

**GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work
Team 21 August 2009 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work Team teleconference **21 August** 2009 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ops-20090821.mp3>

On page:

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

Participants present:

Olga Cavalli - work team chair - NCA
Michael Young - Work team vice chair - Registry c.
Charles Gomes - Registry c.
Victoria McEvedy - IPC
Claudio Digangi - IPC
Krista Papac - gTLD Registries c.
Zahid Jamil – CBUC
SS Kshatriya - Individual
Rafik Dammak - NCUC

ICANN Staff

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat
Gisella Gruber-White - consultant
Julie Hedlund - Policy Staff

Absent:

Tony Harris - ISP

Absent apologies

Robert Hoggarth - Policy Staff

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon everyone. On today's call, we have Olga Cavalli, Rafik Dammak, Victoria McEvedy Krista Papac, SS. And from staff we have Julie Hedlund, Glen Desaintgery and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Gisella. Thank you everyone for joining. I think we have very interesting information going in our - going around in our working

team list. We have some very documents sent by Victoria that I would like here to give some information and details about it. And then we have to review it.

And then we have some information sent by Julie about stakeholder charters. And we have some information sent by (Estes) in our small workshop working teams that maybe he can tell us something about it.

But I must tell you for some strange reason, I have no connectivity since 20 minutes ago. So I will ask Julie if she can remind me of the topics of the agenda. And she helps me through the call because I cannot open my email where I have the agenda.

Julie, the first point is, if I don't recall wrong, is if there is some news from the board or from ICANN that it could be good for the working team to know, right?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Olga, this is Julie. And actually I had just received prior to this call an update from Rob Hogarth. He sends his regrets, he is not able to be on the call. But he did send me a report to give to all of you. That is ICANN staff will be going back to community leaders, the existing GNSO constituencies for some basic charter changes in the next week or so. And that is on the stakeholder group charters, those that were posted for public comment.

Specifically, he says the constituencies will be asked to update their charters to reflect the new stakeholder group structures approved by the board and the minimal changes necessary to keep all of the charters consistent with the bylaws. And then he notes more substantive changes will likely await their recommendations that are coming out of the work of this work team.

So these are really envisioned to be the really minor changes to keep the charters consistent with the bylaws. And then as this team makes

recommendations, those, you know, recommendations also would be made to the constituencies to, you know, incorporate.

Olga Cavalli: Great, thank you very much, Julie. So I'm sure that you and Rob will keep us updated about the outcome of this exchange of information with constituencies. But as you already mentioned, it shouldn't be a big, big change.

Julie Hedlund: That's correct. But if there are any documents that are exchanged, then I'll work with Rob to make them available to this team.

Olga Cavalli: Great, thank you so much. Are there any questions about what Julie has told us?

Victoria McEvedy Yes, I have just a question.

Olga Cavalli: Please go ahead, (Victoria).

Victoria McEvedy Thank you - thanks, Olga. Julie, I'm just wondering, just to be clear on the bifurcated nature of that process, the two stage nature, I'm just wondering what the thinking was behind it and what, you know, what's anticipated in terms of timeframes further down the track.

So you're saying that will happen in the next week or so with the first stage, in the basic changes. I mean, I'm just really concerned that there should be - that understand, first of all but also about any wasted, you know, duplication of (unintelligible) again. What was the thinking behind doing it in two parts rather than doing it, you know, leaving it now and doing it all at once?

Julie Hedlund: I see. So this is Julie, if I'm understanding you correctly, why not wait until this team makes it's recommendations and have all the changes happen at once? Is that...?

Victoria McEvedy Yeah, just asking why that was not...

Julie Hedlund: Right. Well, it's - I can't speak for the board. But I believe there are changes that - minor changes that must be made now to make the charters consistent with the bylaws in the run up to the seating of the council in (Sole). And so that must move forward and that comes at the direction of the board. I know that the board is aware that this work team and other teams are, you know, are producing recommendations that will likely affect the constituency charters.

But as, you know, we don't have those recommendations ready now and there are some changes, that the board has requested to have happen right now, then the staff has no choice but to move forward.

I agree with you that it would be more efficient to be able to have all of the changes happen at once. But there's still quite a bit that needs to be done with this team as far as, you know, making the recommendations, having them reviewed by the operation steering committee and then having them approved by the GNSO council.

