

**Operations Steering Committee
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 22 December 2008 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee meeting on Monday 22 December 2008, at 15:00 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-osc-20081222.mp3>

On page:

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

Present for the teleconference:

Chuck Gomes - GNSO Council vice-chair, OSC group chair
Olga Cavalli - NCA alternate chair
Bertrand de la Chapelle - GAC Liaison

Staff:

Ken Bour
Robert Hoggarth
Glen de Saint Gery

Absent apologies:

Stéphane van Gelder - Registrar
Philip Sheppard - CBUC
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen - ISP
David Maher - Ryc
Ken Stubbs - Ryc
Robin Gross - NCUC
Steve Metalitz - IPC

(Chuck): Okay - all right. Well, sorry for the delay there. Welcome to everyone. And I think - so (Olga)'s on, I'm on, (Ken) and Glen and (Rob) are all on. Is anyone else on? I have the meeting maker. I should have looked at it.

Glen DeSaintgery: No, that's all (Chuck) and I have just received a message from (Bertrand) that he says he'll be on the call. So I have sent back a note to say please join right now.

(Chuck): Thank you. Okay, so (Bertrand) may be on. All right. Well, we've got the - I've added a few things to the agenda that I sent yesterday, nothing significant. But based on (Rob)'s note and (Anna), a couple other things.

Our main goal this morning then is to kind of wrap things up on our immediate task and define the action items coming out of today. So, any questions or comments on the agenda? Okay. All right.

The - (Rob) pointed out that we may need to do something a little more formal with the (OSC) charter. So, let's talk about that first. Here's my thinking on that and I'd welcome any different thinking or modifications to my thinking from any of you.

I think probably we ought to just prepare today a - not in the meeting but just a simple motion for charter approval and I'll submit that to the Council for action in the next meeting. Any discussion on that?

(Rob): (Chuck), this is (Rob). The only question I had there is whether you thought as a committee you all wanted to include the working charter as part of that package or whether you were just going to be submitting the committee charter itself.

(Chuck): Interesting point. What do others think? You know, sounds like a good idea to me - or maybe just a link to those. And what do you guys think?

(Olga): (Rob), could you repeat because I got it not very clearly.

(Rob): Sure (Olga), my only thought was that if you are submitting the (OSC) to - into the committee charter to the council for approval whether you are all considering also (unintelligible) as part of the package for approval, the work team charters. I didn't even know if you thought that was necessary. I thought I'd suggest it.

(Ken): This is (Ken). This is (Ken). I would just make one observation. The more you send to the council, the more they have to read and the opportunity there is for more editing on what's been said.

(Olga): Yes, this is (Olga) but we will have to submit it some day, so if it's brought together, maybe it's easier.

(Rob): (Chuck), does the (OSC) have to send it's work team charters to the council for approval?

(Chuck): I don't think so, but they...

(Rob): Because they all will see them when they're published right?
Everybody's going to see them.

(Chuck): Right, right. I don't think there - you know, I'd have to go back to the approved plan and so forth and see whether that's required or not. I don't recall off the top of my head. (Ken), with regard to your - I understand the concern perfectly well.

In this particular topic, I don't think we're going to have to worry too much about people getting bogged down because of the detail and if anybody does I'm going to - I could easily suggest that - and will, that

hey, these are draft charters that will be modified by the working group and come back to the (OSC).

We just wanted the full picture to be there, something like that. That make sense?

(Ken): Sure.

(Chuck): I mean, it's not as if we're trying to hide anything. Again, you have some people that read things and some people that don't. So some people won't even look at all the details. So, my inclination is let's go ahead and add the links to the charters. And that's a good idea. Any different thoughts on that?

Glen DeSaintgery: (Chuck), just to say (Bertrand) has joined.

(Chuck): Welcome, (Bertrand).

Bertrand: Hi, sorry I was a bit late. Didn't want to disturb.

(Chuck): That's okay. We just got started because the council didn't approve the draft (OSC) charter that we sent forward. We're going to prepare a motion on that. And once we have final edits done on the (OSC) charter, there's a couple other things we're going to add.

I don't know what time you came on Bertrand, but we're - (Rob)'s going to add links - I put your name in for this (Rob). (Rob) is going to add links to the - our work team charters.

(Rob): I heard that.

(Chuck): Yes, thanks. And (Ken) will do a quick formatting edit of each of - well actually I don't think we need a formatting edit on that. I think it's the working team charters that we need. I'll erase that on my notes.

