GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC)
Constituency Operations Work Team
23 July 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 23 July 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-20100723.mp3

On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jul

Participants present:
Olga Cavalli – NCA – Work Team Chair
Debra Hughes – NCSG
Michael Young - RySG
Rafik Dammak – NCSG

ICANN Staff
Julie Hedlund
Glen de Saint Géry

Apologies:
Michael Young – Registries
Victoria McEvedy - IPC
Krista Papac - RrSG
Tony Harris – ISPCP

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you very much. Good morning, good evening everyone.
                    Julie could you be so kind to help me make the roll call please?

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely. Thank you everyone. This is the meeting of the Constituency and
                    Stakeholder Group Operations Work Team. We have Olga Cavalli, the Chair.
                    We have Michael Young, the Vice Chair, Debra Hughes, Rafik Dammak, and
                    from staff we have Glen De Saint Gery and Julie Hedlund. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: And Rafik, right.

Glen De Saint Gery: Didn't I say, Rafik - Rafik Dammak.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, yes. We don't have Chuck on the call, right.

Julie Hedlund: No, we don't and I don't think he was planning on joining these calls since this is around the outreach effort, so I...

Olga Cavalli: Oh, yeah you're right. I just wanted him to maybe - his ideas about the motion could be good. Debbie if I may take some minutes from the call to discuss a little bit the language of the motion. In between us, I would like to get some sense from you if you are okay with which text and then give - establish some times in the email list. Perhaps 24 hours or 48 hours for others to send their comments and submit it to the GNSO. I would very much like to do that this week and starting maybe Monday or Tuesday so the Council has time to review all of the constituencies and stakeholder groups have time to review the motion and the text.

                  Julie sent - do you think that's a good idea, Debbie, that we take some time for that?

Debra Hughes: Yes, absolutely.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Debra Hughes: And I think Julie actually needs a little time to kind of put together the stuff for (Task 2), so I'm completely fine with that Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, thank you very much. And I have a text that Julie sent like two days ago with a revised motion with the wording that Chuck suggested also Victoria suggested some other language.

I must confess that I don't see that we are so able to enforce a stakeholder group or a constituency to do anything. We just some proposed some ideas and some text, so this is why I would like perhaps for Chuck to give his comments about his text or maybe some of us could enlighten me with - some of you could enlighten me with more ideas. Because I think that the motion as it was written the first time or with Chuck's edits, it's okay. I don't know what you think or we should read it or if you agree with the text that Chuck said. Perhaps we can exchange some ideas about this.

Are we okay with the text that Chuck sent? He made some edits to the original edit - the original text that Julie sent. I'm trying to find it.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. I can explain what the changes are.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, please.

Julie Hedlund: He essentially just made a change in the last clause - the (resolve further) clause so that it states at the end "Direct staff to provide these recommendations to GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies for use" -- this is the change -- "In amending their charters as appropriate.

And then he also deleted the last (resolve further), which (disbanded) the GNSO Council Operations Work Team since they may have a little bit more work to do, so it might be premature to disband them.

And then Victoria sent in revised text for the (resolve further) clause that says that the - instead of saying the GNSO Council approves the following (CFG FT) deliverable, she said, "Approves the (CFG WT) majority recommendations and/or the minority recommendations."

And then she goes on to add a statement, "GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies are to implement the mandatory recommendations as described there in and any non-mandatory recommendations adopted by

their general body and a vote by the full membership and shall incorporate the said changes in their charters and any other relevant documents if any and submit the same to the ICANN Board for its determination as to compliance with said recommendations."

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Julie. So that's my question. Does GNSO have this mandate? I mean do we have this mandate to tell the constituencies and stakeholder groups the mandatory something that they have to do that? That's my doubt and maybe I'm wrong. I'm more comfortable with the text that Chuck sent because I'm not sure which is - if it's among our mandate and our mission. Could someone bring me some ideas about that?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. I do think that Chuck spoke to that question on the list because that was a question that Victoria raised, and Chuck said specifically that the GNSO Council cannot - does not have the authority to dictate to the stakeholder groups and constituencies as to how they should - you know what they should do or not do.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, that's exactly my recognition of the situation, but maybe I thought I was missing something.

Rafik Dammak: Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, who is there?

