

**GNSO  
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC)  
Constituency Operations Work Team  
16 April 2010 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work Team teleconference 16 April 2010 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but **should not be treated as an authoritative record**. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-constituency-ops-20100416.mp3>

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

**Participants present:**

Olga Cavalli – NCA – Work Team Chair

Claudio Digangi – IPC

Chuck Gomes – Registries Stakeholder Group

Tony Harris – ISPCP

Debra Hughes – NCSG

Rafik Dammak – NCSG

**ICANN Staff**

Julie Hedlund

Glen de Saint Géry

**Apologies**

Victoria McEvedy - IPC

SS Kshatriya – Individual

Zahid Jamil – CBUC

Krista Papac – Registrar Stakeholder Group

Coordinator: The call is now recorded. Please go ahead.

Man: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much.

Glen de Saint Géry: Good morning...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Okay, good morning, good evening and Glen can you help me do a roll call, please?

Glen de Saint Géry: Certainly, Olga, I will. On the call we have Rafik Dammak, Chuck Gomes, Olga Cavalli, Debra Hughes, and Claudio Digangi. And for staff we have Julie Hedlund and myself, Glen de Saint Géry. And we have apologies from Victoria McEvedy.

Is there anybody else that I have left off? I think that's all. Thank you, Olga, over to you.

Olga Cavalli: Thanks to you, Glen, and good morning, good evening. For today's call I want to share with you some work I have been doing in the week. I've opened the document and I read it completely, and what I found is that - and some recommendations are referenced or repeated in several parts of the document.

So what I did is I highlighted them, and as a general proposal I think that the recommendations should be all together and in one part of the document and maybe the other considerations that are included in the document, which I think are very important and valuable, which brings

to the background on why this recommendation is made and on which basis it has been written, should be perhaps separate because if not, it's very difficult to find which are really the recommendations.

So what I did as a -- I cannot find the word in English -- as - contribution is the word I wanted to say, to the work, I highlighted the recommendations in the second part of the document -- and I'm trying to open it and I cannot find it -- so I sent it to the list. I don't know if it's a good idea, a bad idea, but I think if we don't order the document we - it will be difficult that we finish it by the 1st of July. I don't know what others think and if you have some other ideas on how to move forward in order to finish our document on time.

Man: Olga...

Olga Cavalli: I can't find my document.

Man: Oh, I see - I think I see where you sent it. Okay.

Olga Cavalli: It's the same document, but what I did is I went through...

Man: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: ...all of the documents and highlighted what is recommendations in the second part of it. And some of these recommendations are already in the first part of it and for me it - the result is quite confusing in knowing - for example, say someone wants to know our recommendations and wants to read the document just to build in a new constituency, and we should be more concise and put them all together, ordered and perhaps at the beginning. And then perhaps we can add all of the

background and all of the reasons that took us to include that text in our document, but it could be somehow separated. That's one of my first proposal.

If not, if we agree on the text in the first part of the document and then we go back to the second one and we find again the same recommendation or something similar, then we have to revise it again. And then that will be more time consuming.

Chuck Gomes: By the way, Olga, this is Chuck, and I think your recommendation is outstanding, so I'm fully supportive of it. Whatever report we send forward needs to be very clear on the recommendations and concise and anything else we decide to add can be there, but hopefully it won't confuse the main part of the submission and that's the recommendations.

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments?

Man: No.

Olga Cavalli: So what I did, I sent it - the document that I finished it this morning and I didn't sent it - I sent a comment about this two days ago, but then I went and I did it. I marked all of the recommendations in the section -- now I found the document.

When it starts Part 4 it says "Analysis" and it goes through different issues that have already been reviewed. Then it goes again to some recommendations, "We recommend blah, blah, blah, the term limit should expressly be blah, blah, blah," and then, "We recommend information of the committee and committees," and we already have

recommendations in the first part of the document, which are, for example, not the introduction but when we say Part 2, Compromise Recommendations.

I think that that Part 2 should have all of the recommendations together, ordered and clearly stated. And perhaps then under analysis we can have all this text explaining or maybe it could be footnotes or, I don't know, annexes, but the background of each recommendation should be, in my modest opinion, separate.

Also I noted other thing, and I don't know what you think about it, at the end of the document there are two pieces of document that - dealing with staff, the code of practice, I don't see the relationship with this text and our mission for this document. I don't know if you - what you think about it. It's 3.12 at the end. It says dealing with staff code of practice. It's not related with - I'm not saying it's wrong or right, I'm just saying it's not in between the mission of this document.

And then it says Table 1 the BGC guidelines. That should be in a footnote and a - because it's a text that's already known and I don't see the value of including it. It turns out to be a very long document. And that's my suggestion for the generalization of the document. I don't know if you have comments.

And then as this general - I said this general comment, we would go to the different text that we have to review and we agreed to review this week. Any comments?

