

**Operations Steering Committee
TRANSCRIPTION
Sunday 2 November 2008 10:15 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee meeting on Sunday 2 November 2008, at 10:15 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/osc-20081102.mp3>
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#nov>

Attendees:

Chuck Gomes – GNSO Vice chair
David Maher – Registry c
Stéphane van Gelder – Reistrar
Mason Cole - Registrar c alternate
Tony Holmes - ISP Representative
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben - ISP alternate
Philip Sheppard - CBUC Representative
Ayesha Hassan - CBUC
Marilyn Cade - CBUC
Zahid Jamil - CBUC
Steve Metalitz - alternate for J. Scott Evans Representative- absent
Robin Gross NCUC - Representative
Mary Wong - NCUC

Staff:

Rob Hoggarth
Ken Bour
Glen de Saint Gery

Chuck Gomes: Okay, welcome to everyone for our kick off meeting for the GNSO Operations Steering Committee. I think everyone knows me but for the sake of the recording I'm Chuck Gomes. I'm on this committee in my role as vice chair of the counsel. I will not be a representative of the registry constituency on this, just to make that clear.

Avri is doing a similar role on the policy process steering committee and each of us are just interim chairs until the group elected chair. So, welcome here today, I appreciate you letting me -- I'm trying to control my slides here, but I'll have to refer to Rob.

Go ahead and go to the next slide please. The outline that I put up and we can change this if you would like, just talk a little bit about what the GNSO improvement planning committee recommended regarding steering committees and if the counsel approves. A little background information and I will be very brief.

From general steering committee and in particular the operations steering committee information the board governed committee operational recommendations that specifically relate to the operations area as the planning committee defined it. A possible (OSC) approach and the reason I say possible is because it is up to the committee to decide that.

And possible (OSC) work team, we have asked (OSC) and work team charters - we won't go into detail on those, but at least talk about that a little bit on that and where we go from here. And then some actions items a few of which we possible can done today in this meeting.

Any problems with the agenda? Do you have a link to the wiki, or you haven't inspired that because you're name wasn't submitted yet. Those were sent to the (unintelligible) constituencies and non (com reps) advisory committee and so forth were asked to try and submit their representatives for this committee before today.

But I understand it was relatively short notice and so sorry about that if - Glen didn't get your name or Rob didn't get then we, then you weren't put on the list but will be shortly. Yes, Steve.

Steve: Can we have the record reflect that I am not the representative again?

Chuck Gomes: I'll cover that, I've got that, thanks Steve. I actually have a slide on that and we will talk about that so, the go to the next slide.

And bare with me for a minute, before we go and I talk about this slide, let's go around the room and introduce ourselves for those who may not know some of the people who are here. And let's start with Rob here on my left here.

Robin Gross: Hi, I'm Robin Gross and I represent the non-commercial users.

Steve Matales: Sitting in for the future designated representative from the intellectual property committee.

Ken Bower: I'm Ken Bower, I'm a consultant to the policy staff, and originally just worked on this constituency survey.

Rob Hoggarth: ICANN staff, assigned to staff the Operations Steering Committee.

Glen DeSaintgery: Glen DeSaintgery, the ICANN Secretary.

Chuck Gomes: Who needs no introduction, right? Let's go over here to my right.

Woman: (ICC member of the business bureau).

Man: (Neal, member of the business bureau).

Woman: (Joan Tate, member of the business bureau).

Man: Representative for the (ISCPC).

Tony Holmes: Tony Holmes, ISCPC.

Man: (Unintelligible) registrar's committee.

Man: (Unintelligible) registrar's committee.

Mason Collin: I'm Mason Collin, an alternate for the registrar's constituency.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, I don't think we have anybody around the perimeter so we are okay there. All right let me just give a little introductory information and by the way I forgot the mention on the early slide and the agenda slide that the - I'm very comfortable with interjections and open discussion as we go so please feel very free about that.

I'm not restricting when you can make comments so just signal if you want to say something and I'll let you in at any time.

The planning committee that made this recommendation, it was ultimately approved by the counsel recommended to form two steering committees for all the GNSO improvement recommendations with the exception of the GNSO restructuring, that is separate, that is not part of our GNSO improvement implementation - that is being handled separately.

The recommendation was for two steering committees. The Policy Steering Committee and an Operations Steering Committee and we will talk about what those mean in a minute. The, both committees are focused on processes and practices not GPL policies, it is a very important distinction, so these steering committees are not designed to be where the policies develop or in this case the implementation plans for implementing GNSO improvement.

Milestones will be set by this steering committee and approved by the counsel. Charters will be approved initially by the counsel and reviewed by the counsel, but as you will see later it will be our responsibility to finalize the charter.

On 16, of October the counsel approved the GNSO improvement implementation plan, I'll give you a slide a little bit later that kind of show and org chart for that. Constituencies non (com) counsel appointees the ALAC and (back) were all asked to name one representative each to each of the two steering committees before these meetings in Cairo.

