

**GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work
Team 25 September 2009 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work Team teleconference **25 September 2009** at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-constituency-ops-20090911.mp3>

On page:

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

Participants present:

Olga Cavalli - work team chair – NCA

Chuck Gomes – Registries

Victoria McEvedy - IPC

Claudio Digangi - IPC - joined after the roll call

Tony Harris – ISP - joined after the roll call

Michael Young – Registries - joined after the roll call

SS Kshatriya - Individual

ICANN Staff

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Julie Hedlund – Policy Staff

Apologies

Rafik Dammak – NCUC

Krista Papac – Registrar c.

Zahid Jamil - CBUC

Coordinator: Excuse me. This recording has started.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much operator. Glen, could you be so kind to make a roll call?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes. Certainly Olga. Good morning, good afternoon everyone. On the call we have Olga Cavalli, Chuck Gomes and SS Kshatriya and for staff we have Julie Hedlund and Glen DeSaintgery myself. We have apologies from Zahid

Jamil and Krista Papac also said that she might not be able to make the call today. And I think that's all the apologies that I have recorded Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you so much Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Julie is there any news from staff in relation with policies or from the Board? I just read an email from (Robert) this morning about a new - it's a new request for constituency for consumer constituency. I'm right with that? It's a request or it's a constituency already approved. Which is the status of this - of this email? Did you see it?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, I have not seen the email.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: It just came this morning very early. Yes.

Julie Hedlund: I don't have it.

Chuck Gomes: Olga, that - Olga, that request is not a new request for a constituency I don't think. It's been the works for a while.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: But it hasn't - none of those new ones have been approved yet.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. That was my question. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. The update...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes. The update yesterday in the Council meeting was from (Rob) I think was that staff has sent some suggestions for some modifications to some of the new constituency charters and that's being worked now.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Yes. I remember that from the call. But this email that just got in my (doubt) is if it was already approved or it's just a request. I think they made a presentation in Mexico and during the GNSO open meeting this constituency and I made some questions for them. Yes. I think they were there. Okay. Thank you Chuck. Thank you Julie.

SS...

SS Kshatriya: Would you be so kind to tell us which is the status of your sub working team, where you are? I must confess that I had no time to review all the documents that you sent me. At least for me...

SS Kshatriya: Yes. Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: I've been traveling and had a lot of work. Would be easier to see one version that you could have put all the comments that you already received and I did - I couldn't - I must confess I couldn't realize which was of the seven documents that one. So...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...this is why I'm asking.

SS Kshatriya: I have not. I have not summarized it yet. It is none of the documents are final. They're all supporting documents. But I'll give the brief again. I circulated draft -- one on 4th of September. And the comments from Chuck and Victoria were received.

These Board comments were (unintelligible) almost 100%. And that team has a draft two, which was circulated on September 10. On draft two I got comments from Chuck and Krista. Now Chuck's comments, they were mostly on Victoria's (unintelligible) feedback. So I requested Victoria to give - I mean to (rejoin) (unintelligible) which she had given.

Now all these (two) documents to start comments, Chuck's comments and Victoria's (agenda), all three I have circulated to the (small) team which is Victoria, Claudio and (Rafat) and requested them that telling that after Friday meeting I'll be making a final receiving all the inputs from everybody. So far I have not received any.

Now I'm planning to give another three days and Monday I'll summarize and accommodate as far as possible in my - I'll say final draft I'll tell or maybe draft three if you like where all concerns from Chuck and Krista and also attached all these (three) documents to look into it. So that is my plan. I mean if you have any suggestion, I can take (a look at that too).

Olga Cavalli: No. Thank you very much. It's my problem but I had really not enough time to go through all the documents. And I think it would work for the sub working team this summarizing document that you're talking about that you could prepare Monday if I understood you well.

SS Kshatriya: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: And perhaps what we should do and what you should do among this working team is when you send it just put a date - a due date for receiving comments. And I would also suggest, and I can also support with another email after you

send yours, that perhaps if for example Claudio didn't comment, just encourage Claudio to review the summarized document and send his comments and so on. So you're sure that all your sub working team have the opportunity - a chance to...

SS Kshatriya: Right.

Olga Cavalli: ...give their opinion and their comments.

SS Kshatriya: I agree to that and within hours I'll send mail to all three of them and request them to speed up and that I'll be summarizing on Monday.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

SS Kshatriya: That's (unintelligible) (we plan).

Olga Cavalli: Thank you so much. So you already have a plan. Regarding Victoria, she's not on the call I think, right.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: We had a teleconference...

Glen DeSaintgery: Claudio has...

Claudio Di Gangi: Hi Olga, it's Claudio.

Olga Cavalli: Hi Claudio. How are you?

Claudio Di Gangi: Good.

Olga Cavalli: Before going on, let me summarize a little bit what we have been talking about. You are in SS' sub working team. SS will prepare a summary of all the

documents and comments and information that he has received in our sub working team. And he will summarize it in a new document by Monday. So if you could review it and send your comments, he will send it and also send some other information in our sub work team.

So - and he will also set up a due date for receiving these comments. So it just - this is what we have been talking about these few minutes since we started the call.

Claudio Di Gangi: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: You and the sub working team, which is (1:00 to 2:00) (unintelligible).

Claudio Di Gangi: Okay. Great. Yes. I haven't had an opportunity to comment but I will. But I'll wait until - I guess I'll wait until Monday until this new document is circulated.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you so much. SS, do you have any...

((Crosstalk))

(Michael): (Unintelligible) (Michael's) joining.

Olga Cavalli: (Michael), good morning.

(Michael): Good morning. Sorry about being late. I have a conflicting call I had to clear off first.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes and this is Victoria joining as well.

Olga Cavalli: Victoria.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: How are you?

Victoria McEvedy: (Nice).

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Just for those that just got in the call, we were talking with SS that he will - he will prepare a summary document with all the comments that he has received in his sub working team by Monday. He will submit it to the list. So for those who haven't commented or (unintelligible), among the sub working team, they are encouraged to do so.

And perhaps he should - SS should set up a due date for receiving these comments and he could prepare the draft version for house by one week or before the next conference call. Is that okay SS?

SS Kshatriya: Yes. That's fine.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Victoria. We had a conference call a few days ago, I think on Monday. Could you tell us which is the status of your - of your draft document and your sub working team. I think that you wanted to set up a call for today. I'm so sorry. I will not be able to join because I travel - I must travel to the interior of Argentina. But tell us which is the status of your document.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: Good morning.

Olga Cavalli: (Tony), good morning.

Tony Harris: Hi. Sorry I'm late. A traffic problem.

Olga Cavalli: No problem.

Victoria McEvedy: (Unintelligible) was light (Tony). Don't worry. I was just - I was just going to explain where we're at. We - don't worry about joining the call because we already had your comments so it's not so important. I really just wanted to arrange an opportunity for other people to have a discussion who hadn't been on the call on Monday. And the people on the call on Monday were myself, (Michael) and Olga and Julie.

So I haven't re-circulated anything although I just - I gave a short summary on the list of the comments that we had discussed on Monday and they were about the definition of minutes and also the openness of lists which we decided to go back to the Board Governance Committee about. And I'm afraid I haven't got around to drafting anything on that.

So I don't - I haven't actually checked the status of the (due) although I don't know who's free to participate in the call after this one. Does anyone...

Man: What time - what time would the call be?

Victoria McEvedy: It would be. It would be immediately following this call.

Man: I have no problem.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

Claudio Di Gangi: I could do that Victoria. This is Claudio.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Fine. So we just - we'll just have a chat after that just so that people have had an opportunity to discuss it. And I think it was actually really useful because we actually managed to get to the real (knob) of people's objections, which can just be easier than constantly emailing stuff.

So that's what we'll be doing. And then I will try and - we're only focusing on the exact language of the recommendation, which was Part 2, which I

circulated again. And we're going to try and focus on that. And that seems to be narrowing actual areas of contention. So it is helpful to do that.

Then I'll try and basically summarize. I mean if it's not contentious, obviously I would just amend. But if it is, I'll put both, you know, both positions then and re-circulate. So that's where we are pending the call today.

Olga Cavalli: Great. So Victoria, if you - if you have the chance to have this call today with other members of the working team or whoever wants to join, when do you think, and you have some feedback which is I like - I would like to have a sense of when would you be able to have a document to summarize all the comments received and sent to the - to the - to our working team?

Victoria McEvedy: Well like I say, one of the things we may have to send off for response from a third party. So that would obviously - but I mean subject to that - I mean I can try - I can - I can't promise absolutely because it depends A, how much work's involved and B, on my other commitments. But I mean I can try an aim for the end of Monday my time.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Great. That's in the same line that - what SS is planning. So great. So let's do that and we wait for this information by Monday. And perhaps - what I suggested to SS and may work for your sub working team if you could - once you have a draft document for the sub working team to set up a due date for your - this small group to finally send comments and then you can share with the - with the working team in our list.

Perhaps we could think about one week or one week and a half more and just have those pieces by the next conference call in two weeks. Do you think that's feasible?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. That definitely seems feasible...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: ...from my perspective. In fact that time could be speeded up I think. But...

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thanks so much Victoria. Any questions to Victoria or to SS so far?

Man: Yes. I have just one question for Victoria. And I'm sorry; I may have missed it. You did mention I think a few minutes ago that you had sent another submission this week but I can't seem to find it.

Victoria McEvedy: Oh no, it wasn't this week.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Oh, I'm sorry. I got that wrong then. Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. I just re-circulated the recommendations part of the - of the document that, you know, the contentious final document.

Man: Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: All I did was re-circulate and paste out the recommendations. It was exactly the same wording. So if you got the full document, I don't know what page it was on, but it's Part 2 recommendations. So yes, it's no different if you can locate that.

Man: Yes. That's okay. I've got that, yes.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

Man: Thank you very much.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. (Tony) Krista couldn't make the call. She sent her apologies. But she shared with the whole working team your document. As I already have

commented and my comments were included by Krista and by you and so I think that you are quite okay with document. It's - you're just giving it to all the working teams so we can make comments. Is that okay?