Chuck Gomes: I like where you're going with this, Olga. I just opened up the document so I haven't looked through the whole thing, but I think you're going in a

very legitimate direction. One very minor point, in Part 2, I see that we still call them compromise recommendations; I thought we had eliminated the word compromise.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, I think so, but we still have it. Also it's difficult to review the document with all of the changes. But anyway, having it as a Word document with changes counted, that's easy where you can see it with or without them. We should take away compromise. What do others think?

Claudio Digangi: Yeah, I agree with that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, Olga, this is Julie. I've noted the change. I probably missed it in the numerous changes we have made, but I have indicated it in the sum revision of the document.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Olga...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Yes, go ahead, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: What do you want to do exactly for the - what kind of change you want to do?

Olga Cavalli: It's not specifically a change; it's the way that the document is ordered. If you go to the part named...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...Part 4...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Yes, sorry, Olga, I understand that, but I just want to know how you will - what you suggest as ordering of this document.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. What I suggest is that perhaps me and Julie or if someone wants to help me, I could put all together the recommendations in the recommendations part. Join the ones that are similar or very similar or exactly the same and try to find the common language for each of them. I think this is something that we should do because if not, it's very confusing.

Rafik Dammak: Just maybe it will take more time than expected, so if - I think that the part Analysis is more the background of the recommendations that maybe it should be at the beginning to explain the why of those recommendations. And at the end the recommendations will be just a list and so more easy to follow. But Analysis is more the background and the reason for those recommendations is my understanding.

So maybe we can, how do you say, just to leave the explanation and for the (unintelligible) to refer - to make the reference from - of those recommendations to those explanations.

Chuck Gomes: Let me just - this is Chuck, let me suggest a compromise between what Olga is suggesting and what Rafik is suggesting. Why don't we start with an executive summary that doesn't need to list the recommendations, okay, but gives enough background to make the - to give some sense to the - and context to the - to how we got the recommendation without going into all the detail, and then in the executive summary reference a more detailed explanation of analysis and the work that went on that would follow the recommendation.

So the first thing would be an executive summary, the second thing would be the - a list of all of the recommendations, and then we could have a more detailed analysis. What I'm trying to achieve is something very easy for the community, the OSC, the Council eventually, to get to the meat of the report right away and give enough context in the executive summary so that it's easy to follow the recommenda - how we got to where we are without going into the full details.

So very quickly - and keep in mind, the Council is going - and even the steering committees are going to be looking at a whole bunch of these documents all at the same time. So they're going to have a huge load to review all of these, and it's important that they can find a lot of the detail on analysis and stuff like that as needed. But the most important thing is that they easily can find the recommendations and of course then after that find any minority positions with regard to those.

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments?



Chuck Gomes: Does that work, Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: So if I understand you, the executive summary, it would be the analysis part in more a short way...

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Rafik Dammak: And, okay, yeah, I think I agree that there is in the analysis, the current analysis that there is many times repeating parts (unintelligible) so it sounds a good compromise. I'm not sure for Olga, do you agree?

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments? Hold on. (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Oh, okay. Sorry. And any other comments, any other opinions? And so...

Claudio Digangi: Chuck suggestions sound good to me, Olga, it's Claudio.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Claudio.

Debra Hughes: Yeah, I agree as well. This is Debbie.

Olga Cavalli: Debbie, thank you. So what Chuck is saying is - and I fully agree, it's an executive summary, the list of all the recommendations, and then we can add maybe a more descriptive section with all of the background. Is that the idea, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And I think to be fair that after the recommendations of the group, we probably should include any minority recommendations so that they're - it's very easy to see what those are too. And then you...

Olga Cavalli: So...

Chuck Gomes: ...can go into all of the background and the detail part of the report for those who want to dig in in more depth.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Okay, so it's executive summary, the recommendations, minority recommendations, and the background.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And the minority recommendations doesn't need to include the minority re - statement, but just a quick summary of the minority recommendations. As you'll recall, when the OSC looked at the report on the toolkit of services, several of the members were wondering why were the minority statements longer than the report?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: I mean, there's nothing to prevent them being longer than the report, but they didn't find it useful that, you know, that long of a statement or they - and so it's okay if they are long, I don't want to hinder anybody's ability to express their minority positions, but let's not put them in full where the minority recommendations are.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. We could...

Chuck Gomes: Does that make sense?

Olga Cavalli: ...perhaps once we have all of the minority reports and recommendations we can check how long - how much text it is and summarize it.

Chuck Gomes: Well, yeah, just pull out the recommendations and then make a reference to the full minority statements that apply later in the document.

