

**GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC)
Constituency Operations Work Team
07 May 2010 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 07 May 2010 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/gnsso/gnsso-ops-20100507.mp3>

On page:
<http://gnsso.icann.org/calendar/#may>

Participants present:

Olga Cavalli – NCA – Work Team Chair
Michael Young – Registries
Claudio Digangi – IPC
Debra Hughes – NCSG
Tony Harris – ISPCP
Chuck Gomes – Registries Stakeholder Group
Rafik Dammak – NCSG

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund
Rob Hoggarth
Glen de Saint Géry
Gisella Gruber-White

Guest:

Scott Pinzon – ICANN Staff

Coordinator: The call is now recorded, please go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. Good Morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Thank you for joining on this Friday to our Friday call. The idea for the call today is that it will have two parts. The first part...

Gisella Gruber-White: Olga, did we wanna do a roll?

Olga Cavalli: Oh, roll call, yes, yes, please. Sorry.

Gisella Gruber-White: I'll do that for you quickly, Olga, with pleasure. Good morning, good afternoon on today's call on Friday, the 7th of May. We have Olga Cavalli, Claudio Di Gangi, Debra Hughes from staff. We have Glen de Saint Gery, Julie Hedlund, (Rob) Hoggarth, myself, Gisella Gruber-White. I don't have any apologies noted and if...

Julie Hedlund: Excuse me, this is Julie, I think we have Rafik.

Gisella Gruber-White: Oh, sorry, absolutely, Rafik Dammak, as well, my apologies. And if I could just please remind everyone to state their names when speaking. Thank you.

Over to you, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, thank you, very much. And - are we expected someone to the call? Like...

Gisella Gruber-White: Olga, I have not heard a word from (Raheed)...

Olga Cavalli: No problem.

Gisella Gruber-White: ...now for over a week.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, no problem. No problem. Okay, thank you for joining. As I was saying, the purpose of the call today is we will review first some comments we still have from Task One document. I think it's a document which is quite polished and almost finished, I hope.

We have two comments from Chuck that I would like your opinion about how to rephrase them or complete them. I'm trying to find them in the text. And I would encourage all of you, and if you're hearing the mp3 of the call, to review the document and send any minority report or minority comments so

we can include them in the section that is about that at the end of the document, and we can submit it as soon as possible to the (OSCS).

You know, we're a little behind the schedule with our work, but that's okay, we have been having a lot of different opinions and diverse ideas, so it's good that we could manage to build this document. I'm trying to find Chuck's comments here.

Julie Hedlund: Olga. I'm sorry.

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie, but Claudio just sent around an amended version of the document.

Olga Cavalli: I haven't seen it. Oh, I'm sorry.

Julie Hedlund: I'm just sort of skimming. I wonder if we should just start and go through from the beginning and, I'd be happy to help do that, and cover his changes, as well?

Olga Cavalli: I'm so sorry I didn't see that, I didn't see the message from Claudio, so if you have that online, that would be great, because I don't.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, well I'm happy to walk - this is Julie. I'm happy to walk through it Olga if that's helpful?

Olga Cavalli: So if we can review Claudio's and Chuck's comments. That would be great.

Julie Hedlund: Wonderful.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck just joined. Sorry I'm late.

Olga Cavalli: Hi, Chuck, good morning.

Julie Hedlund: And this is Julie, so Chuck, we are on the version of the document, the Task One recommendations document that Claudio sent around this morning, just minutes ago. And it includes, you know, the remaining comments from you that we have not discussed.

It has the changes that I made after last week's call that are highlighted, and then the changes suggested by Claudio that also are highlighted. So, I will run through the document and covering each of the changes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I'm trying to pull it up.

Olga Cavalli: I just received - this is Olga. I just received the document from Claudio, I haven't seen it before I was talking.

Okay. Julie, If you have it open while I'm opening it, would you comment...

Julie Hedlund: (Unintelligible). Yes, this is Julie, I'll go ahead, Olga, and I'll begin. So, beginning at the first page, under the main title, GNSO Operational Steering Committee Constituency and Stakeholder Group Operating Work Team, Claudio has added a colon after that title and then added the text, Common Operating Principles and Participation Guidelines.

Tony Harris: Good Morning, Tony Harris, Julie.

Olga Cavalli: Hi, Tony, good morning.

Tony Harris: Do you have an echo on me today?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Tony Harris: Oh, that's normal then. I guess I'll be knocked off the call any moment then.
Okay, well I've said hello, anyhow.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I'll proceed, then through the document. Further down on Page 1 there is a change that we discussed last Friday where we are being specific about the origin of the recommendations, and I added at the end of the second sentence in the final paragraph at the bottom of the page, it says, task one, the subject of these recommendations, is split into the following four sub-tasks, which correspond to the recommendations in the BGC Work Group Report referenced above.

And then each recommendation is footnoted to show where exactly in the BGC report that recommendation was taken.

