Charter Drafting Team for the Outreach Task Force (OTF-DT)
TRANSCRIPT
Friday 14 October 2011 at 1400 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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.
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-otf-2011114-en.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#oct (transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees
Carlos Aguirre – NCA
Roy Dykes – NeuStar
Olga Cavalli – NCA, Chair
Debra Hughes – NCSG, alternate Chair
Anthony Harris

ICANN Staff
Julie Hedlund
Glen de Saint Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

No apology received

Coordinator: Excuse me. This is the operator.

                      Just need to inform all participants that today's conference is being recorded.

                      If you have any objections, you may disconnect your lines at this time.

                      And you may begin.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you Julie. Thank you (Carlos) and (Roy) for joining today. And also thanks (Natalie) for being there.

We are going to review the comments sent by (Chuck), which as far as we know are the only ones we have received to our draft charter. And I did review it yesterday night and I already sent some comments about the different items that he is pointing. So let's go one by one.

First, there is a difference that he stressed among strategy and -- which is the other one -- tactics. I must confess I cannot tell the difference, being a Spanish-speaking person.

And so perhaps Julie, (Roy), you could -- I don't know, (Carlos), if you have the same feeling, but perhaps you guys that do speak English as your mother tongue could help us with that.

I think that perhaps he is right, but I cannot tell the different.

(Carlos):   Yes, it's the same for me.

Julie Hedlund: And (Roy), what do you think?

(Roy):   So - this is (Roy) speaking.

I think where he's referring here is to - is just to make sure that we have the overall purpose of the taskforce, as well as the steps of what we want - the steps of what to actually do to implement them, right?

So overall plan plus operation plan. Does it make sense?

Olga Cavalli: And which are the changes to the text that you would suggest that we could do?

(Roy):   Oh.

Olga Cavalli: I think that if he - if he is right and you think that he is proposing a right change, let's do that. But I cannot tell how.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. (unintelligible).

(Debbie):   Hi, this is (Debbie). Just wanted to tell you I joined.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Hi (Debbie). Thanks so much.

(Debbie):   Oh, hello.

Olga Cavalli: (Debbie), how are you?

(Debbie):   Hi.

Julie Hedlund: We just - (Debbie), we just started on looking at (Roy) - I'm sorry, (Chuck)'s comments.

                 And Olga had had, you know, sort of appended some comments to them and I've put them in the Adobe connect room.

(Debbie):   I see.

Julie Hedlund: And the first one was, (Chuck) meant -- about where we talk about strategy, but, you know, that we should also talk about tactics -- tactics being the implementation of the strategy.

                 You know, and, you know, and, you know, (Roy) was saying too that, you know, there's sort of that, you know, where we talk about a strategy, but, you know, we - do we need to make it more clear that we're also talking about through the, you know, operationalizing or implementing that strategy.

And I'll go with asking where we would make a change in the text? And I'm just kind of looking at the text here, to think about that.

Olga Cavalli: I...

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

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Well, go right ahead, because it's...

Olga Cavalli: Sure, go ahead.

(Debbie): Okay, so this is (Debbie).

And this is a issue that's near and dear to my heart if you may remember, Julie and Olga. When we started, remember we were very detailed about some of those specifics that we wanted to recommend.

And then what we decided to do was to kind of step back away from being very specific about specific...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(Debbie): ...deliverables, right?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(Debbie): And so I -- while I encourage and generally support the idea that you don't want to say you'd like to form a group that's going to do global outreach and just kind of leave it to them to figure out how we're going to actually implement that strategy.

I fully support that. I'm now just wondering - it seems like we're kind of coming back around where we were in the beginning, which is good news for me.

I just now don't know how detailed we should be and what kind of tactics do we want to be specific about? So (Roy), just to kind of give you some backdrop -- you know, we had outlined some real specific things about ways to execute the strategy.

And so I'm trying to get a sense from the feedback you're getting, what level of detail from an implementation perspective are we talking about, because as I view the word tactics, I completely understand what you're saying.

So if the - if the - and I think I understand -- let me just say that -- that when we talk about a strategy, the strategy is to outreach -- then how do we implement that strategy and the tactics aligned with certain objectives?

So you should do this type of program, you should have this type of outreach document, you should have this type of advertising vehicle. I understand that. I guess I would love to hear what your group was thinking about from a level of specificity.

(Roy):   Yes.

                And I would be completely speaking on (Chuck)'s behalf if I - if I tried to answer that, because it - so the short answer is, I'm not sure.

(Debbie):   Yes.

                I mean...

Julie Hedlund: So this is Julie.

I'm looking again at (Chuck)'s comment and I'm wondering if he's not necessarily asking for a lot of detail, but asking for us to include not only the term strategy, where we say that we're developing an executable strategy, but also a strategy and tactics or strategy and implementation plan, perhaps?

I mean, I - the term I'm kind of more familiar with rather than tactics is, you know, an implementation plan -- like he says, "Tactics for implementation of the strategy," so I don't really know, you know, I don't quite understand the distinction there.

