

**GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work
Team 10 April 2009 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work Team teleconference 10 April 2009 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnsoco-20090410.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#april>

Participants present:

Olga Cavalli - Work team chair - NCA
Victoria McEvedy - IPC
Charles Gomes - Registry c.
Tony Harris - ISP
Rafik Dammak - NCUC
SS Kshatriya - Individual

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund - Policy Consultant
Glen de Saint G ery - GNSO Secretariat

Absent Apologies

Claudio Digangi - IPC
Michael Young - Work team vice chair - Registry c.

Coordinator: I would like to notify all parties that the call today is being recorded, if you do have any objections you may disconnect at this time. Thank you, you may begin.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you operator. And thank you, Glen. Could you please make a roll call?

Glen de Saint Gery: Certain, Olga. We have on the call Olga Cavalli who is Chair of this group, Victoria McEvedy from the IPC constituency, Chuck Gomes, registry constituency, Tony Harris, ISP constituency and SS Kshatriya who is participating as an individual, Rafik Dammak who is

participating as an individual as well. And for staff we have Julie Hedlund and Glen de Saint Gery.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Glen. We have some, on our list, on our email list, our agenda. I don't know if you had the chance to review it. I know that SS Kshatriya made some very interesting comments and we wanted to just slightly change some items of the agenda. Any other additions to someone in the call would like to do now to the agenda?

No? Okay, our first item is to discuss a charter and priority of (stocks) and to vote on charter. SS Kshatriya suggested in his email, I think it was last night or this morning I don't remember right now, that perhaps we should not vote but discuss it. What do others think?

I think that we are in the position to vote because we have been reviewing this charter for a while. And anyway I have been reading SS Kshatriya comments which, by the way, are really very good and very detailed and I found a place in the charter that - were stakeholder group and constituency seem to be a little bit confusing for me as the way it is written. I just send it - the paragraph to the list 15 minutes ago.

Apart from some changes in the text what does the group think we should perhaps take a vote on the charter or still discuss the content of the charter?

Chuck Gomes: Please put me in the (unintelligible) Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Hello, Chuck. Go ahead, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: The - first of all on the item that you identified my question is it's not clear let's fix it rather than (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: If there are other items in the charter that are insufficient I'd like to know what those are because I don't see any reason to continue working on the charter. I think we'd be much better off starting to work on the tasks that we have to do in the charter unless we want the charter to be excessively detailed then in which case we're going to spend, I think, wasted time working on the charter instead of doing the work that we're tasked with doing.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Chuck. Any other comments? Okay I totally agree with Chuck. I just found this - a very small paragraph that can be easily rewritten I think with only one or two words that would change it, it would be fine. And I agree that we have been reviewing this charter for I guess before the meeting in Mexico, at least myself. So I think we are in the position of agreeing and accepting it and voting on it. Any comments? What do others think?

Chuck Gomes: I'd like to better under (Essef)'s concern with...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, me too.

SS Kshatriya Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: You've identified one of the...

SS Kshatriya (Unintelligible). Hello.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, (Essef), go ahead.

SS Kshatriya Yeah, I don't have (unintelligible) only I wanted to be sure whether the team has reviewed it and (unintelligible) yet.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay, that helps me understand what you were getting it (Essef), thank you. The - and also keep in mind that the - should we find a flaw in the charter we could always go back and request a revision later as well. So it sounds like what we need to do, Olga, is to fix the sentence that you thought was not clear and move on.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, it's a very slight change that I would suggest. It's changing two words for one. Let me open the charter, which of course I can not find it now. Here. It says, "In call cases," - under (unintelligible) three work team rules and procedures - "In all cases the chair would enter the names and affiliations of those in support of its position and for participants representing (unintelligible) stakeholder." And in between brackets it says, "For example constituency stakeholder group of a group."

It's like two times stakeholder and that is quite confusing. So I would suggest: "In support of each position and for participants with representation of - with relevant representation." And then the paragraph for example: "Constituency, stakeholder group, other groups." Very slight, very small but I think it helps the reading.

Chuck Gomes: Olga...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...there may be a even...

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, please, you're an English-speaker so you will help me.

Chuck Gomes: What if we just - where it says, "For participants representing a group of stakeholder groups," we just delete "of stakeholder groups" and just say...

Olga Cavalli: Oh yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...representing a group. And then have the parenthetical...

Olga Cavalli: (Unintelligible), yeah, perfect. So we should take our, "of stakeholder." Yeah, that's still my only comment so if you think that (unintelligible) change I think it is and I discovered it after SS Kshatriya comments. I didn't realize before - I think it will help to someone else reading the charter. What do others think? You think that good change to be done?

No comments so I think - Julie, could you do that for us?