Olga Cavalli: That's okay. That looks very good.

Julie Hedlund: And in addition, I added some links to the specific documents, to the BGC, in the footnotes just to be complete.

Olga Cavalli: Julie, if I may, let me ask a question to the group.

Are we okay with the change proposed in the title, proposed by Claudio?

There are no comments, I think it's okay. Okay, Julie, sorry for interrupting you.

Julie Hedlund: Not at all.

So, continuing with Page 2 of the document and the paragraph that appears just above Section 2 recommendations, we added, as discussed last Friday,

the definition for the word should, and Claudio has amended that definition, so I will read it for everyone.

In addition, the word should, as used in the following recommendations, means: an obligation or duty to take a certain course of action, unless otherwise specified.

Are there any concerns or questions?

Chuck Gomes: Where is that on Page 2?

Olga Cavalli: It's on Page 4.

Julie Hedlund: It's Page 4.

Olga Cavalli: It's Page 4 of the document.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, it's Page 4, okay. I thought I heard...Okay I'm...

Julie Hedlund: Sorry, I said Page 2 but it's actually - I apologize, Chuck. This is Julie. I see now it's actually Page 3 and it appears just prior to the start of the Section 2 recommendations.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: In my document shows its Page 4, but it could be the computer.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, mine - it is on three for me. Okay. All right, I found it.

Julie Hedlund: Any comments?

No. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I'll refrain.

Julie Hedlund: Okay.

So proceeding through the document, the changes indicated in red line are the changes we agreed where shall's are changed to should. And so everywhere they appear, that is the change.

And then on Page 6 in the document that Claudio sent, in section 2.2 Operating Principles, Claudio has added a second paragraph and it reads, groups should adhere to the following common operating principles: representativeness, process integrity, flexibility, transparency, participation, openness, and other norms common to the (GNSO).

Chuck Gomes: Looks fine.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, proceeding through the document. So just highlights of shall changed to should.

So now, proceeding to the section where there are some additional comments from Chuck that I, in error, neglected to mention last Friday. And this is in the Section 2.3 Group Member Database, which begins, in the document Claudio has sent, on Page 8.

And then paging through that section, we actually arrive in the latter part of the section and specifically 2.3.2 Storing and Updating Membership Records, Paragraph C.

And Chuck has a comment on the last word in that paragraph. Specifically the second sentence in the paragraph reads, the operator should also have the ability to set a member or member-delegate to inactive. And Chuck's

comment relates to the word inactive and it is that the group probably needs to define inactive.

And he notes that they do that in the Registry Stakeholder Group Charter.

Chuck Gomes: And I guess, thinking about that a little further, that it's not so much that we need to define inactive in this particular group, but I think that if there is an inactive category it needs to be defined in the charter.

Tony Harris: I'm sorry, this is Tony, what letter is that in this? Is it...

Olga Cavalli: It's D, Tony, it's D in 2.3.2.

Julie Hedlund: Actually, Olga, this is Julie, it's C. And there's an...

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, so it's C, I confused - yes you're right, and there's another comment in D, sorry.

Tony Harris: Because I can't see it here. This is 2.3.2, right?

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Tony Harris: Okay, I've got the wrong one. Thanks a lot. I'll find it. Yes, okay.

Olga Cavalli: Chuck so you're suggesting that we do include a definition or...

Chuck Gomes: No, I'm modifying what I said, Olga, and suggesting that maybe we wanna say something like that, the operator should also have the ability to set a member-delegate to...Oh let's see, wait a second. This is - who is the operator here? I'm confused.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. This operator is the staff administrative person who is making changes in the database.

Chuck Gomes: So we do need to have a definition, then, of inactive.

Julie Hedlund: Why?

Chuck Gomes: Well, the wording sounds kind of funny.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, the operator above is referred to as, by the way, a systems operator and that is shortened to operator. But yes, in this case it is that we're directing the operator to - we're saying that the operator has ability to set the member or member-delegate to inactive, but...

Chuck Gomes: How will the operator know whether somebody's inactive or not? That's why we need a definition.

Olga Cavalli: Chuck, do we have any definitions as an example for a new constituency or others who are in the public?

Do we have a text that we could use?

Chuck Gomes: I don't think our text would necessarily work for everybody else. We do have a definition and, you know, it's a, and I can't quote it without looking it up, but it basically, if they haven't participated in any online discussions or any meetings for, you know, three meetings in a row or something, then they are moved to inactive status. All they have to do to become active is participate, even on the list. So it's real easy.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: But what we were trying to do is avoid the situation where somebody who is not active at all is still counted in the active voting, and so it makes it difficult to reach a quorum or to make a decision. In other words, you can get a lot of members that all of a sudden disappear, and they're still factoring in your

quorum and in whether or not you reach certain levels of consensus. It could be really difficult. And as our organizations grow, that could be a real handicap.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. This is Olga. So, what I think here is that maybe instead of including a definition of inactive, we should say that inactive should be defined in charters or...

