

Operations Steering Committee
TRANSCRIPTION

Tuesday 9 December 2008 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee meeting on Tuesday 9 December 2008, at 16:00 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-osc-20081209.mp3>

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

Summary of the call

<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-osc/msg00026.html>

Present for the teleconference:

Chuck Gomes - GNSO Council vice-chair, OSC group chair

Olga Cavalli - NCA alternate chair

Steve Metalitz - IPC

Ken Stubbs - Registry constituency

Mason Cole - Registrar constituency alternate

Absent apologies

Stephane van Gelder - Registrar

Philip Sheppard - CBUC

Staff:

Robert Hoggarth

Ken Bour

Glen de Saint Gery

Coordinator: We're recording.

(Chuck): Alrighty. Let's go ahead and start. Hopefully (Robin) will join us shortly. We have on the call Olga...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(Chuck): ...myself, we have (Ken) and (Steve), (Rob), Ken Bour-- I should've said Ken Stubbs before; I forgot we had two (Ken)s -- Glen's on and Mason Cole's on in place of Stéphane because Stéphane can't make it today.

And nobody from the business constituency will make it today, but they sent in some excellent input to our meeting. I sure appreciate that, because when people can't make it, that really helps us keep moving forward. So that was very much appreciated. I would ask everyone to try and do that if neither one of your reps are going to be able to make the call to the extent that's possible.

All right, welcome to everybody. Did I miss anybody in the names I mentioned? Okay. The - is - any concerns about the agenda? All right, let's go on. I just put as a point of information on the agenda on Item 4 there that I did send invitations to the ALAC and to the GAC, welcoming them to provide representatives on this group. Janis Karklins, the head of the GAC responded, and - but - he acknowledged receiving my request. Haven't seen anything since then.

Cheryl Langdon and I have exchanged a lot of emails, and we saw each other a lot last week at the IGF in India, and she is working on

identifying a person from ALAC. I would suspect that within a week or so we'll have name from the ALAC to participate.

At first they were going to have Alan Greenberg do it, but he's doing the PPSC. And I suggested that we'd really rather not do that if we can avoid it, because we have enough trouble scheduling things as it is. So she's - she understands and is going to work on that issue.

The - now let's talk about meeting times. It's looking like - in fact I'll just Glen talk to what we have so far on the latest (doodle) on regular meeting times. Glen?

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you (Chuck). Our regular meetings time so far, we have a Monday at 2 pm (UTC), which works out to Pacific Time 6 am in the morning, Eastern time -- New York Washington -- 9 am, Central European time it is 3 pm in the afternoon. And that seems we haven't yet gotten (Robin) in. And from experience that might be a bit early for (Robin).

(Chuck): Oh, it'd be six o'clock like Mason and I huh?

Glen DeSaintgery: That's right. And...

(Chuck): Now did the ten o'clock time work as well?

Glen DeSaintgery: And the ten o'clock time...

(Chuck): Ten o'clock Eastern.

Glen DeSaintgery: ...that was - yes, that's right. It doesn't work for Ken Stubbs.

(Chuck): Okay. All right.

Glen DeSaintgery: That's the only one so far.

(Chuck): Okay, and is there anybody on this call that the time that Glen suggested on Mondays - is that that would not work? We'd appreciate your responding to the (doodle) today if you can, just so that we have that all recorded, but I thought I would just also ask - nobody on this call has problem with that time?

(Steve): Well this is (Steve). I can't say I can do that every Monday. In fact I know that on Monday the 22nd I can't do it at nine o'clock, but generally that shouldn't be...

(Chuck): Yes. Well okay well probably based on our success we're probably never going to find a totally perfect one, but when anybody can't make a call to the extent that you can provide us some feedback beforehand, that would be - like (Philip) did today, that would be very helpful.

So that's looking like the one. Again, if we find that it becomes - if we schedule one and then we find that we have to adjust it, we'll deal with that. All right, thanks.

Now our main task today is to really finalize the charter. And I was hoping (Robin) would be on, because she is one that had a suggestion. (Rob) I don't - did she ever say that she was okay with your edits on the list?