But (Carlos), I see you have your hand up. Go ahead.

(Carlos): Yes. Thank you.

I think the (Chuck) comments - I think they're - (Chuck) - to really more precisely, but when you are - or try to be exquisite in the language, I think it's - there are more possibilities to complicate the meaning of the charter.

I have no - my - I didn't make comments, because for me, the charter is very clear what is the intention of the working group. So - and some things - some comments made by (Chuck) are interesting, but I - and some others are redundant in my - in my point of view.

Olga Cavalli: But can I ask you -- this difference he stressed in between strategy and tactics -- perhaps we can do some changes in the text and maybe he likes it better and we are okay with that.

That was my first intention of the question.

Julie Hedlund: See, and I was -- this is Julie.

I was thinking what he was suggesting is that every place where we say global outreach strategy, we append tactics, you know, and tactics, So the GNSO global outreach strategy and tactics address gaps in outreach.

That was all. I was really sort of looking at his statement as just being, well, you know, we're not really talking about a strategy, we're also talking about kind of how we want to do, you know, you know, we'll be wanting to talk about how we - the group will be coming up with ways to implement the strategy -- I mean the taskforce will.

We don't have to put, I don't think, all of those details in the charter, because that's part of what this group is going to be doing. Although we do have, I think, quite a few details as far as, you know, what we're going to do in our objectives, you know, and all of our goals.

And we have deliverables and timeframes, so it's fairly detailed. So I thought what he was getting at -- and I could be wrong -- was just every place that we say, "Strategy," we also say, "And tactics."

(Carlos):   I...

Olga Cavalli: I can see...

(Carlos):   But people are going to think - if we're...

Olga Cavalli: ...a big difference.

                Yes, (Carlos). Sorry.
(Carlos):   No.

                Just a little comments. I think when (Chuck) say, "Tactics," I think he want to say, "Implementation."

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that was my - this is Julie.

That - (Carlos), I agree. I mean, that - that's the word I would sort of would gravitate to. That makes (unintelligible), because there you've got a strategy and then you've got an implementation plan.

Those are sort of the two - the two key pieces.

Olga Cavalli: And tactics is more the - oriented to implementation?

That - that's...

Julie Hedlund: I mean, I think of tactics as ways to implement something.

You know, if you had an implementation plan, a tactic could be, you know - you know, I'm sorry. I'm not - I don't - I'm not coming up with any good examples.

I - and (Roy), what do you think?

(Roy): No, I agree. I agree.

I don't - I don't know that -- to respond to this particular comment -- that there's a lot of changes that need to be done to the charter. It - and I think - I think it will cut - I think we're getting into the boundary between what goes in the charter and what the team actually does, right?

What the - what the taskforce actually does, because the taskforce will be developing tactics and will be running with and implementing those tactics.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, (Roy). This is Julie.

And I think that's maybe what he - what, you know, what (Chuck)'s point was, is that the -- in addition to developing a strategy -- the outreach -- there will

also be a strategy and implementation plan -- that there's sort of two pieces to that.

So a simple change would be to simply add 'and implementation plan' wherever we talk about strategy.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I think that's a good idea.

What do others think?

(Debbie): Hi, Olga. This is (Debbie).

Olga Cavalli: (Debbie).

(Debbie): And I agree and I think (Chuck) is so experienced with how to get...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(Debbie): ...things done within ICANN.

I really defer to him on this point. I mean, I think he's raising really good points and so I want to make sure that the charter we create is going to, you know, give enough guidance and - so that it can actually be implemented throughout the community.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Julie, would you help us doing those changes?

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

What I'll do after this meeting -- this is Julie -- is I'll produce a redline document and probably just give everyone a few days to look at it and then -

and then perhaps what we could do is send that redline document to (Chuck) to look at to see if we've - to see if we've addressed to his questions.

(Roy), do you think that would be an appropriate way forward to deal with (Chuck)'s comments?

(Roy): I think so. Yes.

The only other thing to keep in mind is -- and I know it's all on the top of our minds -- is Dakar, because I'm pretty sure he'll be going to that.

So...

Julie Hedlund: Right.

And well, and see...

(Roy): Just pretty much turnaround.

Julie Hedlund: ...I was actually thinking that if we - if we get -- depending on, you know, (Chuck)'s usually quite responsive.

(Roy): Right.

Julie Hedlund: ...so if we get...

(Roy): Right. Okay.

Julie Hedlund: You know, if he comes back to us and says, "Yes, I think," you know, "You've answered my questions," or, "No," or whatever, you know, I mean, the next step would be to produce a new document for the council to consider.

Ideally, if we can meet the document deadline, which I'm not positive we can, but, you know, would be to have it on the agenda in Dakar.

(Roy): Yes.

Julie Hedlund: So we'll see, because I think the document deadline is - well, I know the motion deadline is the - is Tuesday.

But I think - I'll have to check - I'll have to check with Glen, because I think there's maybe more flexibility to have things be able to be added to the agenda later than that.