Chuck Gomes: But who's gonna define it if we don't?

Olga Cavalli: Well, okay.

Claudio Di Gangi: This is Claudio. Could we just put a comma after inactive and just say, based on the - as defined in the group's charters?

Chuck Gomes: That would probably work.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, that's what I was trying to say.

Chuck Gomes: We might need to add that if there is such a - I guess that's fine. That's fine, just like that.

Claudio Di Gangi: Olga, Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, Rafik, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: I think we don't need to add about active or inactive, because I'm not sure what the charters of stakeholder groups or constituencies are taking care of the definition of active member or not. It's kind of complicated and I think maybe for instance how to define who is active or not, maybe we (strike this spot).

Chuck Gomes: It's not at all complicated in our case, Rafik. It's very simple.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, sure, but your registry is not like (unintelligible) in the non-contracted parties, so we don't have people (involving the same levels) so and we are also trying to outreach and to involve more people, so that's my...

Tony Harris: Can I get in queue? Tony, here.

Olga Cavalli: Rafik, are you finished?

Rafik Dammak: Oh, yes, yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, Tony, go ahead.

Tony Harris: Yes, actually I agree with Chuck, because I think the whole purpose of what we're doing in this working team is to come up with uniform procedures and standardized ways to deal with things in the constituencies and stakeholder groups, and I guess really we all have to come to grips with whatever is needed to be able to do what we're trying to do here.

And Chuck made a very good point, if we do not sift out inactive participant, for the purpose of a quorum or a consensus position, you've got perhaps (N) number of people sitting out there who are not even anymore interested or involved with ICANN.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Tony. I...

(Michael): Hey guys, this is (Michael) joining late. Sorry, just to let you know I'm here.

Olga Cavalli: Hi (Michael). Welcome.

Who was it? Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Rafik.

Olga Cavalli: Go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. I understand that point, but I still believe that it's really (unintelligible) and can be used to exclude people. So I'm not sure how we can define active or inactive especially in other contracted parties.

Chuck Gomes: Well, Rafik, let me take another cut at it, because there's no exclusion the way we do it, at all, okay?

If somebody hasn't participated in three consecutive meetings, or on the list, the discussion list, and I don't remember the precise terms, maybe (Michael) does, they are declared inactive.

All they have to do to switch to active is participate; send an email, send a response saying, I'm alive. So there's no exclusion at all, it's just we're dealing with a problem. We do have quorums to meet at times, we do calculate and report the level of support from the stakeholder group, and so if you have, and we're maybe looking at hundreds of new members, if we have a bunch that are inactive that prevent us from reaching a quorum or that (slap) the level of consensus in our statements, even though they're not participating, it doesn't work.

Man: I mean the whole - to add to what Chuck's saying, sorry, Tony, you wanted to go first, sorry, go ahead.

Tony Harris: No, go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Tony go ahead.

Tony Harris: No, I was just wanting to add something else. When ICANN staff have to plan conference calls, I think it would help them to have a more accurate estimate

of really how many people will be on the call, and that may also involve a cost factor.

I mean, they may sort of plan a call on 80 people participating and you end up with maybe 40, so I think that's also something we should consider.

(Michael): Yes, I think - sorry, can I go-

Olga Cavalli: Sure, go ahead then, (Michael). Yes...

(Michael): I'm jumping in there.

I just feel pretty strongly about reinforcing what Chuck's saying. I think it's a very low bar to ask people to attend one out of three meetings. I mean that's just to show up on the attendance list, you don't even have to actually speak during the meeting to be considered an active participant.

But it does say that if that's the bar, then at least you should have a clue of what's going on, and therefore if you have an opinion, at least it's an informed opinion. I think that's what the expectation is. People that participate in these things have an understanding of what's going on and don't jump in every eighth or ninth meeting taking things out of context and not necessarily having the background to why something's being suggested or supported.

Chuck Gomes: And we're even more flexible than that. Even if they don't attend one of our meetings, if they've at least participated once on the list, they're okay.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, Rafik, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, so maybe, okay - maybe return to the stakeholder groups or constituency, maybe we can have some additional thoughts to that picture

that we say the definition of active or inactive depends to the stakeholder groups. Because I'm not sure that all the stakeholder groups have the uniform definition of that.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, we're - I mean, that's okay, Rafik, we're not saying everybody has to have a definition like us or even have active/inactive; for us, it's critical.

Rafik Dammak: Because for example, in the non-commercial stakeholder groups, I'm not aware that we define what is active or inactive for our members, so maybe we cannot have this uniform definition for the (base point), so we just add to the (part) saying that the difference is up to the stakeholder groups, etc.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. If I may, Claudio, could you remind us the changes you proposed? I think that it covered this openness to different stakeholder groups, organizations and possible definitions for inactive.