Olga Cavalli: Exactly. Okay. My suggestion about how to proceed is that we review the text that we have to finalize, we have two or three parts of the text that we were talking about last week. We finish that language, and if we have the time, we can start checking which recommendations are in the second part of the document and compile it with the first part. And if not, I volunteer to do that and I'm open to someone else joining with me during this week. And so I took the...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie, I'd be happy to take the (pan) on doing a first cut of putting the Task 1, Subtask 1 and Task 1, Subtask 2 recommendations together into one document. Although I should note - well, I guess that leads me to ask a question. Are we now sure that - are we happy that the Task 1, Subtask 3 recommendations are accepted as is? I have not seen any comments on any changes to them, have you?

Olga Cavalli: No, I haven't and I'm okay with that text.

Julie Hedlund: In that case then - Olga, this is Julie, I could then take all three sets of recommendations, make them one document in the format that we

have discussed with an executive summary, the recommendations listed, the brief minority report summary (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: If we had that it seems to me it would make it real easy for us to do a final check and review and confirmation of the recommendations and the minority recommendations and then we can still tweak the rest of the report. But the most critical part is the executive summary, the recommendations and the minority recommendations. And so if we get those right, it makes it easy to go back and it's a - it may be a little bit time consuming, but not an insurmountable task to edit the rest of the document.

Claudio Digangi: Did we lose Olga?

Chuck Gomes: We might have when we had that noise, huh?

Claudio Digangi: Yeah.

Glen de Saint Géry: Yes, in fact she has disconnected and it probably was due to the noise. I'll see that the operator calls her back.

Rafik Dammak: So what we should do now?

Chuck Gomes: Michael's not on...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie, Rafik, we might want to just wait a minute and see if Olga comes back on. Hopefully she'll be able to join us momentarily.

Chuck Gomes: And Michael's not on today, is he?

Julie Hedlund: Not that I...

((Crosstalk))

Glen de Saint G ry: No.

Debra Hughes: This is Debbie, do you mind if I just take a...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Hello.

((Crosstalk))

Debra Hughes: ...hello.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, I dropped off, sorry. I'm back. I lost the last, I think, five minutes of conversation. I'm so sorry.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, I think it was me speaking. I think what I had suggested, well, or what - oh, well, actually you had confirmed for me that, you know, there are no changes to Subtask 1, I mean, Subtask 3 of Task 1. And Chuck had noted how much easier it would be to be able to make any final changes to the recommendations once we have a combined document to work with.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So we should work on - based on your document, Julie, that would be the base document for putting all together the recommendations and the executive summary and the background?

Julie Hedlund: That would be what I would plan to do. I do have a couple of questions though with respect to whether or not we can, you know, agree just to confirm that various sections of the Subtask 2 recommendations are going to be deleted so I don't needlessly include them in my combined document. For instance you have proposed I think deleting the code of practice and I was wondering if the work team members agree with that.

Chuck Gomes: Now which part were you talking about...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...it's at the end of the document, it's - let me...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Oh, no, I just didn't hear. So is this the one on the staff, you know, dealing with staff...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I don't see the...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, my comment is I'm not saying it's wrong or right, I'm saying I don't see the relationship with the document. But that's my opinion. I would like to hear yours.

Chuck Gomes: No, I'm okay with removing it. I think everything in it is good. I mean, I - most of the time I'm for treating staff well.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie, Chuck, I agree completely.

Chuck Gomes: So I don't have any problem with removing it. I think we're all in agreement with the principles that are there, but I'm not sure it has to be in this report. If somebody really feels strongly about it, I wouldn't oppose it, but I'd put it down...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: That's my comment. That's my comment. I don't see it in the report. I think that it makes it longer and it brings another issue that is not related with what we have to write about. And it's a pity that Victoria is not on the call or someone else that works in her team. Is there any reason that we may want to keep it? Perhaps I'm missing something.

Claudio Digangi: Olga, this is Claudio. I think the ra - I think the thinking was that it was sort of, I guess, related to constituency operating procedures. So I think that was sort of the connection. But I agree, I think sort of having a written formal policy is sort of creating another issue - you know, could be creating another set of issues and - but I think that was the original intent that Victoria had.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, so we have two options. We take it out or we include in the last part as the background. That's - but I didn't find a lot of relationship in between our document and this part.

Chuck Gomes: Well, it's probably a better fit in the communications and coordination team's...

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...than ours because it's an...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Exactly.

Chuck Gomes: ...it's an overall thing for the whole community. And it's basically covered by the ombudsman principles of some other things, the - in terms of how we all treat one another within the ICANN community and that's a, you know, the Board has done some things there and everything.

So, again, I'm - I can go either way. I don't care. If somebody strongly feels that they want to leave it in, I don't have any problem with that. I think it probably makes our - it reduces the size of our report if we take it out, so I lean towards taking it out.

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments?

Chuck Gomes: Does anybody on this call disagree with taking it out?



