

**GNSO  
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC)  
Constituency Operations Work Team  
18 December 2009 at 14:00 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 18 December 2009 at 14:00 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/gnsso/gnsso-ops-20091218.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnsso.icann.org/calendar/index.html#dec>

**Participants present:**

Olga Cavalli - work team chair – NCA  
Michael Young – Registries – vice chair  
Rafik Dammak – NCUC  
Chuck Gomes – Registries  
Krista Papac – Registrar c.  
SS Kshatriya - Individual  
Zahid Jamil – CBUC  
Debra Hughes – NCSG  
Tony Harris – ISP

**ICANN Staff**

Julie Hedlund  
Gisella Gruber-White  
Glen de Saint Gery  
Nick Ashton-Hart

**Apologies**

Victoria McEvedy – IPC  
Claudio Digangi - IPC

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much Operator. Hello everyone. Good morning. Good evening. I'm trying to find our agenda. I think we have apologies from Victoria. Gisella, would you be so kind to help me do a roll call and know who's on the call so it's stated in the recording?

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely. Good morning. Good afternoon. On today's constituency operations call, 18th of December we have Olga Cavalli, Rafik Dammak, (Debra Hughes), Chuck Gomes, Zahid Jamil, (SS), (Michael Young).

On staff we have Julie Hedlund, Glen DeSaintgery, Nick Ashton-Hart and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. Apologies we have for Victoria McEvedy. And if I can remind everyone to please just state their names for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Gisella. For me this is the first time that (Debbie) is on our call. I think that she must have participated on the previous one but I was on vacation. So welcome (Debbie). And Nick, this is the first time I share a conference call with you.

I know you from the ICANN meetings but welcome to our working team.

Krista Papac: Good morning Olga. I also - this is Krista Papic. I'm here from the registry group.

Olga Cavalli: Oh. Great (Krista). Okay. Is Julie on the call?

Julie Hedlund: Yes I am Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Hi. Julie or Nick or someone from staff, do we have something that we should have in mind from board meetings or any updates that we should consider for our work or that is important to have in mind for today?

Julie Hedlund: Well I - there was a board meeting on December 9. And just scanning through I think that the most - greatest interest to the - to this work team is that there was a consideration of constituency applications that had been - just a moment. I'm sorry. A little bit of background noise there.

That there had been some constituency applications. The board decided on December 9 determined that the cyber safety constituency, the city PLD constituency and the IDMG PLD constituency did not meet the requirements for a new constituency in the GNSO.

And no determination was made on the consumer constituency.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Okay. Any other things from that board meeting that we should consider? I think that that is an important note just to have in mind.

Julie Hedlund: I think that was the only one of interest for this work team. There were some various things that related to leasing office space in Washington, DC and an approval for a Verizon bulk transfer process for dot com and dot net. But the constituency issue I think would be of greatest interest to this work team.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And Julie it might be helpful if you forwarded to this group (Rob)'s status update provided for the council meeting.

Julie Hedlund: Oh. That's an excellent idea. Thank you Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, because he did reference our work team and so I think that would be a good idea. And then secondly, Olga as you know, in the GNSO Council meeting yesterday the council approved the recommendations for a toolkit of services.

Olga Cavalli: Exactly.

Chuck Gomes: And asked staff to, you know, move forward on that.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Thanks for mentioning. So our document has been approved by GNSO so that's good news. And yes, that information from the status of new constituencies would be great to have for our working team.

I have seen it as stipulated in the GNSO list but this would be very helpful. Do we have any questions for Julie or for ICANN staff in relation with the board meeting or any other thing? Great.

Number two of our agenda - status of our (subtext) document. We have some discussions in our list about which is the status of this document.

So I would appreciate if we can exchange some ideas and also define how we are going to work with this document as I, in my modest opinion, think that we are reaching the point that we have to produce an outcome from all our months of work and let this document move forward.

(SS) has sent, and please (SS) be so kind to correct me if I'm wrong, I think you submitted your document for full working team review. I'm not remembering exactly the date but I think it was five or four days before or one week before today. Is this correct?

(SS): Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Great. We received comments from (Claudio) to your document. Is that correct?

(SS): Yeah. (Claudio) - they already (unintelligible) commence his making. That was - those were considered in sub team also. Output he has given many suggestions and some of them have been incorporated to his satisfaction.

Some particular - too he wants particular language and also that GNSO model to not be there or that (unintelligible) something that model should not be there. He should have freedom to have his own model.

Well I received in all comments from Chuck, (Krista), Victoria, Rafik and Zahid and probably Tony also sometimes along back he has commented once.