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes, it was just to put a comma after inactive and then to say, as defined in the group's charter. Or I guess we could say, as provided for in the group's charter.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that latter one's probably a little bit better because they may not define it. It may not even be provided for, but that's okay, I think.

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes

Robert Hoggarth: Olga, this is (Rob). If I can get in the queue, as well?

Olga Cavalli: (Rob), please go ahead.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks, I just wanted to point out just some just general background about the importance of the type of issue that you're discussing, because I think

some in the GNSO improvements process and some of the comments submitted in that overall process really looked at active participation as an important element of transparency and representativeness of a group.

And I think one of the key challenges of some commenters on even just the reconfirmation of existing constituencies touched on the fact that there were membership rosters that may have listed folks who were no longer active or even real participants, in a community.

And finding some mechanism for being able to confirm or, you know, do some due diligence, or otherwise assure that people are participating, I think is an important part of the overall process, particularly for participation transparency and representativeness.

Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, (Rob).

Any suggestions about how to amend the text and make it more - and define inactive, or include the change suggested by Claudio?

Chuck Gomes: The change suggested by Claudio, the last one, I thought worked just fine. And it leaves it up to the stakeholder groups and constituencies to deal with it or not, however they so choose.

Olga Cavalli: Rafik, are you okay with that?

Rafik Dammak: Can you please repeat? I'm not sure.

Olga Cavalli: Julie, did you get the last version of the change.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie, Olga, and correct me if I'm wrong, but I heard it as adding a comma after the word inactive and then adding, as provided for in the group charter. Or we could say, well, group's charter.

Is that correct?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, that's correct, and it's ok, this change? Is it okay for you, Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, it's okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, any other comments?

Okay, I think that's a very good change. Thank you Claudio suggesting it.

We have 2.3.2 D, it says, the operator should perform the updates to those holding an executive position in an ICANN community and check that. What does this mean?

I don't know where this text came from, honestly. Does someone have any idea?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie, I think that this was the text that was provided for in the recommendations put together by the group that had (Christa) and Tony in it.

Olga Cavalli: Tony?

Could you give some light?

Tony Harris: I'm thinking, I'm not too sure about that. I don't remember that we put that in.

Julie Hedlund: I can go back to the original document, but I just cut and pasted what (Christa) had sent in her last version.

Tony Harris: Could you point me to the exact, the item, what is it 2.3 what?

Olga Cavalli: It's 2.3.2, the last one, it's D. It's the last paragraph.

Tony Harris: Oh yes, the operator should perform the updates to those holding an executive position in an ICANN community.

I don't remember having seen that before.

Chuck Gomes: It may be okay, but I don't know what it's asking for.

Olga Cavalli: I see it out of context. I think we should take it out.

Man: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And if somebody can figure out what it means and we can reconsider it later, but I would suggest that's the best thing to do.

Olga, I apologize, but I'm going to have to jump off for another meeting that I have to go to.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, for joining us.

Chuck Gomes: But it looks like we've covered that document, right?

Olga: Yes, we did. Thank you, for joining us.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks very much, I'm sorry for my end. And by the way, I may be in the same boat next week, although I may not be able to call at all. I will be in Russia...

Olga Cavalli: Oh, great. Great.

Chuck Gomes: ...for the Russian IGF, so the timing might be okay because I think it's late afternoon for me there, but it just depends on the activities there.

Okay. Bye, everybody, have a good weekend.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, have a good flight, bye-bye.

Man: Bye, Chuck

Olga Cavalli: Okay, Julie, do we have some other things to review by the end of the document.

Julie Hedlund: No, Olga, the text has all been reviewed and I've captured the changes. And so I will accept the changes that were, you know, previously provided and then - well actually I can just accept all the changes if we agree to them and then I will send round a clean version for everyone to review today.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, okay.

Man: Just to confirm, we're taking out D, then, in 2.3.2

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie, we did.

Man: Okay, fine.

Olga Cavalli: And in the case that someone has an explanation then we can re-think about it.

So the plan is the following: Julie will send a clean version with all the changes we accepted and included, and we could commit ourselves to make the last revision in one week. Do you think that's okay? And we should

receive any minority reports or comments by then, and then we can submit it to the (OFC).

Are we okay with this date or we need more time?

Man: I'm okay with it.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, fantastic. Thank you. Thank you, very much for the cooperation in finalizing the document and the good idea for finding the last version of the text.

So we're done with part one for today. And I think we have some other things - there's someone is joining our call, Julie, about the outreach and - did I get it right?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Olga, this is Julie; actually Scott Pinzon is on the call as (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Okay, great.

Julie Hedlund: And he is happy to - I thought, we mentioned last week that it might be helpful for him to - some of the activities already underway within ICANN specifically relating to the GNSO, that could relate also relate to outreach activities.

And just so that we're not duplicating things that are already taking place, perhaps in the outreach recommendations, or if we feel that the types of activities are something that would be useful and that might be something that we might wanna include in - the work team might wanna include in the recommendations.