The steering committee membership will be approved by the counsel that is pretty straight forward task I think. The goal is to keep the membership to a maximum of 12 of possible. We think most of the work is going to go on and those were things below the steering committee and that is what the planning committee envisioned and we will talk a little bit about alternates so that when somebody can't make a steering committee meeting an alternate can participate there.

Eventually, depending on how long the steering committees go, the there could be the possibility of including representative of new constituencies if they are formed.

Rob Hoggarth: Just a quick observation from the approved approached implementation planning the team, this is not an ongoing committee but actually a sunset that needs to be renewed by the counsel I believe in about a year's time.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, an annual meeting is I think what we decided in the final approval of this plan, so. Thanks Rob.

I have a question for presentation.

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

(Unintelligible) function of the GNSO policy counsel is to develop a new (unintelligible). Having said that, what I'm seeing is that (unintelligible) counsel often seems to confuse the role of counsel (unintelligible) that is one point that I will make.

My question to you is, and I seen and read counsel and the constituencies, other times it's (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) there seems to be an assumption that the possibilities or the design of the process of the constituency operations and of course there can be counsels and non-counsels (unintelligible). (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Well, it's my assumption and one of the reasons we have representatives from each of the constituencies is so that there would

be ongoing communication with the constituencies in that regard -- am I missing something there in terms of what your concern is?

Woman: Competition, (unintelligible). I'm just trying to clarify of the rote and function of the steering committee (unintelligible). Operation steering committee is a broader issue and should also include, I think ideas about the governess of the (SO) not just the houses but the (SO).

So what I'm looking for is to understand how that feedback is integrated and to make sure that in fact there is, the ability to have what I consider essential element in that a true (unintelligible) changes in the (SO)?

Chuck Gomes: Okay, let's go through a few more slides because a few of the things I'm going to cover as I proceed. But, like I said before it is my assumption that everything we do here as well as what would happen in the working team would be fully bottom up and that all of us that represent other bodies would be on an ongoing basis communicating with our groups we represent so that there is good communication in both ways.

The role of the steering committee and this is two slides for some of the things you are saying, would be to create implementation work teams, coordinate efforts of those work teams as needed. Oversee development of implementation plans; make recommendations concerning processes and message involved in the transition of the GNSO for all of the GNSO improvements recommended by the board.

The role of the steering committee is really a coordination role, not a working role, it is not the role of the steering committee to do the actual

development of the implementation plans, but rather to make sure that working teams do that and then to be the channel to the counsel in that regard going forward.

For the Operations Steering Committee, this committee is responsible for coordinating, recommending and reviewing changes to certain operational activities of GNSO and its constituency's, and you will see that will include some of the things you were talking about.

The membership of the committee, the GNSO counsel or the vice chair will on the committee that is where I fit in. One representative from each constituency, one non-common appointee, one each appoint representative from the ALCA and (unintelligible) as appropriate, I mean they are not required to have a member, but they were invited just like all of you were, GNSO Secretariat.

And then one ICANN policy staff representative that doesn't mean other ICANN staff can't be involved, but that - Rob is our primary representative as you will see.

Man: Are you going to put these slides up on the wiki?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. I won't personally, but it will be done. All right so, as I said I'm here as counsel vice chair, for some reason I can't make a meeting Avri will cover for me. Ken (unintelligible) is the (RYC) primary rep, he could not make it today and David (unintelligible) is going to be our alternate, so David is filling in for him. Rob Hoggarth, ICANN staff as policy staff in particular has already been pointed out. (Steve Matalase) notice he is an interim representative from the (IPC) they will I assume Tuesday, probably select someone or shortly.

(Stéphane) will be representing the star constituency. Mason Cole sitting next to him will be the alternate as needed there. Philip Sheppard now, I got mixed messages here, so notice I put interim in question mark because different people from the business constituency told me different things, so....

Okay so you can remove that question mark and the interim representative thing, just move that after Philips name there. Olga Cavalli will be representing the non-com appointees on the counsel and (Unintelligible) is the ISCPC representative on this and again if some of the other alternates just let us know and they will be put on the list as well, make sure that goes to the list and I didn't get any work at all from the NCC, Robin.

Are you it or are you an interim?

Robin Gross: Yeah, I'm it I sent it to (unintelligible) last week.

Chuck Gomes: You sent it to whom?

Robin Gross: Glen.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, I guess I didn't see it.

Man: I think we received Stéphane's and Robins and there was one other party that I sent out a second notice to...my apologies I missed it, it would have been on here already, so. Do we want to add Tony as the alternate?

Chuck Gomes: That's fine, if you are the alternate Tony that's fine, the reason it's not there is because I didn't see and I developed these slides, so my apologies.