All the - comments from all the people have been incorporated and some of the comments from all people have not been incorporated and there have been (unintelligible). Particularly I'll commend Chuck who hasn't even bothered to correct his spelling. Can - are you hearing me Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. I can hear you. Yes.

(SS): Hello? Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Hello?

(SS): It looked to me as if the line was not there. Okay. Chuck has corrected even spellings, letters he has introduced, i.e. missed commas and all that. And of course, he really has been very good with probably all of the (unintelligible) that have been missed.

But (Claudio) is not satisfied. Now I'm leaving to (unintelligible) they can do something that (unintelligible). I'll leave it to you.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Is (Claudio) on the call?

Man: I don't think so.

Olga Cavalli: No. Okay, because we have some idea of us - your document has reached to a working team revision process at this stage and (Claudio) has suggested

some changes perhaps - Chuck suggested that perhaps Julie could help you in drafting this.

And this does not mean I think, and Chuck correct me if I'm wrong please, I think that what Chuck meant is that you have done a tremendous work and we really appreciate this, all the working team. And perhaps she could incorporate all of the comments that could come, to the final draft.

And then agree in a final document. I think Chuck this is what you meant in our list. And this is what I wanted to exchange with you and agree which is the procedure for handling the documents once they are for revisions for the full working team.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And Olga let me respond to that. Essentially what I'm suggesting is, is that we come up with a plan for finalizing the document as a full work team and that Julie hold the PIN to capture what we decide. So I don't think there's any action for her right now until we decide what to do.

Let me make a couple of suggestions to help move this forward. Number one, with regard to (Claudio)'s concern with regard to the application of the working group model to constituencies and stakeholder groups, I don't know what the right answer is there.

But I think and I'm throwing this out to the group to consider, this - that might be a question that we want to ask the SIC, the Structural Improvements Committee of the board that took over for the BGC working group on the board. And just ask - raise the issue with them.

And it could be phrased something like this. It does - do the board recommendation with regard to using the working group model as described in their recommendation - is the expectation that those - that same approach would be used by constituencies and stakeholder groups?

I don't know what their expectation is but our task is to implement the board recommendation. So understanding - better understanding their intent whether there is some flexibility there or whether the intent is that it be to use throughout the GNSO, I don't know the answer to that.

I can't speak for their expectations. So that would be one suggestion and maybe - I'll just go ahead and throw the other one out there and then we can talk about them separately.

My other suggestion and I'm just throwing this out to facilitate the process, people may have better ideas. With regard to each of the reports, not just Subtask 1 that (SS) shared, it might be an approach for each of us to identify any issues that we still have.

(Claudio) obviously has already done that. Okay? If the rest of us would communicate via our list, if there are any others, then we don't need to go through the report item by item but just focus on the ones that members have flagged that they would like further discussion on.

(Michael Young): So you're saying like a negative test case basically?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Well it seems like - I think there's quite a bit of agreement on a lot of the report. (SS) did a good job of addressing the issues that I raised. So I'm not sure I would flag anything else when we do this exercise. But (Claudio) has and others may want to as well.

(Michael Young): So Chuck, I mean I guess the default, you know, looking at the work we did in Victoria's group for example, the default starting this would be the list of things that she has into the document that some members objected to or weren't satisfied with.

Chuck Gomes: That's true. Yeah. We could start there. You're absolutely right. I didn't even think of that.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry. I cannot hear you very well (Michael).

(Michael Young): I was saying Olga, that - let me try and put the microphone closer to my mouth.

Olga Cavalli: Oh thank you.

(Michael Young): I was saying...

Olga Cavalli: That's better.

(Michael Young): I was saying basically that a starting list, and we can certainly add to it, would be - for example, in Victoria's document she's broken out all of the objections quite neatly actually, in a section near the end of her document.

They're not quite minority reports but there is actually is a minority statement in there as well. But I mean that's a starting list of things that still needs discussion to see what the entire group weighs in on because so far those items at least in - and I suspect in all the groups, you know, a consensus or definition of a majority was considered within that little sub team.

And now we have to decide how it weighs in with the entire group.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: So (Michael) modified my suggestion in a good way Olga, that maybe the first thing we do is we go through the document and look at those where there was not a total consensus by the subtask team and try as a work team to come to some resolution on those.

And then once we finish that we could do what I said and see if people have other issues.

Olga Cavalli: What's the last part? Once we agree in a document what would be the last part?