Tony Harris: Yes. That's fine.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Am I right?

Tony Harris: Sure. We're finished with that. Yes, that's fine.

Olga Cavalli: (Tony), could you please perhaps we could set up a due date for submitting comments to Krista and to you from the different working team members? What do you think?

Tony Harris: Well, it's not a very long document. So, probably...

Olga Cavalli: I know.

Tony Harris: ...I don't know, maybe a week would be enough.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Okay.

Tony Harris: I don't know what other people think, you know.

Olga Cavalli: I would encourage Krista or you could tell Krista if she can send a message, which is establishing a due date for that...

Tony Harris: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: ...so people know they have to comment or a silent means that they liked it.

Chuck Gomes: Now has the final recommendations from the subgroup been distributed to all of us?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I think that Krista sent it this week. If I'm not mistaken, it was copied to the whole working team list. (Tony), can you - can you say if I'm wrong or right?

Tony Harris: You're right.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Well, just to make sure that we're all dealing with the same document, when she sends her request, it'd be good to attach it again. Then we all - because...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...it is like you said Olga earlier, it's getting hard to keep track or make sure we have the latest...

Olga Cavalli: Exactly.

Chuck Gomes: ...and so it...

Olga Cavalli: I think it's a great idea Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: So...

Tony Harris: Yes. Yes. We'll do that...

Olga Cavalli: (Tony)...

Tony Harris: ...Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks (Tony).

Olga Cavalli: ...as we said to put - yes, it's a great idea. It's a very good document. And by the way, it's not long a very easy to read.

Tony Harris: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: So it won't be difficult to be revised by the rest of our working team.

Tony Harris: Yes, you can read it in three minutes.

Olga Cavalli: And any questions for (Tony)? Comments? Great. Julie already sent her document. I revised it. I'm okay with it. She already sent it to the whole working team. Any question? Any comments to Julie? Should we - Julie, should we establish a due date for receiving comments?

Julie Hedlund: Well I'm wondering, you know, since I sent it previously, I think probably even more than a week ago and then sent it again at the beginning of this week...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...(and asked) for comments. I haven't received comments. So I mean unless you have objections, I - and Chuck...

Olga Cavalli: We can...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...perhaps we can go - I can circulate what is the final version.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Any objections against doing this with Julie's document?

Chuck Gomes: No. And we should - we should make sure then that there is consensus amongst the full working team to send this forward. I think it - as I mentioned in an email, I don't think there's any - this is probably true of all of our different tasks but this one in particular if we are able to go ahead and send it forward so that the OSC and the Council can consider it.

The sooner we do that, the sooner that staff could start implementing - coming up with an implementation plan and the sooner the tools would become available for the use of stakeholders and constituencies - stakeholder groups and constituencies. And from what I'm seeing, that would be really useful if the stakeholder groups and constituencies had access to some of these services if there is enough in the budget to go ahead and implement them quickly.

Julie Hedlund: Right.

Olga Cavalli: You know, so I totally agree with you Chuck. There's someone wanting to talk, sorry.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. I was agreeing as well. And I would - I would suggest that I send the final version without the red lines to the team and say what we discussed here that, you know, unless we hear otherwise from the team, I would (say) that we would be planning to forward this to the OSC.

Chuck Gomes: Is everybody on the work team or at least the people on this call comfortable with that approach or do they want affirmative statements that they approve it?

Claudio Di Gangi: This is Claudio. I'm comfortable with that approach and for the record I do approve it. I think you guys did a great job on this and I think it's ready to go.

Olga Cavalli: Yes from me it's okay too.

(Michael): Likewise.

SS Kshatriya: It's fine with me. This is SS.

Chuck Gomes: So is there any reason to use more time.

Olga Cavalli: No.

Chuck Gomes: Are there some who still need to review it?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. I'm sorry. I still need to review it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Good. That's fine. I just wanted to clarify.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Then I (unintelligible) the final draft, ask for any final comments and then perhaps suggest maybe a short timeframe for any final comments back. Victoria, I'll send that out this morning and others early next week. What would be a suggested timeframe do you think for comments back?

Victoria McEvedy: That sounds fine to me.

Julie Hedlund: All right.

Olga Cavalli: Victoria, when could you - could you send Julie or the working team your revision of the document? When do you think that's feasible?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. Early next week is fine.

Julie Hedlund: All right. I'll set for Tuesday next week.

Chuck Gomes: And we have specific approvals from quite a few members. We should give those who haven't been on calls and haven't approved it the - just a reminder that if they could give us their approval or comments by the same time, that would be great.

Julie Hedlund: Right. I'll just send it to the team and I'll, you know, I'll reiterate what we've discussed here and say comments please by Tuesday next.

Chuck Gomes: And it would be helpful I think Julie if you identify the people who have already approved it.

Julie Hedlund: Right. And I heard Claudio, Olga, was that (Michael)?

Olga Cavalli: Michael and...

(Michael): That's correct.

Julie Hedlund: All right. Thank you very much. Will do.

Olga Cavalli: And Chuck.

Julie Hedlund: And Chuck. Of course.

Olga Cavalli: And Julie.

Julie Hedlund: And me.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. And (Tony) - (Tony's) on the call. (Tony), did you have a chance to review Julie's document?

Tony Harris: No, not yet but I'll do that now.

Julie Hedlund: Great.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: (Ours) is also easy to review (Tony). Just like yours.

Tony Harris: Okay. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Great. So we have a plan for our four sub documents of our draft Task 1. So we could exchange some ideas of how to - how to summarize a whole document. And also we have Chuck too to review, which is the outreach issue.

I already had - Julie's document had a format that I liked. And I - in a previous call I already said that I like that format with some background and then all the document and all the information how it was organized.

Any ideas of if we can use that format for the final document if we can start to - once the documents are - the sub documents are going to be approved then we can start putting them together. I could do that perhaps with Julie. I could start building a final Task 1 draft document. What - any ideas? Any comments? Any suggestions?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. I have some suggestions. I think we've touched on this before so I think I'm repeating myself.

Olga Cavalli: Yes we did.

Victoria McEvedy: Because I think I made myself pretty clear then. But, you know, I would have thought like just, you know, even just from a saving time and very expedient way to prepare work product that it would be best to leave - use the body of

each subtask's report and put a front and a back on them. You know what I mean? Leave them as the body instead of rewriting from scratch or you could - you could attach them as schedules or something like that.

I mean I just think that would save an enormous amount of work. And I mean I obviously say it from my perspective because I put a lot of time and effort into my report. And I don't want that to be, you know, to be wasted. And I don't see why - I don't want to put Olga, you to the trouble of rewriting something from scratch. So that was my suggestion.

Olga Cavalli: I'm sorry. I didn't totally follow you.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. I'll just - sorry about that. I went around in circles.

Olga Cavalli: No. No. Maybe it's - sometimes my English in the morning is not so accurate. So your suggestion is that we take the body of the - of the four documents...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: And we either put them on the end - put them on the end of the document as schedules and refer to them, right. So Schedule 1, 2, 3 and 4, right...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: ...where there is the meat of the discussion, okay. And then in the front is a summary, you know, with a - Julie's opening perhaps and, you know, a discussion perhaps about levels of consensus or whatever or final recommendations and a summary. And then scheduled the four reports or something similar to that.

Chuck Gomes: Question Victoria. Does that assume that all of these reports would go forward at the same time?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And I - and I just suggested that it would be good if we could send...

Victoria McEvedy: Oh, I didn't hear that. I didn't understand that.

Chuck Gomes: ...if we could send the one regarding the toolkit of services since it looks like it's just about ready forward independent of the others.

Victoria McEvedy: I'd like- I think we - can't we send them all together at once?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: They not all - they're not going to all be ready at once is the problem.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: And there would be real advantages if I think to constituencies and stakeholder groups if the toolkit of services could become available as soon as possible.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I know within the registry stakeholder group we're already encountering situations where if we had some of those services it would greatly help us. And so waiting until...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. I think - but we've covered this before Chuck. Haven't we covered - we've like 15 times discussed bifurcating our work and I think we all decided against it.

Chuck Gomes: I don't see this as bifurcating our work. I think - I see this as expediting one element of our work to the advantage of the stakeholder groups and the constituencies. What's bifurcating about that?

Victoria McEvedy: Well I don't agree with that proposal. I think that, you know, it removes the need for expedition from the bulk of the work. And what we should really do is just speed up the rest of it and put it all forward at the same time.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Well you're assuming...

Victoria McEvedy: That's - I mean that's my view.

Chuck Gomes: ...you're assuming that the - we can speed up all the rest of the work and get it done in a timely manner. I think we've already found that that's probably highly unlikely. And as Chair of the OSC, I would strongly discourage that. But I will defer to - I suggest Olga that we decide as a work team whether to go with my suggestion or not; and if the work team disagrees, I will respect that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. If I may, I agree with Chuck. I think there's value - a lot of value in submitting the sub work 1.4 document to the OSC and then forward. That's my opinion.

Victoria McEvedy: Is this on the agenda? Okay. Is this on the agenda for today because like I said, I'm not prepared - I wasn't prepared to deal with this. And like I said, we've already - we, you know, I'd like to go back to - we have already determined this more than once.

Chuck Gomes: Victoria, many days ago I sent a email requesting this.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: So this should not be a surprise.

Victoria McEvedy: Well, I'm sorry because I didn't see that email. And with the (unintelligible) in the world, I have overlooked it. But so this takes me by surprise. And like I say, I mean I think we discussed very fully perhaps in our last call or call just immediately prior to that the pros and cons of all of this and decided against it.

Chuck Gomes: No. We did not discuss the pros...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: I'd at least...

Chuck Gomes: ...cons of my...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Sorry.

Victoria McEvedy: ...my recollection by reference to the previous discussion.