(Ken): Hey (Chuck)? (Ken) again. You know (Rob) and I were just looking at Section 6 in that document where you were asked about the editing?

(Chuck): Yes.

(Ken): That section was retained from the original as food for thought. There's actually a comment in there. And I'm not - I guess we haven't actually decided whether we should keep it or remove it.

(Chuck): Yes, okay. So we can talk about that one.

(Ken): There we go.

(Chuck): That's good. That's good, yes. Got it. That was, yes, okay, all right. That - we'll talk about that and then if we do keep that it will be formatted. Thanks. All right.

And then, so it's probably easiest for someone who is going to - once we have the edit finalized to draft a quick motion and then you can provide the links to it. So, (Rob) or (Ken), can one of you guys do that?

(Rob): Just to confirm (Chuck), you're talking about links to the work team charters?

(Chuck): Yes. In the (OSC) charter.

(Rob): Yes, certainly. At present those links only point to drafts and at present they point to the former draft as I noted in my emails to the committee, I wasn't going to repopulate those pages with the new versions until we had some...

(Chuck): Yes, I understand.

(Rob): ...feedback. Sure.

(Chuck): And you'll post - is it correct to assume that you will post the latest (OSC) charter on the wiki?

(Rob): That is correct.

(Chuck): Okay. And...

(Ken): This is (Ken), (Chuck). One more thing.

(Chuck): Sure.

(Ken): I remember something in one of the council calls where (Ari) said something about maybe not submitting the (OSC) charter to the council until there were milestones?

(Chuck): You know, that's okay. I'm going to disagree on that one.

(Ken): Okay.

(Chuck): She has the ultimate call, but it's going to take a while for the (OSC) - for the work teams to develop milestones and I think we need some level of approval even if they decide to do it on a contingent basis on what's there now.

So, if - they can always turn our motion down, that's okay. But I think we go ahead and do that. Now (Rob) or (Ken), can one of you also then develop a simple motion?

(Rob): Sure, I'd be happy to do that.

(Chuck): Okay. And -okay. Any other questions or comments on the (OSC) charter? And then - you'll distribute that to this - to the (OSC) list first? Is that possible to do that today (Rob)?

(Rob): I can. Just to clarify what you're looking for me to distribute. Yesterday, I distributed the charter...

(Chuck): Yes, I saw that. I saw everything you distributed and that's what I had asked you to do on the list. So, today - this particular thing is just once - and I think the first action is let's add the work team charters to the (OSC) charter.

So you probably can't do that until we finish any work on the work team charters so that you have accurate link and everything's up to date. And then post the - so you'll finalize then the (OSC) charter, post it on the Web site and then develop a motion for the council and distribute it to the (OSC) list today. Does that work?

(Rob): Yes, sir.

(Chuck): Okay, good. And then what I will do - it'll be - I will submit the motion to the council and (Olga)?

(Olga): Yes, I can second it.

(Chuck): Thank you. Any discussions or comments? Okay. All right. Let's go then to the work team charters and the - one thing - one question I had on the work team charters is should we add a link to the (OSC) and PFFC wikis at the very end of them so that there's that connection? And I'll just go by consensus on this group.

Bertrand: Seems fine.

(Chuck): Thanks, Bertrand. Anybody object to that? Okay. So then (Ken) and (Rob), you guys will take care of that?

(Rob): Yes, sir.

(Chuck): Okay. The work team rules have been added. And any comments or discussion on that? Okay. One of the things that came up in the PFFC is the issue of statements of interest. I haven't made - as you can tell, I haven't made an issue of that at all on this group of - maybe I should have.

Certainly, we want people to be open and clear about their statements of interest, but I find that sometimes we spend an awful lot of time on statement of interest and we know we all have interests, so. But, I think to be fair, we may need to include something in the draft charters

about statement of interest like I think the PPFC is doing. What do you guys think?

(Rob): Well, just as a head's up to everybody, I did based on your previous comments on the list, (Chuck), incorporate a section for statements of interest in the work team rules for each of these draft charters that...

(Chuck): It's in the work team rules. As you would guess, I didn't have time to read through the whole thing. So, it's in there?

(Rob): Right. I did and I took it directly from materials that (Liz) and the PPFC had developed based on previous council activities.

(Chuck): Okay. Good. Okay, so it - there it is, it's right there. Okay, I did such a quick scan because I didn't get up until about 5:30 this morning. So, all right. Great, okay. Any questions or comments on that? That's good. So that's included in the work team rules.