(Rob): No. I - she did not give a specific response that I recall.

(Chuck): Okay. Well let's - why don't you (Rob) - before we just kind of skim through the charter - and I'm not going to - we're not going to read it but I'll just go section by section to see if there are any concerns.

(Rob), would you explain to everybody the dialogue that went on between (Robin), you and I? I think that we're the only ones that did that. Now (Philip) has said that the business constituency is fine with the latest edits, so we know that. But for everybody else's benefit, (Rob) if you would discuss what is - what that involved, I'd appreciate that.

(Rob): Sure. Thanks (Chuck). (Robin) suggested a couple of edits to the overall (unintelligible) parts of the GNSO operations team charter. In particular there were two sections (regarding) GNSO operations team that she had expressed some concerns of and suggested adding some language.

The two sections within the (ops team) were prepare clear rules for the establishment of the new constituencies within stakeholder groups. And (Robin) proposed adding language that said, "While recognizing that differences exist between stakeholder groups and that stakeholder groups are primarily responsible for establishing their own constituencies," and she added a similar edit to reviewing and recommending (them) as appropriate regarding methods for encouraging, promoting, and introducing new constituencies.

So the dialogue that (Chuck) and (Robin) had, that I ended up contributing to, really focused on sort of what the role was with respect to stakeholder groups and the constituencies that comprise those

stakeholder groups. (Robin)'s position seemed to indicate to me that there was an active role for the stakeholder groups in creating, modifying managing the constituencies.

As I interpreted your comments, (Chuck), they were much more along the lines of constituencies operating independently. And what I tried to do was to provide the committee with some references to the board governance, committee recommendations, (since) adopted by the board that - you're both right.

And essentially (Robin)'s point, as I indicated in my email, was that the board doesn't contemplate a cookie cutter approach with respect to stakeholder groups and constituencies, and recognizes that those groups should be given significant flexibility to operate.

But in recognizing that, the board also indicated that there needed to be some consistency across stakeholder groups and constituencies. Stakeholder groups clearly, with respect to operating and transparent open and fair manners, and constituencies not only operating in transparent open and fair manners, but also having a level playing field in terms of the resources and in terms of their processes in terms of how they conduct their business.

And so what I had suggested was standing (Robin)'s point with respect to the cookie cutter - the non-cookie cutter approach and adding some (technology) to recognize, explore (unintelligible) that sense not only for stakeholder groups but for constituencies.

But not - my recommendation was not to accept the additional language that said that (stakeholder) groups were primarily responsible

for establishing their own constituencies, because (unintelligible) (locations) are offered in my email. The board and the BGC recommendations much firmer in terms of constituency, independence (unintelligible) and activities. So I didn't want to (read) from the language (bind) you guys as a committee real early in the process to that definition.

(Ken): (Chuck)?

(Chuck): Yes.

(Ken): Yes, I'm sorry to bother you. There is one question in there. (Rob), you mentioned a level playing field with respect to - with the constituencies with respect to resources. Maybe I need a little more elaboration on that, but I mean each constituency may elect amongst its members to assess the member's fees in order to have adequate working funds available for the tasks and projects that that constituency feels are important.

I would run into a situation where a constituency could be hamstrung with respect to raising resources among its members because quote, other constituencies - this would create an imbalance or an - a playing field that wouldn't be level. I - yes, I hope you understand what I'm saying here.

(Rob): Yes (Ken) I think I do. And the leveling, as I understand it, is more a reflection of a floor as opposed to a feeling. The BGC report is very concerned I think about making sure that the various constituencies have a tool kit or a fundamental inventory of services that they can count on. So particularly I think that isn't directed necessarily, but does

encompass constituencies as well as the sense to expand things and allow new constituencies to be attracted to ICANN (in the form).

And outstanding the concept is basically to be able to outline and be very clear as to what will the basic services for constituencies be. Is that staff support, is that specific deliverables that they need, is that other types of services with an analytical perspective that are useful to a particular constituency, promoting constituency.