Olga Cavalli: Excuse me please. If we don't order our conversation, it's hard for me to follow you. I think Chuck is making a suggestion. I respect your idea Victoria. I agree with Chuck. So my suggestion would be - I think we have discussed this before. And Julie's document has been for revision for a while. And some of us had the chance to review it. Some of us on the working team didn't.

So my suggestion would be check with who's on the line now, who is agreeing with Chuck and who doesn't and move forward because...

Tony Harris: Can I speak? Tony Harris.

Olga Cavalli: Sure Tony. Go ahead.

Tony Harris: Just - you know, just three or four words. I agree with Chuck on this.

SS Kshatriya: SS, (shall) I give some...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Sure SS. Go ahead.

SS Kshatriya: Yes. See though Chuck makes some valid reason but I don't know what benefit is going to give to constituencies. Just to have some document a few weeks - I won't say that it should take more than two weeks for all the document, to be ready?

So if all this document goals is to not go in the final but it should go just (unintelligible) that document, that's one. If this document goes then all the subtask documents go independently too, whatever, I mean that are being sent.

Chuck Gomes: That doesn't necessarily follow. We could group all the others together, so.

((Crosstalk))

(Michael): Olga, can I get in the queue?

SS Kshatriya: ...the people can wait...

Olga Cavalli: So your point SS is that it will be in pieces and people will not have the chance to view - to review the whole document. That's your point?

SS Kshatriya: No. No. They will review the whole document but this document will stand alone and it's not going to - I mean maybe Chuck as the Chairman, Chairperson of that OSC he can look at probably something about which I am not able to perceive. But this two weeks will not make so much difference. This...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Oh, I see your point.

SS Kshatriya: ...not going to jump into that toolkit and start working perhaps in (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: I see your point and...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: Olga, can I get in the - in the queue?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I just want to make a comment is that we have been - we have been trying hard the previous weeks to finalize our sub working documents and all that and we couldn't. So I understand your point and perhaps after Tony's comment Chuck may give us his idea if two weeks is too much time or not. Tony, go ahead please.

Tony Harris: Yes. I just want to comment on what SS just said since I mean there was a reference to constituencies there and what's the value in doing this. I think basically you should - you might consider, this is just a suggestion of course, that we - in the constituencies we have quite a lot of document to look at. Not just the ones from this working team.

And if we can stagger that a little bit over time and not have to deal with a, you know, 40 or 50 documents a few days before the Seoul meeting, it would help. It would make our life a little bit easier. I think that's one of the points that Chuck was making.

Additionally, looking at Julie Hedlund's document which I've been reading at full speed while we talk, it's - this - well you have this ranking of the toolkits. If constituencies see this early on, they may come up with some item, which we have missed and we have time to include it. That's just an after thought.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Can I get in the queue too?

(Michael): Yes. It's (Michael). Can I get in the queue as well please?

Olga Cavalli: I think what (Michael) wanted to talk first. Am I mistaken or is...

(Michael): I tried to get in a little earlier.

Olga Cavalli: Yes I know. (Michael) go ahead please.

(Michael): Listen I think I - and there's a lot of valid points here. And, you know, my own feeling basically on that part of the work is that the toolkit is a rather innocuous less controversial set of recommendations anyways.

However, I do think it's important - Victoria hasn't had a chance to look at it and make sure that she's comfortable with it. So I think we should just follow a fairly routine procedure here.

Even though we've discussed it on the call, Olga, I think it's probably best if we formalize this and we put out the documents for final comment in a prescribed time period. I don't know if the right - if that's three days or four days but the right period.

And then we also formally weigh in whether or not we're okay with releasing it after the final comments are - and I personally am of the point where I'm comfortable with the document and I'm comfortable with the idea of forwarding it because it is part of our - if you break out all the subject matter we have to cover, some of it is going to be a little more controversial. A little bit more sensitive.

But this is a - this is a toolkit and this is a series of (assistive) devices. I don't see a lot of controversy in it. So I think putting it out for earlier won't have any negative impact.

Chuck Gomes: Olga, please add me to the queue.

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Victoria go ahead please. Thank you (Michael).

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. I have a couple of suggestions trying to just - picking up on SS' comments and maybe it's just - I'm just wondering if there's a middle ground here between all these houses. What I'm wondering is I do myself object to the bifurcation and like so we discussed it fully before and for all those reasons.

What I'm wondering is if people are going to be in favor of putting some work forward now and leaving the other- the rest to follow then I think what would be perhaps acceptable might be that either other parts can go forward in draft and/or agreed and/or non-contentious parts of other work could go forward too. So that's a suggestion.

Olga Cavalli: Chuck go ahead and then...

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: ...let's...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: First of all, I want to clarify something that (Michael) suggested. My suggestion in moving this forward ahead of the others if the others aren't ready was not in any ways meant to imply that we wouldn't do what we already decided today and that was is that there would be some time and I think it was suggested early next week for all of the others to still comment on it.

So - and I specifically suggested that they state their approval or disapproval and add comments at that time. So please, there was nothing ever suggesting that everybody on the team should not have additional opportunity to finalize their input and to state their approval or not.

Secondly, to SS' comments. The advantages SS, these - a lot of these services I find it in the registry's stakeholder group already that if we had some of these services available now, meeting, scheduling services, Web support. We're having some difficulty right now for example in our own self-management of our Web site and we're experiencing quite a few delays.

Now staff I'm sure isn't going to be able to implement the toolkit of services immediately. But the sooner that happens, it will really help us as a stakeholder group a lot. And I suspect that's true of other stakeholder groups and constituencies as well.

So there - the sooner some of these things happen, it will make us - it will make it easier for us as constituencies and stakeholder groups to deal with all of these issues that are confronting us. So there are some practical advantages to getting these services in place as soon as possible.

Now, with regard to Victoria's compromise, I have no problem with any of our recommendations that are ready to go going forward early as well. The - and

so if there are others like for example what Tony and Krista have done that are ready to go, that's fine.

I do have a problem with sending forward draft recommendations to the OSC and the Council. We should not send anything forward until it's final because those of us at the Council level don't have time to be reviewing every draft of things or even multiple drafts of things. We need to have a pretty firm recommendations that we're looking at because there are just too many things on our - on our plate to be able to manage our time effectively in that regard.

So I would not support sending any drafts forward. They need to be documents that this work team supports and ready to go for review by the OSC and ultimately by the Council.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Chuck. Someone else want to comment. I want to - yes Claudio.

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes. It's Claudio. I was just going to say I agree with everything Chuck just said in getting this out as quickly as possible. I don't really - maybe I'm just missing it. I just - I didn't - I didn't - I don't really see the downside of getting things out if we have - if we have consensus on them. I would think it would - unless it would, you know, confuse the recipient of our work, I don't - I don't see really any downside in holding back recommendations that we have.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Claudio. Any other comment? I personally think that this document is - it's a very good document and there is value in moving it forward. It's more practical. It's not a document that would have any problematic part and is value in reviewing it before. As Tony said, it's less thing to read before the meeting. So that's my personal view but of course we should decide it as a working team.

So my proposal is the following. We will let those people who had not the chance to review it, maybe those of them are not on the call right now. And

so Victoria - Julie please, sorry. Julie, do send it again with maybe a deadline for comments by Monday, Tuesday and let's see then in our mailing list if we agree in moving this forward or not.

And so we have the chance to see the opinions of all others who are not in the call right now but are part of our working team.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Is that a reasonable proposal?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. Can I just add something to that Olga? Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Sure please. Go ahead.

Victoria McEvedy: I think - I just think the conversation kind of moved on just from that particular one development - that particular one document. And I think that there seems to be a rough agreement that any final recommendations that where there's consensus could go forward at the same time.

And if bits and - I mean it's - you know, all of our work is concerned with GNSO improvements, you know, just addressing Chuck's point that this is particularly valuable and useful to people. I mean it's all supposed to particularly valuable and useful subject to consensus obviously.

So I would suggest that if this is going to be done, other recommendations from other sub teams that on which there is consensus with no descent can also be put forward because it is a bifurcation and, you know, I think it's just fear if it's an open playing field. And if we're going to do it in two parts, you know, it can be two parts across the board.

Olga Cavalli: So any suggestions - is my suggestion feasible?

Victoria McEvedy: Yours was limited to the one document. I'm just saying other stuff as well...

Olga Cavalli: Yes. But the issue is the timing. I mean I personally - that's my personal view. I'm not talking from the working team perspective. I think there is value in moving this piece of document forward before for all the reasons that have been explained.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes but I think both - I think both Claudio and Chuck just indicated that they didn't have any problem with final recommendations on which there was consensus going forward at the same time.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Let's let the working team decide. I'm - just my opinion. So let's do the following and please let me know if you agree. Julie, just send the document. Let's establish some deadline for receiving comments. And let's exchange some ideas and have the sense from the whole working team if we agree in moving it forward or not.

And perhaps by that time maybe mid time next week we have the sense of how are the other documents evolving. And maybe we can see if we want to put all together or not. Do you think that's a reasonable approach?

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Again I'd just expand that language not just the other documents. It's recommendations that are non-contentious and/or...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: I know - sorry.

Victoria McEvedy: ...on which there's consensus.

Olga Cavalli: (You're) recommendation's right.

Chuck Gomes: Let me clarify there. Victoria, are you talking about recommendations in each of the four subtasks or - in other words, separating each report into those that are contentious or non-contentious or are you just talking about as long as there's consensus on each of the subgroup recommendations - total package of recommendations?

Victoria McEvedy: I'm not talking about total packages. I'm saying that basically - I mean, you know, I mean I got - I think it's very artificial to, you know, to sort of say, you know, to wanting to be dealing in whole packages or whole subtasks and what have you.

So I'm basically saying whatever. If we get to - what I'm suggesting is that if we get to mid next week, each - you know, if we're going to put some material forward, we should put everything that's agreed to date forward and just - you know, it'll only be very narrow language obviously. So...

Chuck Gomes: So you're okay with bifurcating those...

Victoria McEvedy: Well if that's - but if you're wanting to bifurcate then I think it should be across the board.

