

GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work
Team 27 March 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 27 March 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/gns0/gns0-cowt-20090327.mp3>
<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#march>

Participants present:

Olga Cavalli - Work team chair - NCA
Michael Young - Work team vice chair - Registry c.
Charles Gomes - Registry c.
Rafik Dammak - NCUC
Hector Ariel Manoff - IPC
Claudio Digangi - IPC
Krista Papac - Registrar c.
SS Kshatriya – Individual

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund - Policy Consultant
Robert Hoggarth - Senior Policy Director
Glen de Saint G ry - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, operator. Good morning, good evening for all in the call. I know that for some of us this is very early. For me it's quite okay. It's 10:00 am in the morning in Buenos Aires. Very nice day so that's fine. And I know that (Rafik) and (S.S.) must be facing the night in India and Japan so we appreciate...

Man: Hi It is 6:30 here...

Olga Cavalli: Oh.

Man: ...in India.

Olga Cavalli: And Glen or (Julie) could you please do a roll call to - so we know in the record who we are in the call?

Glen DeSaintgery: (Unintelligible). Olga, I will give it to Glen. We have on the call (Rafik Dammak), who's NCUC, Olga Cavalli, nominating to (this year)'s (unintelligible), (Michael Young), registry constituency, (Hector Ariel Manoff), who is an IC constituency, Chuck Gomes registry constituency, (Claudio Digangi), commercial and business units constituency, Krista Papac, the registrar. And (S.S.) is an individual; (S.S.) (Hector)...

SS Kshatriya): Kshatriya

Glen DeSaintgery: Tough the original pronunciation, the...

SS Kshatriya: Yes. (Unintelligible) (Chutria) it is; yes. Okay.

Claudio Digangi: Glen, this is (Claudio). I'm with the intellectual property constituency.

Glen DeSaintgery: Oh, sorry, (Claudio). You're the IPC. And you have for staff Rob Hoggarth and Julie and myself (Glen DeSaintgery). Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: And Olga, if I can...

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

Chuck Gomes: ...Glen, is (Victoria) from the IPC? I thought she was from the NCUC but it's been awhile since I worked with her.

Glen DeSaintgery: Victoria McEvedy?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: She's from IPC, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Glen. So looking at the list of people that we have together in this call I think that we have some constituencies not represented. Are there, in the group and not (referenced) today, or we are - we have some constituencies missed from our group?

I'm wondering about business constituency. And I think that Tony Harris is in this group for IP - for (I Peace) but maybe he couldn't join today. Are we missing some other constituencies or we should, perhaps, talk to some constituencies to appoint people in this group?

For example, from business constituency do we have someone in the group? I'm checking the chart here. There is a...

Chuck Gomes: (Sayid).

Glen DeSaintgery: (There are six) for you now, Olga.

Chuck Gomes: (Sayid Jamil) is...

Olga Cavalli: Oh, it's (Sayid). Yes, you're right. It's (Sayid). So we are mostly - we have representatives from all the existing constituencies, am I right? Or...

Chuck Gomes: You're right but I don't think we have anybody from the ALAC if they want...

Olga Cavalli: Oh, yes...

Chuck Gomes: ...to have someone.

Olga Cavalli: ...right. You're right. We are supposed - at least, you know, (unintelligible) to also invite other ANS and other groups. Sorry, (Claudio) - (Claudio) is on the line?

Claudio Digangi: Yes. Hi, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Hi, (Claudio). And you're an individual or you represent a constituency?

Claudio Digangi: The IPC.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, I'm so sorry. You just mentioned it. I'm sorry.

Claudio Digangi: That's okay.

Olga Cavalli: When Glen is talking I have a lot of echo and I cannot really hear very well what she says. And she mentioned it so thank you very much. Okay...

Glen DeSaintgery: I'll (unintelligible) you a (sixth) set, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: No problem. The first thing - the next item in our agenda - oh, first, I have seen in the list some revisions and additions, that made (S.S.), in relation to our agenda. I must confess I read them but I couldn't include them in the text. I really have no time since this morning so maybe we can add them, if we agree, as we are going through the agenda, if you think that's fine.

Chuck Gomes: I thought they were good suggestions; constructive.

Olga Cavalli: I totally agree with, Chuck, and I really had no time to re-write it and send it to the list this morning. At least I saw it this morning. Maybe it was sent in my night and I had no time to see it before. So I suggested we include them as we are going through our agenda if no one is opposed to that.

Okay (Julie), could you please tell us about - you are the administrator of the (duties) for the - for electing Chair and Vice Chair. Let me remind you that (Krista) and myself, we self-volunteered for being Chair of this working group. And (S.S.) - I don't know how to pronounce your last name. (S.S.), so...

SS Kshatriya: That's okay; (Chutria).

Olga Cavalli: Please forgive me.

(S.S. Chutria.): I can call it (Chutria).

Olga Cavalli: (Chutria)? SS Kshatriya, (Michael Young), and (Rafik Damack) volunteered for Vice Chair. We all sent our background and our experience and some other things that we think are necessary for Chairing/Vice Chairing this group in the list.

I hope you had the chance to review them. I think we have very qualified group; a nice group of people. And (Julie) prepared (duties) that I hope you all had the chance to participate in. So she should tell us what was the result.

(Julie): Yes. Thank you very much, Olga. So the results of the poll are that we had nine votes total and...

Olga Cavalli: Nine total; okay.

(Julie): Nine total. For Chair we had six votes for Olga Cavalli and we had three votes for (Krista Papak).

Chuck Gomes: Congratulations, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you for the confidence.

Man: Congratulations, Olga.

Woman: Congratulations.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much.

Man: Congrats.

(Julie): For Vice Chair...

Man: Congratulations.

(Julie): ...we had six votes for (Michael Young). We had two votes for SS Kshatriya and one vote for (Rafik Damack).

Olga Cavalli: Okay, (Michael), congratulations.

(Michael Young): Thank you, Olga.

Man: Congratulations, (Michael). You (said it).

(Michael Young): Thank you.

Man: Congratulations.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Well thank you very much.

Chuck Gomes: Olga, could I interject something here as Vice Chair of the Council?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: I want to compliment the - all the people who volunteered because as - and encourage them to stay involved. And there's going to be lots of opportunities for Chairs and Vice Chair positions as we, you know, improve the GNSO. So look forward to you volunteering in the future for roles like that. Thanks a lot.

Olga Cavalli: I totally agree with Chuck. And it's - being a volunteer, it's very challenging. It's very time-consuming but it's very interesting. For me it has been a great experience. So I encourage all of you that are doing this as volunteers, as myself, to keep on doing it because I have learned a lot and I hope to share some knowledge and learn from you, also, in this group.

I am really flattered and honored that you considered that I can Chair this group. I'm very happy and thank you for the votes. That's why this is - I am able to do this job. Okay great.

Thank you very much, (Julie). And I would like to stress that (Julie) has been extremely helpful for me. I have been very, very busy because I'm organizing a couple of activities next week and she has been extremely helpful with these activities in the working group. Hopefully in the first days of April I will return to my normal schedule.

(Julie): Thank you very much, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: You're great. You're doing this help in (unintelligible). Next item on the agenda; it's - I know (Krista) has difficulties in joining us on Fridays. Sorry for - when I selected Friday it was something that we talked about with (Julie) and Glen privately by email and we thought it was the best day because most of the people were able to attend.

