osc-csg/msg00335.html>

These also are posted on the wiki at:

https://st.icann.org/icannosc/index.cgi?osc_constituency_operation_work_team_meeting_notes.

Participants present:

Zahid Jamil - CBUC
Rafik Dammak - NCUC
Olga Cavalli - Work team chair - NCA
Victoria Mcevedy - IPC
Charles Gomes - Registry c.
Michael Young - Work team vice chair - Registry c.
SS Kshatriya - Individual
Tony Harris - ISP (joined after roll call)

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund - Policy Consultant
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat
Gisella Gruber-White – GNO Secretariat

Absent apologies

Claudio Digangi – IPC
Krista Papac
Rob Hoggarth - Staff

Glen Desaintgery: I see the recording has started. So, I do the roll call Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, please ma'am. Thank you.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you. We have on the call Zahid Jamil

(Zahid Jamil): Hi, this is him.

Glen Desaintgery: (Rafik Dammak

(Rafik Dammak): Hello.

Glen Desaintgery: Victoria McEvedy.

Olga Cavalli.

Olga Cavalli: Hello.

Glen Desaintgery: Charles Gomez.

Charles Gomez: Here.

Glen Desaintgery: Sorry Chuck I'm not used to that name.

Charles Gomez: I don't have to spell Charles. If I say Chuck, I have to spell it. So...

Glen Desaintgery: (Martin Young) and (SS Sospatria).

SS Kshatriya Hello.

Glen Desaintgery: And for staff we have Julie Hedlund. (Gisele Grubel-White) and myself Glen Desaintgery. And (Gisele) will be taking over the logistics of all the calls for us in the very near future. Taking it over completely from me.

Olga Cavalli: That's right. Welcome (Gisele) and thank you very much for sending our call in details for this conference call. And good...Yes?

Glen Desaintgery: Sorry Olga to interrupt you. And we have two apologies, (Claudia Digangi) and (Krista Bobeck).

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Yes, they sent emails apologizing for not coming.

Glen Desaintgery: And Rob Hoggarth.

Olga Cavalli: And we have Rob also.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Anyway, they have been very active in the email list. Thank you everyone. Good morning, good evening, good afternoon.

First I would like to thank very much (Michael) for taking the lead in the last conference call and I heard the mp3 recording and I read all the transcripts and I think we did a great job and I thank him very much for that.

And also I would like to review the agenda. It's quite long but I think if we go - it shouldn't take long, each of the things. We have detail in the agenda unless you want to change or delete or add something new.

So, should we start with the agenda?

Okay. The first thing that I proposed to you yesterday or the day before is reviewing the status of (unintelligible) issues that were shared in the last conference call.

And the first was a letter to the (OSC). I just received a draft copy sent by (Michael) on the list. I don't know if you already had the chance to review it. I think it is a very good letter but I wonder if we should send this letter now and it's a question. I'm not saying that I'm against sending this letter. In the light of the latest news sent by the board that the agenda for the (TSO) restructuring should take longer. This is my understanding of the message sent by Julie and also sent by Glen, or by (Denise), I'm sorry to the (GNSO) counsel list.

So, perhaps I would like to share with you some ideas about this letter. I think the letter is fine but my question is should we send it now or perhaps we could wait in the light of this delay of the process?

Any comments?

(Michael): Sure Olga. It's (Michael) speaking.

Olga Cavalli: Okay (Michael) go ahead.

(Michael): I'm not sure - I agree with you. I think we should hold for now. I'm not sure if it's clear yet whether or not we'll - I don't think from the statements that have been made whether or not we're clear that these charters will go through their public comment period and be approved before or after we've finished our recommendations.

I think that's still kind of up in the air. So, I think until we know that and know whether or not there is a timing issue, we should hold the letter back because the letter explicitly describes a timing issue. And I don't think we know that we have one anymore.

Olga Cavalli: That's exactly my impression. Other comments?

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, I'll jump in on that one because I had views on the sending of the letter...

Olga Cavalli: Oh, I don't know...Who is this? I can barely hear your voice it's Victoria?

Victoria McEvedy: It's Victoria. I agree with (Michael). I think we haven't seen the board - sending a very short paragraph in summary. And I think we should just wait and see. And it may well be that we have seen the actual resolution that might be appropriate to something in some kind of (unintelligible) revised form. But, I agree with (Michael).

Olga Cavalli: So far Victoria I cannot understand very well what you say because you are very, very low.

Victoria McEvedy: Sorry about that.

Olga Cavalli: But you said you agreed with (Michael).

Victoria McEvedy: I do. I do. I think...

Olga Cavalli: Oh, now it's better. That's great.