And I think that the board is working under a timetable where they're saying, these are, you know, changes that we want to have done, these minimal changes, we want them to be done now in respect of the fact that there's going to, you know, subsequently be possibility further changes based on the work or this team.

Victoria McEvedy Julie, would - that would be based on the preliminary report from the board meeting on the 30th of July, which addresses this topic. That would be correct.

Julie Hedlund: Right.

Victoria McEvedy See, I wouldn't necessary have read that so precisely. I mean, I don't know if there's another communication from the board on the topic. And so far as that those - that preliminary report, I'm looking at the exact wording now, the board also approved additional charge elements to insure bylaw principles and transparency (unintelligible), etcetera, on each stakeholder group instead of just incorporating those charters.

Here we are...

Michael Young: Sorry to interrupt, just wanted to let everyone know I've joined. This is (Michael).

Chuck Gomes: So did (Chuck).

Claudio Digangi And Claudio

Olga Cavalli: Hi, Claudio, (Chuck) and (Michael). Welcome.

Victoria McEvedy Right. And sorry, I will just continue. And I noticed at the bottom of that resolution the board directs the staff to reinitiate it through the GNSO constituency leaders to complete any necessary additional work on the reconfirmation of their existing charters, consistent with principles - blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.

So it, I mean, that communicate - I mean, those minutes do not necessarily go as far as the bifurcated proposal that was put forward. And unless there's some other document you could refer us to, I mean, maybe that's the interpretation taken. But I'm not sure that's necessarily clear on the face of that document.

Julie Hedlund: You know, it's, (Victoria), I don't have a good answer for you. All I know is the staff has been directed to go to the constituencies to make some basic charter changes in the next week or so. And I don't - I know - I agree with

you, it would appear that, you know, there isn't a, you know, specific, you know, it's not specific in that, you know, reporting out of the board meeting that says, you know, staff will do this in the next week, etcetera.

But I can see if there are any other - I can check with Rob to see if there are any other documents that give - that, you know, that we can share with the team that, you know, give the more specific direction.

Victoria McEvedy Because, I mean, I just might, you know, I'd really appreciate that. The concern is obviously that we're going through all this work, it's going to be much harder to have our recommendations implemented, if they've already been around. That will be the third round of changes to constituency charges.

So it might leave our work to be picked up next year, at which point it may have lost all momentum, as the way these things go. So I can see that the deadline mentioned by the board is September special meeting. I'm not too clear when that is. I don't know if you know, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: The next board meeting is on September 30.

Victoria McEvedy Okay, because I think the question comes, you know, there is a question for this group as to whether or not we should expedite and try and complete our work so that it can actually be of effect in this round of changes. I'm not talking about in the next week but if we've got until the 30th of September, then obviously there is some time. And I think it's an important overall question for us.

Julie Hedlund: (Victoria), this is Julie, I agree and I think that, you know, obviously this is something for Olga to speak to. But from a staff point of view, you know, the sooner all of the work teams complete their work, the sooner the recommendations can, you know, be put forward and we can move ahead.

So certainly - and if these, you know, so that, you know, they can be made, you know, these recommendations can be made to the constituencies as soon as possible. And I will check back with Rob to see if there are further communications that I could share with this team that speak to the direction that we received from the board with respect to going to the constituencies and asking them to make some minor changes.

Chuck Gomes: Olga, can I comment?

Olga Cavalli: Sure, (Chuck), this - go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. First of all, the next board meeting is the 27th of August.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, you're right.

Chuck Gomes: And in that meeting, they're scheduled to act on the bylaws changes, which is the critical part of any constituency changes - charter changes that might have to be made. They already did approve, as everyone knows, the stakeholder group charters.

And really, I think the only changes in constituency charters, first of all, constituency charters will only apply to the non-commercial stakeholder groups. So we're talking about that side, that half. But we know - we will know - we already have a good idea of what the bylaws changes will be, assuming that, you know, if there are any changes, we'll know those in a week or a little bit more.

And any changes in constituency charters will just have to be made consistent with those bylaws changes and the charters that have already been approved. So I don't think we're going to have any surprises because of the fact that we already know the approved stakeholder group charters. We have a very good idea what the bylaws changes will be and any changes in

constituency charters will just have to be to make the charters consistent with the other two documents.