But we really - I'm sorry to know that you are not able on Fridays. I'm glad to have you today with us. So how do you think that we could find a right date and time? Should we arrange a new (doodle) to find a good day and time to meet regularly in our - on these phone calls or we should talk about it now?

Chuck Gomes: How many people could not make this time, Olga?

Olga Cavalli: I think (Krista) and someone else has problems on Friday that we should - we could discuss it now. I had no problem on Friday, personally.

(Michael Young): This time works well for me. It's (Michael) speaking. (Krista), if we stayed on the - if we stayed on this rotation would - are your classes static? Would they be every second Friday evenly?

(Krista Papak): I'm just looking right now because I think we have a weird - that's normally the case but I think with the holiday in April or spring break, not that I'm getting a real spring break, but I think it changes, so bear with me one second. I'm just comparing the calendar. If you guys can hang on...

(Michael Young): And if it's only one or two shifts, I mean, I personally could flip to the other Friday if - because Friday mornings are generally okay for me. How's everybody else for that?

Chuck Gomes: Was there anybody besides (Krista) that had a conflict on Friday mornings?

(Krista Papak): I'm sorry to - you know what? If we stay on this Friday, I have one conflict. It's just my very last class. You know, so anyway this Friday is fine, is my point.

Chuck Gomes: So if we went on an every two weeks schedule this would work?

(Krista Papak): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And what did we decide in Mexico? Was it - did we make a decision; every two weeks?

Olga Cavalli: Yes I think it was every two weeks or every three. And some of us thought that every three was, like, too much time in between calls and every week was too frequent. And we had no complete consensus but the most of the people thought that every two weeks was fine.

Chuck Gomes: So maybe we've reached agreement.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. So, about Fridays, (Krista) are you are okay if we keep the Friday?

(Krista Papak): Yes, if it's - yes, exactly. Yes.

Olga Cavalli: The next one will be tenth of April.

(Krista Papak): Okay so...

Chuck Gomes: Now that's - then that's fine with me. But that is on a holiday weekend for some people.

Glen DeSaintgery: Exactly.

Chuck Gomes: Is that okay?

Glen DeSaintgery: That (comes Easter weekend) for some people.

Chuck Gomes: It's okay with me.

Olga Cavalli: It's Easter?

Glen DeSaintgery: It's the Friday of Easter.

Olga Cavalli: Okay that's - for me its fine. I'll be at home so I can attend a call but perhaps there are people that it's troubling. And at least in my country it's usual that people that go away for Easter time. I won't but maybe we can skip that Friday and go to the next one. What do others think?

Chuck Gomes: We don't want to go to the next Friday because keep in mind that'll be a conflict for (Krista).

Glen DeSaintgery: (Krista).

Olga Cavalli: Oh, yes, right.

Chuck Gomes: So if we skip, we're going to be skipping, probably - not have a meeting for four weeks which is, kind of, long in-between.

Glen DeSaintgery: Twenty-fourth of April.

(Michael Young): I can do the tenth; the morning of the tenth.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Michael Young): I am away but I - it's first thing in the morning so it's not too - you know, it doesn't interfere with the day too much. So I - you know, why don't we just do best case attendance for that tenth and if we have a

couple people off we'll, you know, that's unfortunate but it's better than going a whole month.

Chuck Gomes: And we'll have the recording so - and stuff so they can catch up. And we have the list for providing information in advance to contribute to the agenda and so forth.

Olga Cavalli: Right so if no one opposed we could keep the Friday, April the tenth, for our next conference call. And those who cannot attend because it's Easter time could check the recording and follow the list.

Woman: I have a call this morning in (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: I'm sorry?

Woman: I have...

Glen DeSaintgery: Who was that?

Olga Cavalli: Who was that? I didn't hear.

Chuck Gomes: It sounded like (Marika).

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: But it wasn't.

Olga Cavalli: I think it was the operator. Okay so we do tasks? And hopefully...

Chuck Gomes: And every two weeks thereafter.

Olga Cavalli: And then 24th and so on. Next item; any comments? Okay. We have our...

Chuck Gomes: Question - just one question, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Glen, can you set up recurring meetings so it gets on our calendars or is that a problem?

Glen DeSaintgery: Actually...

Chuck Gomes: I guess we have to do that ourselves, huh?

Glen DeSaintgery: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that's okay. I could...

Glen DeSaintgery: I'm in the - just trying to set up a calendar on the (Sieneta) weekly page which you can all subscribe to.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks.

Glen DeSaintgery: But I don't promise, when expected, that will be ready but maybe next week sometime. A (gruger) calendar it will be.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good. Thanks.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Thanks, Glen. I hope that you had the chance to review our work team charter. I reviewed it in Mexico with (Julie) and with Rob. We made some changes and Chuck has made very interesting additions, especially in relation with the role of Chair and Vice Chair which I think are very good. And I agreed with them.

I would like to know if you had a chance to review the charter, if you have any comment, if you like the wording as it is, if you would like to suggest some addition or delete something. Any comment? I can make a few of people who want to talk.

SS Kshatriya: Yes, (S.S.).

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

SS Kshatriya: Yes, it is about comments editing from Chuck. The (dean) charter goals that deleted "to", I believe "to" should remain there. It reads - it will include updated files to encourage and (unintelligible) participation in the stakeholder group and constituency by explaining that aided (unintelligible) ICANN participation to such groups. That is, we are explaining to the new group their participation ICANN to "to" should remain there, not in.

Olga Cavalli: Could you be so kind to go to the charter - can you access the wiki and make your comments or changes there? Is (S.S.) with - right to do that? Glen or (Julie), he's able to make the changes, right?

Man: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

(Julie): Yes, (S.S.), you should be able to go ahead and make comments to the charter if you like. If you have any questions, though, I'm happy to assist.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay. I want - I'm trying to find where you're at, (S.S.), in the charter. I've got the - my Word version up. And you said the goals - oh, right at the beginning. The goals; is that right?

SS Kshatriya: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Section One?

SS Kshatriya: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay and...

SS Kshatriya: You have it "to" and insert it "in."

Chuck Gomes: Where - oh, yes, where I inserted "in?"

SS Kshatriya: Yes, yes, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay and what about that?

SS Kshatriya: "To" should remain. You are explaining the (unintelligible) to the group; to new groups.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, you're just - you think it should be "to" instead of "in."

SS Kshatriya: Yes, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Participation “to” such groups? Okay. Well, yes, I - didn’t make sense to me but I don’t - it’s not a big deal.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, okay. I see. Great; (Julie), could you do that change?

(Julie): Yes, well, I guess my question is: are we changing it - are we leaving it then and not changing it “in such groups” - as to “in such groups,” as Chuck has noted, or leaving it as “participation to such groups?”

Olga Cavalli: I won’t make any comment because English is my second language so I’m not good at that; in, to, or for, or - sometimes I make mistakes. So for those who are English speakers...

(Julie): I actually think that it may be - editorially it may be different depending on if you are using British English or...

Olga Cavalli: I know.

(Julie): ...American English.

Olga Cavalli: I know.

(Julie): That may explain the difference here.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that’s probably true. So I - yes, I’m flexible, you know. I obviously was not using British English. Yes, as a Canadian...

