Operations Steering Committee
TRANSCRIPTION

Monday 24 November 2008 18:00 UTC

Note: **The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the**

Operations Steering Committee meeting on Monday 24 November 2008, at 18:00 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-operations-sc-20081124.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#nov

Present for the teleconference:
Chuck Gomes - GNSO Council vice-chair, OSC group chair
Olga Cavalli - NCA alternate chair
Stephane van Gelder - Registrar
Philip Sheppard - CBUC
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben - ISP

Alternate
Ron Andruff - CBUC
David Maher - Ryc
Tony Holmes - ISP

Absent apologies
Robin Gross - CBUC

Staff:
Robert Hoggarth
Ken Bour
Glen de Saint Gery

Coordinator: Thank you for standing by. I'd like to inform all parties that the call is

being recorded. If there are any objections to disconnect. Thank you.

You may begin.

(Chuck): Thank you. All right, I don't think - we have (Olga), (Glen), myself. (Robin) will not be able to make it. (Wolf)'s on, (Phillip)'s on, (Steve Metalitz), Stéphane, Rob, Glen and (Ken), (Ken Bour) and then alternates (Tony Holmes) and (David Maher) and Ron Andruff. Did I miss anybody?

Okay. Then are there any issues with the agenda?

Okay, our immediate action items are to elect a chair and if we want an alternate chair to agree on parameters for participation of alternate OSC members. I put that on here but I think we basically agreed to that last time. But we will - I'll bring it up again and see if everybody's comfortable with what we talked about last - in our kickoff meeting in Cairo.

And then see if we can find a time for regular meeting days and times. And we may have to use a doodle for that but that will be fine. So those are our immediate action items.

Let's start off with election of a chair. Any discussion on that? Anybody willing to step up and volunteer to that role? Hopefully we won't have just silence here.

Man: I'd be quite happy with you to do it (Chuck).

Man: Yes I agree. I second that motion.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): Well I was hoping to get somebody else but I'm willing to do it if that's

the direction the team wants to go. Anybody else want to comment on that?

(Phillip):   (Phillip), I support.

Ron Andruff: Ron I support.

(Chuck):   Thanks everybody.

(Olga):   (Olga) supports also.

(Steve Metalitz): (Steve Metalitz) supports also.

Stephane Van Gelder   Stephane Van Gelder supports also.

(David Maher):   (David)...supports.

Stephane Van Gelder: (Tony Holmes) supports.

Man: Now it's a must.

(Chuck):   All right now, okay I'm willing to do that. Is there anybody opposed to that?

Woman: No.

(Chuck):   Okay. All right. I will go ahead and procede in that capacity. Would you like to select an alternate chair for a situation when I might not be able to be there or something like that? And is there anybody that would be willing to serve in that capacity to back me up?

Man: Might I suggest (Olga)?

(Chuck):   (Olga), is that something you would be willing and have time to do?

(Olga):   I will be traveling to India next week.

(Chuck):   So will I. So my guess is we're not going to be able to have a call next week anyways so...

(Olga):   Okay. And I may...

(Chuck):   I will see you there.

(Olga):   Okay great. I didn't know that. That's great to know. And I think that I will be having a week for vacation in January in January of - that's the next month or two months commitment I have. But yes, that's okay.

(Chuck):   All right, anybody opposed to that suggestion of (Olga) as alternate chair?

                All right, moving on. Now in our kickoff meeting we spent a little bit of time for those of you that were involved in it, talking about the role of alternate OSC members.

                And basically at my memory's correct -- and correct me if it's not -- we basically concluded I think that the alternate chair could participate on all the calls and so forth on a regular basis if they so desired. Is anybody opposed to that approach or suggest something different?

(Phillip):   (Phillip) here. My only concern with that I mean I think certainly alternate should be - should feel able to do so. But I think there should be no particular obligation of them to do so.

And I think for me the whole concept of having alternates is that you have additional resource to put in when the first contact cannot make it. And it's up to the first contact to keep their alternate up to speed in terms of what's happening on the group.

And just in terms of, you know, time and effort that alternates are involved, I think it should be clear that, you know, they are welcomed but they're not expected to attend main calls unless specifically asked to do so by the primary vendor.

(Chuck):   Well said (Phillip). Does anybody have any comments? Anybody disagree with that?

Stephane Van Gelder: No, this is Stephane here. I fully agree with what (Phillip)'s just said as far as the RC alternate, (Mason Cole) is concerned. I'm sure he's more then happy not to participate unless I cannot attend the meeting.

But he may from time to time want to come in just to keep up to speed. So I think as much flexibility as we can have there is probably a good thing.

(Chuck):   And in case of and when we do a meeting request that maybe we haven't previously agreed to or something like that, I would tend to if there's an alternate that can't make it but the primary can make it, I would go that direction in terms of a choice for a meeting time or day.

Does that make sense?

Man: Yes.

(Chuck):   Okay. Anything else on the participation of alternates?

Okay now I think probably the easiest way to decide on regular meeting days and times would be to do a doodle. But before we do that it'd be helpful to get some parameters.

Now my opinion -- and this is open for discussion -- is, is that early on we're going to need more frequent meetings than we will later on because there's a lot of things to get kicked off.