Now, here are some of the board governess committee operational recommendations that are particular relevant or for this particular steering group. They make recommendation with regard and this is the work of the planning committee, the (BVC) did not organize them this way, but the planning committee thought that these were through ways to take their recommendations and group them.

One category is GNSO operations that is GNSO as a whole, GNSO counsel as a whole. The other category was stake holder group and constituency operations and the third communications and you can see we have in each of those cases a definition from the planning committee. So, GNSO operations would develop any changes needed to the counsel structure and rule and response to the board approved GNSO structure.

Now let me emphasis, we are not actually working on the specifics of the (bi-cameral) house approach that is approved, that part going to be separate, but there is lots of things and I'll actually list some things that are reasonably past under this category in a later slide.

Under stake holder group and constituency operations actually in the in the planning committee we didn't actually include stake holder groups here but I added it because I think it's reasonable that this particular area would be appropriate. And that is outreach efforts to encourage broader participation in the stake holder group by explaining the added

value (unintelligible) to such group and enhancing constituency per the working group report that was approved by the board.

Communication is approving communication and coordination with other ICANN structure including members of the ICANN board, other supporting organizations and advisory committee. Now, of those I think number three is the easiest, but we have people in the constituency's that want the easy way out, that is probably easiest of the three, the other two will be quite involved.

Man: I would like to make one observation, in the communication as well as the (BVC) report also anticipated functional aspects, such as an improved website and other things like that can be considerably be taken by the work team.

Chuck Gomes: Right, and we will get to that on a future slide as well, I tried to be pretty brief here.

Now, keep in mind that up to this steering committee to define the approach. Although there has been some good work, well it's up to you to decide if it is good or not, but there has been a lot of work, let me say it that way and leave the value judgment out of it.

That has happened already that it is kind of a starting point, when you throw that out and start over and we can use it and modify it and we will talk about that a little bit more.

One of the things that the planning committee did was to propose some possible teams, work teams that would actually do the hard

lifting with regard to developing detail implementations plans for GNSO improvement, recommendations from the board.

The possible teams that were proposed by the planning committee are the GNSO operations team which develop a proposal for counsel consideration on GNSO operations related recommendations, a constituency operations team that would develop a proposal to implement recommendations focused on enhancement for constituency operations.

And then a communications team, develop a proposal to improve communication in coordination with other ICANN structures.

Now, let's look at a little more detail at what the implementation planning team with regard to special teams. In addition to the three teams that were suggested that I were just shown in the previous slide, it seems quite likely that there are some board recommended improvement that might lend themselves to being addressed to the establishment of special focus team for example, and Rob mentioned this just a little bit ago.

Website redesign is one of the improvement recommendations, that would probably lend itself to getting some people involved who have good website expertise and organization and each of us can get people from our - the organizations that we represent that may have (unintelligible) and are willing to help work with that to work on that.

Project management tools another example, document management tools etcetera they are all things that are recommended for GNSO improvement. It was the opinion of the improvement team that those

teams would likely consist of special experts depending on subject matters, so it is kind of a little more narrow definition of membership those if we decide to go that way.

So, just a pictorial representation of the GNSO improvements implementation plans is right here. The planning committee, you notice there is not a line between the planning committee and anything else because the planning committee has really done its work already, but we are going to be using the work they did.

Board liaison was (Susan Croffit) and she doesn't have an ongoing role here although it would be perfectly fine for board member to participate how ever they wanted. So you have the counsel there and then you have the two steering committees, a process steering committee and operating steering committee. And the roles that we have briefly talked about of those two steering committees is to be the kind of coordination between where the real work is going on at the bottom level and the counsel and you know if one of the steering committee finds that work of the team maybe they don't believe it is sufficient to send it to counsel they might send it back down and create more work, but the coordination role.

Down at the bottom you can see, and I will just focus on the process steering committee there are two teams and that is not our role but there are two main teams that are envisioned. The (PVP) revision team, all of us knows the need for that very well as we struggle with time frames and everything else over the last few years.

And the working group model team, it is that it is envisioned and will be up to the process steering committee to decide how to organize it, they

could decide differently that what is pictured here, but that is what was recommended.

In our case you can see what I just talked about and in the case of special focusing it can be multiple teams there just doing different projects. Any questions so far? Yes, Steve.

Steve: Yes, I wanted to get back to I guess this would be the constituency operations team. You mentioned in the early slide that this would include outreach efforts in enhancing constituency. From the prospective of my constituency there is a lot to be done, as far as greater outreach and enhancing our operations but I'm having a little trouble understanding what this group or teams on by this group is going to do to help us.

And I think about how this group or teams would help you know David get better outreach in the registry constituency, I'm not sure what we would do and I'm not sure how it would work for ours either, so maybe we can put little more flesh on this and in terms of what this would actually do for the constituency and that would be helpful to me.

Chuck Gomes: Sure. And the recommendations of the board as you know, recommend that there be greater outreach and recommended that even some things maybe similar across constituency and understand that some won't be, so there is a lot of use sided examples.