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Let me go through it again. So with (Michael)'s modification and correct me if I'm wrong (Michael), but the first step would be to look at - to discuss as a full working team each of the items that - where there was not full agreement on the subtask team.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And then try to reach resolution on those. Once we have done that the second step would be to see if anybody on the work team has any additional concerns about elements of the report and do the same thing with those. Discuss them as a full working team and then try to reach resolution.

And then once we have done that we're probably pretty close to a final report other than just formatting and, you know, adding the stuff that needs to go with the report that is more general in nature.

And if there are still areas of disagreement that would be the point for - where minority reports could be submitted.

Olga Cavalli: I agree with you. I don't know if we go through the first part of the process which he is defining the items, where there are no full agreements from the whole working team. That we - if we saw that and we find that an agreement - a (unintelligible) for each of these parts maybe we don't need to review other things.

Unless the issues that are not considered in some working team members would suggest that they should be included.

Chuck Gomes: That's all I was saying. I was saying...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...the exact same thing.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Zahid Jamil: This is Zahid. Can I get a moment too?

Olga Cavalli: Sure Zahid. Are you done Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Zahid, go ahead please.

Zahid Jamil: Oh. I didn't want to interrupt you Olga. If you wanted to finish I can get in later...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...wanted to clarify. I'm just speaking loudly about how could we do this job from now on.

Zahid Jamil: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: I just wanted to - what I wanted to add if I may, if - which tools could we use to work in a document? That's only one thought. And go ahead Zahid.

Zahid Jamil: Sure. Thank you. I think the approach that Chuck has outlined and I think (Michael) you have discussed, you're absolutely right. I would support that. I have one concern with regard to subtasks to the report that Victoria has worked so - it's a good - it's a lot of work that's gone into it and I appreciate that work.

There's just one basic issue I had when I looked at this report. It seemed to me a really sort of long, like an audit report of the GNSO. It seemed like a criticism and audit of different constituencies.

And I'm not sure and maybe I could be corrected, whether that's within the scope and the mandate of what this subtask is supposed to do. And I see for instance, also an annex at the end which seems to sort of suggest that these sort of rules would be - because I know there are basic meeting procedures.

But actually there are rules about how the constituencies are supposed to conduct themselves. They're not just principles. And when I look at that I'm concerned because it seems like we're trying to add things into charters of the different constituencies.

So I was just concerned by one, the sort of critical nature of the report about issues. Although it's very comprehensive but maybe it's beyond the scope of what I guess was expected maybe.

And one of the things I may appreciate the work that's gone into it and the criticism and personally insensitive statements about the ICC for instance. And at the end we've got these rules which are sort of charter inclusions. Does anybody have any thoughts on that?

And if I've completely misunderstood this please do correct me.

Chuck Gomes: Put me in the queue please Olga.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Zahid just to - I think your comment is very important. Do you have any suggestions considering the hard work that Victoria and this working team has done to fix...

Zahid Jamil: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...the document into a correct way? Hold on a second please.

Zahid Jamil: Sorry.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry. Just keep that in mind. If you can answer it now or maybe you can answer before...

((Crosstalk))

Zahid Jamil: Right. I'll take a crack at answering that one now. And if I have any other ideas I'll add them later if I may.

I think that when I read the task which was to develop recommendations for operating principles and procedures I just think that we should limit our work possibly just to state very simply and factually, this is a recommendation of the operating principles, this list of principles and pretty much leave it at that.

Or the procedures, without necessarily going into so much depth. And I - and this is a shame because I think there's a lot of good work that has gone into it. But I'm concerned about many people who are going to look at this.

I'm sure the IPC will have views and I'm sure the BC may have views and I may have, about how we're characterizing views about, you know, how the constituents have been functioning or should be functioning.

And just sort of, you know, agree at the very basic list of procedures that we recommend. Leave it at that. That may be one way to go about it. And as I said, if I can think of other things I will come back on that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you Zahid. Who was - Chuck in the queue?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And there was someone else...

Olga Cavalli: And...

(Michael Young): And (Michael) please.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: And (Michael). Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Let (Michael) go ahead first.

Olga Cavalli: Okay (Michael).

(Michael Young): So there was a fair bit of discussion in the team, the subtask team about frankly the negativity to the - some of the comment reports. And to be honest, it's toned down a lot from where it started.

In early edits I suggested striking a number of phrases or rephrases because they seemed a little - they didn't seem as objective and personalized in their - in the way they had been raised.

And I'm sure the intention was not to create any kind of attacks upon particular groups or the leadership of those groups or anything. But I still have to agree that as it stands, the report feels like it's still got quite a negative tone to it overall, almost an attacking tone.

And I really think that that comes from primarily maybe an unnecessary justification piece. The majority of the writing on that report is justifications around the recommendations.