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely Olga. I'll take care of it right away.

Olga Cavalli: Great, thank you very much. So are we comfortable with the charter? Has anyone else have a comment or wants to make an addition or - as Chuck said we can always go back and review it in the future as we move forward with our work. But I think it's time for us to take action in other things that we have to do that we really have a lot to do in the future.

So are we comfortable with our charter? How should we - how should we vote or we just say that we have a rough consensus I think or a total consensus if no one is opposed?

Chuck Gomes: The only question might be, Olga, is whether or not we want to allow the people that aren't on the call today to vote as well. We could give them say through Monday - through the end of the day Monday to express via the list any opposition that they might have and then include their opinion in our vote as well. We're not required to do that I don't think but...

Olga Cavalli: I think it's fair. Yes, I think it's totally fair. So what we can do after the meeting is - I could do that or perhaps, Julie, we could do that together. We can tell them what we have been discussed in the group and today in the conference call. And if they have any comment in relation with the charter they should send them to the list at least by Monday. And if not we could consider that we all agree in the text.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Olga, this is Julie. I could send out, after this meeting, the action items, the first of which could be the - a few notes from our discussion on the charter and asking everyone to take one last review of it and

include the link and so that they have until end of day Monday to send back their comments or, you know, approval etcetera.

Chuck Gomes: And if - I think we ought to specifically state if there are no...

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...further (unintelligible) it would be...

Julie Hedlund: That's a good point.

Olga Cavalli: Great, thank you very much, Julie. And by the way I would like you to know that I just sent to the list a report prepared with the contents of - an outcome of our first meeting in Mexico and our first conference call we have two weeks ago as the report that we have to present to the (OSC).

Just for your (position) - and I wasn't sure if the group had to review it or not, but just in the sake of transparency and democracy I just sent it to the group. So if you have any comment or you think it's - you don't like or you want to make additions also Julie, feel free to make comments or changes.

The idea - my idea was to submit it yesterday to the (OSC) but I thought it was not bad idea to share it with the working team. So by Monday if I have not heard any comments from you or additions or deletions I will send it to you, Chuck, as a final report from our first stage.

I also thought that it was good to include these two first conference call and meeting and then move on with new things from now on every two weeks as we agreed in our last conference call. So - yes...

Chuck Gomes: As the (unintelligible)...

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, sure.

Chuck Gomes: ...first of all (unintelligible) haven't had...

Olga Cavalli: No I just send it right now.

Chuck Gomes: So as far as I could tell it's (unintelligible) and (unintelligible). I think your - it doesn't need to be nearly so detailed.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And I think (unintelligible) that (unintelligible) of all it really needs to be in my opinion is just a few short bullets saying...

Olga Cavalli: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...like you said in more detail, (unintelligible) we started discussions on the charter, like when you're reporting on today's meeting to approve the charter - or by Monday anyway - (tell us) some work tasks that we're going to start work on and some priorities; something like that would be just fine.

Don't make too much work out of the report to me as the (OSC) Chair. Really the purpose for me is to make sure I am getting - if I get

something simple like that from each of the Chairs of the three work teams it makes it real easy for me to report on the Council...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...about what's going on. And I'd rather you spending your time in leading the group and (unintelligible) rather than preparing reports. And it's a great report, don't get me wrong...

Olga Cavalli: Okay I understand...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: And by the way you're the Chair, I think it's perfectly fine for you to just develop the report. You can - I would suggest you CC the group on what you send to me. And if anybody has any concerns they can comment but I don't think it needs to be - it's not an official document or anything; it doesn't need to be approved by the work team or anything.

If any of us see something you've missed or inaccurately stated we can let you know.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, thank you very much Chuck. I just had some doubts and so I decided to make it a little bit longer. It can always be shorter that's fine but easier than (unintelligible)...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: ...and of course I didn't know if to share with the group or not. And in front of the (unintelligible) I thought it was good to do it.

Chuck Gomes: What I suggest you do is you share it with (Michael)...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...as Vice Chair. Just the two of you agree on what you want to (send) forward. Keep it simple and short and that should be fine. And then just CC the rest of us.

Olga Cavalli: Great, thank you very much. Any comments to this exchange of ideas with Chuck who is always very helpful? And thank you very much, Julie, because I've used her minutes of meetings to make the report, it's not only my work, it's her work that I used for my report; so thank you Julie again.

Julie Hedlund: You're welcome.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Shall we move to our next item the agenda; it's report on items (talk) out (unintelligible) constituencies. Julie, would you tell us something about that?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, thank you very much Olga. Just very briefly we - the staff did reach out to two new constituents, Ken Bour has made contact with representatives of the Cyber Safety and (Rob) has made contact with the new City TLD Guild...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: And other staff have gotten in contact with consumer constituency proponents. We have not heard back from these constituencies whether they have representatives to participate on our team. But we do expect to hear back from them shortly and we'll let the team know as we have people from those constituencies who want to participate.

