

**GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work
Team 05 June 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 **05 June 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-ops-20090605.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#june>

Participants present:

Olga Cavalli - work team chair - NCA
Michael Young - Work team vice chair - Registry c.
Charles Gomes - gTLD Registries c.
Victoria McEvedy - IPC
SS Kshatriya - Individual
Claudio Digangi - IPC
Krista Papac - gTLD Registries c.

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund - Policy Consultant
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent apologies

Rafik Dammak - NCUC

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Operator. Glen or Julie, could me make role call so we know who is on the call?

Glen de Saint Gery I do that for you Olga. We have on the call Krista Papac

Olga Cavalli: Hi (Krista) I didn't hear you joining the call. Sorry.

Krista Papac Hello.

Glen Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Glen: And SS Kshatriya

SS Kshatriya: Yes.

Glen: And Michael Young and Olga Cavalli. And we have apologies from Rafik Dammak. And we have had no response from Zahid. We ask him whether he wanted to be called after. And I have just seen that Victoria McEvedy has joined the call as well.

And for staff we have Julie Hedlund and Glen De Saint Gery.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you very much, Glen, I'm sorry I didn't hear when (SS) joined in. And (Krista) joined. So good morning again to all of you.

I just resent a new agenda - a revised agenda maybe on hour ago, because I've been going through our emails exchange, and I saw that the one I sent on Monday was not updated. Any additions or comments to the agenda? Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: I missed - well I kind of have a - they may came up in other subjects, but if we get to the end and we haven't - I've got a few things.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: Thanks Olga.

Olga Cavalli: No problem. Just remind me that you want to talk about something else.

Number one, I don't know if saw the email exchange. Gisela sent the results of the (unintelligible), so we have a date and a time for our face-to-face meeting in Sidney. Some of us had said that we will attend.

For those who didn't, or would like to participate in this doing what we could do. Then Gisela or Julie, perhaps we could resend the link during today. And remind the rest of the working team to aware that we have date and time for our face-to-face meeting, and that we have also remote participation possibility.

Any comments about finding dates? Someone that is having a lot of problems with having many hours, or maybe (SS) or...

(SS), this - is this time and date okay for you for attending remotely?

Chuck Gomes: Olga what was that time again? And date?

Olga Cavalli: It's Sunday, 21 June. And if I updated the Sydney time, for me 3:00 pm to 4:00 pm. Is that okay Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that's correct. Well, because see 3:00 pm - I think it's listed as...

Glen : 3:15 pm to 4:15 pm.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, yes, 3:15 pm.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Krista Papac: Actually, it looks like it's - I don't know the time change, but it looks like it's 90 minutes.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, I didn't hear you.

Krista Papac: It looks like the time is - I don't have the time converted, but it looks like a 90-minute meeting rather than 60.

Chuck Gomes: I have a time converter up on my laptop here, so if anybody wants me to convert a time tell me and I'll do it.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. And actually (Krista) you're right. It's 3:15 pm to 4:45 pm. I (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Man: Sorry, is that Sydney time?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Woman: That's Sydney time.

Olga Cavalli: Yes that's Sydney time.

Man: Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: And if anybody wants me to convert it for you, I have a converter ready to go. I just need to know what to convert it to.

Olga Cavalli: (SS) is this timing good for you?

SS Kshatriya: It is okay Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, thank you very much. Any other comments about timing and date?

Man: No, it's fine.

Olga Cavalli: Great. So okay. I would like move to Number 2. (SS) you sent an email to the list, to the Chair and to the staff, and I frankly must tell you I couldn't answer you because I didn't know exactly what you were asking. Maybe it's because of my lack of understanding of your question or that I don't have the right information.

I sent an email to - it was Julie and (Rob) in private, and so I have no time a lot really to follow-up on this. So I would like you, perhaps if we could - if you can tell us what exactly what you're telling us there, and what you need for clarification from staff if this is that what I understood from your message.

SS Kshatriya: Olga I sent two mails and was replied to with (unintelligible) you both there, and confidential documents. There I said that - I mean, two documents could be confidential but not analysis. And I think (Robert) has followed it and he has sent just (unintelligible) email as (unintelligible) sent, so that is fine.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

SS Kshatriya: That was duty of (Jeanie) from the (Blue Team) and it is her criteria that refers to some very old mail I think. It was dated 8 May or something like that. I can't recollect. And so there I said that well, this - the (Blue Team) suggest possibilities, but so far nobody has come forward too.

And change of staff, both to those documents time and again, (unintelligible) just additional criteria, all the criteria which are important. And even they don't get on that sheet (unintelligible). And I think you (unintelligible) able to (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: I have some difficulties in hearing very well, because there is sort of echo. Could someone help me with what (SS) told us?

SS Kshatriya: Julie was is clear to you?

Julie Hedlund: Not entirely. I thought perhaps that you might be referring to the need for additional criteria. I heard the word criteria, but I didn't hear the rest of what you said. If you could repeat, that would be very helpful.

SS Kshatriya: Just have to look at your (unintelligible).

(Claudio): Hi Olga. This is (Claudio). I joined the call.

Olga Cavalli: Who's this?

(Claudio): (Claudio).

Olga Cavalli: Oh, (Claudio), welcome.