But I'll check on that.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, I didn't follow that part.
So what was (Roy) talking about? The...

Julie Hedlund: Well, it's just that...

Olga Cavalli: Reviewing the document in the GNSO?

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

If we can - if we can get - if we could get a quick response from (Chuck), you know, conceivably we could produce another version of the charter with his changes for the council to consider in Dakar.

But my only concern is I don't know what the deadline is for, you know, getting it on the agenda. You know, getting the documents out there, because usually there needs to be a bit of time, you know, for people to be able to review documents before the meeting.

Olga Cavalli: Right. Yes.

Well, you can check that with Glen. And in the meantime, we do the changes.

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

I think we just proceed as we can and make, you know, make (Sue) a redline version, check it by (Chuck) and see what he thinks and then - and then take it from there.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Julie Hedlund: So moving on -- this is Julie -- moving on to his next comment. He's looking at the - at the scope section and querying some of the language.

So if he thinks the intent is good, but the beginning seems awkwardly worded. It says - and the way it reads in the document is, "The OTF's operational plans and activities should further a valid cost-saving and useful purpose," et cetera.

His concern is with the word 'further' being used as a verb. He says that that implies that there's already an outreach purpose. Is the purpose that is the focus or a plan that should be furthered - I think I understand what he's getting at.

It's - it isn't ideally worded, I don't think. Let me just add it again.

The OTF's operational plans and activities - I think it - the word we're probably looking for there rather than further is like, it - to promote, perhaps.

And - but promoting a purpose. I think his point is that, you know, how do you promote a valid cost-saving and useful purpose? Purpose is, you know, (Roy), what do you think?

I'm trying to see it if I can get to what he's - what's...

Olga Cavalli: And you see, this is too much for my English.

Julie Hedlund: I know, it's...

Olga Cavalli: Too refined.

Julie Hedlund: Well, and it's - and I have to say that because it is - and I -- and this is probably my wording, because it isn't worded as well as it could be -- it is confusing. He's right.

I mean, I could - I would suggest that it could be worded like this, "The OTF's operational plans and activities" - let's see.

You know, I would even just take out, "Should further a valid cost-saving useful purpose," and say just, "The OTF's operational plans and activities should one, consolidate human and financial resource...

(Roy):   Yes.

Julie Hedlund: ...to; two, create efficiency; three, produce an executable strategy and implementation plan."

And (unintelligible).

(Roy):   Yes, you couldn't (unintelligible) than I did, Julie. I think that's it.

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

I mean, it...

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I like it. Yes.

Julie Hedlund: ...further a valid, cost-saving (unintelligible)...

(Debbie):   Yes. That sounds good.

Julie Hedlund: That's just confusing.

Olga Cavalli: Right.

Julie Hedlund: That's what I'll do.

Olga Cavalli: Glen is saying that the document deadline for the council meeting in Dakar is 18th of October -- next Tuesday.

Julie Hedlund: It is Tuesday. Yes.

                   So that might be - that's...

Olga Cavalli: Because we only have to talk with (Chuck)...

Julie Hedlund: Right.

Olga Cavalli: ...and see if he likes the changes.

                   Maybe (Roy), you can help us with that and...

Julie Hedlund: Well and I - what I can do is I could just - this is Julie.

                   I could go ahead and, you know, just - if we agree - if we're agreeing to the changes here today and, you know, they seem to be - if they end up being pretty straightforward, I could just go ahead and send the document today to (Chuck), copying all of the rest of you.

I mean, I know (Chuck) really well. But it could also just come from you, (Roy), if you would prefer sending the document to (Chuck) and then ask if he might be able to, you know, give us a response by, say, you know, COB Monday or something like that.

(Roy): Either way.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Roy): I'll tell you what I'm doing right now.

I actually just now saw an email come through from (Chuck) on another matter. So while we're on - while we're doing this review, let me send him a quick email and see if he responds, since he appears to be online.

Julie Hedlund: Oh, good. That's excellent.

Thank you, (Roy).

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Julie Hedlund: And here, (Carlos) has made a comment on maybe we can say when we talk about scope, "Give more efficiency and effectively - and effectiveness to the purpose."

I like that, too. I'll try to work that in.

I think - I think that what we were trying to achieve with that wording, you know, which we can certainly correct, was, you know, to bring in the idea of the efficiency and the effectiveness of the, you know, of what, you know, what the OTF's operational plans and activities are.

So - and this I think maybe relates to (Chuck)'s next comment, as well. He says, "Also, I can understand that cost-effective tactics are very important, but it's hard for me to imagine how additional outreach an be cost-saving. I think it will involve added cost. But if it is to happen, tactics will need to be cost-effective."

I - and that - I think that gets to your point too, (Carlos).

(Carlos): No.

My point is when we say, "Efficiency and effectiveness," we are saying all the other words. So for me, it's a - it's a - it's a complete sentence -- no need more.

So that is my humble opinion.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you, (Carlos).