Rafik Dammak: Olga, it's Rafik. Truly, I don't feel so comfortable with taking out any part that...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: It's at the end. It's in part - let me tell you. If you have the document I sent an hour ago it's highlighted in red. It's at the end of the document and it's in the part -- it's such a long document. I'm trying to find the big typing.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, it's Julie. It's - Rafik, it's

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: It's Part 4.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...3.2 - 3.12.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, but it is - it's 3, but it's Part 4, which is the last part of the document, which is the long...

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so it's point what...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: It's 3.12 dealing with staff code of practice.

Rafik Dammak: That's about relation with the staff.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I'm not saying it's - that it's bad what it says, I think it's not related with the spirit of our document. It's not our mission to talk about it. That's - but it's my opinion. This is why I'm bringing this to you.

Rafik Dammak: Well, maybe if we put it into the annex or something like that maybe. Because we already - I think that we already commented this part a long time ago, so that's why I'm kind of surprised that now we want to take out (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Well, I read the whole document two or three time this week trying to find a way to make it more concise and trying to find a way that - for others because we know the document very well by now, that's what - I guess. But if I work in the community and want to get some recommendations from the GNSO and I read this document I would get confused. So this is what I tried to do to make it shorter, more concise and more ordered. That's my intention. Not - but if you think that we have to keep it in an annex that's okay for me also.

Claudio Digangi: This is Claudio. On - I think on Rafik's concern, his last comment, I don't think we've actually agreed to - I don't think we reviewed the code of practice and agreed...

Olga Cavalli: I don't remember, but maybe I'm missing something.

Claudio Digangi: Yeah, I...

Chuck Gomes: We talked about it at one point. It was a long time ago now.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: So we did talk about it. I don't know what level of agreement we reached, but we certainly did discuss it.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie, actually we also - this might be confusing because also there is the Annex B, which also has to do with relations with staff. And on our last call we agreed to delete Annex B.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, I remember that.

Julie Hedlund: And that was discussed sometime previously actually in Seoul I believe. Or Sydney. One of the two.

Olga Cavalli: Sydney, I think it was Sydney.

Debra Hughes: Olga, this is Debbie, I have a question. So regarding the Section 3.12...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Debra Hughes: Were there any deliverables that this group came up with that relate to this section? I'm having difficulty understanding the relevancy for the section to be included.

Olga Cavalli: That's my point. You know, Debbie, you were not in this team at...

Debra Hughes: Right.

Olga Cavalli: ...the beginning. We divided our work into sub-working teams and so each sub-working team proposed some text and then they proposed this draft and this was why I was trying to understand if there is a

rationale that I don't know behind it and I don't remember. I didn't - I wasn't a part of that working group.

((Crosstalk))

Debra Hughes: So Olga, if I'm understanding correctly this is something that was discussed but no particular recommendation or a particular outcome resulted from that discussion?

Olga Cavalli: I remember talking about this, but I'm not sure if we agreed in including it or deleting it. I myself, revising the whole document, I found it not particularly related with this - what we have to provide in our document. That's my comment.

But we can keep it as an annex if we are not sure of having it or not. I mean, I don't want to force you towards something that I may be wrong.

Debra Hughes: I guess I'm just trying to understand, if I was reading this document and I haven't been involved in - and I've done limited, you know, had limited involvement in this group, I guess I would try - I would look at this section and try to figure out why it's there and what am I the reader supposed to be taking away from it. So I'm leaning towards agreeing with what you're saying, I'm just trying to wrap my hands around is the...

((Crosstalk))

Debra Hughes: ...crux of this document to, you know, to leave the reader this is what we discussed and this is what we recommend. And if the answer is

there is nothing - this is just something we were talking about and it's important then maybe it goes to an annex, but if there's no action items or recommendations or - I'm just trying to think of why it should be included in the body is what - I'm just trying to understand it. I'm not trying to, you know, to mess things up.

Olga Cavalli: That's somehow my comment. So let's give it - we're spending too much time on this. Let's keep it as an annex and then we can take it out or not. It's not harmful, I mean, it's not, in my modest opinion, related to the document.

And then there is a Schedule 1, the BGC Guidelines. Could we add it as a footnote or a link? I mean, I don't see the purpose of having this in the document.

Chuck Gomes: So what - help me understand what you're talking about...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Just right after the 3.12.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay. Oh...

Olga Cavalli: It says Schedule 1, the BGC Guidelines. Why we have that here? I see no reason.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, I see what you're saying. Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: Excuse me, Olga, this is Julie. I just have to leave for about five minutes.

Olga Cavalli: Don't worry.

Julie Hedlund: I'll let you know right when I get back.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Thanks so much.

