

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

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-constituency-ops-20090710.mp3>

On page:

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

Participants present:

Olga Cavalli - work team chair - NCA
Michael Young - Work team vice chair - Registry c.
Charles Gomes - Registry c.
Victoria McEvedy - IPC
Claudio Digangi - IPC
cccc - gTLD Registries c.
Tony Harris - ISP

ICANN Staff

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat
Gisella Gruber-White - consultant
Robert Hogarth - Policy Staff

Absent:

Zahid Jamil – CBUC

Absent apologies

SS Kshatriya - Individual
Julie Hedlund - Policy Staff
Rafik Dammak - NCUC

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

Gisella-Gruber-White: Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. On today's call we have Olga Cavalli, Chuck Gomes, Victoria McEvedy - sorry about the pronunciation - Claudio Digangi. And from staff we have Rob Hogarth and we have Gisella-Gruber-White, myself. Glen DeSaintgery is on but on mute.

And apologies today, we have Rafik Dammak, Julie Hedlund, and (S.S.).
Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, very much, Gisella.

Krista Papac: Hi, this is (unintelligible). I'm here also.

Olga Cavalli: Who's there? I didn't get the name?

Krista: It's Krista

Olga Cavalli: Oh, Krista

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: We didn't hear you joining.

Krista: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you for joining us.

Great, good morning, good evening everyone. Thank you for joining this (for me the) morning. I just sent a revised agenda because I made some mistakes, especially in including a wrong name for one of the (unintelligible) leaders, I put Chuck's name and it was Julie. And I put some other comments.

And I've been revising all the emails exchanged in the email list this morning. So we should start with Point 1. Rob, is there any news from the board that you could share with us?

Rob Hogarth: Thank you, Olga, yeah; I have a number of developments to share with the team as I promised in one of the previous emails. I'm also going to be making

all my best efforts to record action items and otherwise report on this call in Julie's stead. And I'm sure I will only do about half as good a job as she does but I have the best intentions so thank you all for your patience.

Yes, the first agenda item, what I'd like to do is review a number of significant developments coming out of the Sydney meeting. And then we can talk about what applicability those developments have to the work team's efforts.

I think the most significant items that came out of the general discussions that took place in Sydney were initially that the board postponed the seating of the new GNSO council until Sole. From I think a number of folks' perspectives, that was a practical thing that was going to take place but the board made it official in a board resolution in Sole.

Secondly, the board through the structural improvements committee continued the dialogue that it had started some time ago with respect to the stakeholder group proposals by a number of proponents. And the structural improvements committee actually provided those groups with revised charter documents that they were recommending that those groups adopt.

And as part of that effort - and a number of other efforts - the structural improvements committee recognized that if the community were going to achieve a Sole timeframe transition to the new GNSO Council, that they would need to move relatively quickly, provide recommendations to the board so that the board could move forward on a number of different decisions by its July 30 board meeting which is at the end of this month.

And in particular, those decisions would include amendments to the bylaws, something that the GNSO Council drafting team has been working on over the past couple of months. And it's possible approval of the now revised recommended stakeholder group charters, in an effort to sort of remove one of the two - one of the significant gating elements that would then lead to other decisions with respect to constituencies, with respect to operational

rules. And when I say constituencies, that would be new constituencies as well as existing constituency evaluations.

So those significant developments then flowed into two public comment forums that the board instructed the staff to open on subsequent to the Sydney meeting which were open at the end of June - June 30th. Those two public comment forums focused on one, the potential bylaw amendments which created a 30 day public comment period that was scheduled and is scheduled to go through July 29th.

And secondly, a public comment forum period which essentially listed and provided copies of the structural improvements committee's recommendations with respect to the stakeholder group charters. And that was a comment period that will be extended through the end - I'm sorry, not the end of but until the third week of July. Right now it's officially the 21st of July but that's probably going to slide a day or so because a couple of the groups - one in particular, the registries - are working on comments to the SIC comments on their proposed stakeholder group charter. And so those will probably come in a day late or so.

Chuck Gomes: Rob, just one clarification on that. It's not actually just going to be comments. We plan to submit a revised charter in response to the SIC recommendations.

Rob Hogarth: Okay, thank you, Chuck, I appreciate that. Now the fact that these public comment forum periods are now in place I think provides some additional fodder for this group. I don't think any of these actions change the overall charter and expectation of the work of this work team but does have some impact. And that's in a couple of ways; one, we now have direct public guidance from the structural improvements committee on some of the general elements and approaches that they believe are necessary to make with respect to the stakeholder groups.

Two, it reflects a somewhat bifurcated approach, at least as far as the structural improvements committee is concerned, with respect to its recommendations to the full board in which the structural improvements committee has made a distinction between contracting party and the contracted party house. And non-contracted parties, non-contracted party house.

And the reason for that is, all right, where the effect of that is that the contracted parties will essentially be stakeholder groups. The entities within that party house will be stakeholder groups in which the discussion where in Sydney that the lowest common denominator or structure within those houses was in the SIC's view the stakeholder groups, not constituencies.

That view is contrasted with the six continued efforts with respect to the non-contracted party house to recognize the need for constituency groups that would make up the stakeholder groups. So we have a somewhat bifurcated approach here in which the contracted party house has two stakeholder group charters and is unlike, again, based on the recommendation of structural improvements committee, to have, you know, formal constituency structures of the fundamental elements of those houses.