SS Kshatriya: It's not that I often (list) but it is for that you are including the group "in to you" or you are explaining to the group. So, in fact, you are explaining to the groups who are not there with you right now.

Man: Yes, it - Chuck, I mean, I do think it's a British thing because in Canada that's how I would - we would do it, too. We would do "to" versus "in."

Chuck Gomes: Let's go with "to."

Olga Cavalli: Okay I agree with English speakers.

Chuck Gomes: And we don't have any Australians, do we?

Olga Cavalli: No, we don't.

Chuck Gomes: That's probably British, too, huh?

Man: Yes, yes it is.

Chuck Gomes: What was the - was there another one, (S.S.)?

SS Kshatriya: Yes, that's fine.

Olga Cavalli: And you have any other comments, (S.S.)?

SS Kshatriya: It was very nice editing you did. You went through very deeply and (keenly) to each item, and a really wonderful job.

Olga Cavalli: So you made another comment. I didn't get you very well, (S.S.).

SS Kshatriya: No, I said Chuck has done a very good job.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, yes.

SS Kshatriya: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: I totally agree; a very good job and I won't correct his English. I'm not able to. Okay any other comments to our charter? Thank you very much, (S.S.), for your suggestions and comments. Any additions? Any deletions? I think Chuck included the very interesting details about Chair and Vice Chair mission and the rest of the changes are - I agree with them and...

(Michael Young): Olga, it's (Michael). I just want to add my support to those changes as well. I think Chuck did a fantastic job on it and thank you, Chuck, for the effort. Your experience really shows when I look at a document like this and see your edits.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I agree with (Michael). I support the changes and I like the wording of the charter as it is now. So if there are no further changes or suggestions or comments or deletions should we agree that this is our charter?

Chuck Gomes: Well I - let's make sure that we've covered (S.S.)'s - you know, he broke this item down in some other areas so...

Olga Cavalli: Oh, you're right.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Just a second; I have to look at my computer. I'm looking at my papers.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I understand, Olga. Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, I have to open...

Chuck Gomes: No, here I'll help you. I'll help you on that because I edited it on my calendar. So I think his next thing was to discuss team membership. Is that correct (S.S.)?

SS Kshatriya: Yes, it's right.

Chuck Gomes: And then after that to discuss action items and deliverables...

SS Kshatriya: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...and then I think that we will have the - we may be ready then to vote on the charter, Olga. So team membership, okay?

Olga Cavalli: Oh, okay. You're right. So we should discuss, now, team membership. I'm reading your email, (S.S.).

SS Kshatriya: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: It says here we discussed if the team membership is as per guidelines. Each member is to be bracketed into respective categories and see if a category is over-represented or under-represented; also, to find out from members if one is too busy working on other committees. What

do I will think? (S.S.), you made this comment for some weeks and you know that there is an imbalance or...?

SS Kshatriya: In team membership section, these are the requirements of the team. The number of (consulates) will be limited to (at most three) to maintain separation. There will be at least one representative from each constituency whether (who) we have each representative.

Each advisory committee and support (and organization) be given the opportunity to have a representative. Do we have that? So these are the questions which, I mean, answer you will know or the office will know; if Chuck will know. So, whether our team is as per the guidelines given in this charter, that's one of my questions.

Chuck Gomes: I'm looking through that myself right now. Let's see, how many counselors do we have? One, two, three - looks like we have, what, four counselors? So we've exceeded that a little bit. The - as far as all the constituencies, we obviously don't have anyone from the ALAC. Of course we can't force people to volunteer...

Olga Cavalli: No.

Chuck Gomes: ...so...

Olga Cavalli: No, I have also sent all this information and talk with (Christina So) in there - in the conference calls that I participate as the Assistant S.O., as the (Geneso) liaison, and nobody reacted.

Chuck Gomes: And the GAC we - was notified too and that's, kind of, commonly what we get with the GAC but we always want to invite them. And I think that happened.

These things are intended, in terms of the original group that drafted this charter, the team membership - and maybe what we want to do, if people think, is call them team membership guidelines rather than hard and fast rules because I don't think we want to spend too much time on this.

I think (S.S.) is right, though, that we should regularly make efforts to keep it balanced. So if we changed it to guidelines, if we added the word "guidelines" to team membership and still strive towards these goals as much as was - in our control I think we might be okay. What do others think?

Rob Hoggarth: Chuck, this is Rob Hoggarth. If I can interject; the initial paragraph ends with "it is recommended that." So it's set up to be a recommendation. You could call them guidelines as well (if you'd) like.

Chuck Gomes: Good point.

(Michael Young): Yes, I think it's a good idea to add the "guidelines" after team membership because I - that's perfectly accurate but, you know, how many - people tend to jump to the title. And I think it - right out of the gate if people have the expectation, and then if they read that section that it's a guideline, they go into it with a different attitude. And I think that's probably a wise - to add the word guideline.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So we should add more information now on wiki? That's the idea in relation with the membership of each person working in the group? Am I getting it right or not?

SS Kshatriya: Yes, you are right. I think we should have (okay) council members, so many this constituency, so many this constituency, so many - that would be sufficient, I believe. And I am not a part any change. I just want put that (unintelligible) should be known and understood.

(Michael Young): And, Olga, I think we're talking about changing the title of Section Two from Team Membership to Team Membership Guidelines.

SS Kshatriya: No, no not that. It really - we don't change - it won't matter so much as long as we are not going two out of - in place of three there are four counselors. Is it okay? Maybe, probably, voted yet. (Captain) (unintelligible) about it.

Man: Okay but...

SS Kshatriya: Like, as a team member we don't object to it until somebody else objects and then we make it...

Chuck Gomes: Olga, is anybody - you might want to find out whether anybody is opposed to just adding the word "Guidelines," after Team Membership, in the title.

Olga Cavalli: No, per me it's fine. If that's the change, per me it's fine. But I'm not sure if I really understand you, (S.S.), what you want to add in the charter.

Chuck Gomes: Let me help there, Olga. I don't think he's asking for a change, necessarily. He's suggesting -- and I think it's a very good suggestion - - that we just make sure we're in agreement ourselves that we're close enough to the guidelines that we're comfortable. Is that correct, (S.S.)?

SS Kshatriya: Yes, yes. I'm not for any change but just for - that inform (unintelligible) that our team is of this nature, that's all. (Unintelligible).

(Michael Young): (S.S.), are you also saying we should put this on the wiki; basically a declaration of what our...?

SS Kshatriya: Yes, yes, that...

(Michael Young): Right, okay. So we're transparent; fully transparent. Yes.

SS Kshatriya: Yes. So those - the guidelines suggest that team members, I mean, just for example, but we are poor. Okay, no problem. It's open.

(Michael Young): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Now, on his second suggestion, with regard to reviewing whether people are on - in this group or on too many committees, I also think that's a helpful thing for us to keep in mind.

For example, if we find that certain members just can't make very many meetings we might want to explore that possibility, whether or not they're on too many working teams and work groups and the GNSO.

And if so, and they can't make very - meetings regularly, we might want to ask whether that's an issue and if maybe there's somebody else in their constituency who is less busy.

Obviously we want to do that tactfully but - and again, it's the constituency's choice, not ours, so we don't have control over that completely but we can at least work in that direction.