I suppose we as a constituency and as registries can go out and solicit people to bid and become part of our constituency, but it is not the same issue as you have or other constituencies, that is fully understood. It is going to be up to this committee to guide the work, for

example, if we decide to do as suggested as form a constituency operations work team, building up to them grapple with those issues and in what area - and decide there is no predetermination as to which things would be common among constituency and which things would be left totally left up to the constituency.

Hopefully there will be a plan that will deal with those issues.

Steve: I think I understand that but I'm not sure what this group - our constituency would come up with a list of things that we could go to the staff and say we think these things would help us improve outreach to potential members of our constituency and improve the function of our constituency.

I'm not sure what another constituency would have to input to that and I don't know if we would have any advice for the registry or the registrar constituency but how to improve their outreach, so I can see the importance of the topic, I'm not (unintelligible) but it is just not clear on what this group would have to contribute meaningfully on.

Chuck Gomes: But don't you think there are some common elements that will go across constituencies?

Steve: There might be but so what, so maybe the best...

Chuck Gomes: So we have all been upset because of some of those...

Steve: So the best way would be to have each constituency's wish list to the staff and see what the common elements are, and perhaps that would

be the best - that would be the first step this team would take, but I'm just trying to understand...

Chuck Gomes: That working team could actually propose that as here, now what would have to happen in the working team is that they will have to drill in on the specific recommendations from the board and with regard to that and they can come back with a plan like this suggesting.

Steve: Tony.

Tony: So you would probably (unintelligible) the way I would see that like any result. There are clearly expectations that (unintelligible) that, that is going to be enhanced (unintelligible). And one of the things, factor that the (unintelligible) is are they going to address that (unintelligible) and maybe that will be enough.

Chuck Gomes: And please don't think that there is any (unintelligible) except for the fact that we're the GNSO was passed with implementing the board recommendation and ultimately the board will approve the implementation plan. So if they thing that we have fallen short they are going to ask us to do more, does that make sense?

Stéphane: I just think that in the question raised, one of the issues that seems important to me is that we give clear recommendations to the people from the actual working group as to what they are supposed to do. That is an important question; if they don't get clear recommendation from us then they may go in different directions and from what I understand it is our job to go back to our constituency and say, this is what has been decided, please work in this direction.

So, maybe we need to stop by and make sure that we are very clear in our minds exactly where we want to go and how we want to go about it. For example, the point you raised, I thought it was more general outreach for the GNSO rather than constituencies themselves going out and you know doing what basically what they can do by themselves as you said, work on their own outreach day in day out.

Chuck Gomes: Now, actually Steve is correct in his perception there. Notice the difference there between the GNSO ops team and the constituency ops team, there is a difference. The broader GNSO outreach would probably be more in the first box there but this one, the constituency ops teams based on the board recommendation there were specific recommendations with regard to constituencies.

So and we are going to have to go back to board recommendations for each of those working teams for them to do the base of where they are going. The goal of each team will be to develop and implementation plan for the steering committee consideration ultimately the counsel to fulfill the recommendations related to that category. Okay, anybody else? Philip.

Philip Sheppard: A number that has been asked in front of this steering committee might be simple to do and some of the obstacles maybe as simple as a recommendation from the constituency addressing a topic combined with a request for a certain type of assistance expected from ICANN itself, that might be existing recommendation for a different type of persons in the future to do specific role.

I think it can be as simple as that, we should also realize that we don't need to be slavish to the board governess committee recommendation

as some of the recommendations particular when in combinations are self contradictory, only one being (unintelligible) constituency and also causing of new constituency's and that is actually being slightly a contradictory activity if I am simultaneously participation in the business use constituency and trying to shove a load of them out in order to form a simpler group.

Since it might not be quite what was intended that we need to look carefully at what that means and if we are looking at things like new constituency's who is the group and who is excluded and why are they excluded why we missed them in the last ten years and questions like that.

Chuck Gomes: In cases where we think there might be, contradictory recommendations I think it would be wise for this group to go back and get clarification from the board and with regard to that because we don't want to spin our wheels and go down and implement a plan that they are going to turn around and reject, we want to maximize our chances of success. But some dialog there with board representatives of (BVC) chair or whatever would be helpful. Robin?

Robin Gross: Thank you, I just wanted to agree with Philip on the point about trying to build a process that is more inclusive and bringing people into the process rather than trying to create sort of silos of participation within ICANN.

So I think it is important that we have a very open and inclusive and try and focus on the work that we do on making more participation in a broad sense as opposed to the little silos of the various constituencies.

Chuck Gomes: And I think that the board would agree totally with what you just said. And again, keep in mind we are just going to be providing a direction to flow down to the work team and so all of these, and what is good about what is happening right now - this exactly the thought process that we need to go in, to develop the implementation plans. Okay.