Victoria McEvedy: Thanks. Look, I think we should just wait. We haven't seen the actually (unintelligible) and we should just wait to see that. It may well be that we don't need to send a letter at all but it may well be that we decide that it's appropriate to sort of very politely remind them that our work is coming and ask them to consider (a summary) process.

So, I agree with (Michael).

Olga Cavalli: So, we wait and see, that's the idea?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments?

Charles Gomez: Olga, just a couple bits of information from the council list. I along with someone else, and I forget who it was on the council list, this week after we saw (Denise)'s email raised the more specific question of whether or not they're going to be specific in terms of timeframe for seating the new council.

Haven't' seen a response for that yet. But several of us are concerned that we get some specific direction, there's the clear indication of delay. And I think it was (Tony Harris) that actually mentioned on the list that it would be good that the council be seated not at a teleconference meeting, the restructured council be seated not at a teleconference meeting, but at an in person meeting and the next one of those would be (unintelligible) in October.

So, that's probably reasonable that that might be the target. But we have asked that that be specifically stated. And secondly, with regard to the charter approval. My understanding, and Julie you can help us here, is that the board has asked staff to actually come back with some recommended changes in the charters. Is that correct Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. That's correct.

Charles Gomez: Okay. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Chuck. Yes, I saw the comments that you're mentioning and as far as I have seen I have received no response, no complete responses, about timing.

So, about the letter to the (OSC) we can agree that we wait and see how this process evolves. Right? Okay.

So, this is our first point in the agenda. Going to the next one, 1.2, Project Plans.

You, during the last call, agreed to develop a preliminary project plan suggesting timing for completed (chapters). We have received the one correspondent to Chapter 2 sent by Victoria and Chapter 2 sent by Julie and Chuck.

Deadline was today Friday 22. I would like to ask the leaders of the other two chapters which are - well, (unintelligible) I apologize but (unintelligible) talked to me yesterday on the phone and he said he was going to get involved with this issue.

So, maybe he's joining with us in the call during today or I can call him during today or tomorrow but he promised to send this information soon and perhaps (SS) you could tell us some idea if you could send this plan maybe by early next week or...What's your comment about this?

SS Kshatriya Yeah, Olga I have already sent the mail where I indicated that two weeks from today and only from that I have not updated the plan.

So, you can take it that I have (unintelligible) permission.

- Olga Cavalli: I didn't understand you very well. You say you will send it soon?
- SS Kshatriya No, I have already sent the mail, it was about one or two days back.
- Olga Cavalli: Oh, I haven't received it. Maybe I had some problems receiving your emails. Because you told me about one email you sent on May 11 and I didn't see you until you resent it to me.
- Did you send it to the list?
- SS Kshatriya Yeah. It is sent to the list but I have not updated the plan. Only indicated that two weeks from now.
- So, I'll update the plan in a day or two.
- Olga Cavalli: Okay. Great. So, in a day or two we will have your form updated and we have comments from (Tony) that he will get the table updated from his (unintelligible).
- So, this is our - any comments to this 1.2 point in our agenda?
- (Tony): Just that I don't think that (SS)'s email made it to the list. I haven't seen it either.
- Olga Cavalli: I haven't seen it. But he also mentioned an email that he wanted some feedback from myself and I didn't get it. So, maybe you have some - I've been traveling and I lost some emails in the way.

But (SS) indicates that you - just as you did the other day that I didn't reply and you see no responses from myself or from others just resend it or ask some of us. Perhaps we have some problems in-between the network.

Okay. So, go to 1.3.

SS Kshatriya Olga let me...

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

SS Kshatriya ...check the sent mail.

Victoria McEvedy: (SS), could I add a comment too? Just very quickly.

Olga Cavalli: Sure, sure Victoria. Go ahead.

Victoria McEvedy: First of all (SS) I didn't get your email either but just in case of trouble. But also I've only done half of my task. I'm only done the constituency part of the plan. I haven't done the stakeholder group analysis part of the plan. But I can do that in the next couple of days.

SS Kshatriya That would be a (plan) Victoria and one more thing that I had sent the mail to (unintelligible) participants which was on the 11th of May and I'd like to know if you have received or not (unintelligible) maybe check up, maybe something wrong with my side.

Victoria McEvedy: I have that email. I'm looking at that. But is that your work plan (SS)?

SS Kshatriya Good. Thank you.

Victoria McEvedy: Is that the work plan, the task one?

SS Kshatriya Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: I'm sorry. Because I was confused by that. Just maybe other people were confused or not. But I thought that this email of yours was the 11th was the identification of best and bad practices.

SS Kshatriya Yes. That I did plus there are (unintelligible) it was not sent to the list. It was sent only to three of you.