But on the non-contracted party side, there will be stakeholder groups, the non-commercials stakeholders group as well as the commercial stakeholders group. And at least for the time being, those structures will be populated by constituencies in many respects it would appear as they exist today.

And so you know, the early discussions I think of this work team to recognize that you would be talking not only about constituencies but about stakeholder groups was somewhat pressured in that regard.

The other element of that - and I mentioned this yesterday on the GNSO Council call - is that in the context of the stakeholder group charter review, SIC members have asked the staff to provide some thoughts with respect to

potentially adding some additional charter elements that would help them flush out the general bylaw principals of the transparency, openness, fairness and representativeness.

And we're right now sort of working through what that input would look like in hopes of providing some input to the structural improvements committee early next week. And my hope and expectation is that we'll be able to share that work product effort with the community in the form of comments in that forum. And at the very least, in terms of sharing that with members of the council and this work team so that you all would have the benefit of that thought process in your work and deliberations.

Now in terms of final wrap up of this - and it may be worth, Olga, some discussion among this team - sort of what are the impact of these developments on this work team's agenda and the timing of your work. You know, at one level, I think in the original time table, when this work team and others were formed, there was an initial expectation that if we have a new council in place already, you know, that that would have taken place by the city meeting.

So in some respects, that timetable has, you know, been pushed out a four-month period. But that's somewhat balanced by the fact that the SIC is moving forward, has provided some community input and advice with respect to the stakeholder group charters. And at least we'll - is discussing and will likely have some sort of placeholders with respect to some of the factors that this group may be discussing.

And it might help jumpstart or push forward some of your deliberations with respect to what some guidance might look like, at least initially, with respect to things like, well, what sort of meeting expectations are there that constituency or stakeholder group should have in terms of transparency or reporting. What does that mean about membership lists, about reporting on finances, about reporting on decision-making?

So there is, you know, I think some more general community discussions that will take place in that regard, that may impact and contribute to your decisions. I think as it relates to the overall work product of this work team, what it does is it just provides an extra layer of input and potential advice. Because I think even under the original structure, there was some expectation that there would be some place holders.

But ultimately, this work team is making the recommendations that will go forward throughout the operations and implementations of GNSO improvements process. So I think that this work team's efforts are going to be even more valuable and important in terms of contributing to that effort.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Rob.

Rob Hogarth: Yeah, I'll take questions, Olga, or, you know.

Tony Harris: Hi, Olga, good morning. This is Tony Harris, sorry I'm a few minutes late.

Olga Cavalli: Tony, good morning. Sorry, Rob, I interrupted you. It's just (I thought) that you had finished.

Rob Hogarth: Yes - no, you were correct, Olga thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you very much. I think that what you have told us is extremely important for this working team and I really appreciate this - all this information. I would ask you another favor. If you could just please summarize of this - just very briefly - and could share it within our list, all the questions that were coming to my mind when you were speaking were already answered by you by the end of your speech.

I have only one, perhaps, question about the timeframe for our work. When we started in Mexico, we thought that we had something like six months

ahead to do our work. Is this changing? Should we expect having more time, phasing the part of the new GNSO will be dated in Sole or we should still focus and think that we still have three months ahead to do our job? How do you see this situation? And also considering all this community input that we will have from the open forum?

Rob Hogarth: I don't - and I'll - the chair of the operations steering committee sort of, you know, correct or clarify anything I'm about to say. My general sense is that it doesn't change your timetable, it just changes sort of the community view and focus on your work. I think there was a recognition of this work that this work team would be much longer term and have an impact on the ongoing work of the GNSO broadly, including the constituency's stakeholder groups, that we had filed the original timetable. A lot of that preliminary work will already begun.

But the way that the GNSO Council has structured these work teams was a recognition that should the teams come up with additional recommendations, that those would be cranked into additional operational rules or requirements or additional bylaw amendments. You know, consistent with the approach here, this team makes the recommendations to the council which then are ultimately reviewed and made to the board.

So I don't think it appreciably changes that timeframe. In terms of your optimism about - and my optimism about public comments - at this point, we only had one comment so far in the - on the bylaw amendment area. We don't have any comments yet in the stakeholder group charters. So you know, I think the jury's still out in terms of how robust the comments will be in that area.

And I think you guys still need to look at yourselves as the community experts and real keepers of those keys because in the significant flow of other work and other things that people are focusing on, this team is the one that's really

focused on those efforts. And I think we'll be focused on them over the longer term.

Woman: Can I jump - sorry.

Rob Hogarth: The one last caveat that I'll throw in, is that if I - my recollection is correct, the steering committees and the work team charters and at the annual meeting - but they're subject to renewal. And so I think that'll be a judgment that the overall council will make in terms of progress and what's happened. And I think if anything's been clear over the last six months or so in this process is that any predictions about timing are not tremendously worthwhile because they constantly get moved down.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Rob. Any questions to Rob?

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, I have a question - it's Victoria speaking.

Olga Cavalli: Who else wants to be in the queue? Go ahead, Victoria.

Victoria McEvedy: Rob, thank you very much, it's really, really helpful and it's, you know, sometimes it's difficult understanding the implications of some of these things, so I really appreciate you taking the time to just walk us through it like that.