So, Scott is on and Olga, if you'd like we can turn it over to Scott.

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Thank you, very much, Julie.

And welcome, Scott, to our working team. And thank you very much for joining us, today.

Scott Pinzon: Well, thank you. It's a privilege to participate with what I think is a pretty distinguished panel.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you.

Scott Pinzon: The things I have to share are somewhat random.

We work on outreach activities kind of between other projects, you know, mostly what we do is responding to groups like this one, but we try to move ahead when we can, so I just thought I'd share with you about four random points that relate to outreach.

The first one, perhaps, is that, for the first time ever, ICANN now has a corporate communications department with an outreach mandate. On April 1, (Barbara Clay) joined the company, she's our new Vice President of Corporate Communications, and she's a pretty high-powered lady. She worked for eight years in the White House, for a year as the communications director of the Ways and Means Committee for the United States Congress, and I spoke with her last week and she has a mandate from (Rod) to expand the reach of the ICANN community, including the GNSO and particularly to bring diversity.

So that is part of why they're also going to Moscow next week and Cairo later in May. So, just wanted to let you know that there is, from the staff perspective, a strong incentive to communicate with the (GNSO outreach efforts.

So that's number one.

The next little random, outreach-related point is that we are continuing our efforts to enhance the GNSO Web site. This was a big focus of the communication coordination working team. The design that they came up with was approved by GNSO participants in Seoul, and those build-outs are likely to finally occur across June and July. And in that, there's a new About the GNSO section on the Web site that is especially made just for newcomers.

So today, if you go to the GNSO Web site, I mean, you're all familiar with it, there's not a particular point where a person who's new to the GNSO could readily find out what the GNSO does and understand the structures and all that kind of thing, and even get a grip of what issues the GNSO is addressing currently.

So all of that will be on About the GNSO page in the upcoming Web site. And we've even proposed some short little videos that, in two minutes or so, could give a person an idea of what are the hot topics currently and how they could participate.

So that's point two.

My third random point related to outreach; this is a little bit arcane, but I think you can follow along. There is a certifying body called the (ISE-squared), and their mission in life is that they certify - they create testing that allows people to qualify as information system security professionals. And you can be certified as an auditor or as a person who's adept in security systems. And what you wind up with, for example, is a degree or a certification known as CISSP.

There's actually about 40,000 (CISSP) professionals around the world, in over 100 countries, and we recently, as ICANN acquired the ability from this organization to grant what are called CPEs. These are continuing professional education credits.

So for these people to remain certified in network security, they have to do a certain amount of self-education and volunteer work during a calendar year. They need to get 40 CPEs, which are earned at about the rate of one for every hour that you volunteer.

So ICANN is now an official issuer of CPEs, so that we can use these to incent security professionals to join GNSO working groups, for example. Or if you wanted some sort of background briefing on network security, we could offer CPE's to professionals who might want to provide that sort of education.

So it's really a pretty minor point, and yet it is a nice way, cash-free, to incent qualified people to participate in some of the security work of GNSO. And we view this as a little bit of a experiment or a - we're just trying it to see how it works out. If it does work out, then we can also try expanding it to other types of careers that involve these continuing professional credits. Many attorneys have a kind of a similar system in which they maintain their status before the bar, so that's a possibility.

And then finally, the policy team itself as ICANN is working hard to support outreach efforts in the GNSO. One of the things we're doing is a special presentation on May 20, specifically geared to help people who are completely new to ICANN get a sense of what's happening and maybe find their way to what group they would like to affiliate with, whether it's in the GNSO or perhaps at large.

And then we also do update webinars prior to each international meeting so that people can get a running start on where we are, relative to each issue that the GNSO is addressing.

So along the way with that, we're building up orientation materials. We have more diagrams and things that are understandable for explaining how the GNSO works than we have had in the past. It is actually a little bit difficult to

accumulate these because the whole point of outreach is to adopt these so that an outsider can understand them.

Most of the discussion at ICANN, we're so accustomed to talking to one another that it is hard to get people to agree on the accuracy of items that are going to newcomers. So my one plea to this group is if you can help us when we're trying to do things for newcomers to put on the mental framework of a newcomer, instead of getting all deep into, you know, is it gonna be called a constituency or is it gonna be called an interest group? You know, things that people don't care about until they get involved. We're trying to do things that are simple and clear.

And I have a note here from (Rob) that reminds me, I didn't even have this on my list, but I should have, I hope some of you are familiar with the podcasts that we launched in February. If you're not familiar with a podcast, it's somewhat like a radio show, but you receive it on our MP3 playing device.

So it could be your computer, or if you have an iPhone or a Zune, or whatever you like to listen to MP3 files on, that's what the podcast plays on. The podcast is called ICANN Start, because it's specifically geared to help people who are new to the world of ICANN to take one issue and get enough of a basic orientation on it that they can participate with some context when they start listening in on given issues.