Olga Cavalli: No problem. So maybe we can add it as a footnote or a link in a footnote.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, Olga, it's Schedule 1, BGC Guidelines.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, it's at the end of the document...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: It's part of the red part that Olga marked.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. It says, "For the previous BGC report sets out guideline minimums that the operating procedure must observe. These are as follows." So it's part of the BGC report, which is okay, but I don't see why it's here.

Rafik Dammak: I think it's - maybe it should be combined with the executive summary because it explains the background of the recommendations, like the term limits for constituency officer, et cetera, but...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Rafik Dammak: But alone it's not really relevant.

Chuck Gomes: No. Whether or not it should be included is a different issue, but it definitely should not be in the executive summary. An executive summary is supposed to be just that, a summary, and so you don't want to repeat lengthy things and content from reference documents, at least not detailed contents, in an executive summary. Because an executive summary is supposed to be concise and provide a good overview so you don't want to go into this level of detail.

Rafik Dammak: So...

(Tony): It's (Tony).

Olga Cavalli: Tony, how are you?

(Tony): Hi, sorry I'm late.

Rafik Dammak: So (well then) maybe we can suggest an annex or footnote so (unintelligible) it, it's okay.

Olga Cavalli: I would include it in - I would suggest to include it as an annex or footnote with a link, but I - because I guess this is an online document already, and make a reference to it. I don't see the reason - because it's confusing. Then you see this and you see our recommendations

and for someone reading the document it's quite confusing. So we'll put it in an annex. Or - I will check with Julie how can we include this text, but not in the body of the text. Is that okay?

Chuck Gomes: That's fine.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Claudio Digangi: Yeah. I'm okay with that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So we have 23 minutes, why don't we try to finalize the wording of the text we have to review. I have a horrible echo in my line. I don't know if you hear me well.

(Tony): Yeah, I hear you.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, okay. So I will bear the echo. We were going to revise - let me check the notes from the last meeting. So I will work with Julie and prepare a new version with a different compilation of the text and hopefully I will send it not one hour before the call on Friday. I will try to send it before Friday, maybe Wednesday or Thursday. Does someone else want to join us in that task? It's okay if I do it with Julie?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Great.

((Crosstalk))



Chuck Gomes: In fact it's probably easier to do a task like that with fewer people...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Okay, I know, I know, but...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...it makes it statistically simpler.

Olga Cavalli: I agree, but I'm always open to volunteers. Okay. So there are two or three parts of the text that we have to review and...

Claudio Digangi: Olga, can I just ask a question real quick?

Olga Cavalli: sure.

Claudio Digangi: We're working off the wiki, right?

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, I didn't hear you.

Chuck Gomes: No, we're working on the Word document that Julie sent, right?

Olga Cavalli: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Claudio Digangi: Okay, that's what we're - okay.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Claudio Digangi: I was just - let me see, what section was it? I think it was the term limits section is I think a new section that we sort of agreed to setting up. I just wasn't sure where that language was - what's...

Olga Cavalli: Well, that's exactly what I wanted to review with you because I'm not sure if we finally agreed in two or three parts of the text that were substance, not order in the text, but we had to agree how do we want to present those recommendations too. We have to review Part 2, Section 1, Term Limits. Go to the document. Part 2, I'm trying to find the text.

Chuck Gomes: I got it. It's on page, let me see, it's on Page 3 of the 16 pages.

Olga Cavalli: Committees...elections...

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I cannot find it. Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Do you see the page numbers on Julie's document? If you go to Page 3, it's on Page 3. It says - if you look in your Word version it'll show page numbers, especially if, you know...

Julie Hedlund: And this is - this is Julie, I'm back on the call. Thank you very much.

Olga Cavalli: Great, thank you, Julie. Julie...

Chuck Gomes: Right at the beginning of Part 2.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, we are trying to finalize the wording for Part 2, Section 1, Term Limits. I'm trying to find it in the document and I'm totally lost.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, I'm sorry. It's Part 2 and it says - term limits is Number 1, so it's the very first thing...

Olga Cavalli: Oh, okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...right after Part 2.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So we have, "No person shall serve as a group councilor or officer or a stakeholder group executive committee member for more than four consecutive years. A member who has served four consecutive years must remain out of office for one full term prior to serving any subsequent term as a group councilor, officer or member of a stakeholder group executive committee. Any exceptions to this policy would require approval by the group or stakeholder group membership."

In our notes from last call we had to revise this text and finalize it. And Claudio, what you were saying, that we agreed in what?

Claudio Digangi: Well, I recall that there was some language that I had proposed that I thought we had agreed to or at least tentatively. And it was a little bit different than what's appearing here.

Olga Cavalli: You sent it in an email?

Claudio Digangi: Yeah, it's in the wiki (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie, yeah, you know, we had discussed last week that we should - that I should draft new language. I had thought that we had discussed what the language would be and I'm sorry if I - I must have misunderstood that we also agreed to pick up the language that you had recommended, Claudio. I can look back at the wiki. What do people - what would people like me to do?