(Claudio): Hi, thanks.

Olga Cavalli: (SS) I just suggest the following. I have a lot problems hearing you. There's a lot of echo in your voice and I really cannot recognize what you are saying, because it sounds very strange and I cannot get all the words completely when I hear you. Could you be so kind to maybe send a more explanatory email to our list and maybe the staff and the working team and myself can answer your questions and your doubts? Could it be possible if you could do it today? We could work this maybe during this week.

SS Kshatriya: Yes. I'll follow up immediately after the meeting and maybe (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much for great flexibility. You know, telephones work well but I really have difficulties in hearing you very clearly. I'm so sorry for that.

Chuck Gomes: Olga could I say something?

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: On staff support, the - one of the things that I think, and I'm sure Julie wouldn't bring this up. But one of the things that is important for us to realize that with regard to staff support, my understanding in working with them and lots of other areas as well, is just that each of the members of the staff team are assigned to certain projects. So one of

the things that's important for us to keep in mind is just that when we say staff support, for the most part we're talking about Julie.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Not a team of players that will all do this stuff for us. Now that doesn't mean that Julie can't ask for advice from the other team members, but they all have their own projects that they're working. And each of them have multiple projects. I think Julie has at least three working teams, or working groups, that she's supporting in addition to other projects.

So I'm not saying this to dampen things. I just want us to be realistic and make sure that what we do ask for is going to be really useful for us, because there's, you know, limited resources even with staff. And it's important that we don't think that it's just unlimited when we're making requests.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Chuck. I totally agree with you, and really think that (Rob) and Julie, Gisela make great work and are very helpful. But I do realize that they have a lot of work to do and we should be very cautious in what we ask and what we would like from staff. Thank you for your comment. Any other...

SS Kshatriya: (Unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

SS Kshatriya: Yes. This is (SS). Can you hear me clearly? Then I will add something to (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Now it's much better. You please go ahead.

SS Kshatriya: Okay. It is what Chuck said. Chuck it is not that we are asking something too much from staff. But here in this (unintelligible) meeting, this particular group (unintelligible) that some the grouping and must we are stopping the staff support. I mean, the (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: I didn't understand that. Say that again please.

SS Kshatriya: Yes, yes. It is that the staff support is available. The staff comes out with support whenever we ask. But here is not asking.

And some members, they are actually - like the (unintelligible) that support to come. Now, I'll give you example Chuck. You have to listen.

Just today (Robert) has sent a mail, which is to stop analysis of business constituency and permission support. Send message to the Board, send ready 2009. This analysis was available with the staff and be (unintelligible) asking right from (unintelligible). Nothing comes (unintelligible). Do you understand Chuck? (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

SS Kshatriya: (Unintelligible) that something which is to send you have to get sended.

Chuck Gomes: But I think there's a reason for that.

SS Kshatriya: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: I think there's a reason for that (SS). You're - I think you're interpreting it in a way that's not totally complete in the sense that I believe that (Rob) was hoping -- in fact I know that (Rob) was hoping because I've talked to him on - in other venues. He was hoping that actually they would be able to post the more recent work that they've done on constituency charters and (Stirigo) Charters, and they didn't know - and in fact they thought that was going to happen after this past Tuesday when the structural improvements committee of the Board met.

So there was probably good reason for them not to give us that information, because they were hoping to give us more current information that would be more valuable to us. Unfortunately, it looks like it's going to take the FIC group a little bit longer to - before they can post that more current information.

Victoria McEvedy: Well, I'd like to answer that...

SS Kshatriya: I'm not satisfied with your explanation...

Victoria McEvedy: Neither am I...

SS Kshatriya: You are suggesting to look to see. You are suggesting to (unintelligible) that support something and that will be -- I mean, open to the results. What was have to do with the staff, they would have sent it. And whenever they have revised it, they would have updated the - this (unintelligible) and they would have went ahead with the work.

So it's not that I think. You are suggest - from the (unintelligible) you have taken that you want to extended it.

Chuck Gomes: I'll accept the fact that you don't accept it and that we disagree.

Victoria McEvedy: Can I jump in the queue on this please?

Olga Cavalli: Who - sorry. Who would like to talk? And I would like to open queue because I'm having difficulty...

Man: I'm following (SS).

Olga Cavalli: (SS) you want to talk?

Victoria McEvedy: In the queue.

SS Kshatriya: No. I have finished.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Okay. You want to say something else?

Chuck Gomes: No, no. That's fine.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Victoria wants to say something.

Olga Cavalli: Victoria and Julie I heard.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. I'd like to say something. Can I...

Olga Cavalli: No. Julie please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. I should mention that this analysis that (Rob) has sent around was originally provided to the various constituencies. And it was also available to me. And I did review this analysis when I prepared the analysis for this work team.

Now, the structure of the analysis that (Rob) has sent is different from the structure that I used for this team, because when I provided my analysis I was looking at the criteria, and only at the criteria that this work team had identified as, you know, as it related to the Board's recommendations.

However, if you review the material that (Rob) has sent and compare it to what I have prepared there are a number of duplications because it is a very similar analysis.

It is, however, in a very different format because the analysis that was provided in January was provided to earlier versions of constituency charters in some cases, and also was addressing different questions and arranged in a different format.