Those types of logistical policy support, those types of things the board viewed as being useful and necessary. I don't think there's any suggestion in the BGC report that says, "Gee, if a constituency wants to raise additional funds to hire their own secretaries," or something like that, that that wouldn't be permissible.

There've in fact also been debates about you know, whether a constituency should just be given a block grant of funds or whatever to fund their own internal processes. And that's really one of the discussions that you guys are going to need to have within one of the work teams is to - how to approach that in the best manner.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): And that may come under the constituency operations team rather than the GNSO operations team.

(Ken): That part may, but the concept of equity and playing at level playing field I think belongs with the charter. The only concern that I would have (Rob) is, you know, normally in what's - I use basic internal revenue codes as an example. You can always go back and look at

committee hearing minutes and stuff like that to see exactly what the meaning and what the true essential concept was behind whatever gets codified.

I appreciate what you're saying; I just would like to see something in the charter that ensures that it isn't left to somebody's recollection four or five years down the road. And I'm thinking of examples where I know there registrar constituency -- for instance, funds to travel for its secretariat to each meeting for instance. And I don't want to have a situation where, you know, all of a sudden the constituency would not be allowed to engage in that kind of an activity because quote the other constituencies don't have the resources to do it.

So the only guess - I guess what I'm really concerned about is ensuring that somewhere in the charter there is some acknowledgement of this so we don't run into a situation of trying to divine what somebody meant three years ago. That's...

(Chuck): (Ken), where in the charter -- the draft charter that we're looking at right now -- are you - do you have a concern?

(Ken): My only concern is the concept of the level playing field.

(Chuck): Yes, I don't know there's - that concept of level playing field is in the charter, is it (Rob)?

(Rob): No it's not. I was referring...

(Chuck): That was just in your comments.

(Rob): ...to the...

(Ken): All right.

(Rob): Right.

(Ken): (Unintelligible), you know, maybe that's it. I'm not looking necessarily verbatim.

(Chuck): Okay. I just wanted to make sure where we were at. Now the issue with respect to (Robin)'s suggestion, we're in the section on the charter on Page 2 titled GNSO operations team. And it was the last two bullets. And then in the constituency operations team section on that same page, under Item 2 the first bullet there has the same addition. So there are three places where...

(Ken): Okay.

(Chuck): ...(Rob) put in, "while recognizing that differences exist between stakeholder groups and constituencies." And then there was also another - some other edits there.

But does anybody have any problem with those edits made by (Rob)? Okay, now let me throw it open then. Does anybody else - and in a moment we'll kind of scroll through the whole charter very quickly and see if we have any things to discuss further, but does anybody have any areas of the draft charter that you would like to comment on before we just kind of scroll through it quickly? Okay. Then let's - go ahead. Yes who is that?

(Rob): This is (Rob). Just one final item to just sort of close the loop on that. I did circulate the site to the BGC report, and on (Ken)'s specific issue, for those who are interested in some more clarify beyond my rambling description, is to check Page 42 through 44. They do a really good job and it's in the context of steps to improve effectiveness within the constituencies. It sort of outlines a lot of what I was trying to convey.

(Chuck): Right. Thank you. (Unintelligible) start out at the...

Olga Cavalli: (Chuck)? (Chuck)?

(Chuck): Yes.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. I would like to make a small document. Reading the document and - it's taking into consideration (Robin)'s suggestions, which I think it's fine, was recognizing the difference exists within stakeholder groups and constituencies.

Perhaps it could be nice or interesting to define what is a constituency and a stakeholder group, because for example in talking about the defining rules for use of trouble founding, we have that difficulty in knowing which is one and which is the other one, and which is the scope of each of it.

It - perhaps we could include at the end of the document or at the beginning the definition of a stakeholder group or a constituency.

(Chuck): Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Because we are think that there are differences, but which are differences we are not specific about that.

(Chuck): Well hopefully everybody on this team understands that. Does anybody not understand the difference? I'm - still think your suggestion's a good one, but I just want to make sure we are all on the same page with regard to stakeholder groups and constituencies. And let me just give you my view of that and see if everybody has the same common understanding.