Chuck Gomes: Well, what's your suggested change, Claudio?

Claudio Digangi: What I had was, "No person shall serve in the same group leadership position for more than four consecutive years." And I guess we, you know, we decided to have that apply to councilors, officers or stakeholder group executive committee...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, I remember that.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, isn't that what this...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Isn't that what this says?

Claudio Digangi: Actually I think this is a little bit different because mine - the language I had suggested stated that (unintelligible) in the same group leadership position and this doesn't have that language. This is - this basically is saying if you're a councilor you - that you could - the term limit would basically sort of carry over the way I read this. Or maybe, you know, maybe this is just - maybe it's just open to interpretation in how you read it, but it would seem to me that in this text you could - the term limit, it doesn't matter if you're in the same position or not...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I got you. Okay. I got it, yeah, so this just says you - nobody - you can't be an officer, stakeholder group or executive committee, a stakeholder group executive committee member regardless of what position you're (is) there's a term limit in general whereas you were saying in the same position.

Claudio Digangi: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah...

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): Yeah, and I was supporting that too.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay, I got it.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, Olga, it's Rafik.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, Rafik, you want to comment, please go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: Yeah, because I commented this part about why only the executive committee of stakeholder group but and not executive committee of constituency, I don't understand why there were being another constituency from this term limit. And I'm not sure about the language proposed by Claudio or - to what's - if he can repeat it because I don't really understand. And also I want to add that the limit should be applied to the constituency executive committee.

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

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

(Tony): Yeah, I can see what Rafik is referring to, but probably because he doesn't have much experience in constituencies. Within a constituency you might have an executive committee, you might not have an executive committee. You do have some structure within a constituency which coordinates the way the constituency functions. It's not a policy body, it's not something where you have people in power and they stay there like, you know, we're an emperor for the rest of our day's sort of thing. There seems to be some misunderstanding there.

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): And you have different, if I might finish Rafik, you have different levels of participation. You - what would be the right term, you have new bodies emerging constantly as ICANN reforms itself and you have more constituencies coming in. So it's not really the same thing to talk about something - a committee within a constituency and a committee

which is part of the stakeholder group or indeed the actual GNSO council.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thank you, (Tony). But just even if for example there is no executive committee in the - I don't know, in the (RSBPC) constituency, it doesn't mean that it not exist in other constituencies, so it not exist - not existence of that executive committee in some constituency that no rule should be applied in the other constituency which have executive committees, so...

(Tony): Oh, okay.

Rafik Dammak: ...maybe if we want more that we - any leadership position should have term limits so it can work for any case in ICANN if...

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): Oh, okay, that's your opinion, fine...

Chuck Gomes: Can we - this is Chuck, how about if we break this apart a little bit? First of all let's - as far as councilors that's already covered by a position that the GNSO Council voted on a few years ago. There are term limits for councilors, okay. Not everybody, it wasn't unanimous, but it was supported by the Council. So that's a separate issue.

Now let's look at officers, okay. If - Claudio, if I understand what you're saying then - and this is going to be an extreme example, but it will illustrate the point I want to make, that is - if so - if you have a Chair, a Vice Chair, a Secretary, and a Treasurer who are the officers of a stakeholder or constituency, what you're suggesting is that those four

people could just rotate around in different positions and you could keep the same four people without any term limits. In my opinion, that would go contrary to the Board recommendation of trying to create diversity and get new leadership.

Now, what I would add to that is if you are in a situation where you're having trouble getting leaders, you've got the last sentence that the group can approve an exception if it needs to. So you're covered there, it just requires the full group to approve it. So if you've got a real need, it shouldn't be hard to get the group to approve an exception.

So - and then with regard to executive committee members, it gets a little more confusing with executive committee members, not only because not everybody has them, but because they often include councilors and officers, so there's a lot of overlap with executive committees and that's a tougher one to deal with. But at least with officers, I don't - Claudio, I don't think I would support your position there for the two reasons I cited.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Does that make sense?

Claudio Digangi: No, it does. Those are - I think those are fair points. I'm trying to understand, so with the exception to the policy - so the idea there is in the cases when, you know, I guess, you know, the group would want to keep the same people in those positions they can then request an exception.



Chuck Gomes: Well, yeah, if there's a need - in other words, you can - you've got four people, you have four officers and you have four people who are willing to step up and you can't identify - that nobody else is willing to submit the time, the group could approve an exception. The key is is that the whole membership needs to approve that so it can't be manipulated so that you just maintain the same people all of the time running the show. But as long as...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...according to your voting procedures or whatever procedures you have that's approved by the full group, you can do that.

(Tony): Chuck, I'm sorry, when you're saying group, do you mean constituency or am I wrong?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, well, it could be constituency or stakeholder group, either one, (Tony).