But to speak to (SS)'s point, yes, I was aware of the analysis. I - we could not release the analysis at the time because we - it was provided to the constituencies and (Rob) needed to work with the constituencies to make sure it could be released.

But yes, I did use that analysis in producing the analysis that I did for this team.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. That you Julie. Victoria?

Victoria McEvedy: Thank you. Well, I would just like to comment because it was me that asked very directly, (Robert), for the (unintelligible) first person to make the direct request. And I think that my requests were made. Probably the first request was two or three calls ago of this working group, and I followed that up with many, many emails asking for work product.

I mean, I think cutting right through the - I don't know if it's the same point that (SS) is making, but my issue is that I don't think that we were given very direct and transparent in full some answers from staff. If there was a need to get constituency approval and clearance to be released, then we should have been told that that was the obstacle and given, you know, some information about that. You know, even while it was still in progress.

And I made inquiries of the individual property constituency to find out what they got the analysis that we were provided first from (Rob) about a week ago. And they received it apparently on - for the first - on the 27th of March. It was definitely in existence at the time that the requests - very clear requests of the work products were made.

I do think there's an issue here because I don't think it's appropriate the staff to hide information or fail to fully disclose, even if there are constraints to releases. I mean, we should just be - we should be - it

shouldn't be a problem to say if the information exists that there are constraints or there's a procedure that needs to be solid for release.

And I think it's, you know, it's really fundamental issues, the integrity of this whole procedures and processes that we're involved in. And I think it's really inappropriate for it to be hidden from any aspect of the ICANN machinery that material exists and, you know, but may well be there are procedures to release and approvals, et cetera, et cetera. But I do not think this has been appropriately handled. And I think it's a really important point.

And I would hope that we can perhaps, you know, get something, you know, wind this conversation into something constructive, and perhaps a protocol for our working group going forward. Or perhaps Chuck or Olga, who have more experience with some of the ICANN machinery, can tell us what should have happened here, because I think there has been a very serious silence.

Chuck Gomes: Olga can I speak?

Olga Cavalli: Sure. I would like to make a comment first Chuck, if you allow me.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Victoria. Thank you Julie. Thank you (SS). I just want to make a comment from my perspective. I am not - I don't belong to any constituency. I'm an (unintelligible). I've been working in different groups and SOs and I think for maybe seven years. And let me tell you that I was expecting from the representatives of the

constituencies more information, but from constituencies to our working team.

I think what we can we ask many things to the staff, which is fine, and Julie is very helpful, but I really would like the constituencies to give us the information so we don't have to ask for permission if the information is available or not.

You already belong to different constituencies. And some of you have already been very helpful in providing this information, so that is fine. But why don't we use your - the report is already existing in the constituency. So it's my - it's a comment and a question because I don't belong to a constituency. That would help...

Victoria McEvedy: Olga can I answer that because I precisely asked my constituency for this material and it was with - and it - the thing is the constituencies are not in front of the issues that we need to look at. They are not sharing material and it had not been made available until I ask for it.

Olga Cavalli: So it's not a problem only from staff that they don't want to release the information. And so it's the constituencies that they - is that a fact?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

(Claudio): Olga this is (Claudio). Can I get in the queue?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I think we have Chuck first and then I tell you.

(Claudio): (Unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Chuck go ahead please.

Chuck Gomes: (Claudio) can jump in, that's fine. I'll go...

Olga Cavalli: Okay, okay.

Chuck Gomes: I'll follow him.

(Claudio): Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. (Claudio)?

(Claudio): Thank you. Yes. So we had an initial conversations with staff following the submission of the IPC researches - recertification report. And there was basically a response that the IPC drafted to the staff analysis. And I worked on that response.

And that response basically just was recently posted to the IPC list for comments. And we're in the process of, you know, getting back to staff with the information. So I just wanted to clarify that.

Victoria, if you did put in a request with the IPC, and I saw that you put one in about a week ago, and then shortly afterwards the document was posted to the list. And so I don't think there was any delay there in the IPC getting...

Victoria McEvedy: No, no. Well, there was a delay (Claudio). Just (unintelligible) really (unintelligible) because - I mean, some of this is - this sort of thing is really important. So while we're talking about it, let's be precise because I have the exact dates.

And (Steve) (unintelligible) concerned that he got the staff analysis on the 27th of March. Now, the - it was not disclosed to the constituency at that stage. And in fact, it was only disclosed when the reply was drafted. And only after (Rob) had made it available, i.e. it had already gone into sort of the public circulation.

(Claudio): No. You're right about that. There was definitely a - and I worked on the response. And basically what I did following it - the IPC has a committee on the future that was formed...

Victoria McEvedy: I'm on it I think.

(Claudio): Right, yes. And what I did was I sent the draft to somebody on that committee and also the Chair of that committee.

And the IPC is just - really it was just an issue that - I think there was about a two-week period where I didn't even - I did not get a response to my email. And basically there's the IPC - there's a lot of people working on the implementation recommendation team. And there was not any sort of effort or desire in the IPC to keep that document, you know, under wraps. It was just basically - there was that the way in people responding to that issue and...

Victoria McEvedy: Well, I'm not going to agree with that characterization because then that I particularly would have, you know, having put in a minority report on some of these very issues jolts, and the issue itself and I would like to have seen that earlier and had more of an opportunity to had some input into the response.