Rafik Dammak: It's Rafik. I don't think the GNSO Council has any power in this or a mandate in this (unintelligible) because it's - because at the end of the day, it's the board's. And before this (unintelligible), which - who decides about the charter for each constituency and stakeholder group. So I don't think that the GNSO Council will (compete) with (board text) or - and anyway, (it's the kind of thing that's) (unintelligible). (It would surely raise a position for many councilors).

Olga Cavalli: I agree. I agree with you, Rafik, so thank you for bringing this to us. Any other comments? So are we on the call okay with the text that Chuck suggested in order to send a proposed motion to the GNSO? I will take silence as a yes. Okay, great. Thank you.

So Julie, help me please and send it to the list after the call once you have the time - that text and we agreed on the text on the call. And let's say that by Sunday if we don't hear anything against it, we send it to the GNSO as a proposed motion. And then maybe I can send it to the GNSO and maybe Rafik could check on it or who else? Or Debbie could check on it or whatever you want. It would be good if somebody on the working team once we send it to the GNSO could second the motion so we can - we review it on our next conference call on August 5. Is that okay?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Oh, thank you. Thank you very much, Rafik. I count on that (too). Okay, motion to...

Julie Hedlund: And Olga I will go ahead after this call and send the final text to the motion.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Great. And (I see) we get enough support on the list also from many working team members so it's clear that we agree on the text and - I just wanted to clarify which - if I was wrong about the GNSO mission or I was missing something, but I think I'm not.

Great. Now we move to our outreach document. I want to apologize. I had time yesterday afternoon to review the document. I read it all. I got some new text included in it. It's about some ideas for an outreach committee.

What I did is I've been reviewing some other outreach committees. I must confess I didn't invent anything; I just took ideas from other places and I wrote something that could maybe fit the GNSO and what we have been

talking about. And then I did some other text about some actions that we have been doing in Latin America. That is my input to the document.

So the floor is yours, Debbie.

Debra Hughes: Thank you so much, Olga.

Julie Hedlund: And Debbie - I'm sorry. This is Julie.

Debra Hughes: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: I'm still (working with those documents). It took a little bit for the document to actually get to my email, so I'm just trying to finish that up here quickly.

Debra Hughes: No problem at all.

Olga Cavalli: Debbie, if I may say something.

Debra Hughes: Yes, ma'am. Sure.

Olga Cavalli: I went through the document yesterday. I think it's becoming a very interesting document. I think it needs some polishing - the reduction and maybe (ordering) a little bit, but I think it's becoming a quite complete document. So perhaps we could divide amongst us parts of it to review it so all the charge doesn't go to you alone and to Julie. That's what I thought yesterday.

Debra Hughes: That sounds like a good idea.

So what I was hoping to be able to do today and it's our hope that we can start you know like Olga suggested - start cleaning up some of the sections. So do you think it makes sense group to talk a little bit about what we did in the last week?

So for example, I will put me and Michael on the spot since I can do that. And Michael, why don't we talk a little bit about the conversation we had yesterday? And I know the document is not ready, but I just wanted to share with the group some of the things that we were thinking about and where we are taking that. And Olga, if I don't mind at that point then asking you to talk about some of the comments you made. Because I think it might be helpful for the group to hear where we are going with some of these comments. Does that make sense?

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Debra Hughes: So I will tee it up Michael and then I will pass the mic to you.

So what Michael and I were thinking about yesterday is you know as we've discussed this idea of a committee, we thought that it would be very helpful for us to have some clarity around the purpose of the committee, perhaps how the committee should be structured, how the committee - who should be represented on the committee.

And then of course, what are some of the initial goals and initial things that we want the committee to achieve in the first year, and of course important to that are you know programs, and workshops, and kind of setting some deadlines so that you know the committee - we don't you know give the suggestion to the ICANN community and create this committee, but we also haven't given them any suggestions on a path forward.

So what Michael and I have been working on are some of those details so that should ICANN decide to create this committee, they have a little bit of structure and some suggestions on how to move forward.

So with that little intro, Michael do you want to kind of step them through a little bit some of the things we discussed yesterday?