(Tony): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's why I was using group generally, yeah.

(Tony): I understand.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. We should agree in some text or we can have a text and other opinions.

Claudio Digangi: So, Chuck, so I understand your position a little better, so what you're saying is that if you serve as a councilor for two years and then let's say you serve in let's say as the Secretary or some similar position then your term-limited out at that point. You can't...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Well, no, I wasn't fully - I wasn't going that far. I think that's something we still need to discuss. I was taking each of the pieces individually, okay. So with councilors we know they're term-limited. They cannot be a councilor more than two terms consecutive and it has to be a term in between. That's covered elsewhere, okay, so we already know that.

With officers I was strictly focusing on the officers themselves. To say what you're saying that they - it would be possible to - for the same four people to be officers as long as they switch officer positions indefinitely, okay, without any break, without any changes. And I don't think that's consistent with the BGC recommendations. Now if there is a situation though, just looking at officers, where you are in a bind, you can't seat - find people who will devote the time that's needed, you have an option through the exception procedure to deal with that.

Now so don't - I wasn't by all of that saying that a councilor couldn't become an officer if - in that sense, I wasn't going that far. I don't know what the answer is there. I'm not even sure what my position is there. So does that make sense?

Claudio Digangi: Yeah, no, it does. That does. That does clarify it to me. And I guess you sort of run into the same sort of issue there because you're not rotating amongst the officers but the councilors and the officers and the

executive committee people could all then potentially be rotating. So I - you still sort of, I think, run up into that same.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and I - but I think that Rafik has a valid concern here, and that is is that I don't think we want to recommend a situation where, okay, let's say - so you got - if we're talking about a - let's just talk about a constituency and let's say you've got two councilors, you've got three officers, and those - let's say those five people make up the executive committee, which sometimes occurs. Then you don't want a situation where five people just rotate positions and you keep the same leaderships all of the time if you can avoid it. And I think that's what the Board was trying to get at. Let's try to work towards some change there.

And so at the same time, as you guys know, I'm empathetic to the issue that it's hard to find people who will step up. And so we've created in the last sentence then a way for a group to deal with those kind of situations if they have to and I think (Tony) said this before, they probably will sometimes. We all know how that works if we've been around for a while.

But the provision is there for that and it's got the protection built into it that the group membership has to approve that. And if there's a desperate situation, a situation where you can't find leaders, I can't imagine why the group wouldn't support that.

(Tony): Well, actually, Chuck, you're right because we've had this issue with geographic diversity and then when the - there just hasn't been the possibility to fulfill the geographic diversity in the bylaws. You probably don't remember a couple of instances...

Chuck Gomes: Oh, yeah. Yeah, yeah.

(Tony): And so, I mean, it was just not applicable because there was nobody there from another region to step in.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

(Tony): So I guess really you have a reasonable point there. I don't know what you think, Claudio.

Claudio Digangi: Yes, no, I mean, it's - I think it's a fair point.

Chuck Gomes: Now we still have to answer the question about can, you know, okay, somebody no longer can be a councilor but can they be an officer and so on. That's a different question, okay.

Claudio Digangi: Yeah.

(Tony): Well, I - personally I would oppose having this as across all functions because as I said before you don't know how many more functions will be created. We may have more functions; in a year or two down the line there may be more functions to fill than we have members in a constituency.

Hello.

Olga Cavalli: Hello, yes...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: One way of dealing with that, (Tony), is to just separate these into multiple sentences. So we could say no person shall serve as a group councilor for more than - we would have to say more than two terms and that happens to be four consecutive years, okay.

(Tony): Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: No officer shall con - we repeat the same sentence for officers and we repeat the same sentence for stakeholder group executive committee members.

(Tony): Well, that would work for me.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, this is something I was thinking about, something - a similar approach...

Man: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: ...to that.

Man: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: Who could write it?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie, I can include that change in the next iteration, which would be the combination of, you know, everything into one document. So as I understand it then it would essentially read the same as it does here, except for that each of these provisions would be in three separate sentences repeated for...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's one approach. And let's make sure that all of us on the call agree to that approach. I wasn't advocating one way or the other, but pointing out that that's one way to handle it.

(Tony): Well, actually I think with - as far as Rafik's concern that would definitely state that it would include executive committees of a constituency, they would not be able to be reelected, so perhaps that would solve his concern too.

Claudio Digangi: Actually, (Tony), I thought it would just - the language now I think just says stakeholder group executive committee.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, that's right, Claudio. This is Julie. So right now it just applies to stakeholder groups because of the discussion we had on the last call of not applying the term limit to constituencies.

(Tony): Then I misunderstood Chuck's proposal.

Chuck Gomes: Well, my proposal didn't deal with whether or not - I wasn't talking about whether the executive committees just applied to stakeholder groups or stakeholder groups and constituencies like Rafik is suggesting.