Chuck Gomes: Amazing.

Victoria McEvedy: Well you - but I mean, you know, I didn't - I said either - my position was right from the beginning we either do or we don't. And I think it would drag the timeframe of the rest of the work down. But if there is going to be bifurcation, it should be across the board I think.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry. What do you mean by across the board?

Victoria McEvedy: Across - I mean, you know, all the work of the group, of the entire group to date should be - you know, that's agreed should be able to go forward.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I'll tell you that was not what I recommended when I said that I am supportive of other subtask group recommendations going forward if they're ready to go as well same time. I certainly am. But I'm not - I did not mean what you're saying.

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes. Claudio. I didn't think that either.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Maybe you could expand the distinctions Chuck because I'm not sure I understand.

Chuck Gomes: Each - if there are other sets of our recommendations organized by subtasks - in other words, let's just look at 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4. If 1.3 is ready to go and there's consensus in the whole work team that the whole package is ready to go, then I have no problem with that being submitted in - at the same time as 1.4, the toolkit of services. Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: Right. Okay. But I mean per any of those subtasks, I mean, you know, when it comes to reaching consensus, some things may be the subject of consensus and others may not. Things that aren't a subject of consensus fall away, right.

Chuck Gomes: But keep in mind, each of the subtasks are related to a specific BGC recommendation. And to respond to that recommendation with a partial answer doesn't seem to make sense to me.

Victoria McEvedy: Well that's a very artificial distinction given you're taking one artificially, you know, divided off subtask and putting that forward. So...

Chuck Gomes: We're obviously in total disagreement.

(Michael): Yes. Can I - can I weight in here?

Olga Cavalli: Sure (Michael). Go ahead.

(Michael): Thanks. You know, guys I have to say I think that the structure was kind of defined for us in the way the recommendations were laid out. There is like a kind of a natural structure to our work with that and that's why we were led by instinct to form these subtask groups because the questions were broken out.

I do think that therefore there's - it's natural to answer them on a per question basis. I think it could be confusing if you gave a partial answer to one of those questions or recommendations.

Victoria McEvedy: But I - but I'm not talking about partial answers so much, Michael, but there'll either be consensus on things or there won't. Right? So there'll be they're a whole answer or they won't be.

(Michael): Right.

Victoria McEvedy: I mean what there isn't consensus on falls away. Right?

(Michael): Well so, you know, what are we really debating here? I mean is there any - if, you know, one's ready to go and everyone's happy with it, then are we okay with releasing that. I would suggest that we don't, you know, waste too much time on trying to examine, you know, a subtask document if it's only 50% complete. We might as well get it finished, agree on it or disagree and hopefully eventually agree because we debate and get it settled and then let it go. You know, release it.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Well look, I just - as I said, obviously we do disagree and I've yet to look at that document. So it's - it doesn't have consensus even at this stage.

(Michael): Fair enough.

((Crosstalk))

(Michael): I think we've all agreed with that. Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Michael. Thank you Victoria. Any other comments? I have a comment. We always said that we should agree in any version that gets out of the working team. We never thought about not working with consensus from the working team. I'm not sure if this was a doubt in the conversation but that's the way we have been working.

Okay. So we have like five minutes. I'm sorry that I cannot stay longer on the call because I have to take a plane.

SS Kshatriya: Olga, this is SS. I'd like to...

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Please go ahead SS.

SS Kshatriya: Here this actually might (unintelligible) on this but of course I (unintelligible). They are very good (unintelligible) I mean taking teams into history, right. But what I observe is that like you make some decision and bring arguments (and your support).

And here again the consensus came that you send only those parts, which are having consensus. If anybody defers, that should not be sent. So we are (unintelligible) very clear what is to be done. I think maybe as a Chairperson you can just put through and what you are supposed to do in such situations.

So if the constituencies has worked for years without some support - if they work without support of a few more weeks, I don't think something is going to fall. So on letting that (one there), has some benefit, which they will derive in days or years or a week or year.

So I believe - it's not that I'm (affording) anybody else or supporting anybody but just I think we should look into charter and just see where there is at all given anywhere that we can send in to piecemeal and don't sent something with just not having true consensus. Even those teams are to be centric which is consensus (unintelligible). We have done that.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: SS, our charter is - our charter is very clear in terms of the way we're supposed to do it. Not in terms of whether we can send portions separately or the full thing at once. But it is very clear with regard to consensus. We are supposed to make best efforts to reach consensus using a rough consensus approach.

But it does - full consensus does not mean unanimity on the part of a work team, okay. Consensus may be rough consensus in that there's strong majority of support on the working team. And if so, if there's not unanimity, a minority statement can accompany that. But please don't define full consensus as unanimity. That is not the case in the charter.

SS Kshatriya: No. I'm not (defining). I'm just think that please (unintelligible). And I mean let us respect some work, which we have already done. Why (might) we jump on something, which is not (there)?

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Any other comments? Okay. We have not agreed. We have not rough consensus. So let's do the following. My suggestion is Julie will send the document. Let the members of the working team that didn't revise it have the chance to do that. And let's keep up the discussion in the - in the -in the mailing list.

I agree with Chuck about what is rough consensus and unanimity. So I won't repeat that. That's I think the rule that we should follow but we don't have rough consensus in my modest opinion now. So let's keep on discussing this

in our mailing list and let's wait for the other draft versions from the working teams, SS and Victoria. And hopefully by perhaps next week we can have an idea of how to move forward. That's my suggestion. I don't know if you have other.

Man: Olga, this is quite a - that sounded good to me. I was wondering if - I'm just not understanding the concerns that SS and Victoria have about sending this forward. Is it just that they think that our later recommendations won't be considered as...

SS Kshatriya: I think what Olga said is okay. We'll follow up with the mails giving our concerns and okay. Let we go that way. Something will come out of it.

Olga Cavalli: Claudio, what's your point. I'm sorry. I didn't...

Claudio Di Gangi: Well, I was just - I just didn't understand. Maybe it was they had to express it on a previous call. I just didn't understand why they were concerned about sending our recommendations on that one area of work forward.

Olga Cavalli: SS, Victoria, could you answer Claudio please?

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: I mean I could...

SS Kshatriya: Yes. See it is not - it is not required at all to send somebody - something in piecemeal. That dilutes the work of the whole team. That's what I'm telling. There's no pressing reason for that. Only think if we send that in, some benefit comes to somebody, not that benefit was not (agreed) for years. So if that benefit does not go for a few more weeks that's a constituency that (will get) staff support. That's what I understand of major and (unintelligible).

Now if you get the staff support for a few more weeks, I mean, what would follow?

Victoria McEvedy: I agree.

Claudio Di Gangi: Well, I guess - I guess my response to that is that we don't know that it's just a few more weeks. And...

Victoria McEvedy: It's up to us though isn't it? It's up to us (now).

((Crosstalk))

Claudio Di Gangi: Oh you're just going to hold on to...

SS Kshatriya: Yes. (It's tied) to the four weeks. In four weeks all documents are not ready and this toolkit can be sent separately.

Chuck Gomes: So we block four weeks then.

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes, I mean that's kind of how I look at - I don't - I don't think I agree with this - with the idea that it dilutes the rest of our work.

Victoria McEvedy: Well I mean I have to say I feel extremely strongly that it does. And I think it's - this is cherry picking by, you know - this is a bit like saying, you know, we're quite interested in this kind of assistance but we're not having any of the reform that this whole package was - this is the whole GNSO improvements. You know, the whole - we agreed - we had hugely long discussions. Whole calls were devoted to bifurcation. We discussed it about four times and we had absolute consensus on all of those calls.

So if we're really going to do this again, I suggest we do it in another meeting when we can revisit what we already said and we can go through it properly because I feel very strongly that it not just dilutes the rest of the work but

really renders the likelihood of it being given its due time, attention. It removes all pressure for expediency from the rest of the group. It's cherry picking. And I think it's totally inappropriate.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Any other comments? You can stay on the line if you want. I'm so sorry I have to leave.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Olga.

Olga Cavalli: My suggestion is what I said five minutes ago before Claudio was speaking. I think we didn't get consensus now, a rough consensus, so let's keep on discussing in the mailing list. And Victoria I how you can - you can do your call now and move forward with your document and with your recommendation.

And have a nice weekend you all. And thank you for participating.

Victoria McEvedy: Thanks Olga.

Man: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much Olga.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Victoria is there dial in information or are you planning on staying on this call?

Victoria McEvedy: Oh no, I think we should just stay on this call. Should we?

Glen DeSaintgery: This is Glen.

((Crosstalk))

Glen DeSaintgery:Hi. Sorry. This is Glen.

Victoria McEvedy: Hi Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery:If you want to - hi Victoria. Do you want to carry on the call just as it is?
There's no problem.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery:You want to carry on the recording as well?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. Why not? It's just easier I think isn't it?

Glen DeSaintgery:There's no problem again.

Victoria McEvedy: Thanks Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery:Thanks.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. May I - so who have we got on this call now? Who's still on the call?
Tony.

Glen DeSaintgery:Shall I go through the...

Victoria McEvedy: Thanks Glen. Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery:We've got on the call - I see Chuck has disconnected. Is that correct Chuck?
Julie is still on the call. I see SS has disconnected. Is that right SS?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Claudio is still on the call. Victoria, you're still on the call. And Tony Harris is still on the call. And I see (Michael) has disconnected. And Olga of course has (unintelligible).

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Great.

Glen DeSaintgery: So you have on the call Tony Harris, yourself and Claudio and Julie and myself.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Great. I've got Tony. Tony, I've got your recommendations here. You put some comments into the language very early on. I think - I don't know if you've had a chance to look at it in more detail then. But Claudio I haven't had any detail comments (from) you on the recommendation and language I don't think. Have I?

Claudio Di Gangi: I don't - actually I'm trying to think. I think I might - you know, if some of this was pulled from that larger document, there might have been areas where I commented within that document that sort of carry over to some of these recommendations.