(Olga)'s already pointed out that next week's a bad week for both she and I because we'll be at IGF in Hyderabad But after that and also realizing that we have the Christmas holidays which likely we probably want to - we may want to skip a week or two depending on what the day we select for our meetings is weekly - are weekly meetings okay for the first month or so? And by month, it's not going to be calendar month, the first four meetings or so excepting the Christmas holidays.

(Phillip):   Sure. (Phillip) here. I wanted to perhaps just ask - if we're asking the question one way round, I mean perhaps we need to identify more clearly the work in front of us and then understand the frequency of our meetings.

I mean my own feeling is that we - I mean we've yet as a group to adopt the proposed chapter. But if we do, and the work program is already there, then it strikes me that our primary job is kicking off each

of the underlying teams to actually do that work as rapid as possible. And some of those, you know, may even be able to start next week leading us very much in an oversight role.

(Chuck):   You know, that's an excellent point (Phillip). And would it be okay if we come back to this at the end of this call today after we go over some of the other things which will indeed have an impact on that issue?

(Phillip):   (Sure).

(Chuck):   Okay?

(Phillip):   Yes.

(Chuck):   All right. Then the next thing on the agenda is to review the OSC task. And I listed them on the agenda. We have to finalize the OSC charter which we're going to go through today.

We have to decide what work teams to establish and then decide how to finalize the work team charters. For example, should we involve the work teams in that task?

And then we need to solicit -- although this wouldn't require regular meetings to do -- work team members. Although it'll be helpful if each of us go back to our respective groups and solicit volunteers for that thing.

So the first work task is the OSC charter. A draft one was prepared with the understanding that the OSC itself would be involved, the membership of the OSC would be involved in finalizing that charter and

recommending the final charter to the GNSO for approval.

So our next step then would be to go through that draft charter and discuss the issues. And it is not terribly long. And that's where I would like to proceed if there are no objections to that.

Stephane Van Gelder: (Chuck), Stephane here. Can I just ask a question?

(Chuck): Sure.

Stephane Van Gelder: Is there - does the - is the meeting, the agenda for this meeting online on the OSC wiki? Because I cannot find it.

(Chuck): Yes it is. There's an agenda - well I think it is. I...

Stephane Van Gelder: Because there's an OSC meeting agendas link.

(Chuck): But nothing there?

Stephane Van Gelder: But there's nothing there.

(Chuck): Okay.

Stephane Van Gelder: Well there's the agenda for our first meeting that we had in Cairo but am I just getting this wrong or...

Man: You're getting it wrong. I'm actually looking an it right now on that link.

Man: Yes, me too.

Man: Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes. This is Rob. (Chuck) posted it right on the front cover page of the OSC Stephane. So it's right there.

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay, I'll find it. Thanks guys.

(Chuck):   My mistake. And also I emailed a work copy out as well.

Man: Yes.

(Chuck):   So...

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay. Thanks.

(Steve Metalitz): (Chuck), this is (Steve Metalitz). Is the OSC charter that your draft charter that you're talking about on the wiki?

(Chuck):   Yes it is. If you go down to the bottom of the page...

(Steve Metalitz): All right.

(Chuck):   It doesn't - it's not called the OSC draft charter. So...

(Steve Metalitz): Is it just description of OSC?

Man: Correct.

(Steve Metalitz): Okay. Okay.

(Chuck):   Yes. That's it. You've got it okay.

                  And that's what I - so I think it's - the document itself on the wiki when you click on the link is original OSC draft work of GNSO IPT. Is that correct Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: That's correct (Chuck). And that was put up there just as ground information.

(Chuck):   Yes.

Rob Hoggarth: And if you compare the two you'll see a lot of similarities. But the current version is what the council approved on the 16th and of October. And that's what's on the front page there.

(Chuck):   Okay. That's excellent. And the - and so that's what I - what we'll go through right now and see if we can - we'll have some discussion on various items, see if we can even make some decisions on some of those.

                  Does anybody not have that document in front of them? So everybody's with us here which will make it easier?

Man: Yes.

(Chuck):   The first part is primarily introductory and background information, still important I think to the charter. But Rob, can I assume that you as our primary policy support person will kind of be our editor and with regard to this document?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes sir. And it would help if no one else is in the edit mode so that when I make the changes it'll be effectuated.

(Chuck):   Very good. And for those who haven't used the wiki much before, those on the committee do have editing rights. So you can in-between meetings and so forth if you want to add a comment or make a suggested edit you can do that.

And if you would put a note by that when you make an edit that the comments obviously will be clear I think from you. But in the case of edits it's not always real clear.

And that would be helpful so then we can discuss that as a group or even comment on the wiki. Other people can add comments and edits or changes to edits that are proposed.

By the way. I should've said this at the beginning. For those that haven't been involved in a - any sort of a workgroup that I'm involved with, I'm real comfortable with people jumping in and making comments, asking questions, et cetera., at any time. So you don't need to worry too much about me in that regard. I'm pretty flexible there. So please feel free to jump in whenever you need to.