Olga Cavalli: Anyone else want to talk?

Woman: (Saheed Jamal) has joined the call as well.

Olga Cavalli: Hi, (Saheed), how are you?

Zahid Jameel: Hi there, sorry about the delay in getting on the call. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, thank you for joining us. Thank you, (Chuck), thank you, Julie. And (Victoria) raised a very interesting point. But I agree with (Chuck), that the - it shouldn't be a big change. And we have to keep in mind - I don't know if you agree - but this is the whole (part) that's going on.

And I think that we still can do our job in our working team with the information we have now. And then just if there are changes, which I agree with (Chuck), that should be minor. Also, what we could do is that we could have some more - other documents that could help us from Robert and Julie, maybe this next two weeks to see if there are some other things we should review, as Julie said before.

So let's keep an eye on these possible changes and - that may come from the reports made by the board. But it shouldn't make a really sustainable change for the work that we have done. I don't know if you agree with me.

Chuck Gomes: Olga, I'll just clarify one thing. I didn't necessarily mean to imply that the changes would be minor - probably most of them would be. My more important point is that I think we can anticipate the changes that will need to be made because we know what the stakeholder group charters are and we know what the bylaws changes are.

So for example, in the NCU - NCFG, the board obviously made a major change there. It was not a minor change. And so the charter of that group will have to accommodate that change in terms of the six seats on the council.

So again, I'm not - I didn't mean to say that they're all going to be minor. I think most of them probably will but there will have to be some others that will be significant but we can anticipate those. So that all the work that's gone into combining the principles of the constituencies and stakeholder groups and so forth, I believe we could fairly easily check out the ones that might not fit anymore, based on the stakeholder group charters and the bylaws changes.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, (Chuck). I also didn't mean that all were going to be minor. But we should have an idea...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Of what is the outcome. But that's what I meant and I'm sorry if I...

Chuck Gomes: That's okay.

Olga Cavalli: I misinterpret your words. Any other comments?

Victoria McEvedy I'd just would - I'd just like to make one...

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Victoria McEvedy Just one last point. I think maybe we're talking across purposes here because what I was really suggesting is that looking at the direction from the board and its preliminary - the preliminary report from the meeting on the 30th of July, it's talking about additional changes both to stakeholder charters and to constituency charters.

And the question that I raised for this group was whether or not that - it talks about in that preliminary report, it wants to act on those documents at a September special meeting, not at its August meeting. And I was saying whether or not we should be discussing expediting our work so that our work can be included with those changes.

Olga Cavalli: I see. Well, we could keep on watching the process and see the timing for when we have some documents to be compared with or used for other processes. It depends - I don't know what you think. But it also depends on our dynamic and our activities, when can we show something. Is that your point, Victoria? Or maybe I did not...

Victoria McEvedy I guess you know, what I'm saying is, I mean, you know, I don't want to belabor the point. But this is another round of changes to constituency charters, okay? And we know, you know, just focusing on that aspect of our work at the moment, if we don't get our work and our recommendations completed by the, you know, by - in this round of changes, okay, that are coming, you know, following through from stakeholder group changes and bylaw changes, we may end up waiting for our recommendations to be picked up a year later if they get picked up at all.

At which point, you know, the political (unintelligible) for another round of changes to charters may be lost. So you know, it's a question for us, you know to perhaps maximize the value of our work, having spent, what, gosh, six months or seven months or something on this now. Do we try and complete our work in a month or two and you know, at which point the work products would be maximized in terms of usage? I think it's an important question.

Chuck Gomes: And I think, (Victoria), it's probably unrealistic to complete all of our work. But if we were to flag any items that could impact the constituency charters that are yet to be approved and work, get that done quickly, that might be a realistic objective.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, (Chuck), I didn't get you. Could you clarify it a little bit?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. What I'm saying is that personally I think it'd be hard for us to get our work done by the end of August or even very early September, all of our work. But if there are topics, items that we may recommend that could affect the constituency charters, we could identify those and focus directly on those and try and get those done.

Olga Cavalli: And (Chuck), let me ask you, when would the timing for this, detecting this specific recommendation would be? When should we think about doing that?