(Rob): Yes, I had to make a minor edit that I noticed last night after I circulated I had (unintelligible) in one of the references, referenced a number so I'll make that minor change.

(Chuck): And, okay, good. And we're going to add the links to the draft. We already did that. That was done - we've already added the links to the draft charters. Anything else in the work team charters?

(Rob): The only other point (Chuck) that I'd like to note and I noted it in the email yesterday, but you guys may not have had a chance to see it, is somebody has asked whether to include the names of the interim chairs or to identify them on the wiki.

I interpreted that as also an opportunity to add those interim chairs to the work team charter drafts and so (Nathan), (Olga) and (Ken)'s names are on there respective draft charters. At least as proposed right now.

(Chuck): I think I was the one that raised that question. I did see that on your message this morning. So I was okay with it. Anybody not okay with that? Okay. All right. Anything else on the work team charters?

(Ken): This is (Ken). How about the question about whether or not that Section 6 should be in the GSNO operations charter?

(Chuck): Oh, that's right, thank you. Okay. All right, let's look at just that one then and see.

(Olga): I'm lost. Which is the Section 6?

(Ken): This is (Ken). In the GSNO ops team charter that was just sent out, if you go to that particular charter and look at the very bottom, there's a Section 6, BI.

(Rob): Actually that's true in every one of the charters. Basically as I was doing the transfer from the wiki to the draft segment I kept in each draft a list, (Olga), of potential initial next - last next action steps.

Basically it's food for thought for committee members and I just left the open question whether you all wanted to incorporate those in the charters. Those have not been edited. They're simply in many respects just a list of to do items in the draft.

They weren't intended to be part of the charters, mainly for discussion purposes, but it's something that is still in place in each of the charters and can easily be taken out or just used as further discussion for you guys in a separate document.

(Chuck): Yes and the lead-in sentence is set forth below are a number of potential action steps necessary to establish the - and begin the work of the GSNO. The only - I think its okay, but if people would rather not have that, I'm not opposed to that.

The lead-in sentence, I think there's one thing we probably should change. Set forth below are a number of potential action steps and I would delete the word necessary. We can let them decide whether those steps are necessary, but they're both - because it's kind of conflicting anyway to say potential and then necessary.

And the idea was is that these are ideas for the work teams to use if it's helpful. What do you think? Should we just leave them out? Is anybody opposed to leaving these sections in each of the charters?

Okay. What about the word necessary? Do you agree with me that we maybe should we delete that? Or is it helpful to have it there?

(Olga): Delete it.

(Chuck): Delete it? Okay. Anybody opposed to deleting it? And then the last thing then is I would just clean up the formatting so that we use bullet-type formatting and numbering formatting so that it's a little cleaner.

(Rob): Will do.

(Chuck): Okay? So we're ready. Anything else then on the draft charters? We'll leave that in and - okay.

Bertrand: Chuck? Chuck?

(Chuck): Yes.

Bertrand: This is Bertrand. A suggestion, not necessarily to be implemented here, but I see that in each of the charters for the working groups or work teams, there is a huge portion that is significantly similar regarding team membership, methodologies for taking decisions. It's usually point two work team rules, three...

(Chuck): Right.

Bertrand: And yes, two and three basically.

Would it have been useful or maybe more compact to have these as a document that belongs to the (OSC) as a whole and says when the (OSC) creates the work team those compositions and decision making rules are the following and to keep in the respective charters for each of the groups only the part that relate to the objective, the chairs and the calendar time tables?

(Chuck): Any thoughts on that from others?

Bertrand: Not necessarily to do it now. But why was it chosen to not separate it?

(Chuck): I think the reason it was done the way it was is they - we wanted each of the team charters to be independent. Now you can obviously provide a link to make that happen.

What we did, Bertrand is to follow some patterns set on previous work group charters that were used and each of those had those separate elements in it.

Now I think an interesting question that comes up out of your suggestion is is there any reason maybe to include those common elements that will apply to all work teams in the (OSC) charter itself? And I think that raises an interesting question.

One concern I would have there when we get to something like - for example if any special focus work teams are created, the team membership may be a little bit different in those cases because we may be looking for particular technical expertise or something like. Like for example, Web...

Bertrand: This is what I noticed in the (G-cont) work team as opposed to the (G-cot) and this could be working precisely in this way.

Like embedding into the (OSC) charter a general methodology for establishing work teams and the general decision making rules with a provision that says whenever a team requires a specific type of membership or a specific exemption from the decision making rules, it is mentioned in the charter as an exception.