I guess my questions are the IBC (Jay Scott) shared with interested parties an exchange that you'd had with him, talking about possibly a two-stage process which kind of follows on from your comments now about perhaps our work being on the longer term. And I think you were just sort of noticing at that earlier point a possibility of a two-stage process in which the existing charters are reconfirmed either later this month or next month, when the board gets to the stakeholder charters. And perhaps our changes have to be looked at down the track.

And I just want to be quite clear about that because if this group has the option to kind of speed up its work when it, you know, and then have it considered in that process when it made the most use as opposed to, you know, sort of, you know, accepting that there's no urgency and realizing that, you know, the work may or may not ever become, you know, be sort of reverted to and things revisited. I mean, I think we really need to just look at that squarely on the chin.

Rob Hogarth: I think that's an excellent point because I think that in any of this, the earlier input is provided, the better because it just helps, I think, make the process more efficient. If I recall correctly what I noted to (Jay Scott), it was that in the ideal case there were be a dovetailing of the work of this group and some of the blogger community work. And that might ultimately forestall the need for a two-step process.

For those of you who didn't have the benefit of my correspondence with (Jay Scott), his question sort of focus on hey, Rob, what else is happening with respect to the constituency renewal effort? And as I explained to him, you know, from the board's perspective - certainly the structural improvements committee, I think that the general view was that they had to make decisions first with respect to the stakeholder groups that were subsequently then going to drive discussions about the constituencies.

And then again, the stakeholder group charter effort was a real gating element of the GNSO improvements effort. And once that was completed and the board, you know, appropriately sort of took its focus and priorities away from that it would then, you know, change its perspective and start looking at evaluating the existing constituency charters.

And then subsequent to that, potentially looking at how that applied to new constituency petitions. There are currently four but there may be others in the future.

And I think that general approach from the board has been confirmed, particularly because as we see the evolution here, there are unlikely to be, at least in a formal sense, you know, connected with GNSO Council reps and the rest constituencies in the contracted party house. And so in many respects, the board has saved itself and, you know, significant parts of the community, the work and then developing those charters that would not have been utilized.

So I think, you know, what we'll be looking at is at least by the end of this month, there will be significant discussions at the board meeting. I don't know if there will be ultimately a conclusion this month or whether that will take place next month. I think the goal is for it to be this month. And if so, then that just moves up potentially the discussions of the constituency groups.

Now just one last observation there while I'm thinking about it; and that is, when I mentioned the real push that both the board and the council wanted to make with respect to the July 30th deadline, that was a product of counting back from Sole and trying to identify what needs to happen by when. And one of the critical elements of providing representatives and council members at the annual meeting in Sole is, you know, having all the pieces fall into place.

In other words, you have to apply laws, you have to create the stakeholders so they can have the appropriate discussions to nominate and elect representatives. Moreover, very early in the process, there was some sense that those names had to be provided by early September because of certain requirements with respect to travel budgets and providing names, getting people visas for Korea.

I spoke with members of our travel team in Sydney and was able to work with them and get some sliding of those dates. So as I explained to the chair of the GNSO Council, (Aubrey), that, you know, that deadline could potentially slide. And so we might have some additional time for the board to make its decisions.

I think at this point, the desire is to continue to move forward, not take any breathers in terms of trying to get these very important issues resolved because I think at every stage of the process, the board has recognized when they think they've handled the ten issues, they then realize there's 15 or 20.

So again, I think the drive is going to continue to be and the hope is that a lot of this will be concluded by then end of this month. And then we'll have a clearer picture of some of the timeframes. But in general, I think that this work team could continue to press forward.

I think you've all gotten a tremendous amount of traction over the last four to six weeks. And you know, some of the subtask team think that things are ready for primetime, the earlier you guys get that out, the better.

If I can use an example of the operations of the GNSO operations work team, they have some things that aren't completely baked and have decided with the appropriate caveats to still publish them to a general community so that folks can see the benefit of some of their thought processes and work. And they do that even with the understanding that they may not be adopted or endorsed but, you know, in the interest of socializing and potentially getting more feedback, they're pressing forward anyway.

And so that may be a strategy that you will want to employ over the next month or so as well.

Chuck Gomes: Olga, can I add a comment to something that Rob said?

Olga Cavalli: Sure, Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: With regard to the contracted party house and the SIC's recommendation to not have a board-approved constituencies, I'd like everyone to understand that that does not mean that groups like, for example, the city's TLDs could

not still have their own charter and function as a somewhat independent group.

Really, the only thing that changes is that instead of having constituencies in the registrar stakeholder group and the registry stakeholder group that are officially approved by the board, there could still be interest groups within those two stakeholder groups that could function independently, organize themselves and kind of be a block of interest within whichever stakeholder group applied.

So I just wanted everybody to know that it's not quite a drastic a change as everybody thinks. There's still the possibility of interest groups - they're going to be called interest groups instead of stake - constituencies - and they won't require board approval like constituencies will in the other house. But in practical reality, it can function very similarly.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Chuck.

Tony Harris: I have a comment too, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Who - I couldn't hear. Who wants to talk?

Tony Harris: Tony, when you give me a chance I'd like to make a comment on what was just said.

Olga Cavalli: Chuck is that okay? Are you done?

Chuck Gomes: I'm finished, yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, go ahead, Tony.