Olga Cavalli: Great. I have a question, Julie, as far as I understand these three new constituencies are - have not been approved by the Board yet; am I right or am I wrong?

Julie Hedlund: That is correct.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: They have made petitions...

Olga Cavalli: I know.

Julie Hedlund: They have the charters but these still need...

Olga Cavalli: Okay great. Any comments? I am a bit concerned about the participation in this working group, are we really having participation of all the (unintelligible) - of all the constituencies that we do have today? I don't - I know that, Chuck, you're always present and SS Kshatriyaparticipate in as an individual also (Resick).

(Resick), one question are you involved with (NCUC) right?

Rafik Dammak Yes, yes.

Olga Cavalli: So do you participate in the working group as an individual or representing the constituency?

Rafik Dammak I represent the constituency.

Olga Cavalli: I'm sorry, I didn't get your answer. I cannot hear you very well.

Rafik Dammak I am not as individual in this working group.

Olga Cavalli: You're from the constituency?

Rafik Dammak Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Oh great. And we have Tony from (ISP) and we have (unintelligible) and we have (Felipe), okay so we are not missing any constituency right Julie?

Man: What about the registrars?

Victoria McEvedy: The registrars.

Chuck Gomes: Krista.

Olga Cavalli: Oh Krista, yeah, Krista but she cannot make it on Fridays.

Chuck Gomes: Just every other Friday.

Olga Cavalli: I know.

Chuck Gomes: So...

Olga Cavalli: Okay, great.

Chuck Gomes: I thought she was okay - yeah so I thought we had resolved that. She's okay I think. I think today we're dealing with a bad week for meetings...

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...so we shouldn't go by the participation today.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And you noticed too I'm sure that (Michael) is on vacation this week with his family.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: Can I just ask a question relating to this?

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Victoria McEvedy: I just - Chuck perhaps you can give me some of your wisdom on this but is there really a distinction and, I mean, is there a sort of an authorization procedure or an appointment procedure in an official sort of way - I mean I don't really know whether I'm here on a personal or constituency. I know that I'm a member of a constituency. But I - (unintelligible)?

Chuck Gomes: Victoria McEvedy:, by the way it's good to talk to you again, it's been a while.

Victoria McEvedy: Thanks, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: And the - I would just suggest that you contact, in your case, you're with the - representing the IPC, correct?

Victoria McEvedy: That's right.

Chuck Gomes: And so just check with Steve Metalitz and make sure that you're in sync, that you are - just let him know you're - if you haven't already done so, that you're willing to represent the IPC on this and then it's just your responsibility to kind of be the liaison between the constituency and this group. That should be fine, you know.

Victoria McEvedy: Well I heard (Claudio) is on the group also from the constituency and he's obviously a very senior member of the constituency so I imagine he'll be doing that - liaison. But I was just curious really as to whether or not - because this is think, you know, with all these reforms going on and with the - I think it's an interesting question that we may end up coming back to later in a different context.

But, you know, with the move to working groups and the fact that all working group are going to be open to all and all that sort of thing, you know, I'm just - I'm just wondering whether or not they're really - maybe it's something we need to add to one of our agendas.

Chuck Gomes: Well, you know, it's really up to the constituency how they want to handle that. But I would encourage, I mean, in the case of the registry constituency we have two representatives on this for a very specific reason; it's a backup. Like for today (Michael) couldn't make it, I'm still

on so there's that continuity with the constituency; someone is able to carry the messages back and forth and so forth.

So it would be great if the IPC had a couple people for the same reason in my opinion, okay. They don't have to. It's between you and your constituency whether they want you to be in a representative or they just want one person to be the representative. And it's really not for us to say how the IPC should do it. But it's helpful for you as an individual member of the group to know whether you're - it's okay with them for you to be their representative in addition to one other person.

Victoria McEvedy: All right, thanks for that; that's helpful.

Olga Cavalli: Okay thank you. Can we move to our next agenda item? As we agreed in our last conference call we agreed taking one task of one of the three we had in our working plan and to prepare detailed working plan with (sub-task) and a detailed set of things to be done.

This was really very well done by Julie. And then (Michael) and myself made some suggestions in the text and some changes that really I commend her for her great work that it was submitted to you maybe five days ago or four days ago.

Have you the chance to review it? You have any comments? I think SS Kshatriya made one comment about point 1A on the action items of sub-task one which can I think easily be fixed. I think it's a pretty interesting group of things to be done and I also get the comment sent from - from SS Kshatriya to the list about some questionnaires and documents (unintelligible) by (Robert).