Within the new structure of the GNSO, there will be two houses. Each house will have two stakeholder groups.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(Chuck): So there's a total of four stakeholder groups.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(Chuck): There's a registrar stakeholder group and a registree stakeholder group on the contracted - in the contracted party's house. There is a commercial - there are commercial and non-commercial stakeholder groups on the...

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): ...user side of the house.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(Chuck): And within each of those stakeholder groups there may be multiple constituencies. They may be constituencies as we know them today, they may be new ones, they may be just about any variation of that with regard to that.

Now does that - does anybody understand those terms differently than I just described? Okay, so (Rob) maybe it'd be a good idea on - where it says stakeholder group and constituency operations, if that's the first occurrence of those terms here, and to put a little footnote just briefly describing the difference between stakeholder groups and constituencies. Is that possible?

(Rob): Yes, I will do that. That's Item 2. Is that where you were referring to?

(Chuck): Yes. Item 2 on Page 1 it looks like is where I was at. Right at the beginning there. See where...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(Chuck): ...Item 2 at the - on the very - what the - after the - it's actually a part of the first paragraph, and then there's three items underneath it (that's at) three groups. So just put it - is that clear?

(Rob): Yes.

(Chuck): Now...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(Chuck): Yes, thank you Olga. A - there's some general formatting things that we can clean up on this thing that I think would be good. Like for example in the main title we don't need a colon. And I would suggest using bullet formatting for both the numbered items and the bullets later on in the document so that the - it makes it a little bit to follow.

If you need any direction that, let me know (Rob) on that. It looks like it was - the numbered items and the bulleted items were manually entered that way rather using the bullet function or the number function. You follow me?

(Rob): Yes. You just want to keep bullets instead of the two numbers we have on the constituency operations team.

(Chuck): Well I want the - those bulleted or numbers paragraphs to be formatted in bullet format rather than manually entered. They're manually entered right now. That's all. And if you have a question on it, just let me know. It's just real simple.

(Rob): Yes.

(Chuck): Glen can probably answer that too. That way, the - where you have - like for example you have in the first paragraph you have a colon and then you have three numbered items. It will show more clearly that those three numbered items are part of that paragraph.

(Rob): Yes.

(Chuck): Okay?

(Rob): Yes.

(Chuck): And anything in that first section that anybody else wants to comment in - comment on -- the first section on Page 1, the description of the (OC) charter? Okay. And I think you can clean up that language there - the description of the (OC) charter copied from the - in fact that whole - that little subtitle that you have could be deleted, right (Rob), at the beginning of the charter?

(Rob): The description - yes...

(Chuck): ...of (OC) charter...

(Rob): Yes.

(Chuck): ...copied from - that whole thing can be deleted, because we've got that. We'll have the title up above. Okay no comments on that section?

Okay then there's a section titled Working Method for the OSC. Any comments or edits on that? Okay then on Page 2 there, (Rob) where it says GNSO operations team or the lead-in sentence says, "The OSC work activities could be allocated as follows," then I would indent the subsections that follow so that we know they all come under that lead-in sentence. Make sense?

(Rob): Let me look here. Is that essentially the rest of the document? Essentially the rest of the document. (Unintelligible).

(Chuck): Oh. Well then maybe we don't want to make it a colon. That would be okay...

(Rob): Oh okay.

(Chuck): ...since there's so much. So just delete - make it a period instead of a colon and then that would be fine. Yes, I...

(Rob): Okay.

(Chuck): ...that colon is what threw me off there. I already commented on the bullets, so you have that. Any other comments on GNSO operations team? How about constituency operations team? Okay. And then there's the communications team. All right, and the special focus teams?

(Steve): (Chuck), this is (Steve). I assume that's just a placeholder to leave open the possibility of setting up a special team in the future.

(Chuck): Right. Yes. Correct. And actually we even have the - planning team actually prepared a draft charter for special focus teams. It's obviously more generic than the other draft charters for the work team, because it would vary by topic, but that's an option that we would have going forward. For example a common example we've used is if we wanted to set up a special focus team to work with staff in improving the GNSO website. Now that could come under...