Tony Harris: Yes, I'm - I think - I'm not too sure if I feel comfortable about what was said about, you know, maybe we should put in something half-baked for people to

comment on. And basically, I really don't see the need for this huge rush and push that's going on. And I kind of, I mean, we're changing the GNSO. The GNSO is just about 80% of participation in ICANN and it's being reshuffled and redone and it's something that you have to get that right.

I mean, when we talk about, you know, gTLDs, the thing is well, let's not rush on this and let's get it right and it drags on and on which is okay. And I think when we're talking about doing all this work and really doing new charters and new, well, a new GNSO which we'll really have to abide by what's decided in the years to come, I don't think really - I don't see the need to rush like mad to get this done. I think it should be done properly and in due time and with whatever volunteers can do with this.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Tony. Any other comments?

Chuck Gomes: I'd just like to follow up with Tony's...

Olga Cavalli: Go ahead, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: You're right, Tony. And I think in cases where more time is needed, that that's expected. There's never been the anticipation, as I understand it, that all of the GNSO improvement effort has to be done by the time the new GNSO Council with both houses seated in October. So if time is needed beyond October for our group, for example, in the work we're doing, I don't - that's - I don't see that as a big hurdle. Obviously it's nice that a lot of it can be done but it's not a prerequisite.

The only thing that's really a prerequisite is that the bylaws changes needed to seat the bicameral house are done with enough time before the meeting in Sole. And keep - please understand, that does not include all bylaws changes that will eventually need to occur because some of those relate to the work of work teams, especially with regard to the PDP process and the working group model.

Olga Cavalli: Thanks, Chuck. Any other comments?

Rob Hogarth: Olga, this is Rob, if I can be in the queue?

Olga Cavalli: Who else wants to be in the queue?

(Michael): (Michael) please.

Olga Cavalli: (Michael), good morning. Okay, well, go ahead.

Rob Hogarth: Thank you, I wanted to note one thing from Chuck and one thing from Tony. Chuck raises an excellent point and shows that he's got much more practice working on early morning calls here on the West Coast than I do. And that is this concept of interest groups. And it may be something - I hesitate to say that would expand this work team's agenda.

But I don't think at the beginning there was a - the work team's effort to wasn't in anticipation of this category of interest group. And an interesting question that that raises is sort of how do they ultimately get treated and is that something that this work team wants to briefly discuss at some point.

The reason for that is that, you know, one of the major sub elements that you guys are discussing about this whole tool kit of services and some of the discussions that took place in Sydney and would even include the city TLD group was well, that's great, we may be an interest group but how did that impact potentially the quote-unquote in kind services that we might have gotten out of ICANN as a truly officially blessed constituency?

And so I think there will be ongoing elements of that categorization that may have some impact and may be of use for this group to discuss.

Chuck Gomes: And before you go on, Rob, in that regard I think it's really simple for us to handle. It's not so much adding a new task for us with regard to interest groups but anything we would decide with regard to constituencies or most things at least probably could be applied to interest groups in the same manner.

Rob Hogarth: That's a very good point. Yeah, and I raised it just because whether it's long or short, I think it might be a tick or checklist that you all wanted to record in terms of your work.

And I knew when it was coming out of my mouth and Tony called me on it, when I said half-baked, I didn't mean the (unintelligible) but just noting that there was a value in providing the community with your thought process before it was completely finalized.

And again, that was a decision made by another work team, where they thought that would be a useful process tool for them. That's certainly something you guys can consider or abandon. But it's a way of getting out and socializing some of your thoughts and ideas.

Chuck Gomes: Let me give the team, Olga, if it's okay, a little bit more detail on that particular item because the GNSO operations work team met with the OSC in Sydney. And it was a very productive meeting. And what they're - they have some ideas that they have been unable to reach consensus on as a work team.

And so they asked the OSC would it make sense to go out to the community and get some additional feedback on those ideas. And so that's really what they're doing. They're half-baked in the sense that they haven't reached consensus. There's some -actually there's some clarification in terms of what they're going to put out for comments that are going on right now, revising their document.

And so they're really looking for feedback from the community on what Rob referred to as half-baked. They're half-baked in the sense that there's no consensus on the work team on it. There's probably more work that needs to be done on the ideas themselves but they would like broader community feedback to help them in doing their work.

Olga Cavalli: (Michael)?

(Michael): Well, actually I was going to pretty much, you know, going back a few paragraphs about what Chuck was saying in terms of the interest groups. I was actually going to be pretty much the same thing. I agree with him.

The interest groups are pretty much the same thing as constituencies, short, one you don't have to worry about the voting structure or any comments on fairness or structural elements to that voting structure because that's already described at the membership level of the stakeholder groups. So it's redundant and it's not required within the actual group.

The other thing that, you know, you remove the actual over approval process. And again, it basically becomes kind of, if you will, constituency light. So pretty much, you know, if we come up with 15 recommendations around a constituency, we may be peeling back 4 of them because they are no longer applicable. And so I don't really see it as a great deal more work.

But actually back to Tony's comments about timelines, you know, I'm always a person who hasn't done a lot of project management in my career. I'm always a person who really believes you have to set to get work accomplished. Without a deadline - artificial or otherwise - work just doesn't progress. People need milestones to work against.