And I have requested commands and (unintelligible).

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

SS Kshatriya I'll try to be more clear.

Olga Cavalli: I received that email and I would like to comment in awhile because I have included in the agenda.

(Johnny): Hello, good morning. (Johnny). I'm joining late. Sorry.

Olga Cavalli: Good morning. How are you?

(Johnny): Sorry to be late. Traffic problems.

Olga Cavalli: No problem.

Yes (SS). Go ahead.

SS Kshatriya Is it Julie who said she has not received?

Who said just now that...

Olga Cavalli: Oh, let's do the following. Since there are some emails lost in the way. Could you please send - we sent this two or three emails that you're mentioning (SS) and we can set another time, another due date for this for completing this working plan.

Maybe we can agree on Tuesday 26th of May?

SS Kshatriya I'll go ahead with my target where I put. But, I'll (unintelligible) emails to all of you.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, great.

SS Kshatriya Maybe (unintelligible) a little bit of (unintelligible) from my side to make it clear.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you (SS) and (Tony) that you just joined we talked about this yesterday on a private call. We were talking about completing the project plans for Chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4. Your are with (Krista) to send a plan for Chapters 3 and we agreed to have this plan by another due date by Tuesday the 26th. Is that okay for you?

(Tony): That's no problem. I can do that.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you. So, (SS) we sent the emails and we tried to have all this working plans already shared and (unintelligible) into the weekly by Tuesday the 26th. We can check that in our working email list.

Charles Gomez: Olga, this is Chuck. Clarification...Did I understand (SS) to say that he needed two weeks rather than just to the 26th?

SS Kshatriya No. In two weeks I'm make recommendations (unintelligible) to go to and get comments.

Charles Gomez: Oh, okay. So, the work - the 26th is okay for the work plan?

SS Kshatriya Yes, right.

Charles Gomez: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Great. And (unintelligible) okay also for you (Tony)?

(Tony): Yeah, it's okay. I've got everything in my head I just have to put it down.
That's all.

Olga Cavalli: No. That's okay. So, we have some more days to complete that task.

About 1.3, (Identification) of Best and Bad Practices. We have more time. I don't know - did (SS) send something to the list? Maybe you can resend this email that you mentioned?

SS Kshatriya (Unintelligible) to me Olga?

Olga Cavalli: No, I just understood from what you were saying that you sent something in relation with Best and Bad practices.

SS Kshatriya It was not so much bad it was an analysis.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

SS Kshatriya I repeated this mail to you.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, yes. I know. Okay, great.

SS Kshatriya (Unintelligible) what is good and what is bad. It's not exactly bad. I didn't mean that. It's a simple analysis.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, I know. And I would like to comment in a few minutes.

Okay. So in one 1.3 we still keep the due date for Friday, five June for sending this comment? We still have the same people in charge of the different tasks and subtasks, right?

Man: As far as I know, yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. And point two, any comments? (Unintelligible) or maybe I don't have...

Man: I missed something. What is that second date of the fifth of June? Because I know next Tuesday you want the working plan for the subtask. But what is June 5?

Olga Cavalli: It's 1.3 of the agenda; Identification of Best and Bad Practices. That's something that was agreed during the last conference call on May 8. And it's to try to (unintelligible) between the working charters and the information from constituencies best and bad practices so we can add this information to our (unintelligible) documents.

Man: Everybody participates in that? It's not assigned to different groups right?

Olga Cavalli: That's my question. I'm not sure. Because I don't remember from the last call when I heard in the last mp3 recording this was agreed with the same people that different subtasks were assigned.

Maybe someone in the working group can help me?

Man: It sounds like it's probably expected that all of us would contribute there.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Man: I mean, that would seem to be the logical thing.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Let's show some ideas in the list. We still have some time ahead and see how the information comes to our list from the different people participating.

Any comments?

Okay. We'll go to point two. Comments to the letter drafted by Julie. I sent some comments to the list. Julie, I think it's a good letter. I only suggested the change of order. It's an email that I sent to you. I think it's a very good letter just putting what we request first and then some explanatory information after the question that we're making. That's the only suggestion I had.

But, I think it's a very good letter and thank you for preparing it.

Any other comments to the letter sent by Julie?

Okay. So, we should - if we agree on the...Julie, could you make the comments, the changes that I said yesterday and sent it again to the list?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Olga, I'll be happy to do that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. And if we all agree in the list that this is the letter that we want to send we should proceed, right?

Man: Well, is there any reason to wait if there's no concerns other than the one change? Could it be sent on?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, but my suggestion was very small. I mean, it's only some change in some order of the letter.