So hopefully you are familiar with the new E-Learning page on the ICANN Web site. If you're not, you simply go to icann.org and you'll see a new tab that was never there before. It says E-Learning, and if you click on that you can quickly find your way to Webinars and audio briefings and the podcast.

We have - we're doing an episode a month of the podcast and we now have five of them out there. The one that has been downloaded the most is the one episode about (IRTP). For some reason people wanna know about that. And since we launched we have been averaging about 1000 downloads a month,

so there's definitely appetite within the ICANN community for these nice, basic orientation materials.

Are there questions or comments on what I've offered so far?

Rafik Dammak: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, Rafik, you wanna comment?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, also, thank you to Scott for the presentation, but I just have one concern about (unintelligible) specific (unintelligible) also towards (non-commercial) (activities)?

And for example (unintelligible). I'm not sure that - what is the idea behind that to (unintelligible) network security? It doesn't seem that (unintelligible) issues?

So maybe it should work more about that.

Olga Cavalli: Scott?

Scott Pinzon: I'm sorry, I had difficulty understanding. I'm not, I don't...I'm sorry but I don't know what the point...

Olga Cavalli: You had difficulty in hearing Rafik?

Scott Pinzon: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Briefly, so, about the presentation, I didn't see what the specific outreach (unintelligible) and also outreach non-commercial organization or people. And also I'm not sure that (unintelligible) because as far as I know (unintelligible) issues so...

Olga Cavalli: Scott, could you hear the comment from Rafik?

Scott Pinzon: I think I got some of it. It sounds like there was a plea for greater outreach to developing countries and non-commercial users.

The global partnerships aspect of the staff, of course, is dedicated to those kinds of outreach, and also the materials that we provided so far are intended to be for anyone, so...

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible). Really I'm not sure that the global partnership is for developing countries. Even for developing countries, they don't have time to outreach outside the (specificity or other) structure so and that's why I know they (unintelligible) they don't have the time and the opportunity to outreach outside the communities.

So I am still concerned about the specific (and maybe so) in this working group we can work more about developing countries but also non-commercial, also commercial organizations in developing countries or even in developed countries.

Scott Pinzon: Yes, we certainly share your heartbeat on that, and based on whatever recommendations this group comes up with, we'd be happy to support that direction. And I'm intrigued to see what the new VP of corporate communications will come up with, given that (Rod) has specifically asked her to bring greater diversity to ICANN.

To me that speaks of the same groups that you're referring to. So hopefully more, better things to come, and we're happy to follow your guidance on it, too.

Olga Cavalli: Are there any questions for Scott? I have a comment to make. Scott, thank you, very much, for joining us, and I really want to commend ICANN for all

the effort that you're doing for communicating and outreach. But I do agree with Rafik that in developing countries, there's a lot to do.

I want to speak for my region, which is Latin America; it's a nice example, not nice, but nice clear example, in the people that have submitted statement of interest for non-com this year, you have more than 80 from all over the world and only seven are from Latin America.

As I see, mainly all the effort in our region are focused on (CCTLD)'s, which is fine, I'm not saying that it shouldn't be done, but there are many other sectors of the Internet of interest and as people involved in the internet that should be reached, and I think that our work should maybe focus more on other social groups, non-commercial groups, or commercial groups which are not involved at all, or don't have an idea of what ICANN does.

As a university teacher, I can tell you that I speak a lot at ICANN and what we do and all the working groups and all that with my students, but it's not enough. In all the universities, at least in our region, the technical issues or legal issues, there is no idea of the relevance of ICANN as a quality body and as coordinator of the Internet as a whole.

So I think this is an excellent opportunity to do things for our region, but I want to commend ICANN for all the work that has been done so far. That's my comment.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you very much, Olga. Your point is very well received.

One place that you could help us help you is that, often, when I take such materials as we develop and try to get them translated into Spanish, Portuguese, and French, for that matter, you know, the other languages, often budget issues are cited and there seems to be a reluctance to get a lot of these translated.

If this group could come out with another ringing call for greater translation of materials, that would help us get a mandate that we can say, look, it came from the bottom up, this is what the community wants, we need to make this priority.

Currently, I have a plan to get the existing podcasts re-recorded in Spanish and French at the Brussels meeting, and the plan is in jeopardy right now because ICANN's budget may not allow everyone who would like to be at the meeting to attend it.

So if we can get a call from this group for greater effort on, not only outreach, but outreach in languages other than English, I think that would help me get the kind of mandate that I could push back when people tell me that that's not a budget priority.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I do agree that languages are a big barrier for many people.

Okay. We will take your comment. Although, I must say, also that from the day I started getting involved in ICANN until today, there has been a lot of improvement in relation with having documents translated into other languages, so I wouldn't be honest if I said that - if I don't recognize that a lot of effort has been done also, but there is a lot to do.