(Steve): It's listed under the...

(Chuck): ...communications team. It's under the communications team, but as a subset of that, we could create another little special focus team to work on that issue, whichever way we think is best. Does that make sense?

(Steve): Yes, I - but we're not setting up any such team now?

(Chuck): No. Not in -not right now no. Just the ability to do that is in the OSC charter.

(Steve): Great. Thanks.

(Chuck): That's all. And then we've got - looks like probably we ought to be consistent in terms of our formatting here. We all of a sudden go to membership in the OSC in an underlined format. Maybe we should have a bolded title for the rest of this information (Rob) that is something like OSC - well I guess we'd have one - let's see.

(Rob): What I did (Chuck) in playing around with this is I went back - I did indent as you suggested under the work activities.

(Chuck): Yes.

(Rob): And I'll make that a heading, so we'll call it the work activity. And then these can be the processes or something like that. And that's...

(Chuck): That's fine. Come up with some generic title. And then underneath that we'll have the membership, the other participants, the goals and milestones, and the decision making and initial OSC teams. Don't even know if that's - is that part even needed anymore -- the initial OSC teams, because we've kind of...

(Rob): Yes.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): ...established those. That might not even be needed. I'll let you take care of that. We don't need to spend a lot of time on the call doing that. Staff support. And then I think that covers it. Any comments on any of those things?

Anybody not okay with the charter? Now I'm going to ask (Rob) to do another iteration of this. And if you can maybe keep the red line so that everybody can see all the changes that were made, including some formatting changes, and then also create a clean version and distribute it to the list. And everybody'll have a quick look at that before our meeting next week.

(Rob): Will do.

(Chuck): Okay. Any questions, comments? Okay, that was easy. And so what - we will then approve the charter as is. Obviously there's a few people missing, and we need- I think that (Rolfe) already kind of commented on the charter, so he's probably okay. We need to make sure (Robin)'s okay with the charter, and we'll try and do that on the list so that at our next mentioned we have an approved charter. If not, we will approve it at that meeting.

And then we could submit that charter to the council for their blessing on it. I don't think that'll be an issue. It'd be nice if we got this charter to the council before the 18th meeting, but that means we would have to get it out - I don't know if that's possible since (Robin)'s not on the call. She's - that's one constituency that hasn't - that I haven't seen any definitive action.

Get - if you can get that out as soon as possible (Rob), then we'll - and ask people to respond on the list whether or not they approve the charter or have any additional edits. If we can get all approvals then we can go ahead and send it to the council as soon as we have those and not wait 'til our next meeting.

(Rob): Will do.

(Chuck): Okay? All right. Okay now let's go on then to Item 7 on the agenda, decide how to finalize the work team charters. And last week we - or - in our last meeting we agreed that the OSC basically should provide the work teams with draft charters and that the teams may propose changes. Actually that's not too much on our - to do on our part because we've already got some draft charters, unless we want to make any of changes of those before we present them to the teams.

Now hopefully everyone had a chance to look at the draft charters for the working teams - the three working teams. It was also suggested in our meeting last time that to the extent possible we should discourage individuals from participating in more than work team.

And I think that would be more than work team across both steering committees. So there's the five work teams. Otherwise, scheduling will be very difficult and workload will be challenging or those who are doing that.

The (BC) has already identified one participant for each of the three work teams. The key question we need to answer today -- is everyone comfortable with submitting the draft work team charters to the work

teams once they're established as they are? Anybody have a concern with that? Okay.

(Steve): Wait, wait. (Chuck), I...

(Chuck): Go ahead, (Steve).

(Steve): Are these - you say if we submit these drafts as they are, as they are established, or I mean what - I'm not - it's not clear what the status of the working charters is.

(Chuck): Nothing has been - okay the planning teams, in addition to preparing a draft charter for the operations steering committee -- this committee -- they also prepared draft charters for each of the work teams.

(Steve): Right.

(Chuck): So for GNSO operations for constituency and stakeholder group operations and for communications, draft charters were already prepared by the planning teams. And what I was asking just now is, is does anybody want to go through those and make any changes to those draft charters before we give them to the work teams to finish or to try and finalize?