So the - going down then - and I'll just leave it if there's anything that needs editing in the first few - first three paragraphs there. I'll leave that to Rob. But going down to the working method for the steering committee, the one that was proposed out of the planning committee was to establish work teams. And we talked about this a little bit in Cairo.

And the - basically work teams to - that would be tasked with creating implementation plans for the operations areas for which the board made recommendations.

The - and I won't read what's said there in that paragraph under working - the first paragraph under working methods. You can read it for yourself. If anybody has any questions or comments in terms of what the reasons for using that approach were let me know if you have any right now.

(Steve Metalitz): (Chuck), this is (Steve Metalitz).

(Chuck): Sure.

(Steve Metalitz): One question I had reading this is that there's nothing in here about the role of the staff in these working teams and in the steering committee as a whole. And I wonder is that appropriate for, an appropriate topic for the charter?

(Chuck): Sure. I think that would be fine. My understanding -- and correct me Rob or (Ken) if I'm off base on this, but staff basically is to support the committee in fulfilling its task. But I think it'd be good to have that stated in the charter. Any discussion on that?

Rob Hoggarth: To the extent that you asked for my input I think you're correctly stated, (Chuck) we'll be happy to do anything you guys want us to do on the steering committee or on any of the work teams.

(Steve Metalitz): Well I guess one question is would there be staff, particular staff allocated to each team or just how would that...

Rob Hoggarth: We anticipated that it would be the case. And that it would, you know, likely be one of us to support that effort. To that extent as we move forward in their particular area of expertise where we think there is something beyond the capabilities of the existing staff we might recommend the outreach to an expert consulting, an outside party to help us out in that regard.

(Chuck): And Rob, could you develop - you don't need to do it now, but after this meeting could you do a, maybe a one paragraph write-up of staff support for the steering committee and include in that, I think the comment about support that its anticipated that there would be staff support for the working teams as well is very good to have there.

Rob Hoggarth: Will do. I'll just include that in this (unintelligible) teams there towards the bottom of the charter.

(Chuck): Okay. Good. Thanks (Steve) for that good point.

Anything else on the working method paragraph, the first one?

Then let's jump right into the three suggested teams, the first one being the GNSO operations team.

And let me preface it by saying that I think in my opinion this is one of the more time sensitive ones to get format - get formed early and get working on mainly because some of the tasks if we do create that team of GNSO operations would be necessary in June when we go to the bicameral structure.

For example the GNSO rules, a procedure that we've been operating on clear back to the DNSO days are going to need to be updated to fit the new model. And that would be one of the tasks presumably that we would give to this particular working team.

So if there's a priority in my opinion between teams one, two and three that one we want to get going the quickest if we're unable to get them all going at the same time.

So this particular one, keep in mind the difference between team one and team two as proposed. Team one will focus on the GNSO council and its operations within the GNSO as a whole whereas team number two is going to be a constituency oriented task and probably a more - even more complicated task to come up with an implementation plan for implementing the recommendations from the board that relate to constituency operations in contrast to counsel operations. Does that make sense? Any questions on that?

(Phillip):   (Chuck), (Phillip) here. What you're saying makes eminent sense. I think you're right in terms of the priority of timing. I'd like to make a concrete proposal that we agree as a steering committee here and now to initiate the GNSO operations team.

(Chuck):   Any objections to that?

And by the way, I will tend to use that approach of asking if there any objections unless people on the team don't like that approach. It's a quick way to find out whether the - in other words, in doing that I'm going to assume that people are supporting of it instead of just, you know, doing a roll call or something like that.

If ever you want a roll call or handled differently, please let me know. No objections to that suggestion by (Phillip)? Okay. Okay, thank you.

Now is there any desire - we'll come back later and talk about how the charter would be developed for these teams. But as far as what's in this paragraph for team one, are there any questions or comments on that?

Okay. Now team two is to enhance constituencies. And this one is probably going to be the most controversial of the three teams if we establish the teams as suggested here. Because every constituency's different.

And I don't think this in any ways means that they shouldn't still be different. But there probably are some - there possibly are some areas of commonality. And this team will focus on those areas.

And I think the membership of this one - I mean constituency should be involved in all of them but it's really going to be critical that there's good constituency representation on this particular committee.

Now any comments or discussion on team number two?

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes, (Chuck), Stephane here.

(Chuck):   Go ahead.

Stephane Van Gelder: I have a question on the third - the fourth bullet point, develop a toolkit for the constituencies.

I've seen some constituency proposals, some proposals for new constituencies that seem very formalized. I saw them unofficially.

Is there not the kind of toolkit that already exists for new constituencies to propose or to come forward and request membership as it were?

(Chuck): Well I think part of what you're talking about are some templates that have recently been designed to facilitate perspective new constituencies in applying.

Stephane Van Gelder: Right.

(Chuck): Okay? I think this particular recommendation from the board goes further than that although those kinds of things would certainly fit in that category.

And these could be things for example that support could be provided by ICANN staff and using ICANN facilities. By facilities I mean that very broadly, not the physical facilities necessarily that would help a constituency function.

For example, many of us now as constituencies kind of do our own thing with regard to Web sites, with regard to list operation and so forth.

I think this is getting into that. There could be some common services that would be made available to constituencies if they wanted to use them. Does that make sense?

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes.