Okay, so, perhaps Julie you can make the changes and proceed.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. I'll make the changes and as you see it's a memo to come from you. So, I'll make the changes and send it to the list and then...

Olga Cavalli: Send it?

Julie Hedlund: Right, exactly.

Olga Cavalli: Great, okay. Okay, number three comments on how...Well, this is my concern about how (unintelligible) constituencies participation in our working team. I am so glad to have (Johnny) and to have (Dave) in our call because we have some people who are very active like Chuck, Victoria, (SS), (Michael) and (Claudia) participated also and (Rafik).

I would encourage (Said) and (Tony) to review the documents that were prepared by our item staff. There were two tables; constituency analysis and proposed stakeholder groups (unintelligible) analysis with information from these (unintelligible) constituencies.

It could be great if you can review this document. Jack has already made his comments and Victoria has also submitted her comments.

So, if you could add, delete or suggest changes to this table it could be great because this will be the base document to make our further analysis and make our recommendations.

So, I would encourage you to review them and they are very well drafted and order. So, this would not be a problem for you.

Man: Olga, just a point of clarification.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Man: You're asking them to mainly look at the columns that relate to their constituency, right?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, of course. Yeah, I'm sorry if it was not clear what I said.

Man: I've been doing that, yeah. I've been doing that already Olga and I'll have some comments in a few days. I do have to refer back to my constituency on that too.

Olga Cavalli: Also, not only about their constituencies, if they can add some other information that could be relevant to the document, that's fine.

Man: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Are there any other comments about these two documents that we are mentioning? We received, as I mentioned, comments from Chuck and Victoria.

As I see them as (unintelligible) documents for our further analysis I think we should agree on having them with all the information that we think is relevant.

(Tony): Well, I think possibly - I don't know what Chuck thinks but perhaps when you see (unintelligible) in some of the procedures and the way the constituencies have been set up and operating, I mean, we were pretty much left up to write our own bylaws and we had guidelines but there are some - there was some leeway to do things differently in each constituency. I don't know if you agree with that Chuck.

Charles Gomez: Oh, absolutely (Tony). I think we're going to find that there are places where its' good for consistency across constituencies and there are other places where flexibility should happen.

So, one of our goals will be to try and find that balance and our only real guide is what the board recommendations say. So...And in some cases it may come down to a board decision like we're seeing with regard to the restructuring right now that's going on.

(Tony): Yes, and another point is you see comments like it's not evident that (unintelligible) example of our constituency, the (ISP)s. I think there was a comment to the affect that we don't - our Web site does not reflect the fact that we do outreach and how we put into effect efforts to increase our

membership and things like that. And I think that's probably what you could say, well, that's our sin because we do those things. But we don't flag them in our Web site.

So, it's probably an admission of information but not an admission of action.

Charles Gomez: Right.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry. Okay, should we move to point five? Any other comments?

(Tony): I have one more on point three, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Sure, please.

(Tony): The second sentence says should we have a conference call on Friday May 29th?

Olga Cavalli: Oh, I'm sorry. This is something...

(Tony): I'm traveling. I'm a (unintelligible) next week.

Olga Cavalli: I know, I know. You're going to (Panama). I know. I'll miss that meeting. One thing that we were worried in some emails we exchanged with (Michael) and with Julie and (Robert) is that perhaps in this call there were some people not attending like (Krista) and (Claudia) and maybe it could be necessary to have a conference call next Friday.

I think that we have a very interesting group of people today and perhaps (Krista) and (Claudia) could follow the list and the meeting minutes and listen

to the mp3 and we can have our regular scheduled and have our next conference call in two weeks. Do you think it's fine?

(Tony): It's okay with me.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Tony): I think also that this - getting back to the first sentence in (unintelligible) comments on how to enhance constituency participation in our working team. Maybe this has been discussed since I was late on the call, but perhaps we could find out who's going to be in Sydney and perhaps schedule at some time which is convenient to everybody. Get together there and we may be able to bring some more people to the table.

Olga Cavalli: That's a very good comment. And by the way, I have been exchanging some emails with Glen and trying to find a date and a time during the weekend to arrange this meeting.

I don't have in mind, in this moment, if we already have a lot of time, Glen, perhaps you can help me with that?

Man: And while Glen's preparing to do that we're going to need to try and find a time that is not too ridiculous for the people who are not here in person.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. I know it's difficult.

Man: And forgive me for using US timeframe references but those are the ones I checked. From the east coast we're talking about a fourteen hours ahead and seventeen hours from the west coast.

I'm going to be there as one west coast person so it won't be a problem for me but for those that are calling in, that's where it will be challenging.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I know. (Tony), you'll be there right?