So I'm just looking at the charter with also - I think - let's see. Just trying to look at what (Chuck) is - says. It - let's see. "I understand that cost-effective tactics are very important - hard to" - okay, so I think he's going back to the first part of that.

Let's see -- create efficiency, avoid duplication of effort. I don't see where it - that exact language that he mentions is in our document. I'll have to look a little bit more closely.

And when I'm looking at scope, I don't see - in his comment he says, "I can understand that cost-effective tactics are important." Where is he picking that up from?

Creating efficiency. Let me just - I'm just trying to see if I can find where he's looking at in the text.

Yes. We don't actually use - I guess he's referring to his own comment, because we don't actually use the term 'cost-effective' in the document. So he must be...

Olga Cavalli: I think that this is kind of the idea that he's getting from the text.

Julie Hedlund: I think you're right.

Olga Cavalli: And I think what we - what we are intending to say is that we should be working effectively with any budget that we have for outreach.

                  I think this is the idea behind the - in the text that we have written. And we could...

Tony Harris: Excuse me. Tony Harris joining.

                  Sorry I'm late.

Julie Hedlund: Tony. Welcome.

Olga Cavalli: Tony, how are you?

(Roy):   Hi Tony.

Julie Hedlund: So we're just going - we're making our way through (Chuck)'s comments and we're kind of - we're at the part where he had commented on the scope.

                  And we're suggesting some sort of cleaner language for that section, because he's right. There was some - it was - it was confusing the way it was written.

And then he's got a further comment to that. He talks about how, you know, it's important to, you know, have cost-effective tactics, but he notes that it - he - it's hard for him to imagine how additional outreach can be cost-saving.

But although it will add, you know, it'll involve added costs, the tactics will need to be cost-effective. So - and (Carlos) was saying too that we could - we could put in language that emphasizes the efficiency and effectiveness of the effort.

So this is in the scope and I was going to suggest some, you know, some words schmoosing in there to simplify and clarify that language.

Tony Harris: Thanks, Julie.

I did read these comments. And I respect (Chuck) for his great experience with these things, so I was giving it some thought myself, too.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

So do we want to move to his next comment, which is on section three and the membership criteria?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(Roy):   Excuse me, Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yes.
                 Please go ahead, (Roy).

(Roy):   Okay.

Just got email back from (Chuck). He said he should be able to. Is it - I asked him if we got him updated language today, would he be able to turn around by end of day Monday and he said he should be able to.

Julie Hedlund: Oh, that's excellent.

(Roy):   Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much for that.

(Roy):   Sure.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, good.

Well then - so on the next one, he - it - (Chuck) is saying a Steering committee makes sense if there are lots of members of the taskforce, but I would not assume there will be.

There are a small number of volunteers -- under ten -- a Steering committee may not add much value.

And I think that - when I read this comment, I thought that maybe we didn't make it clear enough in the charter that we were expecting the taskforce itself to be fairly large.

I think we have some text in there where we talk about that it would be at least 50 members.

Olga Cavalli: My idea, Julie, is that the taskforce was quite small and dynamic and then have kind of an Advisor committee, which could be large -- large enough to have people from different regions and from different participation spaces in each region.

I mean universities, NGOs, government -- people that it's not deeply involved in ICANN, but could be a reference for outreach. And that is a larger number and that doesn't necessarily need people to be in conference calls or working with the taskforce.

That was at least the idea that we had when we discussed this. I don't know if (Debbie) or - (Debbie) that was in previous stages of this document. Perhaps she can - she can add some comment about it.

This was - this my understanding.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie.

It actually is in the charter. We talk about the taskforce as a whole being broad. And so the OTF members - we say, "The Steering committee would recruit OTF members from each ICANN region with the goal that the OTF includes seven members from each of the five ICANN geographical regions, for a total of 35 regional members 47 total OTF members."

"Although there is no limit on a size of the OTF, the goal would be to maintain no more members than are necessary to ensure that there is broad participation," et cetera.
So we do talk about at least 47 members of the OTF as a whole. And I'm just wondering if maybe we don't - we need to make that more clear upfront that we do think it's a fairly good-sized group and that's why we're suggesting a Steering committee.

Olga Cavalli: About the Steering committee, my example for the Steering committee was the multi-stakeholder Advisory group for the IGF.

We are about 50 people from all over the world and from - in each - in each region, we are from different stakeholder groups.

Julie Hedlund: Right, and that's...

Olga Cavalli: But we...

Julie Hedlund: ...roughly what we say.

Olga Cavalli: But we - but we are not the - we are not the core - the core group that works in the IGF, which is five people.

                  And they do all the - all the operational work, but what we do is, we work in the agenda, we work in the main issues of the agenda, we do outreach and we're doing regional - some regional activity.

                  So that was my - and it has been working very well for seven years so far. So being - having that experience -- and it's extremely - it's not costly, because we work online.

                  And that was my idea, because - based on that experience.

Julie Hedlund: And Olga, this is Julie.

                  I think that's what we've captured in the charter. But I don't know if it's clear, because (Chuck) was suggesting that the OTF as a whole -- he would expect them to be small and so there wouldn't be a need for a Steering committee.