And I think there's a lot of information there that we can use for this sub-task to be performed. I was almost - taken Julie's document and put some names in the column that says (Lead). And I thought it was more fair to share that ideas with you in the conference call because I think we need to move forward. And I think we need to find the people who will be putting this information together.

We have great help from staff but I think we also have to get involved. And I would like to hear your comments about the document that was prepared by staff and reviewed by Chair and Vice Chair. And if we could start perhaps taking some names to write in the Lead column and see if we can really move forward putting the information together.

I am totally convinced that this information must be distributed in different places in different constituencies but the idea that I had from this working group as an outcome is a (ground-based) document for - reference for existing constituencies and new constituencies as to be a referral for the new rules in the GNSO. Any comments?

Tony Harris: I have a question.

Olga Cavalli: Sure, who was that?

Tony Harris: Yeah, this is Tony. I have a question, I'm sorry I'm a little bit in the catching up mode, I missed the last two meetings due to travel. But could you confirm the date and the title of this document? I've got two or three open here; I'm not quite sure which you're referring to.

Olga Cavalli: Well it's the document sent by Julie. Julie, could you tell me today that you send it? I cannot recall exactly...

Chuck Gomes: By the way it was also attached in Julie's message that...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...she sent out for this meeting.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, today.

Chuck Gomes: I don't know if it was sent out yesterday or today. But...

Olga Cavalli: Today.

Chuck Gomes: ...but it's - Tony, the easiest way to get it is just to look at Julie's sent message - the most recent message sent to this group.

Julie Hedlund: Right, yeah, the title of the document is GNSO (OSC) Constituency Operations Work Team - the document, I'm sorry - the document titled - the file title is GNSO (OSD) (TST), (WT) Task 1 Draft Sub-Task Work Plan V1 for Version 1.

Chuck Gomes: It's the only Word attachment that was sent with her...

Tony Harris: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...message that she just recently sent to the group.

Tony Harris: I'll find it, thanks a lot.

Julie Hedlund: Great, thanks.

Olga Cavalli: And just for clarification in the Mexico meeting we agreed - we talked about three main tasks. This is the - all the sub-task of the first one which is enhance existing constituencies by developing recommendations and constituency participation and rules, operating principles and database of members.

So this sub-task one - it has three sub-tasks, one, two and three and it has different action items related with each sub-task - four, I'm sorry - four subtasks. So if you go through them - I don't think it's necessary to read the whole document because it will take a lot of time.

What I would like you to tell me if you agree with this (text) that was reviewed by (Michael), Julie, (Rob) and myself. If you want to make additions - if you want to make deletions the best would be to have some ideas of how to start moving forward. It's who could take the lead. I have seen SS Kshatriya with the very detailed analysis of many document, for example, some (unintelligible) that was sent by (Rob) so I think he could perhaps take the lead on some of these action items.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: I will open a queue; who would like to make some comments?

Chuck Gomes: Chuck.

Olga Cavalli: Chuck first and then? There was someone else talking I couldn't hear. Okay go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, didn't we, in our last call, tentatively identify a few leads for some of these are am I mixing that up with something else?

Olga Cavalli: Maybe you're right and I cannot remember.

Chuck Gomes: I can't either so.

Olga Cavalli: So I'm sorry. Someone can help us?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, this is Julie. We did tentatively identify lead - look at these sub-tasks and - to come up with a draft plan and that was Olga, (Michael) and myself. So we were the initial leads. But I think that may have related to at least, you know, the flushing out of these, you know, of the sub-tasks. So I imagine we could have further discussion on that.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, that's what I remember and that is already done.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thank you. That's helpful; that answers my question.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Someone else was trying to talk and I couldn't hear the name or the voice.

SS Kshatriya Yeah, this is SS Kshatriya

Olga Cavalli: Okay go ahead SS Kshatriya

SS Kshatriya Hello?

Olga Cavalli: Can you hear me?

SS Kshatriya Yeah, see I have a problem today that my - this connection roll off and on so I'm not able to hear (unintelligible) talk which is going on. So I mean that's - so in case you have (unintelligible) anything to me and you don't get response maybe you have to repeat later on sometime. Okay that's one part.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

SS Kshatriya Second, yeah, second is that while I agree to (unintelligible) this next item so my name can be put there.

Olga Cavalli: Okay could you tell us which of the action items (unintelligible) are you more interested in getting involved or you could perhaps review it and let us know in the list and I would suggest the same for the rest of our team?

SS Kshatriya I'll just sub-task one.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, okay. All the action items you would like to work in sub-task one?