(Chuck):   Okay, good question.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thanks.

(Chuck):   Anything else on team number two?

(Steve Metalitz): (Chuck), this is (Steve Metalitz). It strikes me that - this is about constituencies that are in existence or that later become recognize. Is that what...

(Chuck):   Correct, yes.

(Steve Metalitz): And the last two bullets of the previous team description are about how new constituencies get recognized or established right?

(Chuck):   Correct.

(Steve Metalitz): Okay. Well it might just be worth, you know, that might mean that we want to put the information about encouraging the self forming of new constituencies into the first team rather than the second team.

                 Because I think that's the only thing in here that isn't about how constituencies function.

(Chuck):   Okay. And team two, what - which number are you referring to?

Man: First bullet.

(Chuck): First bullet. Developing a global - oh I've got you. Yes, that one. Okay.

Man: Yes. I mean...

(Chuck): You know I think you're - I think he's right. Anybody disagree with that?

Stephane Van Gelder: No this is Stephane. I think that's a very good point which I'd (missed). But I absolutely agree with the fact that this should be overseen by the council directly and probably needs to be in the first group.

(Chuck): Any disagreement to that?

Okay...

(Phillip): Hang on. (Phillip) here. Are we going to move the whole of the bullet or only part of the bullet?

(Steve Metalitz): Just the second part.

(Phillip): The second part to encourage the self forming of new constituencies.

(Steve Metalitz): Yes. I mean I don't have that specific wording but I think the points about new constituencies should all be together.

(Phillip): Yes I mean I don't know. There's I thought there's a difference in task there. And I understand the logic. I mean but to my mind I thought the concept of rules for the establishment of constituency is, you know, what they should look like, what the differentiation, et cetera. is. And that is different to outreach in terms of encouragement to form. Their -

and they're quite separable (aren't they)?

(Chuck):   Yes, I think so. And I think the idea of just moving the second part of number one up to team one makes sense.

                  Now (Steve) do you agree with that, leaving the developing a global outreach program to broaden participation in current constituencies in team two? Does that make sense to you?

(Steve Metalitz): Yes. I agree with that but I think (Phillip) doesn't from what he just said that he doesn't think the second - that encouraging self forming of new constituencies involves - belongs in team one.

(Chuck):   Is that correct (Phillip)?

(Phillip):   Well yes it is. I was thinking of the skills necessary. I mean what I'm saying is I'm comfortable I think with the status quo. I mean I'm prepared - I'm not, you know, I'm not that strong on it.

                  But I don't - for me the logic of team one is, you know, is setting rules and processes you know, how statements should look, how new constituencies forms should look et cetera.

                  The theme of team two is all about health and guidelines and outreach and encouragement. And that's, you know, that's quite a separate set of things. And therefore...

(Chuck):   Would you suggest - would you then suggest just deleting the end of - from the and on in number one and team two so that it just says developing a global outreach program to broaden participation in

current constituencies period and then just deleting the rest, not moving it?

(Phillip): That would be better logic in my view, yes.

Stephane Van Gelder: Can I just - Stephane here again. Perhaps we need to make sure that we're all clear on what the actual two teams are supposed to do.

My understanding when that point was raised was that the first team would be at a council level working as - at that level which is a kind of envelope level for the rest of the work that's done by the GNSO.

So encouraging the forming of new constituencies would naturally go to that level because you couldn't leave it up to individual constituencies who already have to concentrate on what they're doing. That was my understanding of the initial point.

If we're saying that the two teams are actually just working on specifics of both council and constituency operations, then it may be slightly different. I'm not sure if I've made myself very clear there.

Is that it what everybody's understanding is of what the two teams are supposed to do?

(Wolf): Well I - it's (Wolf) speaking. So I (often) - in that context the question of are we talking more about the GNSO operation or the GNSO council operation in that context or those together? Is there a difference between them?

(Chuck): Probably some although my opinion, they overlap. I mean it's probably mostly - team one's probably mostly going to focus on GNSO (council) operations. But that needs to be done in the context of the GNSO as a whole because the council is just the - kind of the executive body of the GNSO.

(Wolf): Yes once again, so I think what they need is also we have to emphasize on, let me say the interdependence between the different groups I would say, (we say) because the - for me the question is how for example the constituencies themselves shall appear in the future in the context of the GNSO and the GNSO council.

So those - to my - it seems to me that there may be a difference between that, between that, both, you know. In the context of GNSO council see the constituency could (unless) disappear, let me say that in that context. So how it is (expected) at the time being, intended at the time being.

So the question is what is that role in the future so - of the constituencies in the context of the GNSO or the GNSO content?

(Chuck): Well I think it's both. But also let me add one more thing (Wolf) on that. The role of the steering committee itself is to coordinate between the different work teams as appropriate and needed so that - it was assumed when the plan - when the draft plan was developed that the steering committees would make sure that there is coordination between the various teams because a lot of what they're doing does interrelate.

And so it'll be our responsibility as a steering committee to facilitate

that kind of cooperation, coordination where needed.

(Wolf): Okay.

(Chuck): Does that - I mean I don't know if that answered your question though.

(Wolf): Yes. If it takes us all, you know, (unintelligible) to that then it's okay.