Chuck Gomes: Well, we'd have to have it almost by the end of August, which is very quick or very early September because anything we recommend would go to the OSC. And I can make that - chair that so I can speed that up.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I don't see a big hurdle there. And for timing, we could go ahead and pass it on to the council right away. And then the council has to make that recommendation to the board. That's why I say, you know, we just have a couple of weeks here and that's why if we narrowed our focus on anything that we think might impact those charters, although the charters can be changed later, we could just - it might be realistic to just focus on those things.

Olga Cavalli: I think it's a very important comment and it could bring a little change to our present rhythm or dynamic of work. And I think it desires a revision of the information that we have now in trying to find this specific recommendation that we could make. What do others think?

Victoria McEvedy I'd like to get in the queue, please?

Olga Cavalli: Okay, go ahead, (Victoria).

Victoria McEvedy I mean, I think that while it sounds like an attractive idea, I mean, our work goes fundamentally to those charters, given that we're talking about constituency participation rules and operating principles, all of which will have to be referenced and/or included, provided for in the charters.

So I don't think that it's really possible to sort of go - I don't think any of our work is not directly concerned with those charters. The charters contain every aspect of the constituency operation and rules and what have you. So I don't see myself - perhaps others have - can see apart through that but I don't.

Olga Cavalli: So you think it's not possible that we could - we don't have time or we don't have the information? What's your...?

Victoria McEvedy: I'm just saying, I don't think you - I think (Chuck)'s suggestion was maybe we could take out, you know, maybe we could carry back some of their ideas that might relate to the charters of the constituencies. And I'm saying, I think our work - all of our work relates to the charters of the constituencies directly. So I don't think there's a possibility to cherry pick in that way.

So we can't - I don't think there's a way to sort of bifurcate our work. The question is, how much more do we have to do and could we complete something that would be worthwhile in the time available, I think.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. And other comments?

Krista Papac: Olga, this is Krista.

Olga Cavalli: Krista...

Krista Papac: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: I hear you very - with very low volume. I don't know the others but go ahead, Krista.

Krista Papac: Okay, I'm just going to say I agree with (Chuck). I think it's nearly impossible to come up with all of our recommendations in time. So I feel like right now, we can either decide to take a couple of things or just press on and try to get this done as quickly as possible. But that, you know, trying to make this in time for these upcoming stakeholder group - make all of our recommendations in time for these upcoming stakeholder groups, you know, discussions by the board is not realistic.

Olga Cavalli: If I may, Krista, I think that (Chuck) suggested some different way of facing this, is going to some specific recommendations that could be an outcome from our working team before this deadline of the board meeting, stakeholder group and others and all that.

Is this what you meant, (Chuck) or I...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah - no, (Victoria) understood it correctly and she may be right. I don't know that we can really pick out some things. I was trying to come up with something that we could get done in two weeks.

Olga Cavalli: I understand.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Now, keep in mind that there are going to be other changes, significant changes and things, after this whole meeting. For example, the bylaws; the bylaws changes that are on the board's agenda for the 27th of this month are just part of the bylaws changes that will need to be made for the GNSO improvements and the GNSO restructure. A lot more bylaws changes will have to be made later.

So I don't think we need to feel like things that we don't get done in this round right now aren't going to be considered. They will be because there's some

very significant things that will have to happen that will have to even go to the board after the (Sole) meeting.

Olga Cavalli: I agree with you - I - correct me if I'm wrong. I think that the outcome and the work of our working team, going with - along with this process and trying to produce an outcome that could be a base document, maybe for the (person) in the near future.

And I personally don't see it very, perhaps, efficient to put our energy in the next two weeks and try to find - produce something. I'm not sure. Just looking at the dynamics that our working team has and I'm being realistic now, sometimes it takes more than two weeks to produce something or to get something working - some working team agree on a text.

So I see the two weeks really not very realistic for our dynamic of work. And I agree that we should perhaps keep on working and trying to (condition) some maybe in the near future but not in two weeks. I don't know if you agree with this idea but maybe I'm wrong.

Chuck Gomes: I'm the last one that wants to discourage people from getting something done quickly. So if the subgroups think that they can pull stuff together, I would encourage that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, so any comments? Could we try to perhaps in this next two weeks, circulate some briefing of things that should be reviewed, try to do this exercise? Do you think it's a good idea or - I'm open to that. I'm happy to work in sharing and following the process. But it's mostly the working team that has to decide.