SS Kshatriya Yeah right.

Olga Cavalli: Great, that's great SS Kshatriya Thank you very much. And in the case that you didn't hear me I just wanted to commend you because you made very detailed comments about different links that were sent by (Rob). And I think you made very interesting reflections on that.

SS Kshatriya (Unintelligible) not working and so I'm good at creating or analyzing documents. And before we proceed further I'll just - (unintelligible)

template for defining (unintelligible) procedures for (unintelligible) constituency Part D, the stakeholder group. Now we are going to develop procedures so in my (unintelligible) what I had said that all (unintelligible) some procedures, everybody has some procedure and (unintelligible) for the benefit of (unintelligible). So the team can work on the (unintelligible) procedures and improve upon them. That's what I wanted.

Victoria McEvedy: Could I make a comment here? I'm sorry...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...go ahead.

Victoria McEvedy: I don't know if it's appropriate or whether or not it's still open but I actually had - I'm wondering whether it's all right to comment on some of the (kicks) of this document because I have an issue with 1 and 1A. And this may or may not be the appropriate time to do this.

Olga Cavalli: Oh please go ahead.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay so, I mean, I was a just little bit concerned that 1A and perhaps 1B are a little bit too narrow, and a little bit to, perhaps, focused on administration and sort of procedural issues. Rather than what certainly I understand, at least from all the background reading is, you know, includes a very substantive point about the criteria for participation.

So I just wonder whether we need to soften that language or perhaps others think it's not necessary. But I guess one thing is when we get

down to some templates for admissions procedures I wonder if we will have (unintelligible), that's a very important part of the issue, and number one, which is about participation guidelines, standard criteria for participation across constituencies.

And it's from my perspective it raises some really important substantive issues as to, you know, some constituencies, you know, to (unintelligible) of mind, has inactive members or nonvoting members. And that sort of thing is a very substantive issues about participation and not just a procedural. So I just wonder what others think about that, whether or not we need to just change that language slightly?

Chuck Gomes: How would you change it, Victoria?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that's my question.

Olga Cavalli: I think, yeah...

Victoria McEvedy: Okay so I think - I was just looking back at, you know, the papers - the background papers and so forth. The wording that's used, the standardized and criteria for participation and/or participation guidelines - guidelines, rules and principals on participation.

So I'm just wondering, see it's sort of number 1 but I'm just wondering if an A, you know, instead of templates, which is very (unintelligible) like a precedent or a document may for admissions decisions and procedures whether it should be something like guidance or guidelines or participation criteria or participation principles or something like that.

Chuck Gomes: I agree - I totally agree with her on that.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, I agree.

Chuck Gomes: I was seeing the same thing. This isn't the place for a template. I think that's a good suggestion.

Olga Cavalli: What do others think? Do we agree to a change in the word template?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...as something people use as a model and fill in information; that's not what we're talking about here. I don't think.

Julie Hedlund: Okay so this is in - I just want to make sure I've got it correct. We're looking at 1 - 1A...

Chuck Gomes: Action item 1A, yeah.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, task 1, item 1A.

Olga Cavalli: Instead of developing a template would be develop a document for the final admission?

Chuck Gomes: No just - I think she said develop guidelines but we'll let Victoria say.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Let's let Victoria say which I think you said guidelines didn't you?

Victoria McEvedy: I did. It could be guidelines and principles for standardizing or - I don't know about the word standard but standardizing criteria for participation from constituencies or stakeholder groups.

Olga Cavalli: I totally agree Victoria. I think that's a great suggestion, thank you very much.

Julie Hedlund: Yes and I understand where you need to make - we need to make the change and I will go ahead and make that change and of course send around a revised version. If you have further comments Victoria, they'd be welcome.

Victoria McEvedy: Thank you. Thanks.

SS Kshatriya SS Kshatriya I have some question. What would expect from us is it the guidelines to expect or document or template?

Olga Cavalli: Oh that's a good question.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I didn't understand the question, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Please, (Essef), correct me because I can hear you very weak. What he's asking is what is the outcome from our working group, that's the question that you're making (Essef)?

Chuck Gomes: Well we're defining the outcome but my understanding is the outcome would be the guidelines and standardized principles that...

Olga Cavalli: That's the idea I have like a (ground)-based document with guidelines for constituencies and stakeholder groups. Is it okay with you (Essef)? Do you have any comments?

SS Kshatriya Actually I could not understand but again (unintelligible). But it...

Olga Cavalli: Oh what we were saying is that we should develop, as an outcome from our working group, guidelines or various documents for constituencies, that's (unintelligible) okay?

SS Kshatriya (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Victoria, you also had a - something on 1B, is that right?