(Chuck): Okay. Thank you.

Other comments on, or questions on team two?

And so is there any - is there support then for establishing a constituency operations team as proposed here? Anybody opposed to that?

Okay.

(Phillip): (Phillip) here. Just in terms of timing and practicality, I would suggest that we take a decision now to form that group as a 15th of January.

(Chuck): Okay. And any decision on that?

(Phillip): That's different to our immediate forming of the earlier group.

(Chuck): Any comments on that?

Man: Just a question. When we form a group do we put an official call out for volunteers?

(Chuck): I'm sure we will. That's one of our action items is to decide how we're going to do that. But I think that would be true.

At the same time, let me throw in this general comment. When we're - I think it'll be very helpful if when we do start the process of communicating to the whole community what teams we're forming, it'll be very helpful to communicate all of the team's whether we're forming them right now at the same time.

Because ultimately they will overlap in their duties time-wise. And it's going to be very important for people to have a relatively full picture so that they can pick a team that they most want to be involved in from those.

Because if we have very much duplication in membership, that's going to create other problems. But we'll talk more about that later.

Rob Hoggarth: (Chuck), this is Rob. If I can confirm then the description that the group has agreed to for the two teams.

My understanding is that for the constituency operations team you want the first bullet to read develop a global outreach program to broad participation in current constituencies period.

(Chuck): Correct.

Rob Hoggarth: And my thought is do you still want to capture that second part of that in the GNSO operations team? And if so, I do have some recommended place to put that. But I just wanted to confirm that's where we are at this stage.

(Chuck): Well if I interpreted (Phillip)'s suggestion correctly that we just leave it out, but let's hear what your suggestions are because maybe that would change my view or others.

Rob Hoggarth: Well there's just that concept in the second half there that talked - and to encourage the self forming of new constituencies.

And it struck me that if you're going to move that into the last bullet of the previous team that that bullet would then read potentially review and recommend amendments as appropriate regarding methods for encouraging, promoting and introducing new constituencies somehow capturing that encouraging terminology.

It's just a suggestion. It could probably still work without that. But that's what occurred to me.

(Chuck): Discussion?

Now I didn't follow exactly where you were -what parts of the document you were talking about so...

Rob Hoggarth: If you just look at the - well if you just look at the previous operations team, the GNSO operations team...

(Chuck): Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: ...and that has six bullets. The last bullet currently says review and recommend amendments. I'm not really sure what that means. Review and recommend amendments as appropriate (methods) for introducing

new constituencies.

And I am suggesting that one way to capture the first bullet of the second ops team into this last bullet of the first ops team is to just put in two additional - would somehow capture that encouraging language that you have deleted below.

And so the recommendation there was to (rewrite) to say review and recommend amendments as appropriate regarding methods for promoting, encouraging and introducing new constituencies.

(Chuck):   Apparently the version of this document that I'm looking at is a little bit different than what you have. I clicked on the link at the bottom of the page and you're probably looking directly on the wiki home page. Is that right?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes. I'm looking directly at the wiki home page.

(Chuck):   Okay. Let me go...

(Phillip):   (Phillip) here. I was following Rob perfectly and I support his suggestion.

(Chuck):   Okay. Any other discussion on that?

                Okay. Anybody opposed to that?

                Sounds good to me then. All right.

                All right, now going on to the communications team. This one in my

opinion is probably the simplest of the three, not that it's not important. But are there - is there any discussion on it?

(Wolf): It's (Wolf) speaking. So I think it's - this team is let me say should be based or should take up its work after some work has been developed for the other teams. That is just my feeling you know.

Because it's necessary to know about, you know, the processes, you know, between the different groups a little bit more and a little bit more in detail before you can really start it out to - the work for that team. That's my feeling.

(Chuck): Other thoughts?

Stephane Van Gelder: Stephane here. I'm actually not in full agreement with what's just been said.

I think the communications team is actually independent of the others. And I think it's a core function as well because it really is important that we have good communications with all the other ICANN structures.

And I think its work that can be done independent and at the same time as the other teams. I don't think it's work that's really dependent on the other team's results.

And I'd also go with what, I think it was (Chuck) said earlier on, that if we announce all teams at once and get all teams started up in a kind of or at least a similar timeframe, I think we will be more efficient and probably have a better chance of getting volunteers.

(Chuck):   Other thoughts?

                And I...

(Phillip):   (Chuck), yes, (Phillip) here. I'm just thinking if you both (asked to)
                comment. I mean to some extent the - I mean we do exist in
                coordination with other ICANN structures. We have a theory and - of
                liaisons. And that's, you know, is likely to be the sort of outcome that
                we come up with.

                And I think probably what was driving (Wolf)'s comments was the - if
                that's going to be the mechanism, then how they fit and what they do
                and link the things like what's going to happen in the other steering
                committee on policy and the workgroups and DDPs et cetera is all
                relevant as a nation for thinking through how the one-way, two-way
                communication, coordination liaisons work.

                So I think some of the practicalities would be mainly to be delayed. So
                I appreciate what Stephane was saying, you know, in terms of there's
                some more generic stuff there that can be done straight away. But I
                wonder if the generic stuff is not relatively obvious and indeed based
                on our existing best practice.