So the operations steering committee teams that will do the actual work, so it is our task on this committee to setup teams to be the actual work, to actually setup their charters. Now, we can actually involve the actual work teams once they are established to set their own charters, or we can do a top down.

We don't have to talk about right now which way we want to go, but so the steering committee - first of all we as you will see a little bit later we are going to have to finalize our own charter and then we are going to have to decide on a plan for finalizing charters for whatever work you decide you need to create.

Now, here are some and these are from the board governess committee recommendations. Some possible tasks for the GNSO operations team and these are not meant to be all inclusive but here are some that came out of the planning committee and I might have added one or two on the next slide. So one thing that can happen the first of the affairs is determine what steps are needed to establish the role of the counsel of the strategic manager of policy process.

That is directly from one of the recommendations. Second, define and develop scope and responsibilities of any standing committee as recommended by the working group. Those suggested today that there

be a committee to analysis trends, a committee to make policy implementation, those are the ideas, okay.

Third bullet, develop a statement of interest and declaration and interest forms. I think that would probably fit under GNSO operations category. Develop curriculum for training counsel members, constituency facilitators and others and of course none of the things we saw recently the GNSO survey went into would help us with some of these issues.

Marylyn: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Has that not gone out to all constituencies. That would be circulated by (unintelligible) constituency leaders, circulating them to their...I saw them in the registry list; it's probably just a matter of time. It was fairly recent...

Man: If you are talking about the survey that Ken was working on that is already up - in a second it is not a constituency. I asked specifically is there a way for people to answer the survey and a representative capacity and the answer was, no. This was a survey...

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry if I implied that it was a survey of constituencies, the reason I brought it up here is that that it deals with the training issue that was a particular item.

Woman: The curriculum with training counsel members constituency and fascinators and other about (unintelligible) policy development process, I want to understand the scope of what we created.

I'm assuming that we are not talking about what general protection development, we are talking about training specifically related to the functions of the policy develop...

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Woman: Like training of chairs?

Chuck Gomes: (Unintelligible) that would be very directly related to policy development would it not?

Woman: Training about the due process would be directly related...

Chuck Gomes: And so would -- you want qualified chairs, in fact under the working model that is (unintelligible) crystal.

Woman: I'm trying to understand what we are talking about, if we are talking about general professional development and creating the next level of leaders for ICANN, this is a (unintelligible) GNSO process?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, because that is what the GNSO role is, absolutely. And keep in mind it is going to be up to what we create under our coordination role to really define these things in response to the board recommendation. (Unintelligible).

Steve: A more general question and I'm not clear on this role versus staff. Would it be appropriate for example, if the team decided to do it that way to ask the staff to do a lot of these things and then we would have a process for...

Chuck Gomes: It gives them job security.

Steve: Right....

Chuck Gomes: Again, that is it, okay.

Steve: I'm just clear that this doesn't necessarily mean that these teams will do all these things, in some cases they will...

Chuck Gomes: Well, doing the things means designing the plan to fulfill the board governess committee recommendation that is what it means.

Steve: And that plan could mean that the staff will draft a statement of interest from and then we will review them?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. They may come back and say that we would like Rob to do all of this. Okay and then only the board will decide whether we are responsible.

Okay the next bullet, this one is for Marylyn. Prepare clear rules for the establishment of new constituencies within stake holder group (unintelligible).

Marylyn: (Unintelligible), this group presenting rules for the creation of use being with whatever being approved by the board, correct?

Chuck Gomes: All of these implementation plans will have to be approved by the board. And like you just pointed out, some - many of them will result in (bi-laws) changes. Assuming the obvious ones, the (PVP) the obvious one and also what you just pointed out.

The last bullet on this slide, review and recommend amendments as appropriate regarding methods of constituency, it is very related to the other one, go ahead.

I added this, we have had in existence back to the GNSO a GNSO counsel administrator procedures, those are going to need to be revised under the improvements and also the structure so that seems like another reasonable task for the GNSO ops team.

Some of you might think of other things if you want to talk about that now we can, it is not restricted to those things as long as we are consistent with the recommendations that have been approved by the board. Any questions or comments on that?

Now, what are some of the possible constituencies' op teams tasks, okay. So the second team, and the main task is develop a proposal to implement recommendations that fit in this category and some examples and two are given. Develop a global outreach program to broaden participation and current constituencies and to encourage the self forming of new constituencies.

Now, don't read too much into that we have already talked about that a little bit, it is going to vary by constituency, and maybe there is not one outreach plan that works across the board that is something we will deal with.

Second bullet, enhances existing constituencies, and develop a recommendation on the following. Develop a set of top level participation guidelines based on the principals of defined on the

GNSO recommendations. And the board did make some recommendations in that regard.

The third bullet, develop a tool kit of basic administrative operational and technical services available to all constituency's.