(Tony): Okay. Then I'm sorry. I'm okay with that.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: It's a separate issue, yeah.

(Tony): Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: A question, we're spending an awful lot of time on executive committees...

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...and is there any executive committee that exists that you guys are aware of that doesn't include the officers and the councilors?

(Tony): Not that I know of.

Chuck Gomes: So are we spending a lot of time on something that it kind of overlaps?

Claudio Digangi: Most likely, yeah.

(Tony): Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga, I don't want to interfere because I - as I don't - I'm not part of a constituency. I just want you to express all of your comments, but I don't know. So...

Chuck Gomes: Could each person that has an executive committee whether it's a constituency or stakeholder group tell - just tell the rest of us what the membership of that executive committee is made up of and not

people's names but rather positions? Like Claudio, can - or - can you - do you have an executive committee in the...

((Crosstalk))

Claudio Digangi: We - at this time we don't actually.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Claudio Digangi: So...

Chuck Gomes: How about you, (Tony)? Do you guys have an executive committee?

(Tony): Yeah, we have one. It's - it consists of the Chair, the two councilors, before it was three councilors, and two more people.

Chuck Gomes: And the two people, okay, so you have two people that would not fall in the first two categories. Okay, that's helpful. Rafik...

((Crosstalk))

(Tony): Sure, they're not on stakeholder group executive committee and they're not councilors.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay, okay. And Rafik, what is it for the NCSG?

Rafik Dammak: We have a Chair and three councilor and another person who (unintelligible) in the Council and we have the executive committee for the NCSG and then I think no - just - there is nobody from that executive committee in the council. All of them are only under that



executive committee and we have a Chair for the NCSG executive committee.

Debra Hughes: Chuck, as I understand it...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: This is...

((Crosstalk))

Debra Hughes: ...to transition - the charter is in transition so a lot of this is still being discussed, but there is no requirement that all of the officers for the stakeholder group be on the executive committee.

Chuck Gomes: Right. Yeah, I understand that. Thanks, Debbie, yeah.

Debra Hughes: No problem.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie, I do apologize, but I have another call that I have to moderate, so I do unfortunately have to leave. I have to leave but...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Don't worry, Julie, I have to leave too.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...for, you know, you can keep discussing and of course I can check the transcript and so on.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Julie. I also have another meeting in a few minutes. How do we manage to finish this language about this paragraph?

Claudio Digangi: Olga, I think...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...some...

Claudio Digangi: I was going to just say I think Chuck had recommend we just parse it out into three separate sentences based on the structure that's there now and...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Okay, and I think that Julie captured that idea. And we can review...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Right, I did and - I'll capture that. I'll review the call. And I do apologize and thank everyone and I have to sign off. Thanks. Have a good day.

Olga Cavalli: Don't worry. Thank you very much, Julie. Thank you. And...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: And then I - Julie - if Julie can send that to our lists then each of us can critique it and make suggestions or something on the list so that when we meet next week hopefully we can reach some sort of a resolution.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. What I'm trying - what I was trying to do during this week is prepare this new version or new ordered version with Julie and hopefully send it to you before the call so we have the chance to review it and you give me your opinion if you like as to how it's ordered. And we can review this language and we also have to review the other part of the document about - it was Section 9-C, but we - I'm sorry, I have to leave, I have another meeting now. So that's the plan for the week.

We will send you a new document with the order that we agreed. And we should work on the text that we already have to agree on and keep on working on the document. And, Debbie, just feel free when you have the time to maybe send some guidelines through for the sub-working team.

((Crosstalk))

Debra Hughes: Sure, I have a document that I wanted to send around to the folks that have volunteered for Task 2...

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Debra Hughes: ...and I'll do that right after this call.

Olga Cavalli: Great. That's a great idea and count on me. We are a bunch of us in the sub-working team, so whenever you think you have the document just send it.

Debra Hughes: Okay, I'll send it now then. Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Debra Hughes: All righty.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you so much. And thank all of you for joining. Any other comments?

Claudio Digangi: Yeah, Olga, I just was wondering, are we back on a week-to-week schedule now for our meetings?

Olga Cavalli: A bi-weekly?

Chuck Gomes: No, every - we're every week.

Olga Cavalli: I think we have to go every week because we - I don't think we will finish by the first of July - of June, I'm sorry.

Chuck Gomes: That's June.

Claudio Digangi: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: So it's - I understand it's a lot of work, but I'm okay with every week. So if you are not joining, don't worry, we - you can catch up with the list and with the MP3, but I think we have to go weekly.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Claudio Digangi: No, that's fine with me. I just wanted to confirm it.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Okay, any other comments?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Debra Hughes: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Have a nice weekend and thank you for joining. Bye-bye.

Debra Hughes: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye-bye.

Man: Bye.

END