But in any event, look, I've been - not that we want us observe the working group on the IPC sort of issue, but I think it's just an illustrative example for you Olga of what, you know, different constituencies have very, very different approaches to information sharing. And that was just an example. I hope that sort of clarifies your point. But I don't want us to get sidetracked on the...

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Victoria and (Claudio). Chuck please.

(Claudio): I just - do you - the last point I wanted...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Claudio): ...to mention was I just also agreed with Julie - with the comment that Julie made that those documents were produced in regards to a separate process. And they were documents that were created by staff to have an informal discussion with the constituencies and...

Olga Cavalli: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, sure, thanks. Thanks Olga. Let me first make a general comment and then a suggestion. I appreciate that several people are -- Victoria in particular -- mentioning that the, you know, constructive work of the - us getting on to constructive work.

My general comment is that I'm somewhat disappointed -- in fact a lot disappointed -- that in our calls we have probably spent 50% to 75% of our time discussing issues like this instead of focusing on the constructive work. And so I hope we can move beyond that and I'll leave it at that. Not that these things aren't important. I don't want to

minimize them. But I don't think, in a lot of senses, they're helping us move forward on our tasks before us.

Now, that said let me make a suggestion that - and I want to encourage everybody that's on the team in this regard. It's useful to look at existing documents and to learn about the constituencies, and we have quite a few people who haven't been involved in constituencies a lot over the years, so I understand that and appreciate the need to come up to speed.

But I also want to encourage the group to be - and this is in my role as Chair of the OSC that I'm saying this - encourage the group to be creative. It's okay for this working team to come up with some creative ideas. Some ideas that maybe are different than the way constituencies are doing things, or stakeholders will do things. And to make some suggestions that you think would be good in response to fulfilling the Board's recommendations.

And now, well test those with the constituency members that are on our working team and ultimately with the constituencies as a whole. But don't just rely on all of the information that's out there and what constituencies are doing and what stakeholder groups are proposing to do entirely. That's an important element. But also, don't be afraid to use your own creative thinking processes and make some suggestions with regard to implementing the Board recommendations. We should be doing some of that too.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Can I jump in - follow that on...

Olga Cavalli: No.

Victoria McEvedy: Sorry. I'm not really happy that with the way we moved through that issue. I'm not...

Olga Cavalli: Sorry Victoria - Chuck you're done? Is...

Chuck Gomes: I'm finished.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you. We have an agenda. We have one hour, which we have spent 1/2 an hour maybe, mainly talking about this. I totally agree with Chuck that this is an important issue, but I think we have to move forward. So I encourage the group, and I don't want to be distasteful in this, but I think we have to move forward. And I would like very much to exchange with you some ideas about the other issues on the agenda and we have only 1/2 an hour.

So I would suggest that we keep on exchanging ideas. You know, our mailing list, this is what the list is for. And try to find the best way to move forward. But I totally agree with Chuck, that we have to find different things to - maybe this difficult is that the constituencies have maybe for gathering information or receiving feedback is an important issue that we should consider for our recommendations. How could we improve that? And this is some food for thought for our work.

So I would suggest, if you don't mind, to move for to Number 3. Is that okay? Or if the case want to make a small comment, that's okay, but very small.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. I mean, I just do think - I just want to reiterate, I'll follow this up on the list. I do think that we've been delayed because of the lack of

transparency in the procedural problem and responding. And I do think it's an issue than infects the whole process.

And so, you know, I just want to - well, I don't think it's us making the issue. We kept asking for the information and I don't think it was handled properly. And I hope that we don't come across it again. But I'm not sure that I'm entirely happy with this resolution. I'll just put that there.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Let's keep on discussing this and let's move to the - and thank you all very much for the exchanges of ideas. Number 3, project plan fruition -- what we have achieved; what is missing. Julie sent a new version of the draft to feedback request form. I just wanted to check with Julie and Glen if this was already sent to constituencies.

Julie Hedlund: I - Olga this is Julie. I believe it was sent because we have received already one comment on it. The - we have received a reply from (SS Kachira) who is the petitioner for the IDN gTLD new constituency.

And it says he has given us some helpful suggestions. He didn't add any new items to the list of toolkit items, but had suggestions for which items he thought could be handled by staff and which by the (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: So the request was sent and we have one response.

Chuck Gomes: And Olga, I can I'll tell you what happened on the registry constituency side. The - I forwarded the requests for feedback onto the registry constituency and asked that it be put on our agenda for our meeting next - or our teleconference call next week and our meeting in Sydney

as well. So the registry constituency will be looking at that request and providing feedback.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Any other comments?

Victoria McEvedy: I'm sorry. I'm not entirely - sorry. I'm not entirely clear what item - I'm sorry, I'm - I don't want to hold the group up. But I'm not entirely sure what we're supposed to be doing this agenda item. What are we doing?

Olga Cavalli: I just was reviewing during the last weekend all our working plans and try to find where we are, what is missing, if we still need some feedback from some of the sub-working teams that we agreed to have. And such as for one issue to be done that was done by Chuck and Julie was to send - to prepare a draft saluted feedback request form that was - had been already sent to constituencies.