And so I do believe it's important that we set a schedule and we work very hard to stick to the schedule. However, having said that, I also believe in assessment of each milestone. And if we hit a milestone and we assess that

we are not accomplishing our attended goals for that milestone, due to what's going on in other areas or lack of progress or jumps in progress or whatever, we need to be prepared to reconsider our schedule if we need to.

And I would rather than do that than have a product - but out a product that doesn't reach the intended goals we stated.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, (Michael). Any other comments, any other want to be in the queue?

Claudio Digangi: This is Claudio, I had a question.

Olga Cavalli: Claudio, go ahead.

Claudio Digangi: So I guess what I was trying to understand - and Rob, maybe you could assist a little bit. Will the current constituencies that exist in - on the contracted party house, it sounds like they'll continue to exist. And so you'll have interest groups and you'll also have - and I guess those constituencies won't formally be part of the stakeholder group and they'll - and they might exist sort of outside the stakeholder group structure.

But I'm just trying to understand, are we moving towards the scenario where there's going to be constituencies outside of this stakeholder group structure?

Rob Hogarth: That's a good question. I think you'd have to talk with the registries or registrars about that. My sense was, based on their submissions - and this was a similar, I think, strategy that the NCUC was looking at originally. And that is, I think there was a view that having both a constituency structure and a stakeholder group structure was duplicative if you - any of you carry them to their logical conclusion.

And so in moving forward now with the structural improvements committee's recommendations and advice, I mean, the board, you know, adopts those. I

think you would likely simply just have a registry stakeholder group or a registrar stakeholder group. And it would be unlikely that those communities would maintain two structures.

And Chuck I'll, you know, let you speak to that in a more broad term since you're directly involved.

Chuck Gomes: You said it pretty well, Rob. There probably won't be a need for that, Claudio, for example, the existing registry constituency to continue to exist. Within the elements of the constituency though, if they wanted to, for example, the sponsored TLDs, they could if they wanted to form an interest group. But it's very unlikely, maybe it's almost determined that there will not be a registry constituency once the stakeholder group charter is approved and the stakeholder group starts functioning.

Claudio Digangi: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I can't speak for the registrars. Maybe (Christa) can.

Victoria McEvedy: Can I just make a comment in the queue?

Olga Cavalli: It's (Christa)?

Victoria McEvedy: Victoria.

Olga Cavalli: Victoria - okay, Victoria, go ahead.

Victoria McEvedy: I mean, I think this is just a really interesting - these are extremely interesting developments and I just wanted to make a very brief comment because I it also goes to the heart of the work of this team. I mean, you know, the possibility of duplicate of structures, you know, a whole layer of sort of procedure and rules that the old constituency level and then a new level coming in of course at the stakeholder group level as I see it, from reading

the board governance committee's report which we're working from was exactly why they wanted to see more standardization at the constituency levels.

So I think it's just really interesting the way these developments are panning out. And I think it kind of reiterates the message actually. But anyway, it was just a comment.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Victoria. Any other comments, anyone else want to be in the queue?

Rob Hogarth: This is Rob with one...

Tony Harris: (Unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Rob, go ahead and then Tony.

Rob Hogarth: I would just note that it presents an extra layer of further organizational analysis or structural analysis as well. How do you deal with new policy development process when you now have constituency groups and stakeholder groups? And again, it may not be a huge element but I don't think we fully flushed that out in view of the fact that the six recommendations are only, you know, two or three weeks old. And that is sort of now we have potentially a structure where stakeholder groups exist at the same time as constituencies.

And in some respects and some processes, they will actually be operating at the same level. And that creates just another organizational process detail that, you know, just add another layer to these discussions.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Rob. Tony?

Tony Harris: I just want to comments on this question of the existence or not in the future of constituencies, at least from the perspective of our constituency, the ISPs. There hasn't been any doubt or discussion about us ceasing to be represented in some form as a constituency or whatever develops in the future because a lot of our members don't come to meetings. And to, well, to - we don't really see how you can represent an industry perspective in ICANN unless you have some sort of structure, whether it be intermediary or top level or whatever it is. But we have to be able to channel and focus our activities within the ICANN structure.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Tony. Any other comments?

Claudio Digangi: Yeah, Olga, this is Claudio. I just have one more question I didn't get a chance to ask earlier.

Olga Cavalli: Please go ahead, Claudio.

Claudio Digangi: I'm just trying to understand from the SIC's perspective what is, I guess, sort of their motivation in creating this new entity called the interest group and how that would - how that changes things within that stakeholder group as opposed to constituencies existing. What's the advantage of - I guess I'm just not seeing the advantage of the interest group as opposed to the - that they can self select and there's no need for board approval for the interest group.

I'm just seeing some inconsistency between both sides. And I'm not - it's not clear to me what the justification is for that.

Chuck Gomes: Can I share my opinion, Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Sure, Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Claudio, I think the difference goes back to a fundamental definition of what a member is within the stakeholder groups on the user side and on the

contracted party house. And it has to do with the fact that to be with any of the registrar stakeholder group or the registry stakeholder group, you have to be - you have to have a contract with ICANN. It's not nearly so clearly defined on the non-contracted party house - as you well know.

And the concept of constituencies fits - especially formal constituencies - to insure, you know, full representation and so forth of various interest groups that are called constituencies on that side is different there. What we found out on the contracted party house is if you have to have a contract with ICANN, okay, there's still the value of subgroups within that stakeholder group, you know, organizing and increasing their processes, like Tony said, of representing people who don't go to meetings and so forth.