Victoria McEvedy: No. I don't think so because I went through all of - I don't think - well, I may be wrong but I - but I went through and printed out everybody's particular comments on that section. I've got them right here in front of me. So - and I haven't got one from you. So I'm thinking that you didn't actually red line into that section. I may be wrong and I have overlooked it.

But in any event, perhaps we can just work through - let's just quickly work through this language and/or the general headings and, you know, identify issues.

Claudio Di Gangi: Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay so - now as I already said on the list and mentioned in the call, people have raised - you know, on the call we had on Monday, my call and Olga had issues with open - completely open discussion and post-discussion and mailing lists which was a - which was not one of our own recommendations.

It was one of the Board Governance Committee's minimums. I mean they - it's in - it's in one of - it's in the guidelines, the back of the fuller document. But they recommended all discussion and (mailing) must be open but with posting them - posting rights limited to members. So that's one thing.

We're going to - we determined that we should take that one back to the Board Governance Commission - Committee and ask for clarification given it's contentious. And the other issues was minutes. And as I said on the list, we managed to - well, I don't - I'd like to take your comments.

But certainly (Michael) and Olga were happy but I thought we should clarify what's a minimum in relation to minutes and that was action points, decisions and resolutions. And as I think I said on the commentary about minutes, you know, there's no reason not to respect Chatham House rules or people's desire to discuss things in committee.

It's the decisions that are the - you know, so we're having to clarify that language and I'll be amending the language or the definition of minutes. I don't know if you - either of you want to comment to those two issues.

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes. I think - just pulling up your recommendations here. I think on the minutes that that makes sense to me, just kind of boiling it down to the key elements there, any major action points, things like that. So that makes sense to me.

On the - on the mailing list, I don't have the Board Governance Committee report in front of me. My understanding of it was that they were referring

basically to a central mailing list that would be open that each constituency would have.

Victoria McEvedy: Well it doesn't say that. But - and interestingly I don't know if you saw - well I think you probably saw my comments to - I mean it's an interesting point. But I'll read you the exact language. But I don't know if you also saw - I forwarded some comments to Chuck's comments to SS' document about participation including the Council of Europe sort of independently commissioned report on all the Internet governance organizations.

And it's interesting because most of them have thought fully open - they do have fully open - just looking for that language. They have fully open mailing lists. And so it's actually a real feature of the - of the sector.

Anyway, that's the sort of thing we can clarify with the Board Governance. It's one of the reasons we thought we should go back to them. I mean it's their own recommendation and it's obviously contentious.

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: I can't find it. I can't put my hand on the language right at this moment.

Claudio Di Gangi: My concern with that Victoria is just that a lot of the constituency work or stakeholder group work by its nature is not necessarily the type of work that if there's discussions going on on policy issues that I think the groups are going to - they're kind of - I don't know if confidential is the right word, but it's sort of specific to the interests of that particular group.

And there's value in being able to have discussions within the group that aren't - that aren't available for everyone in the - in the world to basically see. And I think, you know...

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. (Michael) said the same thing and he made a really good point. He said, you know, if you make it all open, he said basically people - there'll be no discussion on the list. You know what I mean? And he - and he talked about examples of that where he said you're basically drive it all to sort of, you know, behind closed doors in person meetings. And that's the down side of it.

Tony Harris: That's entirely true. That's what's - constituencies exist for that purpose to be able to discuss things amongst themselves.

Victoria McEvedy: Well I - I mean so one of the things I suggested at the time, I said would it make a difference if committees, you know, for example policy committees or committees were accepted. You know, so, you know, would there be some caveat.

But they didn't think that was appropriate. They just thought, you know - I mean by limiting it to decision or action point or resolution, oh - sorry we're talking about the open list aren't we. That's - sorry. I'm confusing the issue.

I mean I don't know. I mean we were talking about - I mean are we talking about for example the IPC list? I mean there's no - there's almost no discussion of anything on it.

Now I don't know if that - in that I don't know what the situation is in the business. Is it business constituency Tony?

Tony Harris: No. The ISP.

Victoria McEvedy: ISP. Sorry.

Tony Harris: We do actually have quite a lot of email discussion and also calls.

Victoria McEvedy: Right. So it is an issue. I don't know, Claudio, do - what happens to the IPC? I mean is - are there sub lists that are related to committees at present? I

mean there's no discussion on the general list which itself is troubling because is there already a perception that has already discussion in a sense driven underground?

Claudio Di Gangi: No. I don't think so. I mean the general list is, you know, it's open to anyone can post on it at any time. I mean there are - there are, you know, smaller lists when there's, you know, working groups and stuff formed on issues. But I think, you know, I think the IPC will - has been planning on having an open list in sort of I think the way the Board Governance Committee envisioned it.

And I - you know, but I think - I think it was good approach that if you guys thought of reaching out to the Board Governance Committee and getting their input. I mean I think - I think that made sense. So...

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Great. All right. Okay. Now well let's just go through - quickly through these categories and hittings. I mean I have to say I'm not that up to speed, you know, been a few weeks since I looked at the stuff myself.

So executive committees, obviously we have the minutes issue. Rules and procedures, is any of this contentious? I can see Tony you've made a point here about the two terms. You feel that people should be allowed to sit out.

Tony Harris: Well actually it says that in the bylaws. The bylaws does not say that when you've had your term that's it for life. It says that you have to sit out at least one full period before being able to sit - I don't have the words right here in front of me.

Victoria McEvedy: Right.

Tony Harris: But there is a provision in the revised bylaws, which as sent out some - shortly.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: And it was pointed out to me by other people in our - in our constituency too.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. I mean if - I mean if they thought that was appropriate at - is that - is that for the Board, for the Council or is that across the - is that GNSO Council, is it?

Tony Harris: This specifically referred to the Council.

Victoria McEvedy: Right.

Tony Harris: The GNSO Council reform and it is in the revised bylaws which was probably sending it was about two weeks ago - three weeks ago.

Victoria McEvedy: Well...

((Crosstalk))

Claudio Di Gangi: I'm not sure I'm understanding the concern here that this would address. I guess it's so the same don't remain in office. But I think the way it's phrased it's - so even if someone wasn't in office for 10 or 15 years, 10 or 15 years later they couldn't get involved again. And that just - that's...

Victoria McEvedy: I mean this is - I mean, you know, this is - this is to - you know, aimed at the scenario where you do - and they have been - you know I could name names and I'm just not going to. But there are people who've held the same office for 10 year periods, you know, as the leaders of constituencies and what have you.

And, you know, you know, anyway I think at the end of the day I don't think there's any - I think that the mischief is already addressed by the bylaws. I

mean if the - I mean part of what we're trying to do is create simplicity instead of individual rules everywhere, you know, detail and this sort of (profice) barrier.

So I mean I have to say I'm very attracted to Tony's suggestion that we should just follow whatever the bylaw limits are. And I had (it stopped) at the term limits at the two terms I think from the bylaws. So but yes - I mean there are - and like I say, I could name names and not in the IPC but in other constituencies where people have been...

Claudio Di Gangi: Sure. I'm one of them. I've been around a long time. Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. But I mean, you know, look; I mean that doesn't stop people rotating through different offices. Right? I mean - but it's when you get someone as the leader of the constituency for example who remains on the same - I mean that - it does stifle new talent. It's, you know, I mean, I mean, you don't agree?

Claudio Di Gangi: I mean I think - I think - I think to follow the bylaws makes the most sense. I mean I hear what you're saying. I would also - you know, to some extent I think there should be flexibility amongst these groups to - you know, if you look at other political systems, sometimes there's term limits. Other times there's not. It depends on - depends on the office.

And there could be, you know, a constituency or group might want to have someone in a specific office with experience and someone whose been through issues. I mean they might find that of value. So I think there's, like all of these issues, there's, you know, there's the positive and negative of how we're going to, you know, the affects of the rules that we set. And we might improve or we might bring like you said maybe, you know, it'll encourage more talent to come up.

But, you know, I could still see how there's some value in having flexibility for the groups in electing their own leadership and not having necessarily a top down rule imposed on them on that issue. But again I see value in it. And so I'm totally comfortable with of course following what the bylaws say or, you know, we come up with some other recommendation in that area.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. I mean even aside from - I mean I - I mean I think that's - so I mean it doesn't - any of us are in agreement. But I think, you know, you know, I mean fresh ideas come with fresh personnel. You know, and people tend to become very positional after a long period of time.

And I mean, you know, the seasoned players can obviously be of incredible value to their constituencies even as advisors, right, so they don't necessarily need to hold the office. So I think there is a value in some limits but I agree. I mean I'm just quite happy to follow the bylaws rather than make special, you know, again just for simplicity sake.

Okay. So I don't think we've got - has anybody - any other issues on executive committees?

Tony Harris: Yes. There was another comment, which I made. I'm trying to find it here.

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: Oh, published (once the name) is not the general public.

Tony Harris: Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: That was your - I have to say well that's something we could again put forward and perhaps ask for the Board Governance Committee's discussion. I mean I have to say I think that if you look at the - if you look at that Council of Europe report, I mean if you look at the IATF or IAFT or whatever it is and

if you look at the other organizations, I mean can't as exceptional - it's lack of disclosure. And the push is for open disclosure wherever possible.

So I mean, I mean...

Tony Harris: Well but let me give you an example. Most - a lot of the things that an - the executive, well we call them officers in the constituency, discuss normally are more in the line of administrative things. Like, you know, we have to hold an election so, you know, when will we make the call for the election and how many people do we have to replace.

And if we're having an - let's say an ISP meeting in Seoul in Korea, how many hours do we need for it? Do we need teleconferencing? We have to respond to things, which the staff asks us. And I'm wondering, you know, if this is something, which requires to be - to be placed out for the whole world to see. It's just the simple operational things, which we coordinate. That's all.

Victoria McEvedy: But is it - okay. But if the - if the rule is...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: It's not policy discussions. It's not deciding, you know, if we want to blow up ICANN tomorrow or something like that. It's very simple stuff.