And that kind of relates to some of the things that (Steve) was talking about a little bit earlier. And other tasks, okay, that help fulfill the recommendations relating to constituency operations, understanding that each constituency is going to be unique.

Communications piece - this one is I think a little bit more simple although as (Rob) pointed out there are some other things that are lumped into this category. The developing of proposals to improve communication and coordination for council center's consideration. So with regard to communication between the CCSO and GNSO.

The ASO are (free to staff) and like this and some things have already been happening in that regard. But the task of this committee will be able to develop an enhanced implementation plan for that. And of course we can add other (shifts piece).

Man: You didn't mention communications for the staff or which staff. Would that also be within the scope of this group piece?

Man: I don't know without looking at the recommendations I don't see why they would be ruled out.

Man: I'm shocked to think that you think that needed improvement.

Man: Well, let me just give an example and to ask whether it would be - and this is something we've raised before several times. And I wonder whether it would be within the scope of this group because I think if it is I'll have an easier time selling this to my constituency for church participation.

There were rules that staff could not unveil expensive, substantive materials less than 10 days or some set period before an ICANN meeting. Would that be something that might come out of this thing?

Man: I absolutely think it would but that's my own opinion. Yeah. I mean again, this is my own opinion again but I don't see why we couldn't add some tasks that maybe don't directly tie to the board recommendation.

The board is interested in making improvements to the GNSO. And if we can add some things that do that it's really hard for me to believe that they would object to that. Yes, certainly.

Woman: (This is for Steve I think) but are we clear that we are developing communications for cross-constituency that is for GNSO interaction with other NSOs and not just council to council and no more?

(Steve) said that some things have started already and what I've seen I think is really pretty much limited to council to council - these lunches and other things. But those are council to council. And really the SO is composed of constituencies that (unintelligible).

So is this group going to think about SO to SO (exchange), which we did use to have or is it talking about council to council?

Man: I would hope the broader. But again, it's going to be up to us to drive that train, right? And so that's going to be the value I think of the steering committee in this regard is to try and give good direction to a working team if we establish one for that.

And you bring up a very good point. And the more advice we can give in that regard - let's not just make it council to council. Let's make it - that's good. Again, this is for GNSO improvements and it's bigger than just the councils. And of course we can add other things here like (Rob) mentioned Web sites are a means of communication.

Not that the GNSO Web site doesn't need improvement as we all smile - and so on - project management tools, etcetera. Okay. Now reference documents - all of these are on the Wiki. Let me just go through these. We're going to talk about these a little bit as I move on to charters.

But the full implementation plan is on that site. And then this presentation will be there and it will also have this link. Yes (Rob).

(Rob): I note that the link dates 24 September and the updated version is 16 October.

Man: Has the improvement plan been updated? The one was approved.

(Rob): The one that was final approved was the final version. I've heard that with the amendments and the council is dated 16 October.

Man: Okay. All right. That's fine.

(Rob): Just to be clear.

Man: All right. The - very good. That's a good point. The Wiki link is there and that will be a very important site, the Wiki site, for this group. And then there are actually from the planning team, there are draft charters for work teams.

They weren't intended to overly manage what the steering committees do or the work committees do but they were done to possibly serve as a starting point. Again, both can be thrown out and we can start from scratch but there's quite a lot of work that was done on some draft charters there.

We're just going to look straight across from there. It's all (Rob's) fault.

(Rob): You're looking at the GNSO improvements Wiki page. What you want to do for the draft charters is to look to the OSC page. And then I have links within that page to all the various charters.

Man: Just to let you know (Marilyn) I had the exact same problem. I went to the - yeah.

(Rob): Certainly. I have two links on the page for each one.

Man: Thanks. All right. And so there are actually draft charters that have already been created not only for the steering committees but also for each of the proposed work teams including a special focus team.

Now you'll find when you look at the special focus team charter that it has a lot more holes in it because there will possibly be multiple

special focus teams. So it has a few more open slots for information. A lot of us are still learning to function with the Wikis and that includes users. And those are posting things there.

So okay - moving on. Now there are some initial OSC action items that I identified - selecting a chair, developing procedures for participation of alternate chairs. The planning committee didn't actually anticipate alternates but there was no opposition to that.

Deciding on regular meeting dates and times, deciding on work teams to establish, finalizing the OSC charter, deciding how to finalize work team charters, should we involve the work teams in that task? And then of course the really important one is soliciting work team members.

Now on that last one and tying it into number four and three and so forth, you know, in reality and of course this is consistent with the board recommendations, we're going to need to do our best to get a lot of new people involved in these processes.

It will not, if you look at deciding on regular meeting dates and times, we need to be very clear that there's a fairly short window in each day of timeframes that reasonably, not perfectly - and I know that part well - accommodate the different time zones. Okay?

And so if we end up having duplicates of people on work teams keep in mind we're looking at three or four or more work teams in our area. There are at least two others probably in the policy steering committee. And then you have steering committees. If we have very much duplication of membership in those it will not work.