I just wanted to check if we had some feedback and if there was - if there were any other comments from constituencies. This is - was - this was my question and...

Chuck Gomes: I think Victoria's question is a good one and I apologize that it wasn't clear what we were talking about. We were looking at the goals achieved and the project plan for the sub-task 4 Victoria. Sorry we didn't make that clear.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Julie and I are on that. And we had - one of our tasks was to prepare this list of priorities and so forth for the toolkit for our constituencies

and - a toolkit of services for constituencies and stakeholder groups. And so we completed that part of the task and sent it out to the counsel and to others and have asked for feedback on the information that we provided. So that we are just saying that that is in - that is - has happened and now we're in the feedback stage.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you for clarification Chuck, and my apologies also because I didn't mention that when I started to talk. And I was so immersed in my list here. Is that okay Victoria?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes, that's absolutely fine. I mean, I just wanted to be clear because there are awful lot of documents and drafts circulating now.

Olga Cavalli: I know.

Victoria McEvedy: You know, I just didn't want to be, you know, signing off on something if - and I didn't know what particular things we were dealing with. And I have actually - it could go with other business, but I kind of have a - well, it probably came to another business. I'll just wait till the end of the list...

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I would like to make a - we have (Krista) on the call right?

Krista Papac: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: (Krista), I would like to ask you for - I know that Tony has sent Julie and myself an email that you are trying to arrange some meetings to perform your items on deliverables during the Sydney meeting, which I think is fine.

What I would like you to send us is estimated due date and start date of your working plan so we can add it to our general table, so it's easier for us to make a follow-up. Would that be okay maybe if you could do that maybe during this week?

Krista Papac: So first of all, I wanted to apologize to this working team because I haven't been very participative and working the way - I just - it was a matter of just over committing myself as I was finishing up school - full-time school and full-time work. But school is over now and now I have time again.

And I'm just going to back to an email that I sent to you Olga and (Michael). So this is the first working team I've really participated in, and so a couple things. I get a little sort of overwhelmed with a lot of the back and forth and trying to decide what stuff I should be paying attention to and what not. And so I think I finally figured out how to kind of manage through that. But I feel like that there's a lot of deliverables that I owe the team right now, but I'm not clear on what they are and so that's why I've reached out to you.

And I think you kind of touched on some of them but not others, and so I don't know if this is a good time to do that, but there's two things. I think that potentially, as a member of the Registrar constituency, there is something about our charter that I could be getting back to the team, or some research I could be doing on behalf of this team into the Registrar constituency's charter. But I'm just no clear what type of information I should be trying to find.

I know who to talk to within the constituency. I just don't know what I should be looking for. And again, you know, forgive my ignorance being sort of new to this. But that's, I think, the first thing I owe.

The second thing is, I have volunteered to lead this other sub-task, which is maintain the database of all constituency members, that's up-to-date and publicly acceptable. And I just - I guess I was looking for some direction from anyone as to - I'm happy to lead that team. I don't - is that something I - do I call the tech people at ICANN about that? I'm not really...

Olga Cavalli: No. Just let me explain. I'm so sorry. It seems that Tony Harris, who is from the ISP constituency, didn't copy you on his email. He already has some very good ideas about this sub-task 3, and you are with him in the working plan.

So what I would do - or what - we could do that with Julie because we are both copied in Tony's email. And we - I will - we send it to you and you can keep in touch with him so he has some ideas for arranging some meetings during Sydney. So that would be perfect if you can join him in this effort, which is perfect.

And maybe you can send to the working team, give the information about the constituency, which is also very good.

So with those two things, I think that that's okay. And I know that you graduated, so I congratulate you for your school.

Victoria McEvedy: Olga?

Chuck Gomes: Olga can I add something to that please?

Olga Cavalli: Sure, go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: (Krista) too, note that that particular recommendation from the Board, that wasn't a definite recommendation that we must have this database. But it was an idea that was part of a recommendation for improvements of constituencies and so forth that you can consider. So your little work team then can discuss whether you think it's a good idea, and if so how it could be done, what are the concerns -- like privacy and things like that.

You don't have to worry about the technical implementation of something like that. It's just is it a good idea. And you can come back and say -- your little subgroup doesn't think it is. And then we can talk about it as a whole working team. Or you can say -- yes, it has some potential; here are some concerns. And so begin to focus on - in that direction. Does that help?

Krista Papac: Yes it does, very much. Thank you. And then in respect to my constituency charter, what kind of information are we looking for here? And I'll work on trying to gather that.

Julie Hedlund: Olga this is Julie. Can I respond to that?

Olga Cavalli: Sure, please.

Julie Hedlund: Yes (Krista). I would - I think that if it would be helpful to you, perhaps you and I could have a short call and I could actually bring you a little bit up to date on what we've, you know, what the work team is doing

with respect to the various constituency charters. So that, you know, you can understand what kind of information we're looking for.

And I can bring you a little up to date on some of the things you might have missed from the team while you were in school. And I'd be happy to do that if you want to set up a time, you know, offline.

Krista Papac: Perfect. Thank you so much.

Olga Cavalli: I would suggest that you...