Victoria McEvedy: Is it sensitive though?

Tony Harris: But basically I went back to my constituency on this point and they said well for the sake of transparency, we'd be willing to make it public if that's, you know, if that's - it helps things along.

Claudio Di Gangi: Victoria, what's the - what's the I guess the value that you see in making that public?

Victoria McEvedy: As I say, I mean, I mean I think - like I say I just refer you - I don't know if you had a chance to look at that Council of Europe report. But, you know, every little - I mean I think probably where people are going with this - like I said, the prevailing rule across these governance approaches is that everything should - everything should be made public unless there's a very good reason not to.

And the very good reasons not to shouldn't be too discretionary. They should be in your non-disclosure policy or what have you. So, I mean I think probably the main thing is that, you know, first of all I can say is I mean you're both long term members inside of a constituency and, you know, as someone who recently just joined the constituency and was a new member of one previously, you've got no idea how opaque they are to others. I mean absolutely opaque.

So every little bit of publication and disclosure moves everybody towards transparency and I think it's - you know, that's an important issue to bear in mind.

But also, you know, looking from the outside even, you know, in the IPC, you've got no idea what's going on, who's doing what, what has gone on, what sort of businesses - you know, I mean the thing is there really isn't proper disclosure.

And that is very intimidating for new members. And I'm a professional member and an English speaker. So imagine how it is from those in the developing world and this is the process and information barrier that we're supposed to be combating. So I mean I agree with you. I can hear - I can hear what you're saying about it's not particularly important. But then it's not particularly sensitive.

And, you know, I mean if there are concerns then they should - you know, if there are particular categories, what we should do is, you know - in light of

the move towards openness and transparency, if there are particular categories of information that executive committees might deal with, the people think there really is sort of grounds for sensitivity about, then they should be reserved from disclosure, you know, as a - as a state of category.

Tony Harris: Victoria, if I might make a comment here. I was just thinking on what we're discussing. I belong to several associations and federations and I seem to be getting into more, you know, as time goes on in the developing world as you call it. And basically let's take the example of the Argentina Internet Association where I'm sitting right now. I'm the Executive Director.

We have - we have board meetings every - once a month. We have to produce minutes for them. The minutes are logged on to an official ledger, which we have. The book has to be written out by hand believe it or not. And those minutes are available for inspection from the Government authorities.

If at any time they think we are not - we are diverging from our official status as a non-profit entity and, you know, becoming something else or we have let's say broken the law in any way. So those minutes are available for public auditing or Government auditing or the regulatory authority would probably be the right term. But we don't put them up on the Web site and, you know, show it to the entire world.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. But I mean, you know, like I say, you know, I think the most people agree and the Board Governance Committee recommended, you know, the primary role here. I mean, you know, all of these initiatives are attempted to force ICANN to become more transparent and user friendly and to serve it's community better.

So, you know, these are not private clubs. They're not even private companies. I mean but even if they were private companies...

Tony Harris: Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: ...the Board would have to put, you know, would have to make its minutes available to all members. But it's not even a private company is it? This is basically a non-profit. Right.

Tony Harris: Okay. Victoria, I understand your point and I'm really not - we don't - we don't want to go to battle on this issue.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

Tony Harris: But basically my question here would be are we asked to do this by the - is it stated anywhere that this is expected of the constituencies? Has the BGC made a specific requirement, you know, they're concerned and we really need to improve transparency. Because looking at the comments which (Denise) sent you, you had an exchange with (Denise) and (Michele) recently. And she says that the working team was asked to consider items such as outreach for participation, constituency guidelines and basic administrative operational and technical services.

Victoria McEvedy: I think you need to go back to the Board.

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: I don't know what...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: But there's a huge. Yes but...

Victoria McEvedy: I don't think it's relevant.

Tony Harris: Can I finish please? Can I finish please? Yes. And I think just to finish my sentence with all the best intentions, your - this document, this very large

document has a huge let's say a huge emphasis on transparency. My question is was this emphasized by the BGC? It probably was. I don't remember.

Victoria McEvedy: Well it certainly was. And like I say, I mean, you know, and I think that's demonstrated by the fact they wanted all the mailing and discussion lists to be open. All the procedures developed and policy - these were the minimums. We're supposed to be coming up with more than the minimums. But we...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: But where does it say we have to come up with more of the minimums. That's another thing.

Victoria McEvedy: Listen, why don't you reread my - the long introduction to the - that I - I tried to set out all of the background to...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: I will reread it. Yes. Sure.

Claudio Di Gangi: Victoria, that's sort of I think your interpretation of that document. And I think that document...

Victoria McEvedy: Listen, can I - can I just cut through this - but, sorry. But we agreed not to have this sort of discussion and I'm not - I'm not going to sit on this call and have this discussion because we're talking about the - we're talking about the language of the recommendations in order to avoid contention.

And you guys, if you want to go into - I was trying to talk to that particular question. But I just don't think - I don't have the time today to have a wider discussion about the rest of the document. And then I said, you know, let's

have a call and look at the language of the recommendations, talk about precise instances, et cetera.

Now I apologize if I myself have deviated from that. But I was trying to give - you asked some background Claudio any my understanding, what have you. But I mean I don't have the time today to have a wider discussion about, you know, what did the Board Governance Committee say, what does (Denise) think, et cetera, et cetera.

You know, and I think the only way we're going to make any progress is by looking at the language of the recommendations and working through them. I'm sorry. I've got a really busy day today. So I actually have to get off this call as soon as I can. But, you know, I am able to make the time to go through these particular - this particular language.

Claudio Di Gangi: Victoria, I completely understand. I'm in the same time crunch today that I don't have an infinite amount of time to spend on this call. But I'm not sure - and I'm fine focusing on these specific languages to make progress but I'm not sure that you could untangle the two issues because to an extent they're interrelated in that these recommendations if they go beyond what's in that report and if they get into every area of constituency, stakeholder group operations and how the groups function. I just - I'm not sure if you can untwine them like that.

Victoria McEvedy: Did you read that report because I set out in utter, utter detail - you know, the reason I went to such time and trouble, and it's 29 pages I mean, you know, is to avoid, you know, to at least set out the argument that I make. Okay. So to ask me to now run through that in person and, you know...

Claudio Di Gangi: Sure, that's fine.

Victoria McEvedy: ...if everybody has a different opinion of what the Board Governance Committee says then...

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: ...right, but I already set out the case pretty clearly. And I don't know what to say or I don't even know where to start if you're asking me to personally persuade you and take you through that - I put it all in writing, you know.

((Crosstalk))

Claudio Di Gangi: ...it was just that there could be - I understand that you have your viewpoint on it and it wasn't to get into that whole debate. But I was just, you know, mentioning that there's alternate interpretations...

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. But it wasn't just my opinion. I mean I did try and back it up right from (unintelligible), i.e., the Board Governance, you know. So I did do that. It's not that - I mean although it may have parts that are opinion. I mean, I tried to track it all back. So, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: Do you want to go back - do you want to go on to committees or not?

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes. That's what I was just going to suggest. And also just to clarify earlier you said I was a long time participant insider. I actually started participating in - only a few years ago within the IPC. So I just wanted just to clarify to you that I'm relatively a new member to...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Thanks. Okay.

Tony Harris: So where do you want to take it from now, Victoria? How are we doing with this point we just discussed?

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: What is your conclusion anyhow?

Victoria McEvedy: We'll I've noted all your comments. I've noted all your comments and your issues. So that's all I want to do at this stage on that particular issue. So I'd just like to...

Tony Harris: I thought we decided that as far as the term limits we are in agreement on that at least.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. We are in agreement on that. Exactly.

Tony Harris: Okay. Fine. So that's settled then. Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: And I have - I've noted your comments on the executive committees and I think I suggest that, you know, it could be footnoted and perhaps - you know, if we're going to the Board Governance Committee on the issue of open public - this - it's the sort of thing we can clarify with them as well.

Tony Harris: Okay. Fine with me. Do you want - do you want to continue then on - lead us as you wanted this call to go, please.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Committees. Okay. So essentially the main recommendation on committees is the working group model be adopted in committee where, you know, where possible is finally agreed and recommended by the Policy Process Steering Committee. So is that contentious?

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes. Victoria, I don't - I don't agree with this. And just I think this is one of the areas where I comment in on the report. I don't agree because for several reasons. I think the working group model is the GNSO cross group model.

Victoria McEvedy: Right.

Claudio Di Gangi: And it's not necessarily the best or applicable model to then - to then carry over within the constituencies. That the constituencies might have their own models for producing their work and that they shouldn't necessarily have to follow. They might choose to adopt that but we shouldn't force all the...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Okay. Could - okay. Fine. Would you be happy if it was sort of a suggestion or an on the table default, you know, for people to refer to or not?

Tony Harris: But we're just saying here all constituencies shall publish lists (who) are active and...

Victoria McEvedy: Not necessarily on committee.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: That is very definite. It's...

Victoria McEvedy: We're on committees. No. No. Tony...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: On committees. Yes. I'm on committees...

((Crosstalk))

Claudio Di Gangi: We're an - we're still on A Tony.

Victoria McEvedy: A.

Tony Harris: We're still on A? Oh I'm sorry. I thought we were looking at the whole thing.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. And...

Tony Harris: Data com working group, operating model, okay.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. So would you be comfortable if it was an option, you know, recommended option but not mandatory Claudio? I mean it's, you know, it's basically so that people - you know, I mean I think again this is directed at information barriers.

So because, you know, if you look on those constituency Web sites, they don't have any rules for how they run their committees. So outsider and new members and people from the developing world won't have any idea how they operate. We'll be able to look up the rules anywhere. And this sort of thing can be important.

So, you know, it's not necessarily only suggestion. You know, perhaps the language could be something like - maybe it could offer a menu of options, i.e., the - either the constituencies - this is - I mean this is just the kind of thinking that was informing the draft, okay. Either constituencies could come up with their own standard committee procedure, i.e., and make it available to people in, you know - or, you know, committees at their option could choose the working group model or, you know, follow (Roberts) rules.