(Tony): Yeah, I'll be there.

Olga Cavalli: (SS) are you going to Sydney?

SS Kshatriya I'm not going.

Olga Cavalli: Which is your time difference with Australia? It's not that much right?

SS Kshatriya Yeah. I'm not quite sure but I think it is nine hours or so.

Olga Cavalli: Nine hours? That's a lot. I thought it was less.

Well, yeah, the idea was to find this date and time during the Saturday, Sunday schedule. It was not easy because (GNSO) has a lot of activities already scheduled and we were trying to (unintelligible) plan. So, I promise to try to find this face to face meeting.

We already did this in Mexico and I think it was the kickoff meeting. It was quite interesting and we could repeat it and perhaps bring more people. Again, talk to (GNSO) and (unintelligible) if they want to sent some representative.

I already did this with (GNSO) in their conference calls and talked to (Rhonda) and tried to bring people from (unintelligible). But we can insist.

Man: Olga, who else just on this call is planning on attending in person?

Olga Cavalli: (Unintelligible) are you going to Sydney?

Man: Nope.

Olga Cavalli: Victoria are you planning to attend the meeting?

Victoria McEvedy: I'm not planning to. It's possible that a window will open up but not at this stage.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, (unintelligible) you're not going? Right?

(Unintelligible) maybe he's going. Are you guys going? Chuck is going.

(Michael are you going to Sydney?

(Michael): Yes, I am.

Olga Cavalli: Great. (SS), you're not going and so we have more than half of the people in the call. And (Krista) maybe she's going. She was in Mexico. Maybe she has to go to Sydney.

(Tony): She usually goes so I think that's...The main reason I asked that questions Olga was so that we know what time zones we're going to have to accommodate and that's helpful information I think for Glen or whoever's arranging the time that's not too ridiculous for people calling in.

Olga Cavalli: Let's do the following. We can send an email to the list and ask who is participating if they can give us their time zone and try to find a suitable date and time in Sydney. This will help Glen and this will help us know when it's the time that we found is fine or is totally crazy for some people.

(Tony): One of the options we could do is, for example, do an early morning breakfast meeting or something like that that would be evening the night before for those that have a big difference.

Now, one of the problems with that, people have a less than eight hour time difference or something than that puts them in the middle of the night.

But, yeah, good idea Olga.

Okay, I'll send it right now after we finish the call and we'll try to find a good date and time to make this meeting and allow people who are participating remotely.

Thank you (Tony) for reminding me of this issue I was missing. I have it printed in front of me. I didn't see it.

Okay. I think we already covered 5.4. I would encourage those who didn't review the document prepared by Julie to review it and make your comments, additions or suggested (unintelligible).

Victoria McEvedy: Olga could I make a comment just about point four?

Olga Cavalli: Sure, please.

Victoria McEvedy: I'm not sure if this is the appropriate stage in agendas but we could otherwise deal with it in other business, but - and I don't know what I was (unintelligible). But it just occurs to me that the reason I wasn't able to go on to do the second part of the work plan on stakeholder (unintelligible) and stakeholder analysis.

And then given this new information we have about the boards direction, i.e. about timing, but also about methodology, I mean, I guess raise the question, I would be very interested to hear what you and particularly Chuck think who will have more information probably - I'm just wondering whether or not it's going to make sense for us to sort of bifurcate our work.

We'll essentially do it in two parts. First perhaps we should get on with all our tasks on the constituency analysis and the constituency structural issues, etc. And because it just occurs to me, do we really need to wait for the board, the structural improvement committee plus staff propose changes? I mean, should we - in a way it seems crazy to be sort of - it's like we've two parallel procedures going on both dealing with the same material.

Should we wait and then comment and see what we can - basically it says in that email from (Denise) that once the board structural improvements committee and the staff had proposed changes to those charters, they made those charters go out for (GNSO) consultation.

So, is the (GNSO) consultation is that essentially us?

Charles Gomez: Good question Victoria.

Let's see if Julie can help us there. Julie, I'm getting the impression, although we haven't seen it specifically in terms of timeframes, that staff relatively quickly is going to make recommendations for stakeholder group charter changes.

Do you know whether that's an accurate assumption on my part?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that's true.

Charles Gomez: And by that I mean in two or three weeks? Do you think that's correct?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I think that's correct.

Charles Gomez: So, Victoria's suggestion may not be to - really may not cause a lot of delays anyway and so probably more conservatively within a month we may have a picture of what changes that the staff is going to come back and recommend be made in charters which would give us more insight in terms of what will happen.

Obviously the stakeholder groups still have to deal with those. But probably that will give us - we'll be at a point where we're looking at a little bit more complete information.