Chuck Gomes: And add - sorry. Add one more thing. I'm sorry Olga. The - to add one more thing. (Krista), what some of us did was we looked at the analysis that Julie did on the various charters, and we did, you know, a promenade on that analysis, so if you could do that, that would be great.

Krista Papac: Okay, perfect.

Olga Cavalli: And I would suggest, Julie, when you set up this call with (Krista), maybe you can invite Tony Harris, that he already did some work to this in the working plan. So maybe it's helpful.

Julie Hedlund: (Unintelligible) constituency charter?

Olga Cavalli: Sorry?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Actually, I think Tony had done the work - had the suggestions on the working plan and that...

Olga Cavalli: Yes he has.

Julie Hedlund: ...that's not - I don't know if - what he's done on the constituency charter, but I will be happy to invite him as well.

Olga Cavalli: I'll send an email to himself, to you and to integrate that so you move forward.

(Claudio): Olga this is (Claudio). Can I get in the queue?

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Please go ahead.

(Claudio): I just wanted to follow up on something that Chuck said that I thought was useful, which is do we have a sense as a group which of the Board recommendations are more advisory, as Chuck sort of put, for the database, as opposed to the other ones that are more, I guess, not as optional?

Olga Cavalli: I think I don't understand your question. Maybe someone else want to comment.

(Michael): Hi. It's (Michael) speaking. Are you saying that you think the recommendations have different degrees of impotence behind them, or expectations around them?

(Claudio): Yes I do, I do. I mean, that is sort of, I guess, behind what I'm saying. And I just wasn't sure if we had looked at it that way or if we had done any analysis of the recommendations.

(Michael): Well, I mean, I understand what you're saying and I - and there's probably some truth to that. I don't know if it's a real can of worms for us to be trying to second guess which of those recommendations, you know, have more weight behind them, so I...

Chuck Gomes: Can I jump in Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Sure, please Chuck. Go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry to jump in so much, but let me see if I can clarify that, at least in terms of the way I see it. Some of the recommendations are clear. Hey, this is a recommendation, you know, or the - but they're - underneath each of those recommendations in the Board report are ideas for how the recommendation might be able to be fulfilled.

So I would say that the definite recommendations - and in the report they're clearly stated as recommendations. And then underneath that is a discussion of possible ways those could be fulfilled.

So in the later case, the examples of how it could be fulfilled, those aren't definite. There are things for us to work on. The recommendation itself is really not open for discussion other than, you know, there may be some interpretation issues. And in cases like that we can certainly ask questions on that.

(Claudio): Okay. Thank you. That's helpful.

Chuck Gomes: Does that make sense?

(Claudio): Yes. Yes it does.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Chuck. I had that idea but I couldn't have to - so clearly. So we have some - we have our working plan. We have to move forward. And if we don't have any other comments about this, we had a due date for today for exchanging some -- this is Number 4 in the agenda -- for exchanging some ideas about this and about practices, where we take this information from (Rob), which is okay.

I am not sure if it's totally related with good and bad practices. As far as I have - I haven't received any feedback from the working team, so I suggest to extend one more week this due date and let's say for next Friday, which I don't know which date it is. Yes.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: And try to rethink some more comment. If someone has something to say about this point of the agenda.

(Michael): Can you put me in the queue as well please?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. That's (Michael)?

(Michael): Yes.

Olga Cavalli: And Victoria?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes, thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Okay (Michael) go ahead.

(Michael): Okay. Well, two things about this. Maybe we need to agree on a little bit more structure, because my understanding was that the sub-task leaders would be correlating some comments from their team members on suggested best and bad practices and writing some type of document. But maybe that wasn't clear how that should be presented or put together when we talked about it previously. So I think we should set trying to verify that.

And secondly, while I have the opportunity, I just want to, you know, I believe I'm assigned to as resource - available resource in sub-task 2, and so Victoria, this is a little for you. But I have some cycles available to help out with the work there. And, you know, I'm fully available if you've got some things that you want to throw my way.

But if the other groups are struggling on a resource level and feeling that they don't have the cycles to get things done then don't hesitate to ask me, because if I can clear up some time to help I certainly will.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Chuck. I'm sorry, thank you (Michael). Victoria?

Victoria McEvedy: Thank you. Thanks (Michael). Thanks for that offer for help. I just wanted to speak very quickly to this issue. I mean, I have to say I wasn't a big fan of this exercise. And I think my own view, I mean, subject to the group obviously, is that we probably, you know, got the most out of it that we're going to give.

I mean, arguably, the staff had, you know, as you say Olga, well, you know, the analysis by staff is rearview of the best and bad practices,

which, I mean, very delicately put obviously. But - and we've given them some - I'm not sure that we need to spend that much more time on that. That would just be my view.

And I think that there's a much bigger issue here. And it's an issue that we need to do at some point, it doesn't necessarily need to be today, but I think it relates to this exercise and the relevance. I think we need to talk about - and I kind of dealt with this on the list last week. You know, we've got these new constituency charter templates. Okay. So, you know, basically the stuff, you know, well, if you get - if there's going to be a new constituency, this is, you know, here's the template and we think this is sort of the ideal structure for, you know, some of the basics.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: So I think there's a big question. And I'm - the - I think it's a big - it's a question we don't know if this is a sub-task, sub-group, sub-task, you know, whatever it is, or it's something we need to talk about in a bigger group.