Michael Young: Right, so when we were going through this, you know the first thing - you
                   know we talked about it on the call a little bit before - in the meetings before
                   was if we are going to suggest an outreach committee, you know the first -
                   there's two things that come up for anybody that hears the word committee.
                   One is who is going to pay for it, and two, are we just creating another level of
                   bureaucracy or work group that's going to overlap with others?

                   And so when Debbie and I talked about this yesterday, a big focus was on
                   how do we define that committee to address those two issues because they
                   are important and valid issues. And even in talking over the idea with some
                   other people outside our group, it's the first kind of thing that people tend to
                   raise. And so kind of two things play into that, defining a purpose and -
                   defining some thing about the committee helps answer those questions.

                   So some basic things to answer about the committee was structure,
                   representation, clear purpose. And so Debbie and I framed those three areas
                   and then filled in a bit of meat around those. So as far as Debbie - actually I
                   will do the purpose and Debbie why don't you talk a little bit about the
                   structure? You had some really good ideas around that.

Debra Hughes: Sure, so when we were talking about - oh, go ahead.

Michael Young: Yeah, I will do the purpose real quick.

Debra Hughes: You do purpose and then I'll do structure. Okay, great.

Michael Young: So we came up with ideas around purpose you know to really hit that issue of
                   you know what the naysayers say to something like this. This is just going to
                   be another overhead and cost and produce value. We thought about giving
                   some very specific clear purpose to the committee, and that is one of the
                   founding purposes or activities of such a committee would be to specifically
                   go out and regularly audit and examine outreach activities that are done by all

stakeholder groups, all constituencies, all working groups throughout the ICANN organizational structure with the purpose and the mission to look for overlapping efforts or you know complimentary efforts. And have the responsibility of informing parties working to consolidate those efforts with them and to achieve better results with (unintelligible).

Because I'm sure you know I alone have seen a few examples of overlap. I think we've all seen a few examples of overlap in terms of outreach where you know various stakeholder groups or working groups want to talk to various members of the community or ICANN staff has a mandate to communicate something new.

And as long as we are setting up a communication forum, there's - and we have a centralized body like this committee, there's the opportunity to feather in complementary information, complementary items. That instead of having you know four outreach activities, maybe we narrow it down to two that are richer and have you know a bigger set of interesting resourced information to present to people. So the committee would actually have a goal attempting to keep outreach efforts across the ICANN space cost efficient and effective. And I think that would be a very strong, valid purpose for them.

Along with that, we would give them a couple of specific items that they would own. So for example, doing an annual workshop would be a suggestion. We talked about that idea and that's a great forum also to bring the different constituencies and working groups and so forth together because the idea of such workshop would be getting different members and different groups to participate in that and present the information that they want to.

Now that actually ends up tying a bit into structure because in order to get good representation and participation at those workshops, we had to think about how we structured the committee to encourage that. So in a second here, I will pass it on to Debbie because she's got some answers around that problem.

Lastly, the committee needs to work on a funding model with ICANN staff that is true to their primary mission, which is to consolidate outreach efforts and seek general efficiencies and effectiveness in those outreach efforts. So they would obviously have a budget around something like a workshop, but the idea with the workshop would be to collapse other things that have been less effective into it. So that we're not necessarily raising the overall budget of ICANN long term, but what we're doing is keeping a long-term cost efficiency to this effort.

Any questions before I pass it on to Debbie?

Olga Cavalli: Michael if I may have a question.

Michael Young: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. I think it's very interesting what you are saying. And when I was preparing the text that I included, I had this slight confusion. We're talking about outreach committees for the GNSO, right? We're talking about GNSO and not ICANN, or we are talking about ICANN?

Michael Young: The way we visualized it is the committee would be something that goes beyond just the GNSO.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Michael Young: It would be across the board.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, just I didn't know. It's a broader focus if we go through the ICANN community if we want to enhance the GNSO itself as more visible to the community. It's a different focus. I just wanted to go into that because I had this (out) when I was just looking for some information and writing something in the document, and I had this confusion. I just wanted to (raise) that.

Michael Young: Well you know and you should because I think we did start out talking that way in all fairness Olga. I - somehow at some point we started to evolve into a bigger discussion, at least Debbie and I, and I should have actively noted that. That's my fault, but I apologize.