(Michael Young): Well, Chuck, you know, that brings to mind something maybe we could reuse that's been discussed in the registry constituency and that is the idea of active participant versus non-active participant.

Perhaps it's appropriate to include that in our charter, which, just for everyone else on the call, it's basically a rough guideline that indicates whether or not someone's active.

So if they've, for instance, been attending at least the last couple of meetings then they are considered an active participant and if a matter comes up for a vote they can vote.

But if they've missed, you know, the last three meetings in a row they're still a participant and they can comment but they have to step back from the vote because they haven't been contributing actively enough to the group. That's an example of that type of active versus non-active.

And it tends, in that regard, then for us not to have to make a group decision or an arbitrary decision whether or not somebody is contributing enough time to the group and do that as an on-the-spot

decision. I'd be very uncomfortable with that. I would think we should set a guideline for that so - in advance of it being a problem.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: No, no. You go first, please.

Olga Cavalli: No, I'm just thinking that there are many, many working groups and different activities, especially in GNSO now; and especially counselors. GNSO counselors should be aware of this workload. That's my comment.

Chuck Gomes: With regard to voting, let me make this comment. By the way, I like what we do on the registry constituency and by the way, it's very easy for somebody to become active. They just have to participate. So it's real easy to become re-classified as an active member. So that works out pretty well. But if they're - if they haven't been active it doesn't - they're not included in a quorum so it doesn't prevent us from doing business.

In the case of working groups, and in this case a working team in the council, one of the recommendations, and another working team is working on this, and that's the working group model team that's under the PPSC, the recommendation from the Board is that we move away from voting and move towards a rough consensus model rather than a lot of voting.

So one thing to keep in mind as we're considering what (Michael) suggested is, is that we really shouldn't be relying on votes much if

we're going to, you know, kind of follow the recommendation of the Board.

We know - it's true that the working group model working team hasn't finished it's work but we know already that that's a goal. And the GNSO has been moving in that direction anyway. So we really should, and I think - is that in this charter somewhere...

Olga Cavalli: Yes, it is.

Chuck Gomes: ...in terms of that - of using a rough consensus approach?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Yes, I - let me tell you what is it.

Chuck Gomes: I thought it was.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, let me find it. Decision making shall function on the basis of rough consensus. It's number three "work team rules." It's the third or fourth paragraph. The working team shall function on the basis of rough consensus meaning that all points of view will be discussed with the Chair and (ask person) that the point of view is understood and has been covered.

That consensus view point will be reported to the OSC in the form of a working team report. Anyone with a minority view will be invited to include a discussion in the working team report. The minority view should include the names and affiliations of those contributing to that part of the report.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Olga. And if we work on - if we follow that, and for those that haven't been too involved in the - in some of the recent GNSO activities where we've tried to apply this, really what that means is, is that we get all opinions and then we try to reach a position that hopefully everybody will support but at least a strong majority.

And so we don't just throw out minority views but rather we try and come to a position that satisfies that as well as everyone else or most everyone else. And then if we cannot get to a point like that after working on it for awhile, you know, there's always a possibility of having minority positions in that. But in essence that, you know, we never - and that kind of approach never even have to take a vote.

So it would - now we'd like to, in the case of people who haven't been active, to get their opinion. And we should always strive towards that, but again you can't force people to use their volunteer time. So you can only go so far. Does that make sense?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, for me it does make sense. And rough consensus is, to me, the best way to work with not such a large group of people. We are not so many. I think we can have some dialogue, in the least, and in the phone calls so we can reach some agreement. It's easier. When you have a bigger group, that is more complicated; at least in my opinion.

Chuck Gomes: And just as I - one example, for those that are new to the GNSO, the three year plus new GTLB/PDP was essentially operated that way. Now that doesn't mean that we had full agreement on every recommendation we ended up with. We did not.

But we always had a strong portion and we always tried to incorporate various viewpoints in the recommendations we came up with. So there have been some good examples in the GNSO where this has worked quite well.

(Michael Young): So, Chuck, I mean, going along with the language in here and the consensus position, or the working group model which is actually something I've got personally more experience in with than the voting model because I've spent a long time in the ITF helping out in groups there, but it sounds to me like what we would add to the charter, then, is maybe a definition of inactive and active participants.

And then maybe when it comes down to this unanimous consensus position section you would alter the language to say something like "rough consensus position where more than 1/3 of active participants disagree and at least 2/3 of active participants agree." That's a (unintelligible). You know, this consensus position is built around active participants rather than us trying to chase down people that have not been attending the meetings regularly.

Olga Cavalli: I think it's a great suggestion. Would you send us some wording or add to it the...

(Michael Young): Sure, I'll do it.

Olga Cavalli: ...wiki?

(Michael Young): Sure, I'll take Chuck's version and do the edits on top of that if there are no objections.

Olga Cavalli: Great. What do others think? I think it's a very interesting suggestion. So if you could do that, (Michael), could be very useful.

(Michael Young): Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much; any other comments on the charter?

Chuck Gomes: So hopefully we could, at our next meeting on the tenth, vote on the final charter with any - with the edits that (Michael) is going to propose and, with or without depending on what we decide, and then any other edits or suggestions.

So I think it would be helpful if Rob or (Julie), you know, sent out a message to the list after this meeting that specifically communicated, especially for those who are not on the call, that we're going to do that in the next meeting and to please come prepared having reviewed the final document that we have right now and any additional edits that are proposed between now and then. That make sense?

(Julie): Yes, sure.

Olga Cavalli: For me, yes.

(Julie): We'll do that.

Olga Cavalli: So great. So let's focus on the final version of our charter given the two weeks. (Michael) and who - anyone else that wants to add something or make any changes, and please to read those changes and - so we can maybe in two weeks have our final version. Should we move to our next item? Am I missing something?

Chuck Gomes: Just before we do that...

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

Chuck Gomes: ...Olga, I caught something else. And this is in my role as Chair of the OSC...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...because notice under Reporting in this, towards the end of Section Three, it says that the working Chair will be asked to report on the working team status to the OSC at least monthly. And of course I made that change. I'm going to suggest a different change right now. I would suggest that that be bi-weekly rather than monthly to correspond - that way it'll correspond to our meetings.

And the council meetings are every three weeks so monthly would be a little bit less frequently than it should be. So I would suggest we change that to bi-weekly rather than at least monthly. Now, the wording actually allows that but I think it'd be better if we were more specific.

Olga Cavalli: I think it does make sense every time we have a conference call...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that's what...

Olga Cavalli: ...to make a report to the OSC.

Chuck Gomes: Exactly, Olga. That's what I'm thinking. So...

Olga Cavalli: I don't know what do others think but I think it does totally make sense because it was the (way to) wrap-up of our meetings. I was just going...

Chuck Gomes: So, (Julie), you'll - if nobody opposes that, (Julie), you going to capture that one?

(Julie): I did already and it'll be in the version that I send around today.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Right. I was just going to mention about report the OSC as our next step because it was not in our agenda but it's in - among the action items that you added in the - in our charter, Chuck, so you read my mind. And we already went through that so it will be bi-weekly, and our - after each of our conference calls or bi-weekly, whatever. It'll help for sure.