(Carlos):   Right.

Julie Hedlund: I'm just wondering if we need to make it clearer that we have a Steering committee because we're expecting a fairly broad group of volunteers for the OTF as a whole.

                  (Roy), what do you - do you think I'm characterizing (Chuck)'s comments correctly?

(Roy):   I think so.

                 We should have said somewhere and I apologize -- it's escaping me right
                 now. Or maybe we had said it in the meeting but didn't put it in the
                 documentation -- something about like a cap of 50?

Julie Hedlund: Well we didn't put a cap in there, actually. What we - we were debating about
                 that.

(Roy):   Right.

Olga Cavalli: Right.

Julie Hedlund: But what we did say, though, is - what we say is, "Although there is no limit
                 on the size of the OTF, the goal should be to maintain no more members
                 than are necessary to ensure that there is broad participation, that there are
                 volunteers who are willing to provide their time and effort and that the size
                 does not hinder the ability to the OTF to complete its' work in a timely
                 fashion."

                 And prior to that, we talk about having seven members from each of the five
                 ICANN geographical regions for a total of 35 regional members and 47 total
                 OTF members. That is including the Steering committee, so 35 plus 12.

                 So we're sort of putting out there 47 total members as a starting point I think.

Man: Yes so if I go back to his comment.

(Carlos):   Hi, can you hear me?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, go ahead please (Carlos).

(Carlos): Sorry, another short comment. At the beginning I was in agreement with the charter. But after to read at this point - in this point, the (Chuck) comments. I think it's better to have a short steering committee.

And but I think it is needed to talk more about it. I'm not sure.

Olga Cavalli: I'm sorry, I didn't get your comment. You're not sure about what?

(Carlos): About 60 members or 10 members. I don't know what is better. I understand your position Olga.

Olga Cavalli: No it may seem...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: That I have, it's not that it should be followed. I mean it's working for the IGF. Perhaps we can refine it and make it smaller. Debby what do you think because you were in the process of doing this document?

Debra Hughes: I don't know. I go back and forth with this. I could go either way, to be frank.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. If we can refine the - that's my idea now, and see what you think. If the idea of copying the model of the IGF, if it's awkward, that's no problem with me. We can go smaller.

What I would avoid to have is only one person per region because that is very frequently seen in ICANN. And that is extremely bad. And I could give you thousands of examples. But I won't go through that in this call.

And at least I would say per region have two or three people because if not, it becomes the power of someone doing things and for a whole region. And that for Latin American happens very frequently. I don't know in other regions. You know (Carlos) what I mean.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: I think it's something that is different from what you're saying Olga. I think
                   (Chuck) is questioning the size of the steering committee.

Olga Cavalli: Yes okay.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, no the size of the OTF. So he's not questioning whether or not we
                   need to have fewer people from each region. He's questioning whether or not
                   we need to have 12 members in the steering committee. I think. What do you
                   think Roy?

Roy Dykes: This is Roy. I think he's - I think he is questioning the size of the OTF
                   because he's saying if your OTF is sufficiently small, then - and I think you
                   give the example, under ten, that only the steering committee is a sub-set of
                   ten people.

Julie Hedlund: Right. But see this is what I don't understand. And maybe I'm just being
                   obtuse. But we say in the charter that we're expecting to have at least 35
                   people in the OTF as a whole.

Roy Dykes: Right, right. And so I think there is a disconnect somewhere between - maybe
                   (Chuck) didn't see that part. Or I'm not sure. But...

Julie Hedlund: That's what made me wonder if maybe what we need to do is right when we
                   talk about the membership criteria, right at the top, talk about this committee
                   and the size and the OTF and the size right in that first paragraph because
                   you're right.

                   I mean we don't talk about the OTF as a whole until after we talk about the
                   steering committee. So, you know, and I don't know that we need to go into

the detail in that first sort of introductory paragraph under membership criteria.

We can then describe what, you know, we could say, you know, the OTF shall, you know, consist of a steering committee of 12 members and an advisory body of 35 members as described below, or something like that.

And the reason I think we've, you know, we struggled with the size of the steering committee and came up with 12 because, you know, because we thought it was important to have, you know, a representative from each of the stakeholder groups and constituencies. Because we really do want to make sure that we're not duplicating what they're doing in outreach.

You know, we wanted to have a chair and a vice chair. You know, we wanted to have a liaison from the GNSO Council. Now we could conceivably - the chair or the vice chair could be the liaison. So we could eliminate a position there.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: And but then we also wanted to have a liaison from, yes from ICANN who is someone involved in outreach. So we're not again duplicating what ICANN may already be doing with respect to outreach activities.

So just sort of counting this up, if we did - if we eliminated the liaison from the council and said that that person was, you know, a chair, you know, who is also a liaison to the council and a vice chair. So that's two.

And then let's see, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine at least and then, well it would be ten if you don't count the support staff. But - and so, you know, and actually really we typically don't count the support staff. So you could leave that off. Then I think we'd be at ten instead of 12. What do you guys think?