So, I think our suggestion is probably good.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, I agree with that Chuck.

Olga Cavalli: Let me understand what you're suggesting that we focus on constituencies and not on stakeholder groups? That's what you're suggesting?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes, basically. I'm just saying we could get on now and do all our work on the constituencies and then wait for the board and the staffs recommendations on stakeholder group charters and then they can comment on those.

So, just so we do things in two stages really.

Olga Cavalli: I think it's a very good idea. Yeah.

Man: I agree, yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments?

Man: I think it's a good suggestion because working on something which may be invalid in a few days doesn't seem to make much sense.

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments?

Great. So, I wonder how this impact our working plan?

Man: Olga if I might say so and this is probably being recorded. But it would seem that there is some possibility that things may be delayed in general across the entire restructuring plan. I don't know what you think Chuck but it looks that way.

Charles Gomez: Yeah, I think that's true and as far as the work plans go, Olga, it's just a matter of adjusting our target date on certain tasks.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, you're right. I was just looking at them.

Charles Gomez: Our work plans are going to need to be flexible to deal with the realities of the situation. So, we shouldn't view them as something that's in concrete that we can't change.

Man: Exactly.

Charles Gomez: And that's fine. And that's good.

Olga Cavalli: And I would totally agree. It's just (unintelligible) exactly looking at that there are different tasks and somehow related with constituencies and some are related with stakeholder groups. So, maybe they have different timing in the plan.

So, perhaps we can review the timing for our working plan in the light of this delay.

And, maybe they are abated or no.

Charles Gomez: I think it's okay for the little sub teams to make changes on their own to their work plan as we go forward. And as long as those are published on the wiki that should be fine. I don't think we need to make a real bureaucratic procedure.

Olga Cavalli: No, no, no.

Charles Gomez: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: I totally agree.

Okay. Let's each sub team review the working plans and also this is something I asked Julie and (unintelligible) we are all able to make the changes into the wiki. So, if someone wants to just go into the wiki and change some dates that's fine or we can ask also Julie that she is also very helpful and she can make these changes.

Charles Gomez: The changes really aren't very hard to make.

Olga Cavalli: No.

Charles Gomez: It's not a terribly user friendly tool but if you log in you just click the edit button and then once you've made your changes you hit save and it's done.

Olga Cavalli: Exactly. Yeah, I tried the other day to add my last name and it looked perfectly (unintelligible).

Okay, so, let's review the working plan and I will suggest to go to point five. I have a question and I would like to share some ideas with you. Okay, we have the documents which are very helpful prepared by staff and reviewed by all of us.

And (SS) made an excellent analogy of the documents (unintelligible) by staff and he made a specific comment of suggestions and ideas that he gathered reading all this information.

I think this is a good exercise.

So, what we should be doing once we have agreed on ground documents for preparing this recommendations and I would like to share with you maybe not completely today but have in mind how are we going to produce this outcome of our charter request us to develop a document in making recommendations on some issues.

So, it's not a big table but I imagine that it should be a (unintelligible) document with relevant recommendations very specific and very concrete that apply to the constituencies and stakeholder group in relation with the task that we must review.

So, I like the analysis made by (SS) and I wonder how are we going to proceed once we have agreed in working plans and in documents to have (unintelligible) information and base knowledge documents?

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: I'd like to (unintelligible) on that.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, Victoria go ahead.

Victoria McEvedy: Look, I mean, it may be that I'm just - my only concern is that, I mean, I think it's very helpful that we have got all the stuff and I think it should be sort of combined and (unintelligible) perhaps some base document for us is a working document. Until the actual subtasks, this is only my own thought, but until the actual sub groups have done some work I mean obviously each subtask is going to come out with something in writing.

And until we see the various formats and the kind of work product I just wonder if we'll end up being process driven if it's too early. We should just wait till we get those reports and then decide how to combine the reports.

I mean, maybe that - anyway I just put that down there but...

Man: Probably make some sense.

Man: I would agree with that as well Victoria.

SS Kshatriya: (SS) here. Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

SS Kshatriya Hello, can you hear me?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I can hear you.

SS Kshatriya Yeah, you have (unintelligible) a sense of (unintelligible). In fact, it was a question (unintelligible) can produce a complete (unintelligible) analysis. I have covered only two plans and (unintelligible).

So, this is going to be helpful to everybody. And what I find now in this meeting is that (unintelligible) otherwise (unintelligible) to the board. So, they are going to do that comprehensive and act surprised.

So, whether the (unintelligible) can have some analysis prepared by the staff. I have just (unintelligible) very clearly that it's a small (unintelligible) exercise only taking two criteria. All possible criteria (unintelligible) can look into.