And, you know, I don't know that we need all of the, you know, reams and reams of justifications for the recommendations. I think, you know, like what was suggested maybe, you know, two or three lines of text of explanation around the reasoning for the recommendation might be a lot more applicable.

You know, you really don't have to get into justifications unless someone really or a group really objects to posing something really controversial. I also don't - I still stand firmly that I think Annex B has gone completely out of the scope of what we were asking it to do. I don't understand why we have it there.

Tony Harris: Yes, hello. Tony Harris rejoining. I was on mute - muted for some reason. Can you hear me Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I can hear you.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Do you want to talk?

Tony Harris: Sure. When it's my turn. But I was...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Tony Harris: ...trying to get - talk before and I was muted by the operator.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead and let Tony go Olga.

Olga Cavalli: If (Michael) is done and that's okay with Tony.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: I caught most of what - I'm sorry I'm late. There was a subway strike. But I caught a lot of what is being said. I thoroughly agree with what Zahid has said about the tone of the report. It is totally out of scope. It is highly critical and completely unacceptable as far as I'm concerned.

And as far as Annex B that shouldn't be in it. That's all I have to say right now.

Olga Cavalli: Chuck?

((Crosstalk))

(SS): ...I also would like to add something. (SS) here.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. (SS) after Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I have three things to suggest here. Number one, let's not start discussing the details of the report now. Okay?

I don't think this is the time to do it. Number two, the issues that Zahid is raising and that Tony supported and that (Michael) talked about are issues that we should - that should fit into that procedure that we talked about.

When we go through the report as a working team even general things - tone, etc. that we have concerns about, those are issues that we should talk about as a full working team.

So I think that the procedure that I suggested and modified by (Michael) if the team supports it, should cover those kinds of things, not just specific issues in the report.

And then third, with regard to charter recommendations, I do believe that some of the recommendations that we make if they're approved by the council, could impact charters. Although our task is not to specifically do that.

If we recommend some procedures that are approved by the council there could be impact on all of our charters. That's not our goal, to change charters, but there could be some indirect impact that way. So I don't necessarily agree that there won't be any charter impact. There could be.

You know, if the - if we make a recommendation that all - and again I'm not suggesting we do this. But that all stakeholder groups should publish their minutes publicly. I think that's probably already something that the board has recommended.

But let's just use that one as an example. And the charters don't include that. That may need to be included in the charters. So that's just my last comment there. Did that make sense Zahid? Because I was - you had referenced the charter issue. I hope that made sense.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: It's (SS) and (Michael). (SS) go ahead please.

(SS): Yeah (SS). Olga it is about Victoria's report. One point too subtask. So she has requested that - I mean she wants to be presented well (unintelligible) in depth on that particular subtask. I also support it and I support to the extent that we do not talk those things where Victoria has to answer.

Or she has to consider something. In general we could talk. But that is - that - I mean I agree with (Michael) that and maybe probably what (Claudio) has said, that it is too elaborate. In fact, at that level we have been talking about.

And that - well I will only say that while we (unintelligible) best to put all the (costs) there. And if it is not taking the (unintelligible) there is something (merit) in that like if it's like (unintelligible) constituency and she's up taking criticism, if it is taken that wealth improvements are required then it isn't merited.

So my - I think what Chuck suggested that we not talk in this (unintelligible) but whenever we talk maybe - I mean these things can be considered. Maybe (Michael) says that (unintelligible) tone was like the - I mean cut down or I mean a little better.

(Unintelligible) a little more. But in the days are there - I mean if those constituencies can take advantage well they can get them in there. If they want all the freedom (unintelligible) finger it can be removed. So my only (unintelligible) let Victoria be there when you discuss in details.

Olga Cavalli: Who was next? (Michael)?

Krista Papac: Hi Olga. It's (Krista). Can I also get in the queue?

Olga Cavalli: Sure. (Michael) go ahead. And then (Krista).

(Michael Young): Okay. I think definitely, you know, I think it's pertinent to have the whole sub team there when we're going through the document as suggested. When we go through any of the controversial parts of any documents I think that makes perfect sense.

I also want to just agree with Chuck's observation. I think it's very accurate that there - I meant I know there are things already in the documents that could impact charters, you know, suggestions around voting and other items.

So I think that it's really important. You know, I've raised concerns or objections on a couple of those points and we're only talking in general terms.

I won't get into the specifics until we have Victoria here. I know others like (Claudio) have - also not on the call.

But I think it's important that we work through those item by item as an entire group.

Chuck Gomes: Can I get a clarification Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: (Michael), what did you disagree with that I said?