The reason we slid into that was because we realized that to achieve kind of - the real goal that we're talking about here is - with outreach is making people understand the structure of ICANN, how it works, what the groups are doing, and the messaging that they want to pass on. And certainly, the GNSO is a huge portion of that and one of the big chunks of complexity, but it's almost impossible really to understand the GNSO fully without understanding it in context to the other SOs and the rest of the structure. So it kind of led us naturally down this path.

Now if people think we're reaching too far, we can pull back to just the GNSO, but I think it becomes a harder argument for a committee then because kind of reaching that overall cost efficiency and effectiveness becomes more challenging if it's smaller basically - if the scope is smaller.

Julie Hedlund: Michael, this is Julie. May I make a comment?

Michael Young: Absolutely.

Julie Hedlund: I - or it's really - yeah, just a comment, but just to keep in mind that I'm not disagreeing with the scope as you describe it, but the original mandate - the recommendation from the BGC Report was specific to the GNSO and outreach for the constituencies and the stakeholder groups. I don't know what that means you know as far as if we expand this recommendation beyond the GNSO. There might be some questions you know arising from the fact that we are expanding the recommendation beyond what it was originally in the BGC Report.

Michael Young: So Julie, maybe to that point what we should do is just (claw it back) to directly the GNSO, but it wouldn't hurt to add less a formal recommendation and more a thought that this type of structure could extend further than the GNSO if people found value in it.

Rafik Dammak: It's Rafik. Just so I can understand the discussion. If we need to focus for GNSO to extend our recommendation to the whole ICANN. But anyway, it's - what we are going to propose it's something that can work for the whole ICANN. Then we can motion that the - this outreach committee will work for outreach effort for GNSO.

But we will advise and recommend that to be a (close) community outreach, outreach committee. And it should be the stage for refining a strategy for outreach initiative to coordinate outreach activities and to help for the implementation with the support of staff for outreach.

So it doesn't help that we (need) if we can suggest this outreach committee for the whole ICANN. I think that's one of the problems in ICANN that I think that are (somethings) that you are not aware about all of them. And sometimes they are overlapping.

So if we can propose something that - to the (pre board) the - present the overlapping and to make to propose a more efficient more (unintelligible) that it can help for the outreach that it - at the end of day it corresponds to somehow to the mandate that we have.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. Can I make a comment? Hello?

Debra Hughes: Oh yes sure. I'm sorry...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Oh no, no.

Debra Hughes: Sorry Olga.

Olga Cavalli: It was so silent that I thought I lost the line.

Debra Hughes: I'm so sorry.

Olga Cavalli: My fear is that I'm not saying that global or ICANN outreach committee is not a good idea. I really like it and I think it's needed.

But my fear is that if it's a little bit beyond our mandate we may have some comments from the OSC or from the GNSO itself or I don't know.

So I think that we should state it in the document. Maybe we can talk about GNSO and propose something wider for ICANN.

If we have some good ideas we should say them somehow in the document that fits our mandate and perhaps propose some other way for beyond our mandate.

Rafik Dammak: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

Rafik Dammak: Hi. It's Rafik. I think that it's we share the same ideas that we - even we - if we say that it's for GNSO but that we can say in the document that we think that it should be (unintelligible) into the other (prize) for ICANN.

So we just need to find to tweak that language that to not (unintelligible) for position, something like that that but that we can recommend that it's - this idea can be implemented for the whole ICANN. But it's - first it should be for the GNSO. I say that we agree.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I think we should do that. Sorry, I interrupted someone. I think I interrupted Michael.

Michael Young: No, no, I was actually pretty much done. So what I'm hearing from Rafik is - let me just recap what I'm hearing from the comments that were being made.

You know, one we do want to be sensitive that we don't overreach our mission if you will or...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Michael Young: ...our stated purpose because we don't want people - I mean I guess what can happen with that is people feel that we're extending and pushing this idea on other SOs. And that could actually get people's backs up if we don't handle it correctly.

But in general I'm also hearing that that's some agreement that it's a sensible idea on its own and there's some value to it.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Michael Young: So maybe, you know, what we can do is just approach this by, you know, if we carve this mission statement, this stuff, I'm going to call it the stub of the mission statement because the committee has to create their own mission statement.

But, you know, if we create a few stubs for the mission of a committee like this, even if it's coming from the GNSO we can basically state that, you know, I'm representing the GNSO.