The reason why I raise this is following the comments I was making earlier, I think we have a nice opportunity here, even if we have five

different working groups, three for the (OSC) and two for the PPFC, a certain number of common elements that come from previous experiences are in fact potentially be put together as common elements.

And it is a portion of our work to identify what are the common elements that can be easily replicated. So it's not necessary to do it now. I mean, now it's done, I don't want to change anything. But I think it's a good opportunity to see that in the charters for each of the work teams, we have portions that are specific and portions that are common.

As much as possible, when you can move the common portions to a higher level, this helps the further establishment of new work teams without having to produce a new draft each time.

(Chuck): Right, right. That makes sense to me. The - what about to the rest of you on the call? Any comments on that?

My suggestion then - I think we do need to leave the detail of membership and the rules in the specific charters, but it seems like it would be helpful if we made reference to those in the same way that Bertrand is suggesting in the (OSC) charter.

Now my question is (Rob) and (Ken) are you - by the way Bertrand, I don't think that would be too big a task to add to the charter before we send it to the council for formal approval, the (OSC)...

Bertrand: Let me be very clear. I just was making this comment as a general methodology. It doesn't need to change anything at this moment. You have moved forward and it's okay.

(Chuck): So in the future you're saying?

Bertrand: Yes.

(Chuck): So you're saying in the future? Okay. It's a good point, so. But you're okay with the charter with the way it is now but let's keep in that in mind in the future when we do that.

Bertrand: Yes, yes. It's not to over burden right now. But it's the core of what we're trying to do is try to identify what is generate...

(Chuck): Right.

Bertrand: ...and what has to be specified in the interest of six.

(Chuck): Okay, good. So then maybe there's no action unless (Rob) or (Ken) think differently. What are your thoughts on that? One of you want to speak to that?

(Rob): This is (Rob). I think it's an excellent suggestion. I was looking back at the proposed (OSC) charter itself and perhaps what I'll do is look (unintelligible) a little bit and see if there is a way to incorporate that.

Now, any (OSC) charter we do have a (unintelligible) on the work teams in which we do break out the individual charters for - essentially the charters (unintelligible) for each group.

So there may be an element after special focus teams indicate that work team rules will be consistent for each of the teams or something along those lines that points to the fact that the steering committee considered this and the approach that their taking is to ensure that there is consistency. I'll take a look at that.

(Chuck): So are suggesting, (Rob), that that might be an easy add today?

(Rob): Yes, I think so. And I - again I propose to do it perhaps after the special focus teams, just where they (unintelligible) separate section in the B that says work team rules and then incorporate it with a sentence that says, you know, each work team will have a consistent set of rules based on the GSNO Council's working group model and measure incorporated into each of the charters.

And then I could even as you suggested in the (OSC) charter, will have links to the wiki that refers to each of the team charters at least in a draft form right now.

(Chuck): And the - now would a similar statement - it'd be probably be a one sentence statement or something like that, could that be added to the membership as well noting that generally membership will be similar in each one except where special expertise is needed?

(Rob): Based on your suggestion, I'd just expand the sentence to say with the membership - I'll think of the appropriate word, but basically the membership rules and the work team rules would be fluent across all the work teams.

(Chuck): With provision for exceptions where special expertise is needed or something like that?

(Rob): Yes. That's a perfect addition to that.

(Chuck): Yes. And I - yes, you can refine the language. Okay, if that's easy to do, then I think it's a very good idea.

(Rob): Well particularly if you accept the facts in what I circulated yesterday that the charter - at least because you do intend to go to the council with a formal motion, is open for some minor changes including both addition of other participants and the (OSC) being the other (unintelligible) work team chairs.

It would not be adding a new (unintelligible) - it would not be opening up the documents (unintelligible) opened up anyway.

(Chuck): Yes, okay. Good. So, that's a good idea. Anything else on the - now this is - what we're talking about right now then affects both the (OSC) charter and the work - well, it doesn't affect the work team charters but it does affect the (OSC) charters.

(Rob): That's correct. That's the only thing it would affect. I do the insert right before...

(Chuck): Yes.

(Rob): ...(cut in) C which would be (OSC) operations (unintelligible). I'd just add another bullet there. What I may need to do is - I'll just do the indent and do the necessary bolding of that.

(Chuck): And this - these are changes that I don't think we need to go back and get approval from the (OSC)? Correct me if you think I'm wrong on that. But rather we communicate what changes we made and I will do that basically in my meeting notes today.