Victoria McEvedy: I'm just looking at that actually; that's right. Again I see administrative; I'd remove the word administrative.

Olga Cavalli: Develop recommended practices?

Victoria McEvedy: Right, that says - yes because...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...constituency membership?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes. I don't think, you know, again we're just trying to pull the focus of that away from mere procedure.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That's good.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I have gone ahead and made that change.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Victoria, any other comments?

Victoria McEvedy: No I think that - let me see - no I think that will do. I think that will be fine. I mean, there are arguably those that - that same terminology repeats itself in C that we've got procedures and we've got templates etcetera. I don't know, that's probably all right down there because we've dealt with in A and B I think that's probably all right in C.

Olga Cavalli: I couldn't hear you, your last sentence, sorry.

Victoria McEvedy: Oh sorry.

Julie Hedlund: In C - C1 if we are consistent could we say ensure that the guidelines for (unintelligible) charter are...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Oh I see.

Chuck Gomes: Actually, Julie, I think that's a place where a template might work whether we go that route or not in terms of our recommendations remains to be seen. But there actually could be a template for constituency charters that every constituency would follow and therefore it would make it very easy for people on the outside to review that and they would all be in consistent format. Does that make sense?

Victoria McEvedy: Perhaps then that's a good - I think that's a great suggestion - just jumping in here but could we say consider whether a template is an appropriate...

Chuck Gomes: Sure. I think that's okay. What do others think?

Victoria McEvedy: That's okay.

Chuck Gomes: And by the way, Olga, let me share a general principal here with regard to this particular document; we shouldn't assume that it has to be perfectly precise right now although I'm totally supportive of the changes that are being made because the clearer we are in terms of our task the better. But we should - treat this as a live document that we can refine and fix language things as we go and we should do that.

So this is - first of all very good that we're doing what we're doing right now but we should keep doing that as we work through it. We may discover things after we get into the nitty gritty work that we want to word a little bit better and we should do that and should have the freedom to do that.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Chuck, I totally agree, this is just a first draft document and it's live and I also agree that it's great that Victoria is making these suggestions and I welcome any comments from the rest.

Okay what should we do? We have like 20 minutes left for our - the end of our call. We have other sub-tasks, 2, 3 and 4. The feeling I have is that perhaps we had like two days or hours to review the document. If I hear no comment other than Victoria and some of the changes that we already made with Julie and (Michael)...

Chuck Gomes: Let me add another one here...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...that's more format of the document than it is content, Olga...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: You've got leads for each of the action items and that is probably just fine but the question I'm going to ask is should we have a lead for sub-tasks instead of leads for action items or is it better to have a lead for every action item? In other words the way this is structured and - I haven't looked at it - do all of the sub-tasks just have one action - one main action item? I'm looking at - you can tell I - oh they all just have one action item, don't they?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, yes.

Chuck Gomes: So there's really no need to number the action items. Is that right?

Olga Cavalli: No but as far as I understand your comment it's that maybe more than one lead in every action item that's your idea?

Chuck Gomes: I'm not pushing one way or another, Olga, it's just that, for example, let's just focus on sub-task 1.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: There's only one major action item as I see under sub-task 1, correct?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And if that's going to be the case we don't even need a number 1 there; that's just kind of added...

Olga Cavalli: Yes, yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...added clarification of the sub - in fact I'm not sure, Julie, maybe you can help me on this but why do we have the number 1 action item - is that just a clarification of sub-task 1?

Julie Hedlund: You know, Chuck, there's no real good reason for it. When I was developing the document I, you know, I put the number 1 in and really did not think about the fact that there was really only one item so it doesn't need the number 1, you're absolutely right.

Chuck Gomes: And so we could either have a lead then next to what is called action item 1 or we could put leads for each of the A, B - which I don't think we want to go to that level of detail; we don't have enough people to do that. But...

Julie Hedlund: No.

Chuck Gomes: ...so and then - and that's okay. So in other words what we need is a lead for sub-task 1 which would be put down in that what is now called action item 1. And the same thing for the other sub-tasks correct? So we're looking right now at needing leads for four sub-tasks; is that correct?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Yes, if we are not dividing in A, B, C...

Chuck Gomes: And I'm fine with that. I just...

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...wanted some clarity there so that - and I think that's - for a group of our size finding four leads is reasonable. If we break it down much finer than that and finding then every one of us are going to be leads on several things which probably doesn't work so...

Olga Cavalli: Well we only need to find three because SS Kshatriyavolunteered for sub-task 1 so we are happy to know that. So what I'm not sure is if you all had the chance to review the document and we don't have time to go through the whole text. I have an idea what if we give the group say until Monday to review the document and suggest some volunteering for leading sub-tasks 2, 3 and 4, taking in consideration the kindly offer made by SS Kshatriyaof leading sub-task 1.