They have the responsibility for coordinating outreach activities throughout the GNSO and making sure there's no overlap and exactly the mission I described and to make all efforts to reach out to any other as those or arms

of ICANN to coordinate - and we use the word coordinate - their activities with them and see if they can also accomplish on a voluntary basis the same efficiencies and same cooperation.

That way, you know, it's - we're not saying we're imposing that on other parts of ICANN but we're certainly going to, you know, engage in any one else's activity, look for it, understand it, engage in it, the committee and try to see if they can, you know, get that SO or that working group outside of the GNSO to coordinate with them if there's - if it makes sense to.

Is that a about - you know, does that kind of - Julie what do you think in terms of kind of massaging that in a way that's appropriate?

Julie Hedlund: Yes Michael this is Julie. I think that sounds like a very good approach. And I think that to a certain extent because the, you know, the mission of the committee would be to coordinate outreach efforts, you know, with, you know, and, you know, try to find efficiencies among various outreach efforts I think it makes sense for the committee to look beyond the GNSO outreach efforts to other organizations in ICANN are doing.

And I don't necessarily think that that aspect of the mission would be problematic in that the purpose of it is to ensure that there's not duplication of effort or to ensure that efforts outside the GNSO are complementary with what is, you know, happening within the GNSO community with respect to outreach.

So I think I agree with you and Rafik and Olga that if we're careful with the language we can phrase this in a way that it could be a model beyond ICANN but, you know, keep it also with (this) mandate of the BGC to extend it at least initially to the GNSO.

Olga Cavalli: Okay my - I think that we have to move forward and prepare the document. And then we - perhaps we can revise it, the language, so we don't over - go

beyond our mandate but we don't miss the chance to say what we think it's important for ICANN.

Hello?

Woman: Hello?

Debra Hughes: I keep doing it again. I'm sorry Olga. I'm speaking and I had it on mute. I think that's a good idea is what I was trying to say.

And Julie, thank you for your perspective. That's been really helpful.

Can I talk real quick about what we were thinking as far as representative and structure? Is that...

Woman: Yes.

Debra Hughes: ...still appropriate to talk about real quick?

Woman: Yes.

Debra Hughes: So we were talking about representing, representation on the committee and who, you know, how do you reach out?

Of course we want to make sure that the committee whether - well I guess, let me take a half step back.

Originally when Michael and I were speaking before we had this conversation we were thinking that in all fairness it might make sense for the Public Participation Committee of the board to perhaps help with the selection and nomination process for folks who would join the committee. And that was one of the recommendations that Michael and I thought might make sense given the goals of that board committee.

And with that idea in mind we were thinking well who were some of the individuals who should be represented on the committee from - that we felt were important?

And of course we listed individuals, some folks from academia, so individuals like individual users, academia, corporations, NGOs.

But the most important thing is that these be volunteers who are going to be willing to act as ambassadors for ICANN and that they would be willing to be able to demonstrate that they have a knowledge of ICANN's processes and that they have a knowledge of the environment and that there be no requirement that they're already involved in a constituency of stakeholder group.

They can be new to ICANN but new to being actively involved in a constituency or stakeholder group but know about ICANN.

Because we were thinking it was important to maybe also include newer voices but the overriding goal being that whoever the volunteers are who would be members of this committee that they would be the types of people who have knowledge of the process and would be willing to support the process and be excited about outreach and being an ambassador for ICANN and that they would kind of use - I mean what I'm not - what we're not saying here is they wouldn't use this opportunity to the detriment of ICANN.

I mean the idea here is reaching out and providing information (to you) - members hopefully think that participation in ICANN is a good thing.

And when we talked about, specifically about some of the structure of the committee, I'm looking back at my - I'm looking at the new document Julie and now I'm - when we're thinking about the structure of the committee and how do you, you know, how do you talk about voting and all those things, we

said that our group really needs to think about, you know, who should be voting members, who shouldn't be voting members and making those types of recommendations.

We really thought it was important to have an ICANN staff liaison to be a non-voting member and that of course that there would be memberships in the Public Participation Committee, that they should membership and, you know, we were up in the air as how many of those board memberships (you're) on.

But thinking again, as we were yesterday that this was a broader committee, we wanted to make sure that they were participating as well.