So, in question of whether (unintelligible) having time and all that (unintelligible). I'll do that.

Charles Gomez: It's not at all clear to me what we would be asking staff to do. Analysis of all recommendations related to our test seems like a pretty broad task. What are we really looking for?

SS Kshatriya Hello, Chuck, you are hearing me?

Charles Gomez: Yes.

SS Kshatriya Constituency that (unintelligible) six country (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) they have something - I don't get the name, number of documents which are to be referred by the (blue) team.

Now, instead of each member going to and they are not all (unintelligible) whole - I mean, very clearly they can go deep in through the document.

(Unintelligible) has been going into those documents for a long time. Again, they'll be making (unintelligible). Not whether they can but taking all possible criteria and (unintelligible) that which constituencies (unintelligible) in those criteria. And that will be helpful to the (blue) team.

That is we are not (unintelligible) from the (unintelligible) but from - (unintelligible) for them to fall back.

Charles Gomez: I guess where I'm having trouble is that most of the constituency charters and their documents are not terribly long. So, let me approach it this way. Julie are you clear of what the task would be?

Julie Hedlund: No. I'm afraid I'm not clear.

Olga Cavalli: No. Me either. I don't get it.

Julie Hedlund: My question would be I had done an analysis based on the criteria that we had determined, that the work team, had determined that we would consider in the original work plan.

I see that (SS) had provided additional criteria to analyze. I certainly am willing to analysis additional criteria for each constituency if the work team agrees what those criteria are.

But, they would be then in addition to those that I believe we've already identified in the various subtask and the work plans.

So, short of knowing what they are and then the few that (SS) identified, I wouldn't know how to begin on this I think.

Charles Gomez: So, (SS), let me ask you a question. Would this approach work where any sub team that's working on a task if they have specific requests for additional information that they would request that of staff directly so they know exactly what to look for?

SS Kshatriya Before answering your question, I'll (unintelligible) to what Julie had just said. Now, what document Julie has prepared it is a (unintelligible) against all constituencies. That these constituencies have (unintelligible) criteria.

But when I looked into that I found it is not so. So, once you look (unintelligible) you find that everything is fine. But if you look (unintelligible) it is not.

That is what I wanted. To look deeply and list as many criteria as possible. Now, Chuck your question is about (unintelligible). Again, if this document is ready then they (unintelligible) clear cut picture. And beyond that if they ask something (unintelligible).

Victoria McEvedy: Can I jump in here for a second?

Olga Cavalli: Yes Victoria. I was just wondering if (SS) is also making the point, and perhaps you're not (SS) but you can say so, were you also saying there must be other work in relation to the board and the structural improvements

committee. There must be a lot more detailed analysis that we might be able to have.

I think Rob answered that question and said that we're not allowed and that it's private and confidential.

So, I just note that incase that wasn't an issue that you were raising.

But I have to say, I agree with what (SS) is saying. I found, not to be critical and it's not personal with a remark, but I did find the constituency analysis (conclusory). It was drawing conclusions without necessarily seeking out the base information so one could validate the conclusion and form an independent view of it.

And that's why I undertook the table, exercise that I did, of putting some of the actual data into that table. And I don't know if other people found it helpful but I did. And it could be vastly improved I think.

So, I think there might be room to sort of merge all the (unintelligible), someone to manage the process of merging all those exercises into a great big master table or something. But I don't know if that's where you were going with that or not.

Olga Cavalli: Let's do the following. I think we have some interesting ideas here but we have some people not participating today that may want to say something about this.

Let's exchange these ideas in the list. (SS) could you summarize what you said and also Victoria and try to find an agreed way of using this base information to go to our next step and discuss this in the list and in our next

conference call in two weeks. Do you think that we can discuss it in the list and finish our - we have two more points in our agenda and we have ten minutes, like eight minutes.

Man: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

Man: Yeah, I'd just like to ask perhaps, I don't know if (SS) or Julie could identify in a very short mail which the criteria items to be added would be. Because if we can get that in a very short email that would give us clarity on whether we think it's worthwhile getting Julie to expand her research into new issues.

Olga Cavalli: Exactly. That's the (unintelligible) some ideas and also have Julie understanding her process to be done. And also let the others in the list participate because we are not - not everyone on the call and I think this should be agreed among the whole working team.

SS Kshatriya Olga, (SS) here.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Now, you have given me some thoughts, I'll do it. But what Victoria I spoke I could not understand correctly or clearly. So, I'll (unintelligible) Victoria to put down her commands into email. That would be useful to me.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, sure.

Olga Cavalli: Great. That's a great idea. And I think it will help everyone on the call and those who are not on the call also.