I think we can go ahead and move forward. None of these are material in the sense that I don't - they would create controversy I don't think, but rather make an overall improved document.

(Rob): Well I mean, any committee members that did object upon either to this recording or seeing your report, would still have time prior to - because you'll have another committee meeting prior to the next council meeting at which your motion would be voted on. So there'd still be opportunity for some modifications.

(Chuck): Yes, we could make some changes. And also they actually - there's actually opportunity obviously at the council level. And even at the work team level for some of these things to change as they finalize their own individual charter and propose them back up to us.

Okay, thanks Bertrand. Okay. I think - now let's go then to the invitation message.

Bertrand: (Chuck), just one additional question. What was the final decision on the inclusion or non-inclusion of the Part 6 potential and next action steps? Is it going to stay in the charter or is going to be put separately?

(Chuck): I think that's best because especially when you're getting new people - to leave it in the individual charters. And the reason I think that is

because each of the work teams are probably going to have hopefully all different people and some people are good at looking back to linked information.

Because of the importance of those elements for each individual work team, I personally think that it's helpful to have it spelled out in each individual charter. But again, I - if others disagree with me I'm open to that.

Bertrand: The thing is as the work evolves the initial steps that are included in the charter become less relevant. So either we want to update and we need to update the charter which is a bit impractical or we keep a portion of the charter that becomes less relevant as time moves forward.

So I'm wondering whether having the initial action steps as a separate page on the wiki that is more naturally accessible once the - wouldn't be better because the charter is a fixed thing more or less and the action steps are evolving with time.

(Chuck): Well maybe the way to accommodate both of our concerns, Bertrand, would be under work team rules to specifically add a little note maybe in there that makes it clear that these rules can be modified as needed with the endorsement by the (OSC).

Does that - something like that work? I think I understand - I understand your point with regard there needs to be some flexibility we don't want to make it too rigid...

Bertrand: But the thing is if you want to update the action steps as the work progresses if it is in the charter either you have to update the charter and then you need to go back to the (OSC) to update the charter whereas it is the normal working schedule of the team or you have to basically replicate in any case on another page the Point 6 that is here which is the initial work program.

(Chuck): Well see - let's see - let me think about that because I - which things under work rules do you think this would apply to? Give me an example of where that - because I thought these are pretty general and workable without having to go back - because I'm on page with - on the same page with you.

I don't want the work team to have to go back to the (OSC) every time they make some little improvement in their charter, but I thought these are general enough that may not be the case.

Bertrand: No, no the rules in general are general. The only point I was relating to was the Part 6 the central initial/next action sets.

(Chuck): Okay let me go down to that okay.

Bertrand: Sorry I wasn't clear enough.

(Chuck): No, I think you were I think I was just a little slow. So, all right. So which part of Section 6 or all of Section 6?

Bertrand: All of Section 6 basically because the structure of the - of any of those charters has basically some common rules that are part two and three. There are specific elements to this charter which is - which are the

potential timeline or the chair and the composition if there are any specific requirements and the subjects that the work team is doing.

This fits perfectly in the charter because it's constant from the beginning to the end.

(Chuck): You know what...

Bertrand: The Part 6 is the beginning...

(Chuck): Yes

Bertrand: ...and if you update it, then you have to change the charter basically. And if you don't update it, as the work moves forward you still have in the charter something that was the initial part and you will need another page anyway to explain what is...

(Chuck): And my apologies for not zeroing in on Section 6 with regard to your comments because now I see why we were going a little bit different directions because I was focusing on the rules and the membership on that comment and you're focusing on six and it's - your comment really makes even more sense with regard to Section 6.

In fact, the more I look at - and forgive me for rushing ahead on that, but that may have been a mistake. Section 6 looks like it's more next steps for the steering committees than it is next steps for the - or at least part of it is - is more for the steering committees than they are for the work teams anyway.

You know for example formation of the GOT. That's really more of an (OSC) test than it is a working test and I'm wondering if this section is needed at all. And let's look - let's just take a couple minutes and everybody glance through it and make sure this even makes sense in the work team charters.

Number one does I think - does it? Does it not? Because we are asking them to do that, but the formation of the GOT is as much or more of an (OSC) test as than it is a work team test.

(Rob): Well that's perhaps - this is (Rob) that's perhaps mislabeled. Formation meant, I think, in logistics when this originally was put together this list, you know, schedule the team meeting, announce who's participating, invite people, set up the mail contact list, a lot of those are more staff to dos than even the work team itself.