I still think even if it's a GNSO focused recommendation that certainly it might be helpful to have board participation.

And then for the ICANN staff liaison we were thinking in order to really create efficiencies within all the different activities that are occurring throughout the GSNO that it would make sense for that ICANN staff liaison to be somebody that perhaps Barbara Clay who's the Vice President for Communications designates so that hopefully that that person would have some insight into the different communications and marketing activities that are going on and can provide some really good advice and information to the committee.

When we talk about voting thresholds and those sorts of things and terms we were thinking hey, we did a lot of really good work on Task 1. Is there a way for us to take any of that work or those recommendations and incorporate those here when talking about the structure of the committee and rights and responsibilities of members?

Did I hit everything there (Mike)?

Michael Young: Yes that was great. I think you covered everything.

Debra Hughes: Okay, any questions on that piece?

Olga Cavalli: No that's very good.

Debra Hughes: Okay. So Olga, did you want to step us through some of the thoughts that you had during the last...

Olga Cavalli: Yes, what we did is (Tony) sent us some ideas about how the membership of the committee could be structured.

But the view is from a GNSO perspective. So it has - it's in a document. I'm trying to find it because it's a new document. It has more text now.

Well I - here, two members of - oh it has changed. Well two members of different stakeholder groups and constituencies. Two members, no it has changed completely. I cannot tell what was there before.

But anyway, he proposed two persons or two representatives from each house, a non-contracted parties house and contracted and then one other additional representative from registries and from registrars as a separate one.

Then he proposed that the liaisons - ICANN liaisons for the regional areas could be included in the committee and someone else. I cannot find the original text now but that's not important.

And what I suggested is some language for the mission of the committee that as I mentioned before I didn't invent. I just took ideas from other outreach committees that I've been researching in the Internet. Of course it has a GNSO perspective.

So I think that we can make - take some text from what I wrote and from what (Tony) included. And then we can blend it with what you did. Because I think it's both compatible with one another.

What we should do now is perhaps take some time to review all the documents simply for one consolidated version.

But that's basically what we included. It's the mission and somehow the conversation but with a perspective being a GNSO outreach committee, not an ICANN outreach committee.

Julie Hedlund: Yes and this is - Olga this is Julie. If - I should say that -- and I'm looking through the combined document -- I think that it's - the way it is now I just merged the two documents. And so as you can see it, it's difficult to follow because the text doesn't necessarily meld well. I mean it's just interposed, you know, one on top of the other.

And actually this is more a question to Debbie. I'm wondering Debbie if I should go ahead and produce a combined document defining what Olga and what you have sent and, you know, editing it so that it makes sense.

Because right now things are like I said, just laying one side by side. They don't necessarily make sense the way they've been placed in the document. It's a simple merge.

But as I have more time then I could actually produce a smoother document and then send that around say on Monday to have everybody read through and comment on prior to next Friday's meeting.

Debra Hughes: Yes, I think that's a great idea. And then we'll all be very committed to reading the document and providing comments to Julie by Thursday so that we can have a document that incorporates all of our comments from next week so that our column Friday will include everybody's comments from the

week and so that we'll, you know, be able to really start stepping through the language.

Does everybody agree with that? Does that make sense?

Olga Cavalli: Yes Debbie this is Olga.

Debra Hughes: Yes?

Olga Cavalli: So if we by next Friday - well Thursday, we can have all the text that we want to include in the document, then perhaps we can go into parts.

Because I see that there is a committee information and then there is some other activities related information.

I think it's quite different (stated). Maybe we - some of us we can focus on one part and some of others we can focus in the other part so we can start polishing the document and preparing a final version.

Debra Hughes: Yes, that sounds great. And I think your - I really liked your idea too that maybe one of the outcomes of next Friday after we go through the sections is to assign owners the sections to really give some hard cleanup after we have our general conversations.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Debra Hughes: So I think that's a good path forward.

Julie Hedlund: And Debbie this is Julie. I have a question. Normally I have a meeting that directly follows this meeting at 10 o'clock. But I do not have that meeting next Friday.

I'm wondering if we want to really take the time to go through the document if people were willing to schedule a longer meeting next Friday?

Olga Cavalli: Well...

Debra Hughes: Go ahead Olga. I'm sorry.