But when we really got down to it to try and figure out, okay, what's going to be the difference between our constituency in the case of the existing registry constituency and the stakeholder group, it was almost all duplication. I don't think that's quite the same case on the non-contracted party house. The ISPs, for example, as Tony mentioned, you know, are a distinct group and have distinct interest.

The IPC is the same and so forth. As we struggled with how to do a constituency and a stakeholder group, we really found that we were going to end up with a tremendous amount of duplication on the contracted side. So I don't know if that helps or not but the key difference is the fact that membership is very precisely defined on the contracted side by its very name. You have to have a contract with ICANN to provide either registry or registrar services to be a member.

Claudio Digangi: Thank you, that was helpful, Chuck.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Chuck. Who else wants to be in the queue?

Krista: This is Krista

Olga Cavalli: Please, Krista, go ahead.

Krista: Okay, so let me apologize first because I'm in a sort of a public place. I'm traveling this week and so it's noisy in the background - I apologize. And my, you know, from the registrar constituency perspective and the way that I sort of see it too, I mean, I would agree, I think we came to the same conclusion that a stakeholder group and a constituency or what we call a constituency today and we're going to call a stakeholder group tomorrow was duplicative.

But when it comes to the interest groups, you know, just because you're a registrar doesn't mean that you're - you have the commonality of being a credited registrar but we have different types of registrars, ones that have retail business models, ones that have corporate (unintelligible) models. You know, with coming of new gTLDs, you have, I mean, I don't know what's going to happen with, like, your dot brands and those might be a different sense that have registrars.

And so they do have different interests. The stakeholder group itself is going to have it's own sort of agenda but the people within it might have different focus or different interests within that agenda. And so it, I mean, at least from my perspective, view it as an opportunity for them to sort of, you know, people with common interests within a stakeholder group could get together and then voice that opinion. And then the stakeholder group as a whole could then deliver, you know, its position or whatever, based on the various interest groups from within it.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Krista. Any other comments? Okay, I think this - of the information that Rob provided is extremely helpful for our work. And all the exchange of comments and ideas shared in this conference call, although it took some time off our agenda, I think it's extremely helpful.

So Rob, I will kindly ask you, if you could perhaps summarize - especially the first part of your talk - especially for those who are not on the call and we'll - that we'll review the - what is (changed) on the list and the MP3 recording. And if you could also share when we have this information that you told that you were preparing about transparency, openness and representativeness in stakeholder groups and constituencies that staff is preparing. If you could share with our group, it could be, I think, very helpful.

For us, for the team, we have to have all this new concepts and ideas in mind. I just first heard about the interest group and conference call we had last Monday shared by Victoria. And (Michael) changed the concept and I really didn't - I was not aware of it. Maybe I missed some information in the GNSO or I didn't have the time to review it.

So I think it's important to have all this new concept in mind for our work. We stick to our original agenda for our timeframe. And we view also all the documents that are public for comments.

We have an agenda - I'm not sure if we have the time. We have ten minutes left for our call. I can stay a little bit longer or we can finish in ten minutes and see how much of our agenda can we review and perhaps the rest can be - we can do it in our list. Any comments about staying a little bit more time or just having our ten minutes for the rest of the agenda and try to achieve what we can do and then the rest in a bit? Any comments?

Chuck Gomes: I cannot stay longer but if others can, feel free to continue.

Krista: This is Krista I can't stay longer either.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, if everyone's agree, we will try to maybe in 15 more minutes after the hour or 20 minutes, I think we will extend it. So if we can do that that will be better. (Unintelligible) our agenda that could not be reviewed.

So can we move forward to our Point 2? What I suggested here is to review with the Subtest leaders the - what has been done during this two weeks. Many things have happened and many work has been done from different perspectives and from different sector leaders and groups.

Unfortunately, Sub Test Leader S.S. could not join the call. What I would like to write here is a comment made by Claudio in our list about possible overlapping in between Subtest 1 and Subtest 2. In this sense, I would encourage Claudio, S.S. and the other members of Subtest 1 team to exchange some ideas with Victoria and the other team, maybe to divide what ideas and exchange ideas, not to overlap under the same work. Because for example, S.S. made a very interesting analysis of some charters of constituencies and he was talking about elections and policy issues.

And also we have already been reviewing that with Victoria, for example, in the conference calls we had last Monday. So I would suggest if S.S. and Victoria could perhaps exchange some ideas about avoiding overlapping. Is that okay, Victoria?

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, that's fine. In fact, we've already had a, you know, an exchange about it. But we will try and accommodate everyone's concerns there and - yes.

Olga Cavalli: Great. And Victoria, if you could be so kind to just summarize very briefly the outcomes of the conference call you leaded lasted Monday.

Victoria McEvedy: Sure, I mean, where we're at is we have a deadline of today, actually. Essentially what we've done is that we've divided up everyone's got a particular task which is to review organization, other bottom up and other sort of international organization and find some sort of models team takes precedence. We propose to sort of add that material in together with our best and worst sort of ICANN practice exercise so that we'll be able to look at participation roles and operating procedures and perhaps then make a recommendation.