(Chuck): So would it make sense to put most of this in the general sense in the charter in the (OSC) charter and eliminate it? I mean is - like number two, is there really any value in having number two in the individual work team charters?

Bertrand: Actually if I may, I think most of what of is in six is fine and relates to the work teams. My comment was not to move it up to the (OSC), but to move it somehow down into a different page because this is something that the team will be doing.

But it will be updated because once the work has been launched, the item is basically ticked, it's been done so we move to another stage.

So the comment was more to take the whole of six out of the charter and on a specific separate page on the wiki that basically says task schedule or something like that so that it can be easily updated.

Otherwise, this Section 6 if we want to update it or if the teams want to update them in order to follow their work program, they will need to update their charter which needs to go back to the (OSC) and it's not necessary.

And on the other hand if it is not updated, we will have a charter that keeps for the whole duration of the team work the initial steps that are now completely - that are completed.

(Chuck): Right. So, what you're suggesting then - and again, forgive me for being slow at getting this, is actually putting Section 6 on the wiki and then just making reference to it in this document and each of the three documents.

Bertrand: Exactly and says - and the charter would say the calendar or the time plan is accessible at the following address.

(Chuck): And it's - in this case it's - yes. Thoughts on that from others - I think I finally get it.

(Olga): I - this is (Olga). I'm understand perfectly what Bertrand is saying. My - I'm just wondering if this time table is really not a part of the charter. I mean, we are just moving through a whole process and this is really relevant so this is my only concern.

(Chuck): Well notice first of all, that Section 6 isn't a time table. It's just initial action steps.

(Olga): (Unintelligible). Yes. So these steps - I think they're very important. So if we put them away, I don't know if we are minimizing the relevance. That's my only comment, but I think you're right, Bertrand, you're totally right.

(Chuck): Let me make sure I understand, (Olga) then. You kind of are in the thinking that maybe it would be good to leave them here, but you're okay with moving them to the wiki or do you support moving them to the wiki and having a reference to them here?

(Olga): Yes I would reference them there, but we - I think this whole change is a big important part of the whole process. So next steps are for me are part of the charter.

(Chuck): So (Olga) then what - how would you implement Bertrand's suggestion?

(Olga) Maybe we can - we can leave some issues of it and put more detail content in other part of the wiki.

(Chuck): Yes okay.

Man: (Chuck) may I make a suggestion - I'm sorry.

(Rob) Oh, I'm sorry, this is (Rob) I was just going to interject that perhaps the best way to handle this and I started this all by just putting it for

comment purposes at the end of the charter so my apologies, but my thought is we didn't - there's two options.

One we could just cut it completely and we could put it on the wiki and given the fact that we have three interim chairs from the (OSC). Those interim chairs could simply point to the wiki and say new work teams this is, you know, these are the expectations that have been previously developed. Take a look at them and use them as a guide for your first action.

The second alternative could be looking into the work team charters. We do have a section on work team rules. These even are broken out a section called milestones. You could conceivably have a section called next - we could even call it milestones and next steps and say a list of suggested initial action steps for the work teams identified on the wiki and then give a link to the wiki.

(Chuck): I - go ahead Bertrand?

Bertrand: Yes, I think the middle ground to make things easier is to do as follows. Keep the initial action steps as they are and put the link to the ongoing time table on the wiki at the end of part four that says the team should develop a timeline for review and approval and make a comment that says the work program of the work team will be accessible at the following address on the wiki.

(Chuck): Now (Rob), it seems to me that - what Bertrand said is consistent with the second alternative that you proposed or it could be made consistent.

Bertrand: Yes.

(Chuck): Do you agree with that?

(Rob): Yes. He's actually suggested a better part of the charter to put that in so...

(Chuck): Yes.

(Rob): ...so I will propose that - I will draft up the language, include that sentence at the end of action five calendar time table. I will then cut from each of the work teams charters these potential initial action sets and repopulate them on the wiki in an appropriate heading that is accessible from a link that will be in each of the charter document.

(Chuck): As so the reference - so they'll be references under Section 5 to both milestones and initial action steps in this document - in the team charters - is that right?

(Rob): I would only - I would follow Bertrand's suggestion to the letter just in having it say milestones and potential action steps recognizing that in the previous section of the agreed work team rules that all the committee members agreed to.

We do have a section that says milestones and in it, it says (unintelligible) milestones to be developed by the work teams proposed to the (OSC) for approval and added after (OSC) approval. So I think you're treating the milestones at least in draft and separately from the next steps or from the actions.

(Chuck): Right.

(Rob): That's probably appropriate.