Olga Cavalli: So our meeting is set. What time would be in Germany because I will be in Germany, (our) meeting.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, let's think about that. Germany I think it's six hours.

Debra Hughes: Six hours ahead.

Woman: It's the same time as here Olga.

Julie Hedlund: Three o'clock I think.

Debra Hughes: Is it 3:00?

Woman: Yes, it's the same time. It'll be 3 o'clock Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I think it's okay. I can make it two hours.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Debra Hughes: I know I would be able to extend. And I'm just doing it right now before somebody schedules something.

Julie Hedlund: I just think that if we - you know, I think that by Monday I can get this all together and get a good solid document without all the redlines and, you know, and edit it and so on out to you. And then we could really spend some time.

And I think Rafik had mentioned before how useful this would be to just go...

Debra Hughes: Right.

Julie Hedlund: ...the document, you know, section by section and hash it out.

Debra Hughes: Yes. And I think this is - that's a really good idea too, especially if we want to try to meet the deadline. And so I'm open to that. And if there's others who are able to do a 2 hour call next Friday that would be wonderful.

Olga Cavalli: I can make it.

Michael Young: I can do that.

Debra Hughes: Great. Rafik, does this work for you?

Rafik Dammak: Okay, that means that will be from 10:00 pm to midnight but...

Debra Hughes: Oh no. Well listen - look, we understand. If you need to drop off, we completely understand. That's (sweet).

Rafik Dammak: No, no (unintelligible).

Debra Hughes: Okay, well that's great. Anything else we need to talk about on Task 2?

Olga Cavalli: So just one clarification. We will have the documents through the week and we may add some more text or we just...

Debra Hughes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...go to Friday?

Debra Hughes: I - what I would say is and - you guys can correct me if I'm wrong - when Julie sends out the document next week, I would love everybody to spend the week adding as much text that you want added of making as many comments as...

Julie Hedlund: Okay.

Debra Hughes: ...you want even if they don't exist now, that's fine. Just add it to the document. But make sure you send it to Julie...

Julie Hedlund: Okay.

Debra Hughes: ...so then Julie will have time to combine it all into one document...

Julie Hedlund: Okay.

Debra Hughes: ...if that makes sense.

Julie Hedlund: Okay.

Debra Hughes: Julie can you give us a time period on Friday that you'd like us to have it by even though we didn't meet our deadline last week?

Julie Hedlund: If I could have it by noon East Coast time on Thursday...

Debra Hughes: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...that would give me the afternoon to combine. Because I - because as you can see...

Debra Hughes: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: ...if I do a merge document it's just not a useful thing. It really needs to be much more carefully done which will take some time obviously.

And I should say that I will have a revised document, a clean document edited to all of you on Monday. So you'll have from Monday until Noon on Thursday to add anything.

And I also should note that Olga and I and I was going to get (Rob) involved too will have - try to schedule a call net week because there are some aspects of the resources issues within ICANN and for outreach that we still need to talk through. And we haven't had a chance to do that yet.

So we'll try to do that and get that included in the document as well.

Debra Hughes: That's great. All right, so I'll be sure to send a reminder on Wednesday of next week to everybody asking them to make sure they get their comments into Julie by noon East Coast time. And I guess that's - what is that, 16:00 UCC?

And then we can move forward from there.

Julie Hedlund: That's great.

Debra Hughes: Any questions? No?

Olga Cavalli: That's great. Great plan.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: (Unintelligible).

Debra Hughes: I'll turn the chair back over to you Olga.

Julie Hedlund: Yes and Olga...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...I just mention to everyone...

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

Julie Hedlund: ...I did send around the motion language. So that task is complete.

Olga Cavalli: Yes I saw it. Thank you very much Julie. My idea is that perhaps Sunday it could be a good time for if we don't hear any other comments, send it to the GNSO. And perhaps and Rafik can second it.

                   So stakeholder group have time to review it and we have a vote on August the 5th and we are done with (unintelligible) that's great. A big step forward hopefully.

                   Okay that's - I think that's all for today. Thank you. Any other comments? Thank you very much for joining. Have a very nice weekend and we talk again next Friday (unintelligible).

Woman: Thank you everyone.

Olga Cavalli: Bye-bye.

Woman: Bye.

Michael Young: Bye.

                              END