Chuck Gomes: And that will help me as Chair of the OSC. I'll work with the other two work teams under the OSC as well to encourage reporting from them regularly as well so that when I give an update in the council meeting on GNSO improvements under the OSC it'll make it - it would really facilitate that. So...

Olga Cavalli: Right, thank you very much. Any objections to bi-weekly reports made by Chair? Oh my God there's a sound that is killing me. It's like a key pressing or something. Any comments? Anyone opposed to bi-weekly reports to OSC? Great.

Okay we should now - I'm missing something from (S.S.) email; this customer - this action item? Should we move to discuss our action items, which is our real work in our group?

We prepared, especially (Julie) and Rob, and I agree with that and made some changes in our kick-off meeting in Mexico. We already prepared some suggested action items to start working with and they're included in the charter.

And there is a document sent by (Julie) and by myself that includes the charter and the changes made by Chuck. And also at the end you can see there's a table that includes those suggested projects and sub-tasks of each of the two main missions that we have in our group.

I don't know if you had already seen them. I think that we should define (and not surely) for all this tasks. First we should agree in at least a short list of tasks to be done and we should agree of who is going to prepare them, which documents are we going to work and hopefully due date for delivering our work.

In our kick-off meeting I remember talking about, with some of you, and exchanging some ideas - and let me go to the minutes of that meeting. There was some documents that we thought it could be useful to have, from their constituencies that are already working for a long time and have a lot of experience, that could share with the group about these experiences.

Like, for example, we should discuss how to think about a data base of people working in different constituencies. We should work about Best Practices that are happening in different constituencies. What could we

share among us to then make a good recommendations and do our work?

I remember some of us, I think it was (Steve) or someone else, you were going to send Rob some documents. I really don't remember if those were stipulated in the list. Maybe I missed them. I don't recall seeing them. Rob or (Julie), do you remember what I'm talking about?

(Julie): You know, I'm not quite sure, actually.

Olga Cavalli: In the notes it's - I'm reading the notes from - the meeting notes from our meeting in Mexico. It says that (Steve Vitales) noted that some of this work has already been done with the GNSO constituency, when (you were processed), recently completed in February, 2009.

And I can (unintelligible) prepare a chart comparing the constituencies rules and Rob agreed that there is already a knowledge base and all that. I'm talking about that. Do you remember that?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, (I remember it).

Olga Cavalli: It's an interesting knowledge base to start with; not to start from scratch. I think there is a lot of good experiences and knowledge in constituencies that we should share them.

Rob Hoggarth: Olga, yes, this is Rob. We have continued, since Mexico City, as a staff, to evaluate the various charters that were submitted by the existing constituencies in the renewal/reconfirmation process.

That work is almost completed and we've prepared communiqués that will be going out to the various constituencies. And as we do that - that's intended at least - they have changed so much since Mexico City. We anticipated that it would be a formal exercise.

But what we talked about internally is for the first step to be an informal exercise so as that the various constituencies felt comfortable having some "off the record" discussions with the staff before we deemed them publicly for changes that needed to be made.

So what I will recommend internally, and what we'll ask each of the constituencies is -- we had these initial discussions -- is if they wouldn't mind us sharing that with this team to aid your work. Ultimately all of it will come out.

We just wanted to streamline the process and make it more efficient because the Board is looking at a, at least at present, a June 2009 seeding date, still, for the council. And we've been trying to get a lot of that work done.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, great. And could we have some of this information (visualated) in our list or some documents that we could use as basis for our discussions?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes. What I will do is I'll confirm and circulate to the list, because we did discuss this in Mexico City, just the links to the constituency renewal filings. And then as we work through the informal discussions with the individual constituencies, (let) them and then I'll make, with their permission, make those assessments available.

Those do include the side-by-side comparisons where the staff has been making recommendations that will be shared with the constituencies within the next week.

So as a first step I'll share that link that's on the GNSO Improvements page and on the Public Comment forum so this group has easy access to that. And I'll coordinate that with (Julie).

Olga Cavalli: Oh, great. So if you could send us a sub-link it would be very useful as a ground material for our work because our first suggested project is "enhance existing constituencies by developing recommendations on constituency for - and participation rules, operating principles, and database of members."

And I think that the, already then, that the knowledge that other constituencies have -- and I cannot talk about that because I don't belong to any constituency -- is extremely useful. I see how you work, you constituency representatives work, and I think that should be shared among our group, and to find the Best Practices and the best knowledge that could be shared with other as recommendations.

So what do others think about this? Could some of the - especially constituencies share some of the documents in our list and/or put them - links to our wiki to have some ideas for (how) this works?

Chuck Gomes: Well, Olga, like I said in Mexico City in our meeting there, this particular work team is going to be especially dependent upon constituency input in the regard that you're talking about and that Rob is talking about.

And also, the sensitivity that the staff is showing with regard to the constituencies on this is very important because we don't want our work on this work team to come across as telling the constituencies what they should be doing.

At the same time there are some common elements that probably should be true in all constituencies. So we're going to have to differentiate between those common elements, where probably all constituencies should follow them, and those areas where it's really up to the individual constituencies to decide, and so constituency input in that regard is going to be especially important.

Olga Cavalli: I totally agree with you, Chuck. I think our challenge is to define a base group of information or Best Practices, or maybe there's a better word for that, that any constituency could follow. Also, I'm thinking about new constituencies that are being really promoted in the last month, and as a balanced basis for knowledge of constituencies.

Then each of them will have their own rules and their own practices. But as a ground basis of good practices and knowledge I think this could be very useful if we could develop something like that, a reference document, a reference guideline. And the experience, the existing experience, I think it's relevant. It's an excellent starting point.

So how could we put this information together in order to select the essential parts? Could we use the wiki? Could the constituencies send us the documents? I would be glad to review them and try to find the relevant things that could make this ground base of knowledge. What do others think?

SS Kshatriya: This is (S.S.), Olga. I have a comment here.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

SS Kshatriya: We should develop some questionnaire and send out to our various constituencies because the work team to develop guidelines (unintelligible) complete (performance) on this. And further, we should have some questionnaire sent out to these constituencies and based on that information - but we will be able to develop guidelines. So my suggestion is we should develop some questionnaire to get the information from them.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you for the interesting suggestion. What do others think?

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob. It's a very good suggestion.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: And it's showing, I think, brilliant minds thinking alike. The community responded to a questionnaire that the staff sent out toward the end of last year that we shared with various members of the (fearing) committee, and that it was expected would be shared with the work teams.

So as I put together this email of links I will also attach the results of that document. What I would recommend this work team do is review that document for the type of information that you're thinking about, (S.S.), and then evaluate whether you want to ask additional questions.

But that may be a useful initial cut, that information already provided by various constituency members that should be able to help jumpstart some of your discussion.

Chuck Gomes: Olga, let me make a process point here. If you look at Section Six of the charter, the action items and deliverables which is what we're talking about right now, notice that -- and everybody seemed to support this -- action item five is "identification of key projects" and then six, "to develop a work plan for fulfilling those projects." And then it becomes easier to develop a calendar as well, item seven.

But I think we have to be careful about starting getting into the details of the work plan until we have a good overall view of how we want to organize this, our work, in terms of projects and then develop that work plan. The - otherwise we're going to be kind of jumping all over the place and doing random things that maybe don't fit together quite as well as it would be like from a holistic point of view.