(Chuck): That sounds okay to me. (Olga)...

Man: Yes.

(Chuck): ...you okay with that?

(Olga): That's okay. Yes.

(Chuck): Okay and (Ken) any comments?

(Ken): No, that sounds good to me.

(Chuck): Okay very good. Well thanks.

Bertrand: Just a final comment. In the three different charters the order of the paragraph of the part five and the part four are sometimes introverted. So sometimes calendar timetables comes before staff support or sometimes afterwards.

For instance in the (Obscene) Charter its staff support four and calendar timetables five and if I'm not mistaken on the two others from the (GCOMT) its four calendar milestones and five staff support. And on the (G-GOT) it's likewise four calendar timetables and five staff support.

It would make more sense to keep in the three of them the order that is used in the GOT which is first staff support which is generic then calendar timetables as five with the reference to the wiki. And then the six of with the initial action sets.

(Chuck): Now will there still be a Section 6 based on what (Rob) was suggesting he did?

Bertrand: I think yes we agreed that the middle ground was to keep initial action sets whenever that's needed...

(Chuck): Okay.

Bertrand: ...and then to have at the end of what would be now five calendar timetables, something that says the specific or the detailed time table is accessible on the wiki at the following address.

(Chuck): That make sense to you (Rob)?

(Rob): Yes sir.

(Chuck): You're okay? You're clear? Okay. Good. I have one very minor nit-pick and that is I don't think colons are needed in headings of sections and the document. The - that's why they're in a different format and caps or whatever. So now in the case where there's a list that immediately follows, I think the colon is fine. Any disagreement with that?

(Olga): No.

(Chuck): Okay.

Man: No.

(Rob): As you have said that I removed the colons in the various drafts I have on my hard drive. I've also changed the order in the charter as Bertrand suggested to move staff support to the back of the calendar timetable.

(Chuck): Now for the sake of the - and rather than confusing things with red line documents - for the sake of the committee members, most of which are not on this call.

It would be very helpful, and (Rob) you've been really good about this anyway so I probably don't even need to say this, that you do just a very brief summary of what changes were made based on what the committee members, you know, saw before and let them know that, you know, what they are and or course we're going to attach the latest versions so that they can quickly look at those. Does that make sense?

(Rob): Yes sir and I'll make it as one complete holiday package of documents for the various committee members who have already departed and that way it will be a nice package that everybody can look at it at their leisure and then discuss on your meeting on the fifth.

(Chuck): Okay all right. Now anything else on the charter - on the (OSC) charter or the team charters?

(Rob): Just one point of clarification. I did indicate in the message I circulated yesterday that the committee did agree on the generic work team rules that we then inserted into bits - into the various draft charters.

As a committee you all still need to approve the individual work team charters and so that is still a point of order that will need to be resolved and you can decide, Mr. Chairman, whether you want to do that on the email list or at your next meeting.

(Chuck): Well my - first of all, now obviously we've made some changes today, but I don't think any of them are material in terms of what the (OSC) members supported.

But my understanding - it wasn't totally clear with regard to (Steve Metallis) but my understand on the list prior to this meeting, everybody has essentially approved the work team charter so I am not sure what you're saying.

(Rob): Well, they never had them in this form. They had approved, I guess, the previous versions and then they approved inserting the generic rules in. So if you accept that as approval (unintelligible) then I am fine with that and obviously that...

(Chuck): Notice on my message to the list I said that the work team charters including the work team rules. I'm pretty sure I said that. And so I think we're okay there.

But let's approach it this way if nobody objects and that is, is that we're going assume that the work team charters are approved because we don't think we made any material changes to content today.

And if anybody, you know, disagrees with that they can let us know and we still have time as somebody else has pointed out today to make adjustments if we find some.

But I think at this stage because it's going to take awhile to get the work teams going that it will - it's better to just keep moving and not wait for another formal approval of the charters.

Any disagreement with that? Then let's go that route. Is that okay (Rob)?

(Rob): That's fine.

(Chuck): Okay. All right. All right. Now with regard to the invitation message the - you got (Steve)'s suggestions. Did anybody else have any suggestions on the invitation message?

(Rob): Mr. (Bauer) did and circulated that just to me and (Liz) this morning. (Ken), I don't know if you'd like to go (unintelligible) or not.

(Ken): Sure. That was on the...

(Rob): On the invitation.