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...talk closer with the mic because I can't...

(Michael Young): Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: ...hear you very well.

(Michael Young): Chuck I actually was agreeing.

Chuck Gomes: Oh. I misunderstood you. That's why I was trying to figure - it sounded like you were.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: I just misunderstood you. Thank you.

(Michael Young): Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: (Krista).

Krista Papac: Hi, it's (Krista). Just a couple of things. A point of clarification first. I mean I agree with the general idea that we're all expressing which is that as a work team we should get together and discuss the document and concerns and things we agree on and all of those good things.

I'm confused and I can appreciate if Victoria's not here to sort of comment on specific things that she did or didn't write. But I - is it normal that we - should we be discussing this at all? I feel like - so I don't know if somebody can answer that for me.

Man: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Sorry. I didn't get the question very well (Krista).

Krista Papac: I just feel like there's a request out there that we don't really discuss this too much. And I feel like as a work team we have recorded minutes on both, you know, oral recording and typically written minutes.

And if we end up going down a path where questions are arising that may or may not be specific are we really restricted from talking about that or - I mean again I would - it would be helpful for Victoria to be in that conversation.

But if we ended up in a conversation that she couldn't participate in or - do we have to sort of stop the conversation or is that normal?

Chuck Gomes: Can I respond to that Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Someone else wanted to talk and I couldn't get the name or the voice. Okay, go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I - (Krista) I wasn't suggesting that we shouldn't talk about those things. I was suggesting that we're not there yet today to talk about those things. And I think Victoria's request is good that let's try to discuss those when she's able to interact with us when we're talking about that report.

We don't know, you know, we're going to have to decide which report we go through first and so forth. And I think it's good to have as many as possible including the leader, when we discuss those things.

Now if the leader is not going to be available enough for us to do that we can deal with that when we come to it. But I wasn't suggesting we don't talk about any of these issues.

I was suggesting today's meeting is not the place to do it because as soon as we start going there we're not going to finish mapping out our approach to deal with all three remaining reports.

Krista Papac: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: If I may say something. I think what we are discussing now is which procedure we will agree among us to make the final revision by the whole working team for the document.

I agree that Victoria should be today with us. Unfortunately she couldn't make the call. And she surely should be present the day that we discuss her report.

So I think that we - the goal for this conversation we're having today is to agree how we're going to proceed and how we're going to review the document to have all of our views and all of our comments heard by the other working teams and reflected in the outcome. Who wanted to talk?

Krista Papac: Actually it's...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: If you all talk at the same time I cannot get the voices. It's (SS) and who else?

Krista Papac: It's (Krista) wanting to finish my...

Olga Cavalli: (Krista) go ahead and then (SS).

Krista Papac: Thank you. So I had a two part question. So thank you for the clarification. The second part that I wanted to comment on is - and I agree - sorry, I also want to say that I agree with your statement Chuck and again I think that several people have said that we're not at the point where we can actually discuss all of the specific details of the report.

I have it - I mean I think it just came in this morning and I certainly haven't had time to even open the document. And so then, you know, building on that I'd like to, you know, add to the list of suggestions on how we tackle this which is, you know, first that we all - because I was not on the sub team, take, you know, get a chance to review the report in detail.

And then maybe each of us can - again, and I haven't looked at it, so maybe this doesn't make sense, but if each, you know, member can sort of come up with a list of concerns and maybe we can just tackle those one at a time as a group with Victoria so that if a concern is sort of question based she can respond to it or clarify it, or what have you.

And that's - I'm done. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you (Krista). (SS), go ahead.

(SS): Yeah. It is about the Subtask 1 where I'm leader and I'm just continuing what Chuck has said. I mean I appreciate that the leaders should be there. That's

what Victoria wanted too. As far as subtasks one is there I may not be present when our discussion is there.

The reason is that I will not answer anything - I mean there is nothing for me to answer. I will not add anything. And (unintelligible). I mean I give full authority to the group to take the (unintelligible) on my behalf. So that's what I'd like to (unintelligible) Subtask 1.

And it may have been that whenever discussing the (unintelligible) I may not be there. So that discussion should not be deferred and (unintelligible) should be taking on Subtask 1. That's my request.

Olga Cavalli: Anyone else want to comment?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Zahid Jamil: Hi. This is Zahid. I'd like to get in the queue.

Olga Cavalli: Yes please. Zahid go ahead.

Zahid Jamil: I think this is a good approach. I agree - just to clarify I think, I agree with Chuck that yes, there will be some charter impact but I think it's best that it's kept to the principles basis. And I do agree with him there will be that minimal impact at least.