I mean the point is that for new people and outsiders and non-English speakers, et cetera, they can go somewhere and find out how that committee should operate and understand how to operate within it.

Tony Harris: Or you could say it could be - it could serve as a guideline rather than be adopted.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes. Yes. That's fine with me. And like your other recommendation sounds okay to me too that there's, you know, there should be some general description of, you know, how the committees work and that should be made available to the members. I think that's okay.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

Claudio Di Gangi: I think my overarching concern with all these is just simply that we provide flexibility to the groups to operate according to their own - you know, we're reflective of their membership. Tony's constituency is totally different than the IPC and the, you know, across the stakeholder groups. There's just to me a lot of diversity and so we should just try to maintain flexibility basically for the groups.

Tony Harris: Yes. Absolutely.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. I don't have any problem with that. I mean it, you know, at the end of the day it's to try and just drag up this standard practice and just make people more aware of these things. So I think that serves as a guideline and maybe offering some options. I don't have any problem with offering flexibility whatsoever.

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: You know, at the end of the day it's about openness and, you know, it's so that people can find out how things work. Again...

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes. I was going to - on 2B, I'm not sure, you know, going back to this flexibility thing. I mean there might be value in having the leadership of a constituency strategically place members on committees. You know, I see what - I see what...

Victoria McEvedy: But then that's just - you know, then - I mean I don't see why that should be problematic because isn't that just someone's suggestion because someone that they might like to join a committee. What we don't want is invitation only committees that are closed to others and work in secret. I mean that's the mischief and we're intending to address.

Claudio Di Gangi: Well I mean I think we have to balance - I think we have to balance it. I mean...

Victoria McEvedy: Well do you want invitation only committees...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: ...in secret.

Claudio Di Gangi: No. I don't - no. I don't want invitation - I think they should be - I think, you know, participation should be encouraged in all the committees and I think that it should not be invitation only. I think that people should be feel free to step forward and volunteer and serve.

But I just wanted to maintain that the flexibility that there could be discretion, that the leadership of a committee maybe would say, you know, you've been working on five committees.

Maybe we should make room for somebody else to participate in this committee they haven't participate yet. And they would have some strategic flexibility to determine oh, there's 10 people on this particular committee. Maybe that's too large. Or just have a, you know, just have that ability to sort of manage the process.

I think that needs to be balanced. I think what you said that we want this to be as open as possible and we want, you know, we want to encourage participation and it's not to make it that it's somehow closed group.

But, you know, that's just sort of what I'm just struggling with there is just how to - how to balance that. And, you know, I agree that it should be made know to the entire constituency membership. I'm just not sure if I'm okay with a hard line rule that says there's no discretion involved. And that...

Victoria McEvedy: Well I don't - well, okay. Okay, let's look at the language then taking your point. Because I don't think anywhere that we say there's no discretion. And so arguably - I mean we're not excluding any discretion or the ability for people to - if we look - just look - where would look - where would you see as the amendment, any amendment, required here just...

Tony Harris: I have one Victoria. I think we can't say it's open to all members because all committees all open to all members. I mean the executive committee would not be open to all members because their officers are elected by the constituency. So everybody can't join that committee. You vote for your officers...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: The officers are the committee..

Victoria McEvedy: I mean I don't think - okay. I mean that's a good - it's a really good point. And of course executive committees were not intended to be there and included in committees and that. But no problem to...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: ...to clarify.

Tony Harris: But it's called executive committee. I'm making that point just in case.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

Tony Harris: It's not like nitpicking, but it's...

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

Tony Harris: ...true.

Victoria McEvedy: That's a good point. Okay. So that's - well that's one precise - Claudio, or Tony, I mean so open to all members, is that really something you have a problem with, the word open to all members?

Tony Harris: No. Because committees other than the executive at least in the ISP, they're always open to anybody who wants to join. We usually have difficulty finding volunteers. That's...

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

Tony Harris: ...something else. But they are open.

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes. No, I'm not - it's the same thing in the IPC. I mean maybe I'll just think about the language a little more.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. Okay.

Claudio Di Gangi: But I think it's okay but when you say open to all members, does that mean that any member that steps forward is automatically placed on the committee? Is that the same thing?

Victoria McEvedy: Well, I mean maybe the Chair. We could - would it be appropriate to add some language in that the Chair of a committee could limit numbers or, you know, make other suggestions or whatever. I mean, you know, if you want to - if you want to add an caveat then...

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: ...there must be an appropriate way to do that. I mean it's not...

Claudio Di Gangi: But that's - I'll think about - I'll think adding in some language.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. Okay. I mean, you know, it is more important to get a good general rule and allow some flexibility I think. You know, I mean it's, you know, it's changing mindsets I think probably or just making it clear to people that you are informing members that they would have a right - they would have an automatic, you know, subject to whatever caveat it might be, you know, they could apply to join any of the committees that are in existence. You know, again for new members and, you know, people who aren't familiar I think that would be helpful.

Tony Harris: Are we still on B or have we gone to C already?

Victoria McEvedy: I think we are moving on to C.

Tony Harris: Oh, I thought we were already on that just now. Victoria, just a comment. I mean we're staying open to all members in B and this C would seem to be an overkill of the previous one.

Victoria McEvedy: I think it was - was it your comment though? I added...

Tony Harris: No I have no - I didn't make any comments on this...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: ...in writing.

Victoria McEvedy: Oh. Someone made a comment. I mean I added...

Tony Harris: No.

Victoria McEvedy: ...it in particularly.

Tony Harris: I mean I think you're right what you're saying here. It's useful for a committee to have the best expertise. But it's probably a redundant if the previous one stands.

Victoria McEvedy: I think someone - I added it in only because someone particularly raised it. It way well be it gets swallowed by Claudio's caveat when he comes up with one.

Claudio Di Gangi: That was me Victoria...

Victoria McEvedy: Right.

Claudio Di Gangi: ...that commented on C. And that was kind of - that was kind of the, you know, issue that I was just commenting about B.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

Claudio Di Gangi: That - and that does tend to restrict eligibility in those areas where expertise is required. And so that - I think that sort of addresses a little bit of my concern insofar as the committee that require expertise. And I think if I can come up with some other language...

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. Okay. Great. Okay. Moving on to D.

Tony Harris: I have - I have a comment on that. My only comment would be 72 hours it seems not too much because it may involve a weekend and, you know, so people would have to work on the weekend to do this. And perhaps one week would be more appropriate.

Victoria McEvedy: Right. Now the only thing is we wanted to have a - I mean the only thing is just again to make things easy, we wanted the periods to be the same for all meetings. You know, just again, you know, the less variation just for simplicity sake.

Tony Harris: Will you have this in other - in other...

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: ...places in the document?

Victoria McEvedy: It was the same at 1A for executive committees.

Tony Harris: But it's not realistic -- I'm sorry, it's not meant as a criticism to you -- because we may have, you know, these work products and minutes they may develop during an ICANN meeting and on the last day and people are maybe traveling for two or three days to get back from...

Victoria McEvedy: Asia.

Tony Harris: ...Asia to South America. So when it - how can they do this in 72 hours?

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. One week.

Claudio Di Gangi: Is there a - just thinking. Is there a need to put in a time?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes I think there is a need to put in a time, at least a recommended time. I mean I'm sure it'll be honored in the breach and not the observance. And I mean there are no sanctions for failure - it's a guideline, you know, at the end of the day, right. But if you don't at least put it in, people won't even try and

meet it. You know what I mean? I mean I'm - like I said, I mean what's the sanction? You know. I mean, but...

Claudio Di Gangi: Constituency wouldn't be operating in accordance with the rules and I think that when we create the rules - I mean if you want to say, you know, if it's clear that it's just a suggestion that they're done within 72 hours. But I just think that, like Tony said, if you - if it's written as this is rule that you must, you know, all groups must - this must be done within a certain timeframe, it just to me seems...

Victoria McEvedy: Then it needs more time. Okay. One or the other.

Claudio Di Gangi: I just think that the recommendation - if the recommendation said that, you know, the committee should be posted on the Web site and I think that addresses kind of what...

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. I suppose so. But I mean, you know, you know, sometimes things can be particularly fast moving and, you know, withholding it, I mean - I think we need - maybe we need to - I mean Olga and (Michael) were happy with the 72 hours.

And we did discuss the facts. I don't know and I don't know what's going on with - because I haven't read it. I don't know about the staff support scenario. But, you know, my comment on the call to them was well the IBC is full of lawyers. So is the NCUC. I don't think it's very hard to get people - we're only talking about action. Remember we're only talking about action items, decisions or resolutions.

So, you know, they're not like for - like it's not minutes or recordings or a discussion of what happened or that discussion. You know, it's the action points. So I don't know. And I think it make a good point Claudio about suggestion versus rule.

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes. Yes. I think - I think it might be more helpful and just put it as a suggestion.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. I think - or if it wasn't a suggestion, what would - would you be happier - if it was going to be a rule, do you think a week would be more acceptable?

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes. Yes. That sounds - that sounds more reasonable.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. I think also actually just speaking to that, I think someone pointed out to us - is the IPC. You guys have got a secretariat. Is that right Tony?

Tony Harris: That's - I think it's the business constituency that has a...

Victoria McEvedy: Oh, it's the business. Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: ...has secretariats. So at...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: ...the end of the day - what's that?

Glen DeSaintgery: Sorry. It's Glen.

Victoria McEvedy: Hi Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, the business constituency has secretariat as well as the registry constituency. And the registrars have got somebody who writes up their papers for them.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: Sorry to interrupt.

Victoria McEvedy: Thank you. No, that was helpful. Okay. Those two aren't constituencies anymore and don't concern us in this language. But at the end of the day, like I think we are - I mean I hear what you're saying Tony, but we are dealing with, you know, we're dealing with professional people. And remember we're limiting - well it's this work product as well. But - okay. Why don't we consider...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: ...the one-week rule.