Are we going to be, you know, working from - are we going to try and patch up the total variations in the existing constituency structures, or are we going to start with a clean slate and sort of start from the templates? I mean, are these - are we going to look at this per issue or, you know, and I think there are some major issues of principle here.

I mean, we - are we going to have lots of variation at constituency level and then variation at stakeholder level, at which point we just own a huge layer of bureaucracy, which is not what the Board intended I

think. I think they - but anyway, we need to discuss this stuff I think. And I think it kind of - it's not necessarily relate that - I don't know how approximate it is to this sub-task. But anyway, that was my question there.

Chuck Gomes: Can I ask a clarifying question there Victoria?

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: What - which of the Board recommendations that are working team is tasked with - or focusing on does what you just said relate to?

Victoria McEvedy: Well, I would certainly say it relates to my - to sub-task 2, what I'm supposed to be in charge of. And I put these issues in my work plan. The first issues in my - and then it's fundamental.

I mean, you know, we're looking at operating principles and procedures, and so one of the big questions - I mean, it's quite clear from the Board support on my reading that - the Board's got in it's committee's report that they are looking at something of universal model - uniformed model. I mean, that's the meaning I get from those.

I can prepare something in writing if that would be more helpful and we can do this on the list.

Chuck Gomes: That would be good. No, but you're answer was good too. It was helpful, so that helps me. So in terms of common operating principles of constituencies and stakeholder groups.

And then there's also the uncommon ones, because I think it's fair to say that a one-size-fit-all model, even with charters, is not going to - it's just not going to work because there are so many variances so...

Victoria McEvedy: Well, there's - well, that's exactly the question though. Is it going to work and isn't? And what level of variation do we think would be, you know, we don't to - I mean, I can't have enough to find to read through anyone, because what level are we going to have variation at every single step of the procedure. And I think - anyway, I think we need to discuss it.

Chuck Gomes: I think you're right. And I think we can actually venture our own opinion as to where we think it makes sense. In fact, I think that's a big part of our task that you're highlighting right now, is to decide -- okay, what areas does it make sense and would it be valuable for there to be common operational procedures across constituencies; and what areas would it be much more appropriate to provide some flexibility? And it's in our per view to evaluate that, discuss it, and come forward with some recommendations in that regard.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Chuck. Thank you Victoria. And someone else want to comment about this?

I would like to make a comment. This is exactly my concern, and this is why I add it brings us to the Number 5 -- additional criteria for reviewing the system information.

I've been reviewing with the tables that Julie prepared and those comments sent by Victoria, by (SS), by Chuck. And the first thing that came to my mind is how to order all this information and how to extract

some relevant concepts. And just an idea, just to be creative at least from my perspective, what I did was to color the table and in different - in a different way. So what meets criteria and what does not meet criteria.

So I thought that maybe if I had the time with some of you, go and review why we think it meets criteria and find the general concept about each of the points. And then try to find this general issue that we should consider to make our recommendations. It's just an idea to start some exchange of thoughts.

But I think I totally agree with Victoria. It's something that we have to discuss in the group, maybe in our email list, and perhaps in our face-to-face meeting in Sydney and so on. So this is only the idea of adding Number 5.

But I think it's already - what I had to say is this and maybe if someone have another comment. Victoria do you want to add something in...

Victoria McEvedy: Well, I would have - I had kind of a related - well, maybe I already dealt with this in that dialog. But I just wanted to, you know, what - because one question that I have in my own mind is like procedurally, do we split off and start having sub-telecom meetings with each sub-task now?

Olga Cavalli: Maybe.

Victoria McEvedy: Or to what extent? And then let some of the stuff - so, you know, let the big questions come back from the groups into the bigger group, right. And then maybe they'll rise to the surface and we could do it that

way, or I don't know. But is it time to actually start getting on with the work, I guess? And should it be done by separate sub-task meetings?

Olga Cavalli: Well, I think it's a - it's very interesting question this sub-task. I thought about that. Maybe have different telephone calls or different lists. Let's exchange some ideas about this and like Point 2 also, about staff and documentation about constituencies, and see how can we order and - or organize our team. And maybe in sub-teams or - let's exchange that and let's try to be creative as Chuck said.

Would someone else want to ask something? We have six minutes.

Chuck Gomes: Just to encourage what Victoria just said. I - and Julie correct me if I'm wrong, but I think if any sub-group wants to do separate calls, that Glen would help them set up a call. Is that correct Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yes that's correct. And we've done that with other work teams. It works very well.

Chuck Gomes: A call or recurring calls. So just wanted to make sure that that was clear.

Olga Cavalli: Also, I think Julie -- correct me if I'm wrong -- but with the permissions we have for the wiki, if the sub-task wants to use or generate a new page in the wiki and work there, that also possible. Is that right?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that's correct. And I'd be happy to set up wiki pages for any of the sub-teams to do their work...

Olga Cavalli: So maybe it's a tool that we can use also, the wiki, not only the calls and the email list, but to post altogether some information that we are generating in sub-team.

(Michael): Well, is there any reason we shouldn't just go ahead set up those pages?

Olga Cavalli: Well, we should decide first how to organize the work I think. But feel free to propose something or to obey the Web page.