SS Kshatriya And the second (unintelligible) that the criteria, I expect (unintelligible) because they are more clear about (unintelligible) than I. I mean I definitely have picked up two criteria (unintelligible) and help the (unintelligible) to go further into this.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Let's see how we agree to move forward about this and see how the staff will be involved in preparing what they have to do and our involvement as a working team.

So, I would suggest to write two points that Victoria wanted to talk about (unintelligible) and the constituency part of the (OSC) and the role of the (OSC) in relation with our work products.

Victoria would you comment about these two points that you suggested to including the agenda?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes, certainly. And Julie thank you very much for sending me - they were actually very helpful. I do read all these links actually sooner or later. It's a huge amount of information to digest when you're trying to get on top of it.

Look, it seems clear, my understanding is, maybe part of my issues and I apologize to anyone if I was driving them crazy over the last, by asking so many questions, but I mean, although we're - people were reporting out of our group to the (OSC). Sometimes the - I mean, of course Chuck and Olga do tell us stuff but it's usually coming - it's not coming in advance and you can't consider it clearly necessarily.

So, I think that there's a - but I saw from what Julie said, basically my question was are they just managing? They're not - I wanted to be sure that

there wasn't a replication or to understand the nature of any overlap. I mean, in particular in the steering committee and our work team and also their role in relation to our work products because...But I think from the charter that Julie sent, and Chuck and Olga you can comment on this, they set up as three sub committees basically and their then just going to manage and oversee our tasks. Is that right?

Charles Gomez: That is absolutely correct. The steering committee is not doing any detailed work on these things. They're serving really a coordinating function; getting the team started. If the teams have questions trying to answer those questions, serving as an interface between the teams and the council as necessary. So, really, in practical terms, the steering committee, the (OSC) in particular is not very active right now other than on a list keeping them informed and then giving reports to the council in terms of progress to the work teams.

The real works going on with the work team.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, great. Thank you very much. That's all I needed to know and I'm happy with that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So, any other business? Any other comments? I think we have some things to do in our list. We'll send the email right now to the list and to (unintelligible) to see if we can find a date and a time that suites everyone. (Unintelligible) participating and we can exchange some ideas on how to use the existing information to prepare our outcome.

We still have something to do about the working plan. We have a new due date for Tuesday 26, May and we have to - another due date for Friday June 5 for exchanging some ideas about best and bad practices.

Is there any other comment or any other issues to discuss in the call?

Victoria McEvedy: Well, I have one. I just, to follow-up on what I was just saying. Would it be possible, do you think, for either Chuck or Olga or someone to perhaps, from time to time, give us a - because very much it's like you (unintelligible) and ask for the information. We're not necessarily getting an automatic update on why the developments impacting our work and/or materials that arise and may be useful.

And I just don't know what other people think about whether or not that will be helpful. But, I would find it helpful.

Charles Gomez: It sounds like a good idea. I've been trying to forward all day anything that I saw that might relate to this particular working team and, in fact, I think I forwarded something this week...

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

Charles Gomez: That it was a topic that came up that I saw, oh, this could be something for this particular work team. I do the same thing for the - because I'm (OSC) chair I do the same thing. And I've sent several to (Ray Facet) who chairs the (GNSO) operations work team. So, I'm trying to do that. I may not have done it well enough but I'll try to be more diligent in that regard.

Victoria McEvedy: Right, thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, we've tried to gather all the information that's relevant. I myself will also try to send to the list of the things I think are important but maybe we missed something. So, perhaps some other people on the working team may find relevant information and please share it into our list.

Charles Gomez: Let me ask a quick question Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Charles Gomez: Would you rather I send it to the whole list or just to you? Probably I've been sending it to you because you're the chair. But if you're comfortable I can send it to the whole list.

Olga Cavalli: I cannot recall in this moment you're message. And for some reason I didn't share it with the list because I don't remember exactly what it was in this moment and I thought it was okay to have that in mind for myself as a chair.

But, perhaps with (unintelligible) that's an important issue to share with the list. That's fine.

Charles Gomez: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: I agree that the list must be...I'm not the one sending everything to the list because I think we have to take care of the list. It's not people don't pay attention to the emails. But if there is something that you think is important just please share it with the list.

Charles Gomez: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I think we're done its one hour. We made it this time.

Thank you all very much for your participation. I will send right now this information about trying to find a date and time in Sydney for a face to face

meeting and we have some due dates and some (unintelligible) to be done for this date. And we meet in two weeks, right? In a conference call of course.

Charles Gomez: Yes. And thanks Olga. Nice meeting.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much.

Have a nice weekend.

Man: Thank you Olga.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Woman: Bye.

END