And I just wanted to agree with that one point. The other thing is I agree that we can't go through the report today. I agree with the approach that we're taking and I agree with (Krista)'s modification of following the procedure.

And I think that's the way we should go forth in the process. I just wanted to support that. Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Zahid. Any other comments? Okay. This is with respect - I also had no chance to review the last version of the report because it just came I think today or late yesterday. So my apologies for that. Just to summarize the status of subtasks.

(Krista) could you give us an update of what's the status of your...

Krista Papac: Sure. This is (Krista). So we discussed this on the last call that Chuck had made some very good suggestions about adding some clarification around database administrators or the database GNSO members, participants, constituents, stakeholders, etc.

And then I wasn't really sure the best way to approach recommending how that structure look. And I think (Michael)'s working on some suggestions. He's got quite an extensive experience with databases. And so I'm sort of trying to pull that together so that I can address that concern in the document and then resubmit it to the group.

The entire working team - for the entire working team's review, final review.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you very much (Krista). Any questions to (Krista)? Any comments? Okay.

Krista Papac: Actually - that's okay. Yeah. Never mind. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, no, no. Go ahead if you want to add something.

Krista Papac: No. I'm - I - I answered my own question. Sorry.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. No problem. I was wondering if we can discuss a little bit more about the procedure and how to review in the documents and get our comments from the full working team.

Which tools could we use? How could we do this? Sometimes working in the list directly sending comments back and forth is difficult to trace them. It's difficult to put them all together. At least for me that happens sometimes.

I am very fond of wikis. I use them a lot for different things. Out of the ICANN activities I use them with all my students and with my own professional activities.

But any comments about how could we - I - what I imagine now is the three documents and a working tool that we could all access and we could there in - give our input and our comments so we can start to see a new map of comments and suggestions or suggestions of deletions or modifications.

And then finally get a new version agreed by everyone. Is that a feasible idea? Do you think that's okay? Do you have other ideas? Any comments?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Put Chuck in the queue after whoever jumped in.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Tony, Chuck, who else?

Zahid Jamil: Zahid.

Olga Cavalli: Zahid. Tony go ahead.

Tony Harris: Yeah. I'm a little uncomfortable with a procedure if we start - if we all start editing the document because you end up with, you know, with all of these dotted lines crossing words and others put in. And it's a real jumble to make any sense out of later.

Some other perhaps simpler method would be preferable as far as I'm concerned.

Olga Cavalli: Any suggestions? Tony?

Tony Harris: I would simply refer in a normal email to a paragraph or, you know, an item number, so and so or whatever it is. And just state what my - what I'm uncomfortable with.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: I agree with Tony's concern. And here's what I would suggest. And I think that whether we use email or whether we use the wiki, to have a bunch of editing and things going on gets very cumbersome and it's very hard to manage. And I think the same thing applies to email as it does to the wiki.

My suggestion would be that we go through the issues in each of the documents one at a time. Okay? When we get one done we can go to another. And that we do that in teleconference calls like we're doing right now.

And that we use the wiki during that call. And I'm sure Julie could hold the PIN on that and - so that we can - we make changes that we agree to in the wiki, to the document. And then we can all see it live by refreshing the wiki.

But I think we're going to need to go through these things in live teleconference call. And it'll be - it'll take a lot of time but it'll take a lot less time than if we try to do it on email or all of us doing it simultaneously on the wiki individually.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. Zahid?

Zahid Jamil: Yeah. I think I - I agree with most of the comments, in fact all of them so far. Here's what I would suggest in addition. It would be that - and my understanding of the structure is that there will be - document one will go first, document two will go second.

Now I'd like to suggest a bifurcation when we're dealing with each one of those documents. That when we're looking at a specific document and I don't think this applies to (SS)'s document so much, but it definitely apply to Victoria's when you look at it.

If we try and see if we can first view it, the basic sort of framework issues because I think we may find that when we're dealing with the framework issues a lot of our line by line commentary may not be required.

So if you can just sort of, you know, and I've heard that some concerns I've raised other members have also raised the same concerns in saying maybe there doesn't have to be so much explanation.

Maybe we can sort of, you know, summarize it. Have simple introductions of paragraphs that say why we're doing this. And then have the recommendations. And if we were to agree on that then we wouldn't need to sort of go through line by line edits, etc. or discussions or raising issues.

And then as a second part to looking at the document we could then do the live line by line editing which Chuck has mentioned. I completely agree that's probably the best way to go. So I see each document being sort of dealt with in two parts.

One, generally if we're comfortable with the framework of what we've done. And second, then line by line edit. I hope that that's a useful (position).