Victoria McEvedy Yeah, I would just like to make a comment. I don't think it would hurt us at this stage of our work to really add some expedition. Would we, you know, where we get to ultimately in terms of those timeframes maybe isn't the end

of the world. But I don't, I mean, I think we may have broken the back of some of our work.

And you know, we have been gone for a very long time to get to this point. So I do wonder if we shouldn't perhaps to agree and perhaps expedite in any event and just try and see where we end up.

Olga Cavalli: But you think we should do it, (Victoria)?

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah, I think - subject to what other people think, I'm just not sure how much more work we have to do and I would have thought that if we applied ourselves in the next three weeks or so, we might be able well to complete a great deal of our work. And then we could reassess where we stood.

Olga Cavalli: So what's the deadline for this - for identifying these issues? How much time we have?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I estimated earlier that we really don't have anymore than two weeks because of the fact that by the time our recommendations go to the OSC - and I think we can minimize that, like I said - and on to the council. In fact, I wouldn't be opposed to just, you know, notifying the OSC and sending them to the council at the same time, just because of the time constraints, if we have something that's ready.

But you know, if the board meeting, the end of September, you've got to give time - the council - the next council meeting is the 3rd of September. And then three weeks after that, we have another one which will probably be on the same day as the board meeting or maybe a week earlier, I can check that.

So I mean - and the board needs - the council needs stuff a week in advance, the board needs stuff at least a week in advance. So that's why I'm saying,

we really have no more than two weeks and it's not even clear that two weeks will work.

Victoria McEvedy This is the September meeting, though, isn't it, that we're aiming towards, (Chuck)...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Victoria McEvedy At the end of September.

Chuck Gomes: And the constituency charters, I think what the - what Julie read there from Rob was is that they're going to act on the constituency charters in their September meeting, which is the latter part of September.

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments, other thoughts?

Chuck Gomes: In fact, it's the 30th of September, to be exact. I think Julie probably said that.

Olga Cavalli: So we should think about a two weeks' timeframe?

Michael Young: If we're going to go with this (page) in two weeks, do we want to schedule another meeting next week and do a couple of quick meetings, just to keep pace to make sure...

Olga Cavalli: That's a great idea, (Michael). I'm able to do that. That's a great idea. Any ideas of how we could - do we agree in trying to do this effort in the next two weeks? I hear no nos, so I take that as a yes.

Michael Young: I'd like to throw out to the group too, Olga, that I can - and particularly this next week, I have some open hours. So I can help any of the subgroups out if they need an extra hand.

Olga Cavalli: Great, thank you so much, (Michael). Any other comments?

Victoria McEvedy Yeah, I can commit some time to do this.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, me too. I'm not traveling so I can help also. So the issue would be to try to, in this next two weeks, try to identify some - I would say it should be some concise information - and correct me if I'm wrong - recommendations and comments. Then they should be reviewed by the OSC and then by the council and they would go to the board. This would be the procedure, (Chuck)?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Hello?

Chuck Gomes: There we go. Can you hear me?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, I thought it was myself.

Chuck Gomes: Anyway, like I said, unless I get any objections from the OSC members, which I don't think it would, we could kind of just notify the OSC and the council at the same time of what we're doing. That still puts us past the council meeting, I think. Let's see, we're on the 21st right now - yeah, that'd put is a day - yeah, so meeting next week would be essential to see if we're going to make it.

And so I'm going to be traveling on - mostly on vacation next week. But I think I can make that meeting because it's so early for me, it won't interfere with anything we're doing.

Olga Cavalli: Could we suggest Friday - next Friday at the same time?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I think - it's okay with me.

Michael Young: That's fine by me.

Victoria McEvedy Fine by me.

Olga Cavalli: (Victoria)? Okay, I will - I'm available also. (Saheed), Rafik? Is that good?

Zahid Jameel Yeah, it's okay.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Okay...

Rafik Dammak: Yeah, Rafik - it's okay.

Julie Hedlund: How about - this is Julie, I'm sorry. I had to leave the call, I was getting some very bad interference on my line. So I'm back now, I missed the last couple of minutes.