(Chuck):   Any other thoughts?

                It does seem to me -I see the truth in both comments. There is some
                immediate value I think although it may not really be able to be
                completed until some of the other work is done.

                Like for example, the GNSO operations team looking at some things

there in particular, the role of liaisons and so forth like (Phillip) pointed out, you know, until that team makes some progress, some of the details of the work that the communications team does probably wouldn't be able to be finalized until that happens.

But there might be some value even though their task may be relatively simple in the early stages of getting it started sooner rather than later.

(Steve Metalitz): This is (Steve Metalitz).

(Chuck): Go ahead (Steve).

(Steve Metalitz): It just struck me a minute - this may be an obvious point. But the communications team, it's a lot harder to figure out what they're actually supposed to be doing.

I mean with the other two you have a series of bullets there and you could - once the team forms I suppose their first order of business would be to decide to prioritize among those bullets as well as seeing if there are other things that they ought to be doing.

But communications team, this isn't really as well fleshed out. Improved coordination with other ICANN structures, that just means in coordination of the council or of the GNSO with the ASO and with the server advisory committee or what...

(Chuck): I think that is - was the primary thrust. Although I believe that policy staff have assumed other tasks in that regard. And Rob, I'll let you speak to this or (Ken). And that is I think you would - some of you had thought that Web site improvement for example is a communications

tool and that may be that - you would fit that here. Is that true Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, that's exactly the case (Chuck). And one of the things that we will constantly need to do as you guys move forward with this work is refer back to the BGC report that the board endorsed for a variety of, you know, particular points, you know, looking at legislative history or whatever.

And, yes, the BGC report anticipated things like Web site improvement, potentially other vehicles that the council might determine or the community might determine that don't exist that need to exist in the future that are as yet undetermined.

It really is a catchall category that leaves some real potential for changes there. And what I would, you know, commit to doing is going back to the BGC report and may be pulling out some of the bullets that (Steve) suggests to help give that team a little bit more direction.

(Ken Bauer): Rob, this is (Ken). Another one was some collateral that might be used for outreach programs including brochures, interactive media, leaflets, things that might support a general outreach also.

(Chuck): Now the - one of the things too -- and we won't get to this today -- but if any of you have looked at that draft charters for the different work teams you will see that there is a pretty good listing maybe with the exception of this particular group of recommendations from the board that relate to each of these areas.

So it gets more specific when we get down to the team charters in that regard. So we will get to that point in future meetings and maybe in the

working team themselves.

So I'm kind of - I'm sensing that there's - there is good consensus on forming these three work teams. We'll talk - in just a minute we'll talk about the timing of their start and following up to (Phillip)'s suggestion and (Wolf)'s suggestion here.

But - am I - does anybody disagree with my conclusion that there is good consensus on our group for forming the three proposed operations team? Anybody?

(Phillip): Is that question, does anybody disagree?

(Chuck): That is - that's what I was supposed to ask.

(Phillip): Okay.

(Chuck): Yes, does anybody disagree with my conclusion there?

(Steve Metalitz): Well this is (Steve) again. I guess subject to seeing a little more detail on what the communications team is supposed to do.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Steve Metalitz): Because I think as it stands now that one sentence is there, I'm not sure you need a team (unintelligible).

(Chuck): Well keep in mind it may be an easy team. There are - an easy group right?

There are objectives or recommendations in the report that have to do with this.

(Steve Metalitz): No I understand that. But that's why I'm saying subject to seeing a little more detail.

(Chuck): Yes. And if you want to see that detail look at the - and I don't - you know, not having looked at it in quite a while, I don't know how much detail's there or not. But you might want to look at the communications team's draft charter. It's linked on the site there.

(Steve Metalitz): Yes, I just looked there and it does have some more detail.

(Chuck): Does it have more, enough so that you're comfortable with deciding to plan on a communications team?

(Steve Metalitz): Well I want to look - take a look at it.

(Chuck): Okay. All right. That's fine.

(Steve Metalitz): I'm not objecting to it. I'm just saying that I think that...

(Chuck): Okay.

(Steve Metalitz): ...that's an area, because I'm foreseeing going out to my constituency and recruiting participants.

(Chuck): Right.

(Steve Metalitz): I just need more information.

(Chuck):   Exactly. Yes. And so let's talk about timing okay? (Phillip) made the
                suggestion that we don't actually start although we could recruit
                members I assume (Phillip). But the actual work would start around the
                15th of January.

                The - is anybody opposed to that suggestion with regard to the
                constituency operations team?

                Okay. Now let's talk a little bit about the communications team realizing
                that some more clarity is needed in terms of the roles of this team.

                (Wolf) and Stephane, you know, suggested kind of different views on
                this. Let's hear from some other people on the team in terms of the
                startup of the communications team.

(Wolf):   Yes, it's (Wolf) speaking again. So, you know, when I look to the draft
                chart of the team, you know, and the - there's a list that you just
                mentioned, the Web site related things and then the
                internationalization programs and so on, those tasks seems to me, you
                know, it could be a kind of (task lists) which that team should fulfill.