Olga Cavalli: I think that's good. But I would like to read it once you change it. But I think it's a good idea.

Julie Hedlund: I'll - what do others think?

Man: Sounds reasonable to me.

Roy Dykes: This is Roy. It sounds okay.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. And what I'll do is right after this meeting I'll send around the red lined version. But it basically what we do is I will put up front in the paragraph under membership criteria, the size of both the steering committee and the OTF, you know, as a whole.

                  And then note that, you know, and reference the description below. And then we'll go into this description of each, the steering committee. And I think what I'll do is I'll give them each a header too so it kind of makes it more clear.

                  Steering committee, and that would be ten members. We'll make the chair who is liaison to the GNSO Council and the vice chair we'll take out. Then we don't have a liaison position. And we eliminate the support staff position since that's really just assumed.

                  And in fact, you know, I can put somewhere in the first paragraph, you know, staff support provided or something. I mean that's sort of a given.

                  And so then when, you know, and then I can say further down, you know, the OTF as a whole should be comprised and so on. So that - maybe that will call it out a little bit clearer that we're talking about sort of two different things.

                  And when we send that back to (Chuck) I can - and what I'll do is I'll propose - when I send this to all of you I'll propose a draft response to (Chuck). And

basically I think this one is something that we want to maybe call out. And say, you know, here's how we've, you know, we do think that this is going to be a larger body of at least, you know, 40, you know, I guess it would be 45 since we're down to ten, 45 people.

You know, and so we do think that there is a need for a steering committee. And that that's a, you know, and that's based on, you know, experience that, you know.

Olga, the group that you have experience with that's arranged that way, what are they called again?

Olga Cavalli: (Unintelligible) stakeholder advisory group for the IGF. It's called the MAG - M-A-G. What we do is the agenda of the Internet governance forum. And we are advisors of the Secretary General of the United Nations. We have never seen him. But we are advisors of him.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. So I'll make that note too so he can see where we're - where we've pulled that structure from.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Julie Hedlund: Is that acceptable to everyone? (Carlos) what do you think?

(Carlos): I'm confused. I don't know. Really it's difficult to decide about this. I understand that the Olga experience, I don't know really.

Julie Hedlund: So you're suggesting maybe that we shouldn't have a steering committee? Or I am not sure I understand.

Olga Cavalli: So what's your proposal?

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

Olga Cavalli: Sure Tony. (Carlos) do you want to think about it and we hear Tony?

(Carlos):   Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, go ahead Tony.

Tony Harris: Well I'm sorry, I have been a little remiss in following this too closely due to a workload. But I do wonder when is a call going to go out for volunteers?

Julie Hedlund: So that's a good question. And I think I'm going to have to adjust the timeframes we have in this a little bit. What has to happen is first the charter has to be approved by the council.

                   And then once the - so the stage that we've been in so far Tony is just to see if the stakeholder groups or constituencies had any comments on the charter before we send it to the council for, excuse me, for approval.

                   And then once the council approves it, then we'd establish the chair, the vice chair and the steering committee. So there would be a volunteers call first for the steering committee composition and volunteers for chair and vice chair.

                   And then we would develop recruitment materials and a Webinar. And that would be part of the broader recruitment because one of the things we talked about on one of the calls was that in order to really get the right set of volunteers, there's going to be a certain amount of education that's going to happen.

                   You know, so that people, you know, really understand what this effort might be and how they can contribute. So we're kind of anticipating that the recruitment effort will take a little bit of time.

So there's really kind of two stages for volunteers. There's the call for those to be the chair, vice chair and steering committee. And then there's the, sort of the larger development of the call - a recruitment call for the sort of the broader group, the group of 35.

Tony Harris: Understand. So basically have no idea right now how many people would eventually volunteer.

Julie Hedlund: No.

Tony Harris: And hopefully there will be a lot. But - and perhaps the amounts we've mentioned, you know, so many people here, so many people there. I'm just wondering if that's actually going to happen.

Julie Hedlund: That's a good question. Olga what do you think?

Olga Cavalli: Well yes, it depends on how you consider volunteering. If we go into the ICANN regular atmosphere and community, maybe we don't get so many. But that's the challenge.

And that's the challenge with outreach, if we don't bring in more people that is in the boundary and is interested, but not inside the community. And that I cannot tell if we will get so many.

Perhaps what we could do is start this kind of two steps issue. At the beginning having a smaller one and perhaps revising that in the future. Having less volunteers at the beginning. And when the outreach efforts start to give their results, bring in more people.

Tony Harris: I agree with that because I think the problem is if we put in writing expectations as to the amounts of people who will be available for these tasks, it may just not - there may not be enough.

Olga Cavalli: I know.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Why don't we put a minimum number, say no less than.

Tony Harris: See that sounds probably a safer way to go so we can see what the interest is.

Olga Cavalli: Perhaps within time, if the outreach works that we can get more volunteers. So the mark of volunteers, and we are 50 all over the world. But that took a while.