Scott Pinzon: Yes, thank you, for saying that. I agree with you, and even though we have done a lot, we can always improve, so it's our pleasure to try and support your efforts.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, any other comments or questions to Scott?

Robert Hoggarth: Olga, this is (Rob), if I can be in the queue.

Olga Cavalli: Sure, (Rob), go ahead.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you. I think one of the important elements that this work team can be discussing in terms of making recommendations that I think would be extremely helpful is to talk about creating some clarity in terms of roles and expectations.

I think Scott has done a very good job, and has some tremendous professional capabilities, skills and talents in helping us to develop some of these new tools, and in helping to draft up documents that talk about ICANN and some of its more complicated aspects in plain language.

I think one of the challenges we have beyond that, as a staff, however, is to sort of really clarify what do community members or what does the GNSO expect from the ICANN staff in terms of outreach? What does the work team think is the role of the constituencies or the stakeholder groups? And what may be the roles of just other volunteers? So that we have some clarity and build some synergies in terms of expectations and leveraging the various resources, because I think that we have, over the last year and a half, felt somewhat challenged as staff when we do do outreach, we get feedback from some members of the community telling us that it's not our job, and then others come and say that you're not producing enough.

And so I think that if this work team can get some consensus around what the staff role is, what the role of the individual stakeholder groups and constituencies are, that would be extremely helpful.

Debra Hughes: Hey, Olga, this is (Debbie), can I get in the queue?

Olga Cavalli: Sure, (Debbie), go ahead. And by the way, let me tell you that we have set up a working team that (Debbie) is leading and I'm very glad that she is in the call and she can make her comments, but she's done a great job. She has drafted the first document and we are all contributing to it.

So, go ahead, (Debbie).

Debra Hughes: Thanks. I would - two questions. Thanks, (Rob), for your feedback, that's really helpful because it kind of relates to the question that I've been wanting to ask.

I think, in our last call, the group had wanted to get some clarity around the level of detail that the OSC was looking for for this deliverable. I mean, this task was a little bit more elusive, I guess, to kind of wrap your hands around than the previous task.

And so, two questions, one; were we able to get any clarity at all about what type of deliverable in the level of detail that we were looking for? And I guess the second point is; well I guess I'm saying I've got an answer because I heard a lot of what (Rob) was saying; I think that might help me from a directional standpoint on where to go next.

But I was just wondering, Julie or Olga, have we heard anything back from them?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie, I can address that.

Olga Cavalli: Sure, go ahead, Julie, yes.

Julie Hedlund: So actually, I sent around to the work team, and I'm sorry if some of you didn't see it, I'll send it around again. Two things; first of all, I had looked very carefully at the BGC work groups support, with respect to the recommendations relating to outreach, and I provided to the team, and I'll send it around again, the direct quotes from the report, I think that provide some more detail concerning the task two, the outreach recommendations.

And, as I noted in my email, the recommendations are fairly broad and, I think, provide a good deal of leeway for this work team to decide, based on the BGC recommendations, what types of specific activities you might want to

recommend. And when I did send that around, Chuck Gomes commented on that and also on the question that was raised last week with respect the OSC providing guidance, and his comment to the list was that the OSC would simply direct the work team to the BGC work group's report.

The OSC doesn't have additional guidance to add beyond that which is in the report. So again, I think that gives us a really broad mandate to this team to devise, you know, specific recommendations for activities within the guidelines provided by the report.

And in that respect, I would just add that I hope that the overview that Scott has provided of some outreach activities in, that are happening now, might give the work team some ideas as far as what activities they might want to recommend to continue, if there should be specific recommendations relating to translations. And as Rafik and Olga have point out, more specific recommendations for activities related to reaching out to developing countries and non-commercial groups and users.

Debra Hughes: Thanks, Julie, and I did see your email, I was just - thank you for the clarification, I wasn't sure if there was any other communications that I wasn't aware of. But I did receive that email and review it and I just wanted to know if anybody else had heard anything else?

I mean, the report is what it is, and it speaks to that and I've read that, I was just wondering, you know, what their intent was behind some of the stuff. But I guess what I'm hearing is that this group has the possibility to be as detailed or not detailed as it chooses to be.

Robert Hoggarth: This is (Rob). Yes, I think there's a real opportunity for influence and leadership here because this is an area that many people in the community are interested in, but nobody really has the complete picture.

And even as you heard from Scott, from the CEO level there's a real desire for outreach, but what does that mean, and who does it, and how do we accomplish that in the best way to ensure that we're really reaching out to those communities, like Rafik and Olga are mentioning, have been underserved or under-communicated to over the years?

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, (Rob).

Any other comments?

Thank you, (Debbie).

Claudio Di Gangi: Olga, this is Claudio.

Olga Cavalli: Claudio, go ahead.

Claudio Di Gangi: I just had a brief comment. Thanks, Scott, for joining us.