Olga Cavalli: One clarification question Zahid. The first part of the work, this overview of the document, how do you want to proceed? Through email, through - how do you want to make it?

Zahid Jamil: I'm just kidding when I say Google Wave. That's what - no, no, I'm not signed up for that. But I think email is probably better for me...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Zahid Jamil: ...to access because of BlackBerry. Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Any other comments?

Krista Papac: Olga, it's (Krista). I'd like to comment or get in the queue.

Olga Cavalli: Sure (Krista). Go ahead.

Krista Papac: So I want to support what Chuck said. I think that having conference calls is going to be more productive and we can get more things taken care of more quickly.

While they will be time consuming and I think the beginning of the year is usually a tough time as well as the end of the year which would be the timeframe we're looking at.

And then of course the line by line item (unintelligible) for the time also make a lot of sense to me as well.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Any other comments? Great. So we have two documents that are for full working group revisions. Are we going one by one? Are we going the two ones at the same time? What - any comments? I would suggest we go one by one.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That's what I said as well.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Any - this doesn't prevent us to start reviewing Victoria's document because it's quite long and maybe will take more time. And she submitted it right now. Today or yesterday.

So if we go first with task one draft document that (SS) has prepared, so we agree in exchanging emails and stating the issues that are concerning each of us through - so we could perhaps agree on a list of issues that should be reviewed in - then in a specific conference call about that document. Is that okay?

Tony Harris: I have a question on that.

Olga Cavalli: Tony. Go ahead.

Tony Harris: Yeah. Well it goes to what (SS) said.

Olga Cavalli: Oh Tony, let me clarify something. I'm not saying this is decided. I'm just trying to summarize...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: I agree with you. Sure. I'm just saying that if you have these calls specifically about a report and then what happens if the person who leads that report, be it (SS) or be it Victoria, cannot make that call?

Then we have to - the call is off? We have to reprogram the teleconference? What happens in that case?

Olga Cavalli: Your comment is very important. I think we should agree on a date and time that we can proceed participants and the leader is at least two could make the call. Yeah. It should be agreed...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: ...we'd probably all show up and the leader is not there and, you know, that's it. You can't do anything.

Olga Cavalli: Well for today Victoria said that she couldn't make the call and that's okay. Some of us have sometimes different agenda problems. And - but she apologized and that's fine. And what we are talking is about procedure.

I think that we can be quite sure through a (Google) or through an email exchange that the leader of the document would be in the call. Maybe if he or she is not available then we can reschedule it. But the idea would be to find a date and time that he or she can participate. Is that a good idea?

Tony Harris: It sounds very nice. Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So for revision of the documents and receiving comments we will use the email list, the working team, the whole working team email list and the documents will be reviewed by the whole working team. Any comments? Great.

So (SS) we will start with your document. We may say that we start this process today after this call. And which would be our due date for this first revision or detection of issues that could be reviewed, modified or changed? What do others think?

Chuck Gomes: Are you asking for an estimated due date when we finish Subtask 1?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. Not finish. The first revision to address what could be changed...

Chuck Gomes: Oh.

Olga Cavalli: ...or modified or suggested.

Chuck Gomes: Oh. I would suggest we do it in our next meeting. So we just need to decide what our next meeting is.

Olga Cavalli: Great. So it's in two weeks? Let me check the calendar.

Woman: In two weeks it's New Years.

Olga Cavalli: Oh. Yeah, that's exactly what I was thinking about.

Man: December 31. No. January 1.

Olga Cavalli: January 1. So should we change the date? Should we skip one week? Should we make it during the next week of the first of January - the following week of the first of January or before? I'm not traveling now so I'm mostly available.

Man: Well you could make it on the 8th of January, right, that's a Friday.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. But that would be three weeks from now. That's - is that okay with the group?

Chuck Gomes: Well the alternative is doing it on Christmas Day or New Years Day.

Olga Cavalli: No, no. I was thinking about perhaps moving the day...

Chuck Gomes: Oh, a different...

Olga Cavalli: ...of the week.

Chuck Gomes: Moving the day of the week becomes very problematic because of how...

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, I know.

Chuck Gomes: ...many different GNSO things are going on.

Olga Cavalli: I know. Okay. So next conference call will be Friday, January 8 at the same time. And from now on we will review (SS) document. And through emails - through our email list we will send him our issues and concerns and comments. Is that a good idea?

Krista Papac: Olga...

Chuck Gomes: That would be true of everybody. We're not just sending them to (SS). We'll update and we should have an updated document on the wiki after each session so that people can see now - to the extent - it's difficult on the wiki to show changes that were made.