So my suggestion is, is that let's - unless people want to change, though, that order of things, that let's, you know, decide what pro - how we want to organize the overall work that's shown in the table and what are the key projects? Now, it could be just - we could decide to just do one big project that does the whole thing. That's one option.

But let's do that and then let's get into the details of the work plan whether we're going to use questionnaires, whether - and obviously Rob's suggestion is good, to review a questionnaire that's already been done and so forth, so that we're seeing the whole picture when we're doing this stuff and not kind of jumping around and jumping ahead of ourselves.

Olga Cavalli: It's a very good suggestion and I - my request about documents and knowledge base is just because I don't belong to a constituency and for me would be very helpful to have all the information that is already - it is already existing in - at my hand to review it. Maybe for you it's something obvious and maybe it's - just makes so much sense.

So, Chuck, you're suggesting that we should review? And as far - sorry, as far as I understand these two main suggested projects are based on things that are related with how constituencies work today and how we want them to work, hopefully, in the future.

So this is why I'm insistent about having the information and I think that the questionnaire and the information that Rob mentioned are very important.

Chuck Gomes: By the way...

Olga Cavalli: I don't understand your point.

Chuck Gomes: I'm in agreement with you that those are good ideas. I'm at a higher level than that. I'm saying, let's first of all - okay do we want to treat this as two projects as shown in the table? Or do we want to break it down - or do we want to treat it as one project?

Do we want to - and then once we decide how we're going to do - you know, we may treat it as three or four projects. And then let's start working on the details of how we do the work in those projects like getting a database of information...

Olga Cavalli: I see, I see. I see your point.

Chuck Gomes: ...and so forth. Does that make sense?

Olga Cavalli: Totally. That makes totally sense. What do others think? I mean, you want to organize our work first and then we (see our) sources of information.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Great; I got you and I think you're right. Any comments to Chuck's suggestions?

(Michael Young): I just want to support what Chuck's saying. It's (Michael). That's definitely, I think, the way to go at it. That way, you know, we'll, at the end - we'll end up at the end of work having made sure we've (brought) all the tick boxes that we want to.

If we don't approach it that way I do agree we'll end up jumping all over the place. And chances are, you know, we'll end up missing something or we'll realize we've missed something that we thought was important at the end of the work flow if we don't organize it first.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, (Mike). Any other comments? I think both things could be done at the same time. We can agree on our table and at the same time we can grab information that could be useful for our work. So I think both ideas are totally compatible.

We have a table - I don't know if you all have them in your computer or paper around. This is a suggestion made by (Julie) and by Rob based on the recommendations made by the Board to our work team.

And there are two main projects and some sub-tasks related to these two main projects. One of them is "enhance existing constituencies by developing recommendations on constituency participation rules, operating principles and database of members." And the other big project is "develop a global outreach program to broaden participation in current constituencies."

And then there are several sub-tasks. I don't know if you want me to read them. They are like one, two, three, four for the first big project and one, two, three for the second one.

Chuck Gomes: We can each read them, I think.

Olga Cavalli: I know. But I have a feeling that the second big project is somehow - could be somehow being done not at the same time as the first one. I think it could be better first to make the recommendations, or try to work on better recommendations for constituencies and participation, and then think about an outreach program. I think it could be easy to make it once we realize which are the participation rules and the recommendations. What do others think?

I see the second project and it's somewhere more in the future than the first one. As one - as the first one giving some input to the second one. Chuck, any comments?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I'm trying to hold back and let other people talk, Olga. I don't want to monopolize the...

(Julie): No, me neither.

Chuck Gomes: I think you're suggestion - your question is a very good one. Should we approach those two projects as - to do them in parallel or should we do them serially? And I think that's a decision we could make ourselves as a group, which way we want to approach it.

Olga Cavalli: I see the second one more as a consequence of the first one. Once we have digested, developed, some recommendations and participation rules then I think it's the outreach like an outcome of those first rules. Not necessarily totally one after the other one, but maybe one could start once the other is already in - ongoing.

Chuck Gomes: No, so...

(Krista Papak): Here's a question. Is the - it's (Krista). Is the global outreach program -- and maybe we don't know the answer to this question -- but is it something that the actual constituencies would do themselves or is it just a, you know, an ICANN sponsored overall global outreach program?

Chuck Gomes: That's to make a recommendation and probably we're going to end up emphasizing both, don't you think?

(Krista Papak): I mean, yes, I actually do. And so that's, I think, so ending, if there is one in some or all constituencies - and what it is makes sense, and then talking about how you supplement that on one side and then - or,

sorry, how you - how the - or, you know, making recommendations about how constituencies approach that on one side and then on the other side looking at how you supplement that through additional efforts. Like, I do think maybe it comes a little bit after the first one but not completely linearly.

Olga Cavalli: Exactly; a little bit after. That's the same thing. That's what I think. I agree with you. So perhaps we could focus on the first project as we think that somehow could be our best thing to do.

Chuck Gomes: I wonder, Olga, if we could get - hear from everybody that's on the call on this one.

Olga Cavalli: Any comments are welcome.

(Michael Young): The only thing I would say, I agree in principle that the first project, you know, clearly should be the predecessor in the toolkit. To some degree it's just a service, the outcome for the findings of the first project.

But I'm wondering, you know, I mean, toolkit items that are just, you know, that are referred to here, they're fairly common, you know, toolkit items and there's many, many different flavors and versions of various communication helper's pooled applications, techniques.

I'm wondering if, maybe, one or two volunteers shouldn't go and start compiling a generic toolkit bag of things used around these type of principles in general so that when we come to it someone's already done, you know, collected five of this type of - five examples of this particular type of communication tool, and five examples of this type of

tool, and five examples of that type of tool, so then we can relatively quickly go through and pick the most ideal version when we know at that point, you know, what we're looking for.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, (Michael). Well that's - well, that was my desire of having information. Somehow - it's somehow related with your comment. Let's see what is happening. Let's see suggestions so...

Rob Hoggarth: You know what? Let me give an example.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: So we talked about possibly doing some surveying. It wouldn't hurt to have somebody go and look at the three or four survey tools and see what's applicable and just know about them, be able to talk to the group about them. And we get to the point where we're ready to run a survey we know all the options. They're on hand and we can pick a tool and move ahead with it.

Chuck Gomes: So first step there is to review the survey that's already been done.

Rob Hoggarth: Right.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry; it's the survey that Rob was mentioning?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: That's a starting point and then we can decide whether we want to follow it up with an additional survey of constituencies after we review that.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, that was - this was my comment before. It would be very useful to know the knowledge base and then to use it as a starting point. That was my comment. And I think this information is really - could be very useful.

Chuck Gomes: And that's getting in to our work plan which is the next step on the thing. Are we in agreement that we're going to divide our work into two major projects? I'd still like to hear from others that haven't spoken on this issue.

Claudio Digangi: Yes, I'm in agreement with that. This is (Claudio).

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, (Claudio). Any other comments?

(Krista Papak): It's (Krista) again. I want to contradict myself a little bit. I just - I'm sorry, I just was thinking about it a little bit more and the second - you know, there's the piece that is sort of making recommendations to constituencies about how they do global outreach and the other part is supplementing that through other activities.