It'll be impossible to be scheduled. So that's just kind of an editorial from me. And that's consistent with what the board recommendations on that regard to. So I know (David) is going to have a challenge on his side to get a lot of new blood from the registries participating in these things so we can spread out the workflows.

And if we don't, scheduling will not even work because there will be overlap of meetings. Again, you know, it's usually an early morning - for some of us really early on the west coast of the US and you know that too, (Robin). We're in the same boat.

And then you have people in Asia that are sometimes late at night and Europe late at night. So it is a fairly short window so that's just an editorial on my part. Go ahead. Now immediate action items and I don't know what we're doing before we run out of time. We're over already?

How and when should we elect a chair? You know, hopefully we can spend a few minutes and I know we have a little bit of flexibility to extend here and I think it's worth doing. They can always come down here and chase us out. But my understanding is the next (action item) as (Rob) said is going to be short.

And then we also have a working lunch that we could cheat a little bit on. We have to develop procedures for participation of alternate OSC members and then decide on regular meeting dates and times. Now we don't have to finish any of those today but I think it would be good if we at least had some discussion of those three items. (Steve).

(Steve): Let me just say on item two I think we should allow the participation of alternates because since it's spreading the workload that would be advisable. So I guess my proposal would just be as many of the constituencies have already done you could designate a principal and an alternate and they're expected to keep each other informed and where possible both participate.

But if one or the other can't make it they could each act.

Man: Any opposition to that? We have just completed our first action item. Congratulations. Okay. Thanks (Steve). And I was pretty sure that that's the way most people felt. We've all experienced that.

Now how do we want to go about electing a chair in terms of again - I'm just an interim chair just to get this thing kicked off. So now we don't have - it probably doesn't work to elect a chair today because we still have a few seats that haven't been filled.

And - or we could decide that the last constituency to decide on their constituency rep is the chair. All in favor? Okay. All right. So we do need to do that. I don't think it makes sense to do it until the membership of the committee is completed but hopefully we'll do it quickly. Any comments on that for now?

(Stefan): You might want to know if anybody actually wants to be chair.

Man: Yeah. And so in the mean time, following up on (Stefan's) comment there, if somebody does, communicate it on the Web that you'd be willing to serve in that capacity and we would greatly appreciate it if you did that.

Woman: I'm sorry. I just thought there were several people who said they would be interested in it. So wouldn't they have to go back and check with whoever they are...

Man: I'm not understanding what your concern is. We're not going to do any elections now. I was just getting people to think about it. Okay? So be thinking about it.

What about - you know, and it's probably not possible - it is not possible to do regular meeting dates and times at this point until we have full membership. But that will need to be one of our tasks that need to happen quickly. (Steve)?

(Steve): I may have missed this but in terms of our time table, do we have - I know this group has to be reauthorized after a year. I think I heard that at the beginning but what timeframe - are there other timeframes that we need to know about?

For example, I know for GNSO restructuring and formation of the stakeholder groups, the board set a timetable.

Man: Yeah there is.

(Steve): And so are you going to get to that?

Man: Well, there isn't one really.

(Steve): Okay.

Man: Am I correct on that for GNSO improvements?

(Rob): There are within the BGC report a number of references to six months, references to eight months taking into account public comment. The sense that I've gotten from the participating board meetings is that a tremendous bias for action.

I don't know what the penalty is for missing a deadline but I think just a real interest in seeing that things are moving forward. But I think it's certainly incumbent upon this steering committee to set those timetables for itself and for the work teams.

(Steve): I hear that. I think of course that was six months starting from about 10 months ago I think so we're already past that. But it would be helpful to do that because in terms of recruiting work team members, their first question is how long a commitment is this.

How many meetings am I going to be attending? So whatever we can do to plot out a notional timeframe would be helpful.

Man: And I think that's a really important task for this steering committee to do. And they're not going to all be the same work commitments as - you guys know that as well as I do based on the work load that will be involved in it. Any other comments on these action items? Okay.

If that's the last one or any other questions or discussion or anything? We will be - you know, the group will need to have regular teleconferences especially in the early stages. Now I may be wrong on this but my view is that as the working teams really get up and going this group may not need to meet as often.

But until we get the charters approved and functioning and so forth we'll probably have to meet fairly regularly, maybe even weekly. But that probably will diminish on the steering committees. Now another question that I didn't put on a slide but is it okay for somebody on a steering committee to be on a working team? Absolutely I think that's okay.

I hope that we won't be on multiple working teams because again, then we start to really complicate things. Anything else? (Marilyn).

(Marilyn): What I saw as I was hearing this suggestion that there's nothing (saying that) there be a minimum if one counselor or effectively two counselors could serve as liaisons between the number of counselors and the working teams.

Man: That was a recommendation that was put in there. Was that for the working teams or was that for - I - yeah. No. I'm very familiar with the language but I'm not remembering the context of it.