                But, you know, the major issue is for me a kind of survey or research
                concerning the communication needs between the different entities,
                the different committees and so ICANN structures, you know? So
                that's the first thing for what I think is necessary. And that is what this
                team should do at first.

                And then let me say mirror the requirements with the existing structure,
                with existing communications structures and then, you know, have a

kind of list, you know, of what should be improved. And from that, that's the basic what is needed.

And the other things then you know, the follow-ups cards, you know, cannot fulfill that, it's for me it would be kind of tasks which staff could fulfill. But that's my opinion.

(Chuck):   So (Wolf), what would be your recommendation in terms of when we start the communications team?

(Wolf):   So I would say a big task, the first task for that communications team should be a kind of - a way of (unintelligible), a list of needs communication start to establish that. That's the major issue. And then talk about the execution of that list. And the execution could be done not through the - through that - through a big team but let me say more or less through staff.

(Chuck):   So would you suggest that the communications team be formed as soon as possible or would you delay it?

(Wolf):   Yes, yes. And if that is the case I would say as soon as possible to be established and to answer it to come up with that kind of requirement list.

(Chuck):   Okay. So I think that then brings us into sync with what Stephane was saying. Is that correct Stephane?

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes. Sounds good to me.

(Chuck):   Okay.

(Phillip):   Yes (Chuck), (Phillip) here. I agree with all that. I think just as a point of information, I think there's some confusion in the description of the communications team one line on the first wiki page, improve coordination with ICANN structures, develop the proposals, improve communication.

And then what is the more detailed charter for the communications team which lists specific projects like new GNSO web site, international programs, translations, et cetera which are far more specific tasks and actually rather less related to the sort of internal ICANN structured communication as opposed to General GNSO communication.

And I think once you understand what's intended in the charter it makes eminent sense to kick off these teams straightaway because there's no reason not to.

(Chuck):   Okay thanks. We've got about 5 minutes so I want to bring things to a wrap-up here. Let me make the suggestion and see if there's support for it.

Rob, could you develop a draft message that could go to the council and then of course be forwarded to all GNSO participants however best that can be done that would basically say that the OSC has decided to form these three worked teams, give enough information about each work team to give people reasonable understanding of what the teams are going to be?

Also I think saying that we recommend that the highest priority team to

get started soon is the GNSO operations team and then to start asking people to think about which teams they would like to and to of course to solicit new volunteers as well as existing people to participate on these teams as they are formed.

Now my thinking then is that you would send that to our list and we could discuss it and interact with it on the list for any improvements and hopefully finalize that at our next meeting which I think is going to have to be the second week in December.

Anybody opposed to that approach?

(Phillip): (Chuck), (Phillip) here. You're being madly bureaucratic (Chuck). I think we can trust Rob to draw up the request of participation all on his own, send it to the list a couple of days and see if any of us can do better.

Let's just get on with it.

(Chuck): I'm okay with that (Phillip). I'm trying not to be to directive.

(Phillip): But a direction helps occasionally. And just on that line I'd also like to say that the BC anticipating this wise decision that the steering committee has taken did inform its team members to the GNSO secretary last week.

And I'm pleased to say that (Rod Andrews) is our man for the operations team and (Zachary Baheed) is our constituency ops team. And communications team maybe (Marilyn Cadish) chooses to respond to my email.

(Chuck):   Well excellent. I - that's great. And so is anybody opposed to just having Rob draft that message, run it by the list and if there's no objections, going ahead and sending it out?

(Wolf):   Sure.

(Chuck):   You're opposed or you're supportive?

(Wolf):   Supportive.

(Chuck):   Okay good. Nobody's opposed to that so hey, that's great.

Rob Hoggarth: Well this is Rob with one question for clarification. And I think it's a significant issue that the steering committee needs to discuss before I send out anything. And that is what you all anticipate what will be the composition of these work teams.

                  I recall several discussions within the community over the last many months that said don't worry about, you know, feeling left out of the process. Once the decisions start moving to work teams we're going to have broad participation, many folks will be able to participate.

                  And the reason that I raise it is that I don't anticipate or I didn't interpret those previous discussions as being limited to the existing constituencies.

                  And I throw that out because I want to make sure that the steering committee has that discussion in terms of - I don't know whether it's eligibility or what the exact terminology is. But I think you do have to

come to some consensus on what you expect the make up of these teams to look like.

(Chuck): Well first of all I think the board recommendations are clear that it needs to be open. And I believe that the planning committee fully intended that.

Now again, I haven't looked at the individual charters, the draft charters that were proposed for the working teams. But I think they also encouraged openness.

There is one thing that I personally think that we should strongly encourage people that just pick one team actually across both steering committees, pick one team to be on and have different people from the various groups on each team so that we minimize what are already very challenging scheduling situations.

Rob Hoggarth: The other aspect that falls from that I believe it is I just recall the recent discussion that the council had with respect to representativeness versus individual participation.

And again, and (Phillip)'s comment made me think about this, identifying Ron and (Marilyn) and (Baheed) as representatives of the BC. I'm not sure if you guys are looking for that type of establishment and treatment within these work teams or again it's more just hey, I'm interested. And so I Rob Hoggarth as a member of the Internet community am going to invite myself to participate.