                  And at the beginning it was more kind of controversial. Who is in there? And who is appointed and all that? And, you know, this is a process. It's not one-day thing.

                  So perhaps we can put a minimum, no less than, and keep it like that. And see what happens. And no less than should be a find number that it's not too large. And that doesn't bring a lot of expectations to have a lot of volunteers.

Tony Harris: Sounds like a good idea, yes.

Julie Hedlund: Oh so if I were to make that change, this is Julie. So looking at the section on the recruitment for the larger - for the OTF as a whole where we say the steering committee should use its best efforts to encourage and recruit potential OTF members from each ICANN region.

                  It's the goal that the OTF include no fewer than seven members from each of the five ICANN geographical regions, etcetera, etcetera, for a total of 35 regional members. And it would be then 45 total OTF members, including the steering committee. Is that what you had in mind?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Does that answer your point Tony?

Tony Harris: Yes, I think that's - I think it also answers (Chuck)'s concerns also in a certain measure.

Julie Hedlund: Good, well thank you very much. So moving on to the next comment, and I think that's a particularly good one is that (Chuck) notes the dates listed should be designed to fit with ICANN's budgeting cycle.

                  And it does - it's a very good point. I mean the - we'll need to make sure that there are funds identified in the FY '13 budget. And that really means I think that I need to add a step in the timeline deliverable process. And that would include staff, including a budget request. And that happens, really that should start right at the beginning of the year because I know we'll be kicking off the review of the budget framework I think into (CAR).

                  And I think by the beginning of the year, you know, the various SOs and ACs will need to put in, at least begin to put in their requests for budget items, you know, for consideration.

                  You know, which then of course is, you know, the budget requests are adopted - the budget is adopted in - at the meeting in June.

Olga Cavalli: I think the comment from (Chuck) is very good. And that we can adjust to - we can get this information. You can get that information and we can adjust the date.

Julie Hedlund: I'll put that in. I actually am quite familiar with it because I have to do the budget request.

Olga Cavalli: So I think that that's quite reasonable and very good comment, sorry.

Julie Hedlund: I'll adjust the timeline accordingly. And then he also says - so I'll do that with the budget, you know, the budget process. So I'll add that to the deliverables.

And then his next point on roles, function and duties, again he says he thinks that the steering committee of 12 is too large. It might be difficult to get more than 12 volunteers for the entire task force.

And he suggests designing the steering committee with more flexible criteria to be able to use it or not. And staff it or not according to the eventual task force size.

I think we've addressed that with respect to, you know, we've reduced the size of the steering committee to ten. But we've also noted that we're saying that we'll have at least 35.

Try to, you know, through our recruitment efforts, have at least 35 members. And, you know, beyond the steering committee itself for a total of 45 members with the steering committee. But what do others think?

Roy Dykes: This is Roy. I think yes, I'm sorry. This is Roy. I think that's a good goal. But to echo Tony's concern, the size of the eventual task force winds up being much smaller than that or, you know, a dozen or so, we should still be prepared to carry out the goals. But we just might have to - we have to adjust accordingly based on the person power that we have.

Julie Hedlund: Do you have a particular change in the document?

Roy Dykes: No.

Julie Hedlund: I think what his point is here too is that essentially, and I think this gets to what you were saying too Tony perhaps. Is that, you know, the steering

committee is predicated on the assumption that we will have a large task force as a whole, of at least 35 other people beyond the steering committee.

If we didn't get that many volunteers then what do we do? I mean do we need to have that big of a steering committee? Or does the steering committee in a way become the task force?

I mean if we have - and I don't really have an answer to that. I mean it's sort of a chicken and an egg question because we really don't know how many volunteers we'll have.

And so I think, you know, we don't know whether or not we'll need a steering committee. We're assuming we do. But what if we don't?

Tony Harris: But you could put in something to the - that says effectively, depending on the - on the size of the task force or the amount of volunteers that end up being a part of this, it may be necessary for efficiency purposes to then set up a steering committee.

Julie Hedlund: I see.

Tony Harris: So you're not saying we won't have a steering committee. You're just saying well let's see how many people are there. And if there's - obviously if there's 35 or 40 or whatever, handling all their opinions all the time is out of the question. You need a steering committee.

Julie Hedlund: Let me do some re - what do other think? I mean that's a - I could do some changes where, you know, we talk about our expectations. And then, you know, based on those expectations then there could be, you know, a need for a steering committee for efficiency.

In that case it would be comprised as follows. And that would just really be just like adding a sentence in before we talk about the steering committee and the group as a whole.

I think we'd probably then have to take out the - I think we'd have to really separate out first of all that the OTF would have a chair who is a liaison to the GNSO Council and a vice chair.

And not talk about that in terms of a steering committee. But say that those - and it would have a staff, you know, ICANN staff liaison because that would, you know, be something that we would definitely want to have.

And then we could talk about how we want to recruit for the OTF. And then, you know, with that assumption, you know, that there may be a need for a steering committee. And if so, this is how the steering committee would be, you know, would be comprised. Does that make sense?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, yes.