(Ken): Yes. Okay. Let me just open it and all my changes are tracked so I can tell you what I did. I made just some wording changes like in the title. After help build the new GNSO, it used to read volunteers are now being accepted for GNSO implementation work. Teams that will develop GNSO improvement implementation plans.

And I just changed it to volunteers are now being accepted to join work teams that will develop GNSO improvement implementation plans. It's a little less redundant and I think it - so.

(Chuck): Nice change.

(Ken): And then in the next paragraph I changed the - after incubators it said where, I changed it through which. So it reads the GNSO is creating five new work teams to be the incubators through which new GNSO policies, processes, rules, tools and resources not are, but will be proposed and developed by members of the ICANN community.

(Chuck): Good change.

(Ken): And then the - after the next one, it says we encourage you to participate in one of the work teams. It reads - it now reads if you do have an interest in participating please send the message to and we need to put that address in. Indicating which work team you want to join.

Please include in the message your name, affiliation, company/organization, position/title - I just cleaned up some of the language in there. You'll see it. I'll leave my track changes on.

(Chuck): Yes. That's good. And it - none of them - they all sound - this is all just..

(Ken): Yes. This is just sort of grammatical formatting stuff. Then down much lower where we have background information and scope of the work teams. Since background information was centered, I also centered

scope of the work teams since they're both - and then that first sentence the word is should have been are, I think.

(Chuck): Which sentence were...

(Ken): Background information and the scope of each newly chartered team are summarized below.

(Chuck): Oh, yes. Gotcha.

(Rob): Just if I can cut - just real quickly. Can (unintelligible) you made a quick reference to the Web site. Glen is on the line and I wanted to acknowledge that Glen has volunteered for the message to go to GNSO secretariat at ICANN.org.

So she'll be accepting the initial expressions of interest in those (SOIs) that are coming in for the various work teams. That will be the address that we'll use as the standard place (unintelligible) indicate their interest in volunteering.

(Chuck): Thanks Glen.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes. Pleasure because as you now check, I did that for the (IBN) groups and for the Who Is and it worked quite well all coming to one place because then if you go to a couple of places, you're never sure if you've collected them all.

(Chuck): Yes. No, no. I totally agree. You probably remember a comment I made when - in one of the early drafts of this that I was concerned about separate emails for each one.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

(Chuck): So, by the way, (Ken), you centered scope of the work teams. It's in italics as well.

(Ken): I took the italics out.

(Chuck): Okay good. All right.

(Ken): Yes. I fixed that.

(Chuck): Good. Anything else (Ken)?

(Ken): No. Just formatting after that.

(Chuck): Yes good.

(Ken): No other (unintelligible).

(Rob): And what I'd like to do is to - as soon as this is in final form and I have it, even before people on the committee will do any responding because I don't think we're going to see much activity between now and before New Years. So I'd like to go ahead and send it to (Jeff Newman) and let's see, who's his - who's the alternate chair for the PFC?

Man: That's (Jay Scott).

(Rob): (Jay), okay. I'd like to send it to them and see if we can - and just suggest with them hoping that I can get a response from them during the holidays that we go ahead and move forward with this and as soon as we get - if I can get concurrence from them then maybe we can get this process started.

So first of year the invitations out there and ready to go. If we have to wait until the first of January that's okay, but I'd like to keep it moving if we - if it's possible.

(Chuck): Anything else on the invitation? Nice work (Ken).

(Ken): Yes. Thank you.

(Chuck): Okay. So - okay. Oh - and we have - no, never mind. We've already covered that. It looks like we're okay on that. Action items for the next meeting. I'll make those clear in my message - my meeting notes that I'll send out shortly. We've got a lot of them for - certainly for (Ken) and (Rob) and me and Glen and so forth.

The - I'll work with the - with (Jay Scott) and (Jeff). Make sure we're coordinating well with them because the - especially with regard to the draft invitation. They're involved as well. The - I think I know what all the action items are. Again, I'll make those clear in the notes that I send around. Any questions on action items?

Our next meeting as decided last time will be the 5th of January, same time, same station. Any other business? Okay. This is primarily logistics, but important logistics and some key action items. So thanks

everybody. Have a Merry Christmas or any other holiday that you celebrate and a very happy New Year.

Man: Same to you.

(Olga): Same to you, (Chuck). Thanks everybody.

Man: Thank you (Chuck).

Man: Likewise.

(Chuck): Thanks for all the great contributions from everybody on this call today.

(Olga): Thanks to you. Bye.

(Chuck): Okay.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye everyone.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks (Chuck). Bye.

Man: Bye Glen.

Man: Bye Glen.

END