(Chuck): And I think that latter thing is okay too. Now it's going to be our responsibility as a steering committee to make sure that there's good

broad representation of the various stakeholder groups. And I think that's something we can address as we go along on this, that more important right now is let's get some of the work of forming these work teams going as quickly as we can. And we're going to have to deal with the issues you're talking about as a steering committee in our next few meetings.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay fair enough. I'll draft it consistent with that sort of approach.

Stephane Van Gelder: Stephane here. Well Rob's points do raise quite a lot of questions in my mind. My understanding or at least let me put another question to all of you.

We're all constituency representatives here. And if we're trying to make this process as open as possible, are we actually expected to go and spread the good word outside of our constituencies? Because that wasn't my understanding.

And the initial - my initial reaction to what was being said earlier on about having Rob draft a message to be sent out was to keep it as simple as possible to make it appealing for people who haven't gone into this process in depth yet and make sure that we do get volunteers.

I mean from what I'm hearing from you guys you seem to be expecting a lot of volunteers. And I actually have the opposite worry. I was worried that I would not be able to get my fellow members motivated on this.

(Chuck): I think Stephane that yes, that some of us expect that there will be volunteers that aren't necessarily associated or representative of

existing constituencies. And what we're saying is that those kind of people would be welcome at the working team level as well.

Stephane Van Gelder: Okay.

(Chuck): Is that - does anybody disagree with me on that?

Okay. And again, I think that's consistent with the board recommendations.

Now we do - I need to bring this to a close so let's - is there any particular day of the week that is bad for anyone for our meetings to kind of narrow it down for Glen if she sends out a doodle for meeting times?

And again, we'll be starting the - our next meeting would be the next, the second week of December. Is there any, the Monday through Friday - Friday's if you have people from Asia don't work too well. But so far I don't...

Man: Monday's good.

Man: Monday is not good for me so from January onward. So in December it's okay. But from January onward Monday seems to be not good for me.

(Chuck): Okay, any other days that are bad (Olga)?

(Olga): Yes. I will be traveling, arriving...months like two days from India to Buenos Aires. So Monday, December the 8th I will be on a plane.

((Crosstalk)).

(Olga):   So Monday is okay for me but that Monday no.

(Chuck):   Okay, so it sounds like Monday may not be a good choice or how about Tuesdays through Fridays? Are there any bad days there?

Man: (Chuck) what about Monday the 15th?

(Chuck):   I kind of - what we're missing next week already, I hate to delay. Again I'm not - by the way, I'm not just talking about our next meeting. I'm talking about a possible regular meeting day so that we're not always going spending time scheduling meetings.

                 I understand that there will be exceptions where we have to do that. But I'd like to try and pick a day when we can schedule a meeting on a regular basis.

                 Now we may not have it every week but it'd be a regular day and time. So that's really what I'm getting at. And I'm hearing Monday is not a good choice there.

Woman: Tuesday is okay for me.

(Chuck):   Okay. And then - and so Glen could do an appropriate - how about time of day? Is this time of day a good time?

Man: Yes it's great.

Man: This time won't work for me on Tuesday, December 9th.

(Chuck):   Okay. Well again hopefully Glen can send out some - are you still on Glen?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes I am.

(Chuck):   Thanks Glen. I should have known. The - Glen will send out several times. Now is it okay if she sends out some times for Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday or should we stick to Tuesday?

(Phillip):   Well I just can't Thursdays only because of council meeting over there.

(Chuck):   That's right, good point.

(Phillip):   Why don't you just try Tuesdays and Wednesdays and perhaps a range of hours around this time and let's see how it works.

(Chuck):   Okay Glen, is that all right?

Glen Desaintgery: I'll do that (unintelligible).

(Chuck):   All right. So then - and then in our next meeting we'll actually start to look at the draft charters for the work team and starting off with the GNSO operations team which is the higher priority. And that will help us dig down a little further. Anything else before I close the meeting?

(Phillip):   (Chuck), while we're waiting till our next meeting to do that, all the draft charters are written, the participation details are written.

(Chuck):   Yes.

(Phillip):   They're all on the wiki. Why don't we ask everybody on this call to look at that in the meantime and if they want to recommend changes to eat email the group?

(Chuck):   Excellent idea. And then keep in mind that one fundamental question we need to answer, do we ourselves want to finalize those charters or do we want to involve the working teams in finalizing those charters? Any quick thoughts on that?

((Crosstalk)).

Man: Sorry.

(Phillip):   I was going to say - if I could say the same thing, I think we should work - remember charter and let the working groups themselves adopt them.

(Chuck):   Any disagreement with that?

Man: Yes I think you need to give the provisional charter but subject to change if...

(Phillip):   Exactly.

(Chuck):   Yes, my thinking exactly. So it sounds like we're in agreement on that.

                Okay, I'm sorry I went over the hour. Anything else before we close?

Okay thanks everybody...

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Thanks (Chuck).

(Chuck):   ...appreciate it very much.

(Phillip):   Yes, thanks everyone.

Man: Thanks, bye.

(Chuck):   And remember (Phillip)'s suggestion to review the charters okay?

Man: Thanks.

(Chuck):   Thanks.

Man: Thanks. Bye.

END