(Steve): Oh okay. So basically they would make - they would - the work teams would set their own charters based on this draft from the plant.

(Chuck): Yes. They would come - and then they would come back to the steering committee...

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): ...”Hey here’s our suggested charter.” And then as the coordinating body we would take a look at those and comment. And if we’re okay with them, then we just pass them on to the council.

(Steve): No, that sounds reasonable. Thank you.

(Chuck): Yes. I think...

(Rob): (Chuck)? (Chuck)?

(Chuck): Yes, go ahead (Rob).

(Rob): This is (Rob). My only misgivings from a staff perspective on this is because these initial drafts were put together prior to (Paris) there’s been a goldmine of additional community experience -- the July group’s efforts on restructuring and everything else.

And it might be useful, noting that everyone’s been very busy over the last couple of weeks, to take one final sort of look through on these. In a couple of case they’re just very broad.

And again it depends on your philosophy as an oversight committee, but you might want to look at it one more time just with a sense to say are we giving them enough guidance and structure that they’re able to sort of hit the ground running.

I'm just very sensitive (unintelligible) last email where he said, "Gee," you know, "gee want to get them working and rolling but we want to give them a sufficient direction to point in."

(Chuck): Well let me propose something. It's going to be a task that I'm going to suggest you do unless somebody else wants to volunteer, but...

(Rob): I noted that in the agenda.

(Chuck): Could you take a cut at each of those draft charter and prepare a red line of them that can be distributed to this list between now and our next meeting? And then we can comment on list and then in our next meeting say, "Yes, I think they're good enough," or make any final edits so that we can - they will be ready once the teams are formed.

We actually have some time, so it's going to take a little while for the teams to be formed. So if you can do - is that possible? Is that a reasonable plan?

(Rob): Yes. Yes, I'd (delighted) to do that.

(Chuck): Okay. And then with a red line version we'll be able to tell pretty easily - we can just review those fairly briefly and get going.

So the next action then is to actually start the process of forming the teams. So is there any reason why we can't move forward on that? Obviously we need a message to the - that could be - that we can send to the council, and then councilors can go out to their constituencies for identifying members.

So is it - anybody want to volunteer to draft a message that we can use in that regard? I'd like to finalize that message by our next meeting so that we can go ahead and send it to the council before the meeting on the 18th.

(Rob): Mr. Chairman, if I can raise my hand -- this is (Rob) again.

(Chuck): Oh I see that hand. I appreciate that. Thanks. Yes.

(Rob): I don't intend to - I'm sorry, I don't intend to dominate the discussion here. We had talked about an invitation at the last meeting, and I had started to - the effort to put one together, and immediately came up with a number of potential issues that you all as a committee may want to discuss before going out with an invitation.

We've - one of my issues has been confirmed. We're pretty sure that we're working on these three work teams, so we're all right there. The two other significant issues that I see- an important third are one eligibility and size of these work teams. I don't know if you all are comfortable or you have a consensus in terms of how big they are who's going to be eligible to participate.

Secondly just the decision making process. How do you anticipate these work teams will operate and what sort of decision making process do you foresee them engaging in. And then finally a related item, my important one is, then does what role would - does the OSC play in quote/unquote overseeing that work? Will you be reviewing it and passing it on?

Will you be reviewing and ruling or, you know, making a decision based on recommendations made by the work teams? These are some fundamental work issues that I encountered just sort of putting together the invitation to try to figure out how broadly do we circulate it, what sort of expectations should volunteers have.

(Chuck): Okay. And I think there are at least a couple different tracks there. Number one, based on the BGC working group recommendations approved by the board, I think these working teams, just like ultimately working groups under the working group model will be, they need to be open to interested participants.

So I don't know that there's any restriction on membership other than, you know, following reasonable guidelines in terms of workgroup functionality so that things operate smoothly. The - and I think that the draft charters provide some guidance in that regard, do they not?

(Rob): They do at present. That'll help - you know, any guidance you can provide in that will help me in terms of redlining those charters as well.