So the deadline for everyone to come back with today, it's likely in effect to be Monday morning. But I'm proposing to collate all that information and I've already started a draft report which would be the basis of a - some draft recommendations for the work team to move onto now because they're actually the principle that will have to be discussed.

But I think they're going to be much easier to look at once we've actually got something in front of us in terms of a draft. So in terms of our work plan, we're doing Exercise 5, which is collect input on available models of operating procedures from all sources, etcetera. And once we've done that and I've circulated a draft report, we will go back to Items 1 to 4 which are to consider some of the bigger issues. So that's where we're at, at the moment.

Olga Cavalli: Great, thank you, Victoria.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, we're looking at trying to do that next week so I'll be trying to collate and draft the report and circulate it next week.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Victoria. Some of us in the Subtest work team in this sub-work team had some things to do. I myself have promised to give some information from our local RAR. I already requested them but I had no feedback. And so my apologies for not being able to provide this on time which was today.

But I think during next week, I will be able to share this information with our sub team.

Victoria McEvedy: Great.

Olga Cavalli: So thank you very much. I think it was a very good conference call last Monday. And thank you for your leadership in that and I hope to contribute with what I committed with. Any comments, any questions to Victoria about what is going on with Subtest 2 work team?

Okay, Subtest 3, Krista has sent a very interesting document. She sent an update of the work plan which I successfully uploaded in the Wiki today, this morning. I thought I could not make it but I did. So it's already uploaded and as far as I know and because Krista told me - also Tony told me - you had very interesting meetings in Sydney with constituency representatives and with ICANN staff related to this issue.

So perhaps you, Krista, could share with us briefly your comments? And also, I would like to also thank Krista for sending the constituency analysis document with comments in relation with the registrar constituencies. So thank you very much for that. And I will comment a little bit later about it.

Krista:

Okay, no problem. And just actually on that last piece, I did send comments with updates from the registrar constituencies on the constituency analysis document. And I'll be sending - I don't think I'll get it done today but it's virtually the same for the stakeholder group analysis document.

So Tony and I actually (spent some time) in Sydney meeting with - we actually met with each constituency except the NCUC. We had some problems getting together with them. But I'm actually exchanging emails and have a call scheduled for next week on how to talk to someone from there on this whole idea of the database as constituency members, etcetera.

But I think both our - mine and Tony's experience has been that people are generally open to it. The biggest concern is privacy and just really making sure that the database is one that's created, has different measures in it and has a granularity period so that people can sort of decide who can see what kind of information about them. And Julie was actually able to get us together with (Ken Bauer) from ICANN IT.

And you know, I don't - Tony, I think you'd probably agree with me. But you know, (Ken)'s approach was refreshing and his feedback was good because

it was sort of like, you know, you guys can do whatever you want. You just need to, you know, whoever's going to design this can do whatever they want. We just need to know what the requirements are and he offered up some great suggestions.

So, I mean, overall I think, you know, we're - we've got the majority of what we need here with the exception of talking to the NCUC. And I guess one of the things - I'm a little - I just want to clarify - I mean, I feel like once we sort of filled in all of the boxes on Subtest 1.3, the next step - and again, you know, this is my lack of experience and working on these teams. But the next step is for us to put together a recommendation based on what we found. Is that correct or am I missing something?

Olga Cavalli: That's correct. And this is something that we're still need to talk among us is once we have gone through the analysis of charters and you have all - done all this meeting and you have all this information, we should share some ideas about how to start preparing our outcome of documents.

So we still have time. We have to think about it and be creative in finding a way to pull this together in a very clear way which is easy to go through and read and understand. But if you have some ideas, just please share with us. I have shared some in the list. Also, Julie had. But we are still in that process, Krista. So you're right, we should start producing some outcome.

Tony Harris: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Tony Harris: This is Tony. Can I comment on and add to what Krista just said?

Olga Cavalli: Go ahead, Tony, please.

Tony Harris: Yes, Krista has an excellent point there. But I think basically one way we could possibly go about this would be we have the okay now from all the constituencies except the NCUC, apparently, on submitting the information on who the members are and so forth.

Perhaps once we have the 100% of that taken care of, the next logical step might be for the ICANN staff to say, well, we would suggest presenting this data in this format and providing this type of information, this level of information and does this look all right.

And then we could look at that and it would also be a basis for public comment probably also.

Olga Cavalli: I think it's a very good idea. Rob, are you - did you get what Tony was saying? You think that's feasible?

Rob Hogarth: I do. And it's - I think it's a neat approach too because it's, you know, some level of prototyping, it's - and I think it's a good way to conduct business. You guys give us a general guidance. We, you know, suggest ways, you know, to implement it and then you provide feedback.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. And one comment also and maybe I am making some mistake but this is an analysis that includes the existing constituencies. And I think we should also provide some guidelines of how to proceed with new stakeholder groups and tourist groups and constituencies that will be formed and defined in the future GNSO structure. And this is where I think perhaps we should establish some guidelines. I was referring to that before.

Tony Harris: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, Tony.

Tony Harris: Yeah, quite right. And actually I think the database is sort of focused on the concept of participants in the stakeholder group more than constituencies. So that would also include as you say, you know, new people, you know, new participants, okay?

Olga Cavalli: Great, thank you.

Krista: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very - who wants to talk – Krista?