Chuck Gomes: It might be up to each sub-task whether they will find a wiki useful. Julie and I can talk about on ours - I'm not - immediately. I'm not sure it would be. So just setting them up, unless they're going used, would it be better to just - if a sub-group wants to do that they should - why don't they communicate that so that - and then it could be done.

Olga Cavalli: I just mention the wiki because it's another tool that we have. And I use it a lot for my teaching with my students. So I'm very much - I find wikis very useful for working in teams, but that's only my comment.

Chuck Gomes: Olga I've got to jump off for another meeting.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, me too.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks everybody. Have a good weekend.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Chuck and have a good weekend too.

(Claudio): Olga, this is (Claudio). Could I get in the queue?

Olga Cavalli: Sure (Claudio), go ahead.

(Claudio): Is it just toolkits, that document? I wasn't sure if I understood correctly. Did you say the constituencies have that already or is that something that...

Olga Cavalli: Well, that's a letter prepared by Chuck and by Julie that was sent on my behalf to all the constituencies and new constituencies and stakeholder groups had. Is that correct what I'm saying Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. It should have gone out this week - earlier this week from Glen to the constituencies.

(Claudio): Okay, thanks.

Julie Hedlund: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Any other questions, comments?

Victoria McEvedy: Well, I have other business and one other thing.

Olga Cavalli: Go ahead Victoria.

Victoria McEvedy: I'm afraid - and it's a shame that we've lost Chuck. But I kind of hinted at this last week. But we've got you Olga, and maybe you can do it for us this week. But, I mean, look - what - I'd like, I mean, I think I'd like to say I raised this already in our last call. But it would be very, very helpful to have a formal report as to relevant developments I think, made into the working group, because it would have been - I was going to ask Chuck and/or you to update us on what happened in

relation to this - with the Board meeting on the stakeholder charter's issue.

And just to, you know, because we're waiting for the outcome so we can start preparing that way for the second part of our work. But I just think it might be useful to have a formal sort of update into our working group prior to each call.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry. I didn't get you very well. Update about what?

Victoria McEvedy: Well, I guess, about relevant and related developments. And particularly, obviously, we're waiting for the Board's work on the stakeholder charters aren't we.

Olga Cavalli: Could that be possible Julie, to have this update? I'm not sure if I have all the information that you think is relevant Victoria. And maybe it could be also useful for me. Is that possible to have some update from the Board?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. Updates are certainly provided, you know, by staff as they're available.

And the most recent one was the one that I sent around that (Denise Michelle) had sent to counsel. And then I had sent it around to my work teams. And that was that the Board had passed the resolution that the staff would work with the structural improvements committee of Board to provide recommended changes to the stakeholder group charters. There has been no further update on that. So that's why there's been - you've not seen anything from me or from (Denise Michelle). So that activity, it is continuing.

And as Chuck, I think, mentioned earlier, you know, we don't really have a timeframe we can give you. But as soon as we have more information we'll certainly provide it to the team.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, let's do that. Once you have any news from the Board just let us know. And we also - we took so information usually from (Denise) and the GNSO counsel. Is that okay if we share with the working team?

Man: Olga, sorry to interrupt. I just wanted to let everyone know I'm dropping off.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I have to leave also. Okay. Let's have the update from the Board.

Victoria McEvedy: What I'm kind of suggesting is that it actually would be quite - be formalized so that because, you know, otherwise I think we, you know, people forget to forward things or what have you. People are on lots of things to get to and they update us. You know, because if (unintelligible) there are lots of relations that's moving bits and pieces going on, and we're not finding out what, for example, happening in the steering committee.

And all it - I mean, it's really I think, you know, a formal update to the group of, you know, other relevant things that might be on their work. It's not so...

Olga Cavalli: Well, maybe we can add an issue in the next agenda.

Victoria McEvedy: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Update from the Board. Do you think that's fine?

Victoria McEvedy: Not from the Board. I mean, to - so that it's an update from staff on relevant developments.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, from staff about latest news from the Board and other relevant issues. Is that okay?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes, great.

Olga Cavalli: And so let's add that to the next agenda so we don't forget.

Julie Hedlund: Are you adding it as a discussion point Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Update I think. It's not a discussion point. It's just in GNSO, we usually have an update from (Denise). And if someone wants to comment that's fine. Maybe we don't have that much time but we can try.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, I cannot follow you if you talk together.

Julie Hedlund: Sorry. Go ahead (Krista).

Krista Papac: I'm just - I don't know. I personally would rather just receive the updates as they come rather than having another agenda item when we have difficulty getting through the agenda that we have already.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. It's a good suggestion. Let's ask the rest because not all the working team is on the call. I think we can - we could ask if how we

want to get update from staff about Board activities. We can ask that in our list and have some feedback.

I have to leave. I have another commitment. So I'm so sorry have to finish the call so quickly. But we already agreed to have one hour and it's one hour and one minute.

So I would encourage you to have other things to comment to. Go through the list. We have some things to do. And Julie will help me in following up during this week.

I hope to meet those of you who are going to Sydney there, and I wish you very good travels and safe travel. And for those of you who are sending remotely, hope to talk to you in Sydney.

Man: Great. Thanks Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much for joining.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Have a nice weekend.

Victoria: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Woman: Bye.

END