Claudio Di Gangi: Victoria, could I just - you just said something which I'm not sure I agree with or it's not really clear to me which is that they're not constituencies. Since participation within those stakeholder groups occurs at the stakeholder group level, wouldn't this also - I mean these - are you - wouldn't these same rules apply?

Victoria McEvedy: No. These are - well the way that I've drafted it, these do - I mean if you look right down the bottom, it says at Number 12 - I mean this is - and there's an important reason for this. It says at Number 12 we recommend that - well someone said all or otherwise particular numbers of the recommendations also apply to the contracted parties have stakeholder groups.

I mean there aren't constituencies in the other two anymore. They've been abolished, haven't they? And people talk about the fact that there may be in place of them interested parties or voting factions. However, there are none as yet. And none are charters or otherwise exist.

So I - the way that I had prepared this just in terms of this - the layout and language because I'm familiar - I'm familiar with constituencies and I understand them a little bit even in theory. But nobody is yet familiar with stakeholder groups. And they are operating under transitional charters.

So my suggestion was that even once we figure out some rules that might apply to constituencies or their equal partners, which are interested parties should there ever be any, we would need to think again about what might be appropriate at stakeholder group level.

Claudio Di Gangi: Well, the reason that - the reason that - I'm confused by that because we would be creating different standards for participation there since as you said there are no constituencies are interested groups formed within those stakeholder groups. That participation occurs directly at the stakeholder group level that we would be creating two different sets of standards here.

I mean in ICANN's 10-year history all these groups have participated on equal footing. They've all been - granted there's been, you know, weighted voting but they otherwise they've all been conformed as the same types of groups under the constituency structure.

Victoria McEvedy: Well, but hang on. But a stakeholder group and a constituency are not the same thing are they?

Claudio Di Gangi: The stakeholder - but the structure of them is not but I'm talking about the level of participation. So if you're a - if you're formerly a member of the registry constituency, now you participate within the stakeholder group, there is no constituency...

Victoria McEvedy: No. I understand that. But they are suggesting...

((Crosstalk))

Claudio Di Gangi: ...creating a current standard, you...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: They're going to have interested parties below. That's what - but we're yet to see them. And they're not in existence. So they compare us at is constituency and interested party or so we're continually being told. Right.

Claudio Di Gangi: There's no requirement, as you said, for an interested - an interest group to be formed. And it's, as you said, it's very possible that they will not be formed. So...

Victoria McEvedy: That's my own belief.

Claudio Di Gangi: Right. Well...

Victoria McEvedy: That there won't be any...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: ...and there certainly - there won't be charters or they won't, you know, and they won't really fall within the thing. But, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Claudio Di Gangi: But we can't assume - we can't assume that they will be formed. We have to kind of operate under the assumption that we won't know if they will.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. Okay.

Claudio Di Gangi: Participation is going to be at the stakeholder group level.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Now if you - you know, you will be familiar as I am with the commercial - with commercial - what's it called? Commercial stakeholder group (within) the charter.

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: It's an interim transitory charter, isn't it? Now that thing provides - I mean it provides currently that the only people that can participate in that stakeholder group are constituencies. Locks everything back down to a constituency, doesn't it?

Claudio Di Gangi: I believe that that's - I believe that's how it has - I believe that's how it has to be structured. I think that was...

Victoria McEvedy: Well I don't know about that. But that's how it is structured now anyway which is all we need to worry about I think. Right.

Claudio Di Gangi: Well because - I'd say it has to be (because) the non-commercial stakeholder group wanted to abolish constituencies and the Board instructed them basically that they had to go with the constituency model. And that was - that was sort of the cause of their - of their unhappiness with sort of how that - their charter which they had proposed was not accepted which proposed eliminating constituencies within their...

Victoria McEvedy: Right.

Claudio Di Gangi: ...their stake group. And so the Board - it's pretty clear that I think with on the - on the - on the non-contracted side that the board is requiring that there be constituencies.

Victoria McEvedy: Right. Okay. So - but things are not going to be - things are not apples to apples between contractors and non-contractors. And I didn't make that situation. I can't recommend - I mean I - it's not - it's not - anyway I'm just

saying if we're going to make recommendations to stakeholder groups, and I'm not sure that we should when they're in a transitional form. Do you think we should?

Claudio Di Gangi: I think that all of our - I don't - I'm not sure if we should define it as - I think that the rules that we write for the constituencies to follow should apply to participation within the contracted party stakeholder groups because otherwise you would have one set of rules applying on one side and a different set of rules apply on the other. I think it should be equal across...

Victoria McEvedy: Right. Okay. Well, do you think we could leave that to come back - and once we've got - I mean just because we're working with an - I mean I just thought it would make our task easier to work with something we know, right.

Like to think about these things in a practical - you know, there - to think about these things in a practical way, you know, in trying to figure - iron out, you know, contention and issues and what have you with something that's a known quantity to us, right, and then to come back and go okay, what should go over, you know, to an unknown quantity that we don't really know how it may evolve in future.

And so that's why I've sort of said at the end, once we - once we figure out what we can live with with constituencies, we should come back and think this might be appropriate to go forward to the stakeholder group. I mean do you - how do you feel about that as an approach? Just it's not that we won't take things forward but it's just, you know, it might - I thought it - well, for myself anyway, that that it would ease the thinking.

Claudio Di Gangi: I guess my - I guess I would okay with that if the default that we were operating under was that everything will go over and that unless there's a specific reason...

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

Claudio Di Gangi: ...that there's not a constituency and, you know, that would cause us to say well, you know, Number 4 won't apply because there's no constituencies there and that's going to cause a specific problem with Number 4.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Well I don't have a problem with looking at it from that basis at least to start with. And then if there are, you know, structural or constitutional problems that arise because of the nature of a, and no one's raised any yet, because of the different nature of the stakeholder group, we can address some working back from the default. I don't have a problem with that.

Claudio Di Gangi: Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: Where are we?

Claudio Di Gangi: I think we're on 2D or 2E.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

Claudio Di Gangi: Do you think Victoria that maybe we could - we could set up a call for next week?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. I think that's a great idea because I'm sorry about - I really have to get on and I'm sure that you guys do too.

Tony Harris: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: I'm going to have to go too.

Victoria McEvedy: It is really, really helpful to have this conversation with the two of you. So I mean it would be really good. And I can - I can try and work around the, you

know, your availability. But I would like to do this because it's actually really, really helpful and also I think, you know, we're going to - I mean it looks reasonably as though we might (have seen) that were things we can all live with. And that's quite encouraging.

Do you want me to make an amends of what we've already discussed today and then circulate it and then try - could we try and have a call Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday next week?

Claudio Di Gangi: Sure.

Victoria McEvedy: Oh I've got...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: ...on Monday, don't I. I'm supposed to come back on Monday to the group. Do you think we could do it Monday?

Tony Harris: Depends what time. I'm engaged on Monday until about 1600 UTC.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

Tony Harris: Monday's not a good day for me.

Claudio Di Gangi: Victoria, what did they ask you to come back to the group with?

Victoria McEvedy: I'm going to try and go back with - after we've had this call, I was going to try and get back with them a draft - a redraft of that.

Claudio Di Gangi: So maybe...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: If we do that - if you do that, I've - if we have a call on Tuesday or Wednesday, that's wouldn't make such a big difference because I mean we would make a lot of headway on this.

Victoria McEvedy: Well do you want - or you guys, I don't know, could you do this over the email and then we can see if we still need a call?

Tony Harris: Yes. That is probably the best thing. What do you think Claudio?

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes. No, that's a good idea too. I'll try to do it over email. I will just need a few - you know, I think it'll be tough if you're still aiming for Monday to - maybe we could just let Olga know that we need a little bit more time.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. We still want to be Monday, Tuesday I think.

Claudio Di Gangi: To - you wanted - you want comments on all this by Monday or Tuesday? Is that what you're saying?

Victoria McEvedy: Well, yes. Yes.

Claudio Di Gangi: It'll be close. I mean I could try, you know, and we'll see what happens. I'm just...

Victoria McEvedy: Do you think - well tell me this. Will it be faster to have another call then? Because, you know, actually, you know, when you have to sit down and do something that's boring and you can do it on your own and whatever, I mean or do you think we were making better progress doing it over the phone?

Claudio Di Gangi: I think it might be quicker. I think, you know, maybe we should reassess maybe by Monday or Tuesday. I'll try to - I'll try - I think it could be quicker to just, you know, to get comments in, you know...

Tony Harris: Well you've got mine.

Victoria McEvedy: Well, yes, but...

((Crosstalk))

Victoria McEvedy: ...yes, your having other comments Tony and they're really useful and helpful and I mean I have to say I think this call has been quite helpful and productive. And I think we're making a bit of progress than we would necessarily doing it - look, why don't we- I think we should try and - why don't we aim to do both. Okay.

If you can give me anything you can by I'm going to say - let's say close of Tuesday, right, in writing. And then let's try and - could we try and have a call as - let's schedule a call for first - early Wednesday or something like that. Do you think we could do that?

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: Yes. Because...

Victoria McEvedy: Because then we'd be able to iron out...

Tony Harris: That'd be okay.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

Tony Harris: Yes. Wednesday morning I'm okay.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Well look. I'll send - I'll open a doodle. I mean and the let's just - and we'll do that over the list.

Claudio Di Gangi: Are you guys going to be in Seoul?

Victoria McEvedy: I'm not planning at this stage to go.

Claudio Di Gangi: No. Tony, you going to be there?

Tony Harris: Yes. I'll be there.

Victoria McEvedy: Right.

Tony Harris: Are you going Claudio?

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes.

Tony Harris: Okay. Fine.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Listen. I'm going to run. Thank you both very much. I really appreciate your time.

Claudio Di Gangi: Thanks Victoria.

Tony Harris: Okay. Thank you Victoria.

Victoria McEvedy: All right. Thanks. Bye bye.

Claudio Di Gangi: Bye bye.

Tony Harris: Bye bye.

END