Julie Hedlund: I have a question, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Julie Hedlund: It's Julie. On sub-task 4 which is to develop a toolkit of in-kind staff support, this item as reflected in the board recommendations and in the (BGC) report was one that was recommended that staff take on as a lead.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: And I'm wondering if I could suggest that I take this on as a lead. I obviously would coordinate with the work team and everything would go through the work team for approval but I could - this is one where I think there might be some, you know, some administrative things that might be, you know, relatively straightforward for staff to pull together and present to the team as some suggestions.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you very much, Julie. I think it's a great suggestion. I also have been reviewing a document that was sent by - I don't know if it was (Rob) or SS Kshatriya with a questionnaire sent by - to all constituencies on the survey. I think there's a lot of information there that could be useful. It's a long document and I didn't have the time to review it very deeply. But I think that part of that information could be useful for our base document of guidelines.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...this table we should also not only just show leads but participants. And it could be in the same column as the lead column but to be more specific I'm fully supportive of Julie's suggestion that she just made that she lead this one. I would certainly be one of those that would volunteer to provide support if needed on sub-task 4.

Olga Cavalli: Great. We have sub-task 1 and 4.

Julie Hedlund: And I can change - I can adjust the document - I think we could show that it's lead and participants or something like that just to show who are the people who are working on a particular task if it's more than one likely to be. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Okay I would be glad to work - I volunteer my time for working on sub-task 2 or 3 but I think it's mainly constituency information that could be relevant to taking consideration. And as I don't belong to any constituency I would be glad to volunteer my time of working with (unintelligible)?

Chuck Gomes: You make a really good point Olga, it's going to be really critical on some of these tasks to have several people from different constituencies being a part of it because if we don't do that we're going to find ourselves coming up with stuff that the constituencies will reject later and we don't want that.

Olga Cavalli: Exactly so I would be glad to join someone else in sub-task 2 or 3 but I don't think I should do that alone.

Victoria McEvedy: I'd be happy to volunteer and I may be - have a unique role in the sense that I've been a member of at least two constituencies - not at the same time...

Chuck Gomes: Oh great.

Victoria McEvedy: But I was once a member of the (NCUC) and now I'm a member of the (IPC) so I have at least seen how two different constituencies operate. Although I'm actually relatively new to ICANN; I don't regard myself as (unintelligible) as informed as some perhaps more senior people so I'm sure we could do with some other expertise but I'm happy to participate.

Olga Cavalli: Oh great, Victoria. Would you like to work on sub-task 2 or...

Victoria McEvedy: I would like to work on sub-task 2 but I'd also - very - I think some of the issues (unintelligible) in sub-task 1 are extremely crucial and I'd like to be involved...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: ...some little...

Chuck Gomes: And I think that's perfectly legitimate. I think most of us are going to have to be involved in...

Olga Cavalli: Oh sure.

Chuck Gomes: ...each one of these. One other format thing on the table that I would like to suggest to make this easier to track would be right now - to illustrate it let me just look at sub-task 1.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: A, B, C and in fact even sub-elements (1), (2) etcetera are - that whole group of things is all in one row in the table. I think it would be much more effective if those things were broken down into separate rows...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And then it's real easy to show status and dates and so forth broken down to more detail which isn't terribly cumbersome it's just in this format it's a little more cumbersome to keep straight which one you're showing the status on. Does that make sense Julie in terms of a format here?

Julie Hedlund: Chuck that's a great suggestion. In fact I - this document was more sort of to get the text out there for all of us to look at. I didn't know how many changes might be made at this meeting and I'm happy to go ahead and break these up into rows, it's very simple to do.

Chuck Gomes: Excellent.

Olga Cavalli: Great. And I agree with Victoria - with (Chuck) that we all should - especially people working in different constituencies should be not perhaps leading but involved in the development of all the sub-tasks and action items. So Victoria, just to clarify you're interested in cooperating with sub-task 1 and what about 2 and 3?

Victoria McEvedy: Yes, definitely number 2. I'm (unintelligible) 3...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: ...because number 5 is the issue. The private - the legal privacy issues are quite - are going to be quite important.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Victoria McEvedy: Just reading the background documents I can just see, you know, there's been a huge issue with Whols and the privacy issues. And I can - and I hate to sound - I'm rather concerned, I can see already there's an issue here that's - people perhaps might be resisting this. There's obviously going to be a very live issue about resisting this database on privacy grounds.

Where in actual fact I think there's probably - I think it's probably a very good idea and principle because it's all about openness and transparency. And so I think I'm quite (unintelligible) sub-task 3 too. But I don't know if that's going to be feasible but...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Does someone else want to talk?