In terms of the Web site, I think something that would be helpful, and maybe we can include this in our recommendation, participation page that basically, I guess, sort of consolidates the different elements on one page so you could have maybe like, a link to the ICANN newsletter, the policy page of the ICANN Web site, different ways for people to get involved like the nominating committee page could be linked there.

But I think it would just be helpful is you came to the ICANN Web site, that there is just a specific page or section dedicated to participation that people could go to and it would sort of give a higher level overview of the different ways they can get involved.

So that was just my thought about the Web site. And I also, you were talking about the continuing education requirements, and that, to me, I think, could - I'm just a little concerned there, like how far that would go and if that's sort of

- if there's some sort mission creep a little there and just how that sort of fits into ICANN's overall mission and the objectives, I guess, that ICANN is sort of focused on achieving.

I guess my question there is, is that program intended to be an outreach program? And I'm just trying to understand how that program is getting developed.

Scott Pinzon: This is Scott. I'd be happy to respond to that.

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry to interrupt, I'm sorry. This is Julie. I do have to get on another call that starts right at 10, so Olga, I will follow up with the end of this conversation to make sure I've caught everything, but I think I have caught this conversation thus far and I can follow up on the MP3.

Thank you, everyone.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Julie. Thank you, very much. Have a nice weekend.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you!

Olga Cavalli: Bye-bye.

Scott Pinzon: May I...

Claudio Di Gangi: You're still on the hook, Scott.

Scott Pinzon: Okay. Claudio, thanks for your comment. The distance of this program is really sort of random and reflects my background before I came to ICANN; I was involved with network security for about nine years.

And it's not intended to suggest any particular emphasis, but I had noted in my journey to ICANN that, in the whole world of information technologies, as

we call it in the US, I guess not in other countries, you know it more as (ICT), ICANN is largely absent from the discussions.

So, in my mind, this is an outreach move, in the sense that I would think that people who run computer networks, whether it's in a non-profit organization or a commercial business, or wherever, should be very interested in what ICANN is doing, since the DNS and IP addressing affect virtually everything they do. And most of them are unaware that ICANN would like their involvement.

So this was an attempt on my part to give people who are not, don't really have ICANN on their radar, a reason to come take a look and see if there's some way that they can contribute.

As I mentioned, the CISSP program has gone all around the world, and it includes lots of adherents in Asia and India, so it's not a US thing, for example, even though it's a US company that does the certifying. So, I see some potential there, but it is not meant to be any major deal, yes.

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes, I'm sorry, I guess I should have clarified. I think more on sort of ICANN's core function. Like from the technical standpoint that you're talking about, it makes more sense to me. You know, I guess it was just - if it starts broadening out into other areas, I could just see it getting a little messier, but the way you described it there makes sense to me. Olga, I actually have to drop off the call, so...

Olga Cavalli: Yes, me too. Thank you, Claudio, for your comments. Thank you, very much, Scott for joining. I don't know if there are other comments, but we are a little bit past the hour.

Rafik, you wanna comment?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, just because Scott was talking again about the information security and also about (network) and system network, etc. And I think that he's talking more about technical community and those people who may be interested by the Internet issues, just I think maybe (unintelligible) starts I think that it's not - shouldn't be the point itself (unintelligible) but to (outreach) other community and I think that even in our documents we say that we should have more joint activities or (initiative supporting) organization like (unintelligible) and also the (unintelligible) etc., If you want to outreach those technical communities. So but anyway, good job, with that.

Robert Hoggarth: Olga, this is (Rob), I know that you all have to sign off. This is such an important and necessary area that I'm sure that you can flesh out other things by email, as well, between your calls.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Thank you, (Rob) and thank you, Rafik. Thank you, Scott. Thank you, (Debbie) and Claudio. And I think it's a very important issue.

I'm very much interested in contributing from my experience, for my region. I think Rafik has the same vision from Africa and now he lives in Asia. So (Debbie) is leading very well, this working team, so I hope that we can produce a useful document for the whole community and for the GNSO.

We don't have much time now, but I encourage you to exchange some ideas in the list and we have a document to revise, and (Debbie)...

Debra Hughes: Yes, so...

Olga Cavalli: ...(Debbie), perhaps we can speak in the list how do you want to go about some next steps for Task Two?

Debra Hughes: Absolutely. What I'll do for the weekend is try to take some of the ideas that I've been hearing and try to update the document. And then maybe Monday through Thursday we can exchange some ideas.

Olga Cavalli: Excellent, excellent. And talk to you next Friday. Have a nice week, and thank you, very much, for joining us. Sorry for being a little bit late, but I think it was worth it.

Woman: Thank you everybody.

Man: Thank you. Let me know.

Olga Cavalli: Bye-bye.

Man: Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Bye-bye.

Gisella Gruber-White: Bye-bye. Thank you, (Louise), enjoy the rest of your day, and have a great weekend.

(Louise): Thanks Gisella, you too, bye-bye.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thanks. Bye.

END