(Chuck): Yes. I think they contain some guidance in that regard, and those could be - we could start off there. That doesn't mean that they can't change. So I - does anybody disagree with the fact on the openness of the working team? I think that's consistent with the board recommendations. Even though these are working groups per se like we're going to have in the future, still that principle of openness, anybody's welcome to participate on these work teams.

And I think we want, you know, to the extent that as we maximum the number of stakeholder groups that are participating in these -- I think

that's a goal -- at the same time you really can't force a stakeholder group, whether it be an existing constituency or some new one, to participate if they don't want to. But we certainly would like to maximum the stakeholder group's representative.

I don't know there needs to be any limitation in terms of number of members from anyone stakeholder group either. I think what we want are people that are motivated to work constructively to - toward the tasks that are presented to them.

(Steve): (Chuck) this is (Steve). Could I make comment here?

(Chuck): Yes.

(Steve): I guess I would like to see these charters recirculated and (Rob)'s proposed redline, but seems to me there is a difference between these teams and the working group. For example if you have - you want a constituency operation, if someone who's not a member of any constituency, what would that person contribute to the...

(Chuck): Well they could be possibly a member of a future constituency.

(Steve): I suppose that's right.

(Chuck): Yes, and that's the only thing that I...

(Steve): Although that one - I think that group is mostly about existing (constituencies), but I guess you're right.

(Chuck): Yes, and keep in mind they're going to be working on stakeholder group operations too.

(Steve): Yes.

(Chuck): So they have that. But you're - by the way (Steve), I - all along I have had the - kind of the same opinion as you. The key members of that particular work team is going to be existing constituencies, because they have the experience base to...

(Steve): Right.

(Chuck): ...work with. And...

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): They know the variances and so forth.

(Steve): Yes. When I think of trying to recruit people for these groups, that's, you know, we...

(Chuck): Good point. Yes.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): In fact, I would be fully supportive of some sort of a comment in our recruiting message that we believe that existing constituency members might be very - are going to be key members of this particular work team, but it's not restricted to them. Good point. Someone else?

So (Rob), so the openness is one thing in terms of membership. The - obviously in the GNSO operations team, it's going to be helpful to have people on there that have some experience with GNSO operations and the administrative rules that we use currently. But again, it doesn't have to be restricted to those people, because it won't hurt to have some new ideas.

In terms of rules for the work teams, that's a good point that you raise. Now (Auvrey) has had some - used some typical ones that seem to be working pretty well. Why don't we include some of those into the draft charter. Does that make sense, at least as a starting point?

(Rob): (Unintelligible) (Chuck) could you repeat that?

(Chuck): Yes. (Auvrey) pretty consistently, whenever we've started a drafting team or a working group under existing (PDP) and so forth, has provided a set of guidelines for the working group. You know, what if somebody is misbehaving and...

(Rob): Yes.

(Chuck): ...how do you - those kind of procedures. You've seen those, right?

(Rob): Yes.

(Chuck): Yes, if we could just maybe cut and paste those into each of these charters for a first cut. And - is that possible?

(Ken): That makes sense, (Chuck). It's (Ken).

(Chuck): (Yes). And again, we can modify those. With regard to the role of the steering committee, the way I understand the whole proposal of using steering committees was is that the steering committees would kind of be an oversight body of the work of the work teams, but they don't need to be in detailed involved.

That - there should be some regulatory reports to the steering committee in terms of progress so that we can keep things moving. If they have questions that they need answers on, they can come to the steering committee.

Ultimately the steering committee would either approve or go back to the work team for a little more work and then pass it on to the council in terms of any implementation plan recommendations. Ultimately what they're going to have to do is produce an implementation plan for their area that includes all the recommendations from the board that relate to that.

(Rob): And their plan, as you understand it, will be recommendations that the OSC will evaluate and then pass on to the council?

(Chuck): Yes. Or go back to the work team for some additional work.