Tony Harris: Yeah, this is Tony. I'm just saying that I agree with what's being said that there would appear to be a privacy issue on the database of - contemplated here.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, we have discussed about this a little bit in Mexico. But I think it's - I think it could be very useful tool especially for outreach in developing countries.

Tony Harris: I can tell you it's Item C looking at the third one - where it says, "Discuss with ICANN staff on how to create a DNSO discussion list." Well that was done in the days of the DNSO, Chuck, you can probably comment on this too. When we had - what was called a general assembly at that time.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Tony Harris: And it developed into a (major) list which became unmanageable. We had people like (Jeff Williams) sending 20 postings a day.

Chuck Gomes: He's still doing it.

Tony Harris: I'm sorry?

Chuck Gomes: He's still doing it on the GA list.

Tony Harris: Yeah, so I mean, we've done that. We've done the general assembly and I think it was done away with for very good reasons as far as an actual operational feature of the meetings.

Chuck Gomes: And those are the kind of things that the people that work on that task are going to have to mull over and come up with some recommendations. It could be a recommendation that we don't have that. Actually there's been some revived discussion on the still existing GA email list of some sort of a cross constituency/cross GNSO list again so that the idea is not dead.

Even the people that are suggesting it now, though, Tony, have a concern about it not, you know, getting away from what the GA list still is today where one person monopolizes and there's two or three others that jump in every once in a while.

Olga Cavalli: So Tony I think you have a very interesting experience and you also check - you think this text in sub-task 3 it's feasible or it may be changed to some more realistic idea?

Chuck Gomes: My suggestion, Olga, from a process point of view...

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...is that now's not the time for us as a whole group to get into questions like that but the people that work on this task that focus on those...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...and then come back with recommendations (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So we have volunteer for sub-task 3 or Tony with your experience?

Tony Harris: As long as I'm not the leader sure I'd be happy to be part of a...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Tony Harris: ...person team or something but not in a lead position.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Okay we have three minutes left until we reach our hour of conference call. I think we have made very interesting progress. If there are no other comments I would suggest the following: Julie will help us in developing a new document with all the changes in the text that we have suggested to her and to us because we also prepare it for you. She will do the changes in the rows and columns.

Julie, perhaps we could ask - we could include some names of leaders or contributors to each of the different sub-tasks and we could add it to the document.

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely. I'll include...

Olga Cavalli: We - yes.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...end as well as the other changes that people have suggested. And I can also make sure that this is available up on the Wiki.

Olga Cavalli: Great. And I would encourage those who have volunteered to help with this task and sub-task. If they could think about some (unintelligible) can do that. And we discussed this on the list because we will have no time for do that in this conference call. And it would make not much sense to discuss it in another conference call.

I think we should enhance the discussions in our list so we can use our time in the conference call more efficiently. What do others think?

Chuck Gomes: Olga, with regard to action items and follow up this am I correct that we've identified a lead for sub-task 1 and a lead for sub-task 4 but that...

Olga Cavalli: And for 2.

Chuck Gomes: ...we still need leads for sub-task 2 and 3, is that correct?

Olga Cavalli: No sorry if I'm mistaken, please, Victoria correct me; Victoria, myself have volunteered for sub-task 2. Is that okay for Victoria?

Chuck Gomes: Did you volunteer as leads or as participants?

Olga Cavalli: I don't want to lead thanks but I'm very related with constituencies because I don't think that I'm the one.

Chuck Gomes: And Victoria were you volunteering as a lead on any of those tasks?

Victoria McEvedy: I'm happy to lead 2 if you need a lead.

Olga Cavalli: Great, great.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so then what I'm getting at then is we need then - and thank you Victoria for that - we need a leader for sub-task 3, correct?

Olga Cavalli: Exactly. Tony said he can help but not leading.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, so what I'm suggesting is that in our request on the list is that we request that someone volunteer to lead sub-task 3.

Olga Cavalli: Right.

Chuck Gomes: And then I think we should request for participant names for all of the sub-tasks.

Olga Cavalli: Okay great.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Chuck. Okay it's for us in Argentina it's 11 o'clock so I think it's time for finishing our conference call. Do anyone has any other comments?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you very much. Have a happy Easter to all of you. And we'll keep in touch through the list.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...that's something.

Olga Cavalli: (Essef), you have something to say?

SS Kshatriya Yeah, (unintelligible) and bye.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Good bye.

Olga Cavalli: Bye, bye.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you everyone.

Olga Cavalli: Happy Easter to everyone.

Victoria McEvedy: Thank you. Bye.

Olga Cavalli: Bye.

END