And I don't - I guess I don't actually see why anything that would prevent us from brainstorming ideas about, you know, ways to do global outreach from the beginning. I mean, I don't have a particular - I don't care if we do it serially, linearly, or some version of it. I'm just sort of trying to throw food for thought out there.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, (Krista). Maybe perhaps we could - yes, you make a good point. Maybe we could, perhaps, make two sub-teams. And the two sub-teams could work in parallel with the information available and have some interaction and (unintelligible) the list in the conference call, not necessarily one big project. And then the other one - or we could do - work in parallel.

Chuck Gomes: That's the decision we need to make. By the way...

Olga Cavalli: It's an idea.

Chuck Gomes: Let me interject something in terms of outreach that affects us right now, an idea that I thought of a little bit ago when we were talking about the charter, and that is, is that I think it would be good if we reached out to the new constituencies in formation, the ones that have expressed interest -- and Rob and (Julie) can help us there -- and see if they would like to have someone from their new group join this work team.

Now that's a little bit of a digression from what we're talking about but it's a real-time issue that might be a good thing to do. And how many are there of those, Rob? Are there three?

Rob Hoggarth: At present there are three, Chuck. They're at two different stages. All three potential new constituencies have filed notices of intent to form a new GNSO constituency and the cyber-safety constituency has taken the next official step of petitioning the Board for recognition.

And that was - the GNSO council has treated that second official step as a triggering mechanism. And from the perspective of the cyber-

safety constituency that has created an invitation to participate in the restructuring drafting team, and inviting (Cheryl Preston) or another member of her leadership team to participate in this group, would be entirely consistent with that practice.

Chuck Gomes: But, Rob, we wouldn't have to be restructured (sic) to just the ones that have reached that specific level. We could actually reach out to the other two constituencies as well if they want to provide somebody to this group. Is that correct?

Rob Hoggarth: That's correct. All members of the ICANN community have been invited to participate in work teams.

(Krista Papak): The thing that is helpful about that is that they're in that formation. I mean - well, first of all its inclusive which is great but it's also in that formation stage where, you know, they're having real, live structure and toolkit challenges. And so it gives us a good - on that first project it gives us good insight into, you know, what it's like to form a new constituency in today's ICANN world.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, (Julie) and I'll take as an action item from this discussion to reach out to all three and invite them to have a representative participate in this effort, number one. And I'll sort of be open to further inquiries from the group as well for additional work.

Chuck Gomes: And I suggest, Rob, that we - obviously we'll refer them to the charter as it currently stands but call particular attention to the team membership section so that they know that we're not trying to get the same people working on all different kinds of groups. But if they can

find some people that can - find someone that would like to volunteer for this that would be great.

Rob Hoggarth: Great; we'll do that. Thank you. Great suggestion.

Chuck Gomes: Now, sorry for the digression, Olga, but could we go back and continue the discussion you were having. I think we've heard from everybody on this particular issue except for (Rafik) and - who else was on the call? (S.S.) probably hasn't commented on this one. Could we hear from them?

SS Kshatriya: Could you repeat it? I didn't hear well, (S.S.).

Chuck Gomes: Sure. We're talking about how we should treat our two major pro - first of all, though, I think the first question is, you know, in the table at the bottom of the charter there are two major projects.

So a very simple question is do we want to organize our work around those two major projects? And secondly, the question is should we work on those projects simultaneously or start one before the other or some combination of that?

SS Kshatriya: My suggestion what Olga felt, that we start with the first one and maybe just after two or three meetings take up the other one. Once we have done some work on the first then it'll be easy to go for the second project.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. How about (Rafik)?

Olga Cavalli: (Rafik), do you have the document? It's a Word document that I sent with the agenda. And I'm not sure if you can see it very well on the wiki charter because at the end it's becomes quite confusing. But in the document I attached to my email where the agenda was described there's a Word document that it also includes the comments made by Chuck.

(Rafik Damack): (Hello, this is to Chuck Whistle)? I think that we should start by the first project and (continue) after.

Chuck Gomes: And, (Claudio), did you comment on the - whether doing - whether we should do them concurrently or serially?

Claudio Digangi: I didn't. I don't really have a preference in that regard.

Chuck Gomes: Okay good. Well at least I think now we've heard from everybody which is helpful.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I like the suggestion made by (Krista) that perhaps we could - well, how I interpreted it, that maybe we could somehow divide the work group and work in parallel.

Maybe that's what I thought that you mentioned. Or perhaps we could wait one or two weeks and see how the first part evolves. I'm not sure. Both of them seem - has - makes sense to me.

Perhaps we could have that in mind and not decide it right now. And think about the first thing to do in our sub-item, to do in our first project, and find our next task to start working with. And then perhaps the rest comes more clearly.

Our first project is “enhance existing constituencies by developing recommendations and constituency participation rules, operating principles, and database of members.” And then we have some sub-tasks

“Each constituency should have clearly communicated set of participation rules and operating principles.” This is where I thought it was interesting to see what is exist - what is happening now and perhaps we can work with that information. So we perhaps wait for this information to come to us. Then it says, “Operating principles should ensure constituencies function in a representative, open, transparent, and democratic manner.”

Should we propose a set of basic principles that insure this representativeness? Should we make this recommendation based upon some experience already existing in the constituencies? Just a question.

Then we say “develop and maintain a database of all constituency members and others not formally a part of any constituency.” That, as far as I understand it, doesn’t exist but it seems to me that each constituency has somehow an identification of who is belonging to its database and it’s communication tools and working list. But that could be a start.

Also we had a discussion here about privacy issues and if we want to - how we want to build the database. How many information we want to put inside. How are we going to share that information and all that, which is not an easy discussion.

And the last one for the first project is “offer each constituency (unintelligible), staff support, and/or services.” This could be done after we have done the previous one.

So again, I see, very useful, having this document to - as a starting point for - at least there's three sub-tasks of the first project. This was my - I come again to my first comment. I mean, this information from existing constituencies, at least for me, is very useful.

(Michael Young): So, Olga, if I could make a suggestion...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(Michael Young): I think what might be practical at this point is starting with those three sub-points -- and I agree with probably we should leave the toolkit for a future meeting -- I like the way that Chuck has indicated, you know, in these columns, right out of the bat, a lead.

Because I think, you know, without somebody driving each of these items, you know, all - we can have a great discussion and it won't necessarily result in the kind of action items that we want.

So I would think it would make sense to go through each of these items, get a volunteer as a lead, and then as a next step - and get a volunteer as a lead and have anyone else also indicate if they're interested in working on that particular item sub-task.

And then have the lead and their associated volunteers for the next meeting maybe work out a suggested project plan for that bullet: task

items, some more detailed task items, some areas of investigation, for example, some information gathering, some tasks that might result in an output and also, as part of that, a definition of - a suggested definition of what the output of that element should be.

That gives them -- each lead -- a couple weeks to help develop, you know, a suggestion around that and then we could all review those and approve the work before we start to dig into it in detail.

Chuck Gomes: That's a very practical suggestion in my mind.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: If we had a volunteer from the group for each of the first three -- or we could even include the fourth one if we wanted to, we can delay that, I'm flexible there -- that would develop a first cut draft work plan, which (Michael) was describing, for tackling that particular sub-project. I think that would be a very good start. And then once those are done the full group could then review those and add to it. And then we could actually start work.