(Rob): Okay.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): Let's stop there. Please, if somebody interprets our - the task differently than that, please speak up. I think that is what was - the model that was intended. Again, it's not intended that the steering

committees get involved in the detail that they're doing. They're going to function as an intermediary between the council and the thing, kind of keeps things going and coordinating the work. If there needs to be some communication between the different work teams, we can coordinate that as well.

I don't want to make this too complicated. At the same time, it's important that we do spell out these things like you said, (Rob). I think the draft charters also, as I recall, have, you know, some - they have kind of blank spaces for timelines -- target dates and stuff like that -- that we would expect the work team to fill out very early as they finalize the charter and come back to us, so that once the work teams are formed and they provide their feedback on the charter, then we'll finalize the charter and hopefully get them going quickly.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): Any questions or comments on that? Okay we've given (Rob) a lot to do, but when he gets his stuff done and distributes it, then it's going to be important that all of us jump in and review the stuff he sent so that in the next - if not the next meeting, the next couple meetings hopefully we have the charters in good enough shape to give to the teams.

And hopefully on the other task of developing a message to invite people to be part of the work teams, hopefully we can finalize that by not later than our meeting next Monday, assuming that Monday is going to work.

(Steve): (Chuck), do we have - we may have said this last time, but do we have target date for getting recruits for this team?

(Chuck): We - I don't think we set one, but I think we need to. We probably better do that once we know we've got the message ready. I would think - I - would two weeks be reasonable to go back, or is that too short, once we have a message? Say two weeks from the council meeting on the 18th? Of course that's right over the holidays, so that's kind of bad isn't it?

(Steve): Yes, I'm not sure too much we'll get - we'll recruit too many people during that time.

(Chuck): Maybe by something like January 8 or something. What do people think? We can finalize that later, but just let's get some initial thoughts on that. You guys know your groups, so you need to give good guidance. We don't want to take too long to form them, but we are dealing with the holiday season.

Plus there's going to be challenges, especially if people to get different people on each work team. All of us are going to have to be reaching out and trying to motivate some new people to participate. What do people think? Is - like is three weeks maybe from the 18th sound kind of reasonable to work towards?

(Steve): I think it's reasonable as a target. I'm - again I don't know can be...

(Chuck): It can be changed. I mean we all know that if people don't respond, they don't respond. So - but if we at least give them like you - like you're suggesting (Steve), a target date, that sometimes can be helpful.

(Steve): (Okay).

(Chuck): Good point on the target dates. Anything else that pop into people's mind? Well that - so our action items for the next meeting, most of them go to (Rob) first, and then to us once he distributes things on the list.

So in our next meeting, the ideal would be to complete our message for inviting the work team - people to join work teams. And again, one of the messages in there needs to be that we strongly encourage - it could be the people to be in no more than work team across all five work teams and both steering - under both steering committees.

Again you can't force that, but let's at least try to get people to work in that direction to the extent that they can. And so that's - hopefully we can finalize that then in our meeting next Monday, and then we will - in the meantime we'll also be working on these charters. And we discuss those again in our next meeting and see where we're at.

And hopefully the meeting after that we will - and we will be able to maybe be close to having those in good enough form so that once the teams are formed - again, we have some time there, but it would be helpful if we can get something out, even if it's still in draft form, for people who are joining the - deciding to join one of the work teams.

(Rob): (Chuck), my suggestion on that -- this is (Rob) again -- is, you know, I'll pull off the Wiki the documents and then red line them. Once you all have an opportunity to review and then discuss at the next meeting, we can repost with the new clean versions of the charters. And the

invitation can include a reference to the Wiki pages for folks who are interested and, you know, getting a sense as to what...

(Chuck): Yes.

(Rob): ...the expectations would be.

(Chuck): Sounds good. Okay anything else? All right, well there's no use continuing to meet any longer. I think we accomplished what I had hope we'd accomplish today. And let's just keep moving. Thanks everybody and I'll prepare a quick summary and send it around for those that aren't on the call especially. Appreciate everybody's cooperation.

Man: Thanks (Chuck).

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thanks (Chuck).

Olga Cavalli: (Unintelligible).

(Chuck): Have a good rest of the day.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): Bye.

Olga Cavalli: Bye. Thank you.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

END