Krista: No, I was just going to add to your comment briefly, just, I mean, I think the whole database point is to add new people, whether they're become new as a part of - not one - not the whole point but one of the points is that, you know, you would add new people, whether they're becoming part of an existing stakeholder group constituency or a new one. So yeah, absolutely, that should be inclusive or included.

Tony Harris: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Krista and Tony. I think it has been a great job that you have done and you have made great improvements. There is some music going on and off, I don't know who has the music.

Tony Harris: Or they could change the station and put on some salsa, that would be...

Olga Cavalli: That would be nice. Okay, Sector 4, Julie is not on the call and I'm not sure if Chuck is still on the call...

Chuck Gomes: I am but I'm going to have to jump off. Let me be real quick and see if anybody has any questions, okay, Olga?

Olga Cavalli: I think there is not much to say. We are waiting for feedback for the letters so I think that's okay, Chuck, so...

Chuck Gomes: I do have one comment, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: First of all, there are two comments. The deadline for input from constituencies and others would be the end of July for the - so that's an ongoing process. I haven't seen any feedback yet but that just may mean that the list of proposed services is pretty satisfactory. We'll have to decide on that.

But one last comment before I jump off and that is that I think the possibility of this tool kit of services applying to interest groups is one that it'll be important for us to pursue. And we'll just have to decide, okay, how does an interest group qualify for those services compared to a constituency in the other house and so forth. But those are issues we can talk about further as we move forward.

Any questions before I jump off? Okay, thanks, everybody, I've got to run...

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Chuck, thank you very much for joining us. Okay, so we - can we move to Item 3 of our agenda. We still need some exchange of ideas about best and worst practices. I was reviewing the document that Krista sent with the registrar comments. I think it's very interesting.

We also have the same document revised by Victoria and we have some other versions. Unfortunately, Julie is not with us today because she has been updating all this information in the Wiki. And Victoria made a very excellent suggestion today in the list, saying that she could perhaps works in merging of these documents.

That's a great idea, Victoria, perhaps you could work with someone else in this venture? I could help you.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, why don't I - well, I'm very happy to work with Julie, who's probably the best person...

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, of course, Julie should be the one from start. But I could be happy to cooperate with you and Julie.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, that would be great. We could - we can draft in rounds then. I can be happy to - why don't we - we'll deal with it on the list of logistics. But in principal, I think that's a great idea.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, I think it's a great idea. And if someone else wants to help, it's welcome. Any comments?

And finally, I would like to clarify some comments that we made in our meeting in Sydney - face-to-face meeting in Sydney that Victoria attended remotely and S.S. attended not all the time.

Victoria McEvedy: No, I didn't attend.

Olga Cavalli: You didn't - I'm so sorry. But you read the - you have the MP3 recording and you made your comments before, I was confused - my apologies. Victoria, you made some questions about some private emails we have been exchanging, not through the list but personally to the different members of the working team.

The purpose of these emails was at certain moments of the past, maybe one month and a half ago or two months ago, was to summarize the activity in the list. It's not that we are not being concerned or anything, it - what we wanted is was this was an idea we had with (Michael) was to summarize the activity in the list sometimes - and it happens to me.

Not in this working team because I'm leading and I'm following it daily and working on this working team very much. But sometimes I'm not leading and I'm participating and I had a lot to do and I cannot follow the daily update of the list.

So the purpose of those emails sent before was to summarize was done the approval of the charter, the main issues that were decided, work clearance that should be submitted and all that. That was the only purpose of this email sent. And the idea that we had in Sydney of having a private call with you or with S.S. or with the other - the team leaders was just do this, was to update of what has been done.

It's nothing wrong that sometimes we have many things to do and we're volunteering time and it's difficult to follow up. Just that, I just wanted to clarify this with you and perhaps hear if you have any comments or any ideas of how to improve this.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay, thanks very much, Olga. Just for the rest of the team, I mean, I guess that my concern - and, you know, things can be very different. I just read the transcripts afterwards so I wasn't at the meeting. And you know, perhaps, you know, when you're not there in person and you're not hearing those voices, you can get the wrong impression. And I took the impression from the transcripts that there had been a concern - that the team leaders - and perhaps myself and perhaps one or two others - had not been performing.

And there was - it looked from the transcripts as there was a suggestion that attempts to follow this up with us had not been successful. And it was perhaps not the impressions that was intended but my comments were really, you know, I sort of felt that this hadn't been necessarily handled as delicately as - or diplomatically as it might have been because I didn't get an opportunity to make - I wasn't at the meeting and I wasn't able to - I wasn't asked to submit a status report to the meeting.

And I hadn't received any emails about Subtest 2 and sort of suggesting that things needed to be done that hadn't been done or what have you. So I mean, I think we can leave it there and I was just wanting to, you know, clarify that position. Thank you, Olga, for doing so.

Olga Cavalli: No, no - and my apologies if - I just said something that wasn't comprehended. It was not meant to mean that. It's just sometimes my English is limited so maybe I made some mistakes.

Okay, any other business?

Krista: Olga, this is Krista I really have to go. So thank you everyone...

Olga Cavalli: No, thank you very much. Thank you for joining and I think we are done. Any other comments?

Okay, thank you very much for the meeting and we keep working on our list. Thank you for joining today.

Man: Okay, thanks Olga.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Thanks Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Bye.

Man: Thanks Olga.

END