But if Julie can, you know, either put them in brackets or something like that so it's easy for people - they don't have to read the whole document every time to see changes.

And then it's going to be the responsibility of each of us to review those. And if we miss a meeting, to listen to the recording and - so that we don't keep backtracking.

Olga Cavalli: Someone else wanted to talk and I couldn't recognize the voice.

Krista Papac: It's (Krista), Olga.

Olga Cavalli: (Krista), go ahead please.

Krista Papac: Thank you. So I think I'm confused. I thought that what we were going to do is review the document and everybody make a list of their concerns and submit that to the whole team.

What I was going to - if that's the case what I was going to suggest is that somebody, if it's (SS) great, or Julie or whatever, just be the keeper of the list of concerns, literally bullet point list of concerns.

And then we would be discussing those on our January 8 call and then deciding if or how we would address those concerns in the actual document following the January call. Am I incorrect in my understanding? Or...

Olga Cavalli: I think your suggestion is great. And I understood it that way. I just - your suggestion that Julie and (SS) should be the keepers of the issues list is very good. Any comments? Do we agree on that?

Chuck Gomes: That's what we had agreed to.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And the - I think if Julie now has the PIN it's probably fine to have her do it unless (SS) wants to do it.

But we should after this meeting, a request should go out to everybody on the working team to identify and submit any issues they want added to that list within, you know, within the next two weeks so that they're identified at least a week before that meeting.

Krista Papac: Agreed. (Krista) agrees.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. (SS) are you okay in reviewing the documents sent to the list with Julie and perhaps prepare a list of concerns or issues to be addressed in the document? (SS)? We lost (SS). Okay. No problem. We can explain it to him in the list. Okay.

I think we have a plan for the next two and three weeks. Let me ask you something, if I'm understanding correctly, in the conference call of the 8th of January we will work on the document so we can include all these issues and concerns in the document in an agreeable text.

Is that what we are going to do in that call?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: It may take multiple calls.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, that - my question was will one hour be enough? Maybe we can have a longer call. Or we can have another call after that one in two weeks.

Chuck Gomes: I don't think I can do longer than an hour at this - in this time slot...

Olga Cavalli: No. Me too.

Chuck Gomes: ...on Friday.

Olga Cavalli: And also we may know how much tasks will be needed or reviewed in this next two weeks as we exchange some ideas in our list. So we may know if we will have a lot of work to do with that work with that document or not.

So we can decide maybe in two weeks, if it's one call or maybe more. So we have a plan.

Chuck Gomes: And by the way Olga, just that - you already know this, but ICANN staff is investigating to see if there's a better tool for doing things like we're going to be doing. And that was specifically in response to a request from the PDP working team.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And so, you know, if that becomes available we would be able to use it. I don't know whether they're going to be successful or not. But I think they're going to get right on that.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I - my only comment to sending emails and comment is that sometimes they get lost and it's difficult to track them. But if (SS) and Julie can prepare a list of concerns and issues that's okay because we will have a reference.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I am taking away the following action items. I will keep a list of concerns and I will keep them in order according to, you know, their relation to the document. I will create a wiki page for each of the documents we'll be reviewing beginning of course with task one, Subtask 1.

I will bracket in that document any changes that are specific, you know, to sections in the document so that people can see where the changes are when we view this on the wiki.

And I, you know, I will try to then have all of the concerns and any changes bracketed one week before we have our meeting on January 8th.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Julie Hedlund: And if another tools comes - becomes available in this time certainly we can use it. I do know that there are some concerns about, you know, the fact that we'll need to get licensing and it would have to be a tool that works across platforms.

I know that's being investigated but I would be - I can't say that it would be available for the first of our meetings. So I'll proceed according to gathering items from the email list and using the wiki as a tool to begin with.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Now Olga, one last...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...thing. If we could also use - if everybody - I don't know if everybody in the work team uses Microsoft Word but the tracking function there automatically - you can automatically highlight changes that are made so we could via email distribute those kinds of documents.

We don't need to resolve that right now but that's another option we could use in addition to the wiki if we wanted to.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. That's another tool. Sometimes if many people are making changes it becomes a little bit complicated to review. But that's okay. That's another tool. Okay. Thank you all very much. I think we've reached the hour. We have a plan to do for the next three weeks.

I want to wish you all the best for the next Christmas and have a wonderful 2010 and Happy New Year. And we will talk in three weeks in January.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Merry Christmas. Happy New Year everybody. Thanks Olga.

Woman: Happy holidays.

Man: Happy holidays everyone.

Olga Cavalli: Bye-bye.

END