Roy Dykes: I think it does. This is Roy. I think it does because it leaves the language flexible.

Julie Hedlund: Then let me work on that. And I started making (unintelligible) document and...

Olga Cavalli: Sorry.

Julie Hedlund: And maybe that will address (Carlos)'s concern too about well are we absolutely sure we need a steering committee. Well we may not. If we don't have a lot of people, we may. If we do have a lot of people, we just don't really have the answer to that question until we get, you know, we recruit.

Okay so I'll make those changes and I'll send that around shortly. And then finally on status reporting, and I thought this was a good point, we may not always have to be on the council agenda each time.

And so, you know, that doesn't have to be an update as part of a council meeting. It could really even be just something that, you know, that - I can change that wording. Go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Yes that it's included in the agenda has some value because then it's kind of an obligation of the revision of the situation.

But it shouldn't be so tied to that. So more loose, more flexible. Perhaps you can change the wording with that.

Julie Hedlund: I will do that. And let's see, yes so it's where we say produce activity reports for GNSO at each GNSO Council meeting. We could just say produce activity reports.

I would say just say produce monthly activity reports for the GNSO Council. And not say that that has to be done (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Excuse me.

Julie Hedlund: Because I think it would be kind of up to the council to decide whether or not something in the activity report warrants an item on the agenda. So I can build in some flexibility there.

Olga Cavalli: Yes I think that we should be flexible. Could we in the council agenda, or not necessarily. But sometimes maybe that's not bad.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, any other thoughts? And let's see, (Carlos) was typing. If this number is short, the whole workgroup will be a steering committee, and no need for another steering committee inside the steering committee.

Yes, so I think - and I think that's the same point, (Carlos) thank you, that we were trying to make with the size of the steering committee. We don't know if we'll need it or not for sure. So I'll adjust the language accordingly.

Olga Cavalli: So Julie again, you are the one two carrying all the work.

Julie Hedlund: That's what I'm here for.

Olga Cavalli: We know, but thank you so much for that.

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely. Well my pleasure. And so what I will do then to finish up here is I'm going to go ahead now in the next half-hour, work on changes to the document.

And get - and also suggested draft - a response email to (Chuck) to go along with that. I'll send that to all of you. And if everyone could take a quick look at that, I think we've pretty much talked through these changes. But just to make sure that I've captured them correctly.

Then what we could plan to do is later today, you know, I could send - I send the response and red lined document to (Chuck) for his review, copying this group. And then ask for a response by COB on Monday.

Olga Cavalli: That would be great. So maybe we can send the document to the GNSO Monday?

Julie Hedlund: Well yes. It could go Monday or, you know...

Olga Cavalli: Or Tuesday.

Julie Hedlund: By Tuesday, and Tuesday is the document cut-off date. So it would get there in time.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Julie Hedlund: So that would be good.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, I think it's a very good plan.

Man: Julie one more quick thing?

Julie Hedlund: Yes please.

Man: If I'm remembering correctly that the document as it is, the one we were working on had red lines.

Julie Hedlund: Actually no. The document that we were working on is the one that we sent to the council, you know.

Man: So it's already clean.

Julie Hedlund: So what (Chuck) saw was clean. But what I'm doing is putting red lines into it so you can see where we changed it.

Man: Okay, that's - okay. I just didn't want versions of red lines. Sounds great.

Julie Hedlund: No there's no versions - this will be the - the red lines will just be the new changes.

Man: Okay, thanks so much.

Julie Hedlund: Sure, no it's good clarification.

Man: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Well thank you everyone for joining today. Olga if there's nothing else then...

Olga Cavalli: No, I think...

Tony Harris: I have a question.

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely, go ahead Tony.

Tony Harris: Yes I'm sorry. I probably missed some email. Is there going to be a meeting of - will we be meeting in - on this subject in Dakar?

Julie Hedlund: No, we decided that we could accomplish what we needed in this meeting. So unless others disagree, we don't have a meeting scheduled. What we'll try to do is get this on the agenda for the GNSO Council meeting, for their meeting on the 26th.

Tony Harris: Okay fine. That's clear.

Olga Cavalli: That's very good.

Tony Harris: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: We're just so efficient we don't need to meet again.

Tony Harris: I can see that, yes.

Julie Hedlund: It's part of the efficiency and cost effectiveness of the outreach effort.

Olga Cavalli: This has taken a long time. You know, (Debby) and you, Julie, know this has taken a long time.

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: So thank you very much everyone for, especially you Julie. As usual, it's lovely to work with you. And people have a nice weekend. And see you soon in Dakar.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you everyone. And you should see a document from me in the next half-hour or so.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Julie Hedlund: And if you could give it a quick look and a quick turnaround, I'd appreciate that.

Olga Cavalli: Great thank you very much. Thank you everyone. Bye.

Julie Hedlund: Bye bye.

Woman: Bye bye.

Man: Bye bye.

Man: Bye bye.

                              END