Olga Cavalli: I think it's a great idea. Volunteers; I can help but I don't belong to a constituency. I think the reason of a constituency - of someone working in a constituency is very - is relevant in this volunteer work.

Chuck Gomes: That's true on some of them, Olga. It's less true on others. Like, for example, the first sub-project, the "participation rules and operating principles."

I think what you said is very true. If you look at the second one in terms of representative, open, transparent, democratic manner, and so forth that's less dependent on people from constituencies.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, you're right. Yes. Okay I could handle the second one.

(Michael Young): Okay. I could volunteer to do the third one.

Olga Cavalli: "Develop and maintain a database of all constituencies," that one?

(Michael Young): Sure.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. No volunteers for the third one, "Sub-task each constituent," sorry, "Each constituency should have clear communicated set of participation rules and operating principles?" Some constituencies I could share and bring us some information about their operating principles and participation rules and...

Chuck Gomes: Well, let's back up a step, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: We're not - the person doesn't have to necessarily come up with the ideas that are going to be the result of this work. What we're really asking for right now as a first step is to develop a work plan for accomplishing that, which could involve doing a survey. It could involve doing a, you know, reaching out to the constituencies and getting feedback in other ways, etcetera. So...

Olga Cavalli: I understand, yes. I - you're right. I was thinking about the experience of someone that could bring some knowledge base for this, finding the information and finding the tasks to be done. But you're right.

Chuck Gomes: The lead on this doesn't necessarily have to be an expert in it.

Olga Cavalli: No, I know. You're right.

Chuck Gomes: They can just help develop a plan to how we're going to achieve the objective.

Olga Cavalli: (Find someone)? I suggest - I have an idea. Perhaps I could, with the help of (Michael) and, of course, (Julie), that she's always there, very helpful, we could perhaps, (Michael), prepare a draft, a working plan, for all the three or four sub-tasks of the first project. Would you be willing to do that with me and with (Julie)?

(Michael Young): Sure, absolutely.

Olga Cavalli: And we could share it with the list, maybe in - during the last - during the next week.

(Michael Young): Right. I do want to set, kind of, an expectation for the group. And I understand maybe people's reluctance, you know, at the planning level but, you know, once we get these plans out there and everyone agrees to the work items in the plans I would really like to see everybody, you know, stepping a foot forward and each of them picking up some of those work tasks equally because this is a lot of work.

And, you know, it's not one of those working groups where two or three people carrying 90% of the, you know, paper work and administrative effort will get this done in any kind of timely way. So we're all really going to have to pull together, in my opinion, to get this - to move this group forward in the timeline that's expected by, you know, the GNSO.

Olga Cavalli: I agree with you, (Michael). I also think that once we have developed a set of information that is going - is flowingly going through the list that will help all the participants in the group to get more involved with some of the things that have to be done.

Maybe at the beginning it's a little bit confusing. I've been reading the charter for awhile. I reviewed it for Mexico and again. And perhaps people is starting to get involved with the text and with the things that we have to do now.

So maybe we need to (reach) that kind of a process (unintelligible) so it takes some time to get them involved in the process. So I think that through our work and the list we will have them involved in the work. And I agree with you; it's a lot work.

(Michael Young): It is. It's just, you know, it's not something - it's something we'll all have to pull together to get it done. And I understand people's, maybe, reluctance at this stage.

I mean, some of these work items as they're stated have some ambiguity and we're going to have to interpret that and put together what we think the work needs to be and agree as a group and hopefully it meets expectations.

But, you know, to your point, Olga, I've re-read this stuff a number of times and it's - some of the statements are fairly broad.

Olga Cavalli: You're right. Any other comments?

Chuck Gomes: Now, Olga...

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

Chuck Gomes: I know we kind of had mixed results in terms of whether to do the two major projects concurrently or serially. But maybe there are those on our call today that are more interested in work, you know, working on the second major project than the first. And if that's the case it might be okay to, kind of, work on those in parallel.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, yes; very good suggestion. I suggest the following: let's (Michael), (Julie), and I could make a first draft version of a new tasks to be done in the working plan and perhaps we could think about the two projects, at the first stage, in parallel and see some reactions in the list about who would like to be involved or who's able to get some information or who would like to lead the different tasks. And see how it, moving forward, in the list and in the group, focusing on our next conference call in two weeks. Does it make sense?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And, Olga, I'd like to point out one other thing. In the case of those who are representing specific constituencies, like (Claudio) and (Tony) and (Raheed) and (Rafik), we're going to need them to kind of play, I think, in a lot of ways perform a liaison role with their constituencies, and this includes (Krista) and (Michael) as well, but with their constituencies to get information flowing back and forth, to

get the surveys done, to do a lot of things like that. So in those particular cases let's keep in mind that those people are going to be very important in our interaction with their respective constituencies.

Olga Cavalli: I totally agree with you. I think the experience in each constituency is the key issue of a good (recount). I mean, it's a knowledge base which cannot be ignored and must be used as a starting point for our recommendation. So I totally agree with you. Okay I think we have a draft, then, to work with; (Michael) and myself and (Julie). And, (Julie), do you agree with that?

(Julie): Yes, totally, Olga. I'll be happy to help.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you because I'm including you. I didn't ask you if you wanted to. You're always so helpful that I just gave it for granted.

(Julie): Yes, that's why I'm here; here to help.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. So what's our next point? I think we discussed some issues about our - I lost my agenda.

Claudio Digangi: Olga, this is (Claudio). I have another...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Claudio Digangi: ...call coming up so I'm going to have to drop off.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Hey, before you drop off, (Claudio), very quickly, Olga, let's decide on what we want to target for our length of these calls. We've gone an hour and half. Is that a reasonable time to shoot for each time?

Olga Cavalli: I personally would like to, if we work on the list and we are efficient in using our list and discussing things there, maybe we could think about one hour or, perhaps, one hour and a half. I think two hours is quite a bit long. But it depends on our dynamic on the list. If there is discussion in the list then there is less discussion in the phone call. That's always like that.

Chuck Gomes: Actually as I looked at my calendar I typically will have another - a conflicting meeting after one hour anyway so I think from my point of view an hour is (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Yes, for me one hour could be fine because it's not - it's like today. I'm complicated now. No problem.

Chuck Gomes: We'll plan an hour. (Claudio), you can - sorry to delay you but I just wanted to make sure we were all on agreement on that.

Claudio Digangi: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I totally agree.

Claudio Digangi: I think we can work with an hour. I mean, I - people naturally tend to fill the time they have so if we have we'll be forced to a level of efficiency.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. And we have to be also efficient in using the list and discussing things there and exchanging information and, of course, reading

documents and charters and all that. And then we use our hour more efficiently. This is our first time. We are starting to work together but I totally get that one hour is a good time.

Claudio Digangi: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay thank you, (Claudio). You have to leave? I also have to leave now. I don't know if - how - what else should we discuss. On my side I will work with (Mike) and then with (Julie) making this working plan that hopefully we'll share with you during the next week.

I will prepare a report for the - for our - for the OSC and I encourage all those working with constituencies to try to find information that could be useful for our work to be done. And am I missing something...

Chuck Gomes: Don't think so.

Olga Cavalli: ...from my agenda?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Olga.

END