So - yeah. Again, we can work with that. The idea I think is to be consistent with the board recommendation that the council not be the policy making body but rather the management body and that you don't have the working teams especially overwhelmed by counselors and then you don't spread out the work load and all those concepts.

(Marilyn): Another question for clarification - item five. Would there be members from the committee not associated with the working teams? (I agree) (unintelligible).

Man: What's the context again? I'm sorry I don't have that in front of me.

(Marilyn): (Unintelligible).

Man: Yeah. We're talking about working teams here.

(Marilyn): I know. But it says participation by members of the steering committee will not associate with the (unintelligible). What was the process by which we defined those?

Man: That was not defined.

(Marilyn): Okay.

Man: But all we're saying there is it's open if you're not associated with a constituency it doesn't mean you can't be part of one of these working teams. That's all it is. That's all it is. (Stefan).

(Stefan): Yeah. Just a quick question on benefits and coverage. Are we okay with a committee with the reps posting the briefing link to the constituencies?

Man: Yes. It is public. Now only committee members will have the ability to write on the site. So we may use that person's documents and you can go in and make comments or edits on the site. But anybody can view it.

(Stefan): I mean maybe I'm not...

Man: That's okay.

(Stefan): If the constituency operations (work right), it's going to be - the purpose is to (get in groups) and then we're going to do some constituency structuring. The constituencies are going to be.

And we have five (committee) members who are not associated with the constituency. Now we discussed earlier about recommendations about how we would increase inclusiveness and recommendations to the constituency for this. But if the members on these teams are non-constituency members, wouldn't that be some sort of a (difficult) proposition?

Man: Well, let me make a couple comments and these are my own personal comments, okay, in that regard. First of all on the constituency operations team it's my opinion that that's going to need to be heavily staffed - I shouldn't use that term but - with constituency members because they've got the experience.

But I wouldn't exclude other people in that because there will be new constituencies formed. So they should be welcome to provide some input. But I really believe that that particular working team if we create it would depend heavily on people with constituency experience.

(Stefan): (Well, this I can ensure) because when we go back and sell this to our constituencies the question they will be asking is who has been recommending this? You know, and so it will be well, we did it or we all worked together through our existing constituencies.

And some will be saying no but there was an outsider there as well. It may cause some confusion concerns. We may be okay with it because

(we're sitting in a group) but our constituency members may have some concerns.

Man: Sure. And let me comment on the term that I've heard that two people used so far of "selling to our constituencies." And I understand that there's going to be plenty of opportunity where especially the final plan we're going to have to make sure we have constituency support.

But the board has made these recommendations. That's already a done action. It's not a matter of selling the recommendations to our constituencies. It's our responsibility to fulfill them. The council has approved the implementation plan. That doesn't mean that the council can't change the implementation plan.

That's certainly an option but that plan has been approved and I'd like to think that it was approved in a bottom-up way where we all went back and gave our constituencies a chance to comment on that. So now at the same time there will be a need for us to get by.

And hopefully we will have already obtained buy-in for the decisions that are made, the plans that are implemented so that it's not a matter of having to sell some idea.

See, this is not supposed to be a top-down thing where we sell something. Let's develop plans that involve as many as possible when we do it. (Phillip).

(Phillip): I think that another phrasing for selling it to our constituencies is motivating unpaid volunteers to be consultants to ICANN. And that's the biggest challenge.

It's up to us to construct reasonableness in terms of time commitment and the certainty of outcome that one can so motivate volunteers.

Man: Yeah. Motivation is key but let me ask you a question, (Phillip). How do you define ICANN? You said consultant to ICANN.

(Phillip): In this case I'm defining it as the body and its staff as opposed to anything slightly more metaphysical.

Man: Yeah. And I think that in my opinion the correct definition of ICANN is really all of us. It's the whole community. And so when you say "consultants to ICANN" - you know, if we want a bottom-up process where we're all involved in that, it's all of us.

It's not the (Robs) and so forth. So I think that's important for us to remember. On the one hand we can't want a bottom-up process and then want everything to be done by staff or whatever. We're all a part of ICANN. Anything else before I close?

Sorry for going so long but hopefully this will provide a good basis. Yes (Rob)?

(Rob): Do you want to discuss when we'll meet next?

Man: Yeah. We probably should. Let me suggest because we're way over that we do that on the list. Let's make sure we get the list updated quickly. And let's try to decide by early next week - find a meeting time that would work.

We'll know what people's times are. Hopefully you guys will have your reps by the end of the week and we can do that. Is that all right with everybody?

We'll do that on the list and we're using a little meeting planner thing that seems to work pretty well where we put out some alternative times and then people get a chance to respond when they're available and so forth.

And it's probably easier to do on that even in a meeting like this. But good question. Anything else before we close? Okay. Thanks everybody.

END