Olga Cavalli: So you're leaving the call, Julie?

Julie Hedlund: No, I had to leave the call because I had interference, so I'm back.

Olga Cavalli: Also Julie, I have connectivity now, so...

Julie Hedlund: Good.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you for your assistance in the agenda but I have the agenda in my computer, which is great.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, good.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. How should we organize our work? How do we start? Should we use the documents that we have now to bring some ideas and some food for thought and some recommendations? Should we exchange some other information in the list? Any comments, any ideas?

Chuck Gomes: Well, really isn't that up to the subtask groups, to expedite the best way they can - they've done all the work to date...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And it seems to me that they should decide how they can best do it and take off.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, so we should keep the - (Chuck) is suggesting that we keep the same structure of the working team for this work in the next two weeks.

Chuck Gomes: I think that's the only realistic thing we can do...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Because they're up to speed on all that. If you try to get the whole work team up to speed on all the four tasks in such a small time, you're going to have a challenge. They - they're the ones that I think are best qualified and ready to expedite the work.

Olga Cavalli: Great, because we have all of them on the call, we have (Estes), (Victoria), Krista and Julie. And I am also in two sub working teams, so I am able to cooperate in what is needed. So let's think about exchanging some ideas in the list during this week. Let's do our next conference call next Friday and see what we have achieved and if we are going to make it - I hope so.

And we should have a good outcome for the other - we could finalize our work in the conference call on Friday in the next two weeks. This is - this should be our working - ours to do for the next two weeks. Do you agree?

Krista Papac: Olga, it's Krista.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, Krista, go ahead.

Krista Papac: I'm not - next week is actually a pretty tough week for me, so I'm - I believe I can make the call, I don't know how much of the deliverable I can have by that time. But I'll certainly give it my best effort but I just wanted to sort of put that on the table now.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, Krista, if you need some extra help, just let me know. I could be - I could help you and maybe analyzing some documents or if you're not able to make the call, you need some assistance for your working team, just count on me also.

Krista Papac: Okay, I mean, for me, I think we - I have - I hope a call with the NCUC on Monday that get their input and it's just a matter of, I think, writing the recommendation based on our research, which is pretty easy. It's just that I've got about three big documents I have to write this week and I don't know how I'm going to get those done.

So it's more of a writing than an analyzing situation. But I'll send you an email offline and maybe we can - between the two of us get something put together.

Olga Cavalli: Great, okay.

Krista Papac: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Let me know and I'll be glad to help you. (Estes), is this okay with you?

SS: Yeah, it's fine.

Olga Cavalli: Fine. And (Victoria) and Julie?

Victoria McEvedy Fine with me.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Okay, so we have a plan for the next two weeks. This would be for Point 1 of the agenda, thank you very much, (Victoria), for writing this issue which I really didn't think - I just didn't think it was so much important. But thank you so much for bringing this so we will have a more focused work during these next two weeks and maybe we will get some good outcome.

The idea for the rest of the agenda was to review the group of working teams, (Estes), (Victoria) and Krista and Julie. We have, like, 20 minutes, I hope we have time to make this revision. Just I want you to know, maybe you say it, (Victoria) sent a document. I could hardly review it, but I think we have some time now to check it and send her some comments. (Estes) also sent some information for our work - subworking team. And I was expecting some more feedback from constituencies. Perhaps, (Estes), you could tell us how is your work improving?

SS: Yeah, no - I'm actually this - what I submitted to subtask member was (unintelligible) 1.2 clause membership that I (cooperated) (unintelligible) clause. And I'm working on this membership clause, more elaborate we are completing the things, which I'll be sending sooner to the - now if you want, I can (be) to the (unintelligible) or else since we are speeding up, I'll (unintelligible) working what I've sent to the subtask members. That's (Claudio) and (Victoria) and Rafik.

So I mean, shall I get their comment and then work through (unintelligible) or if you want I can separate it too (unintelligible)?

Olga Cavalli: I would suggest our working team is not so big. So if you send it to all of us, in my perspective, it's okay. It will work - you - it will accent our exchange of ideas. So I don't know what...

SS: Yeah, no, it looks like these are not great. So I'll (unintelligible) also and then expect feedback from all the members.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, thank you very much, (Estes).

SS: And then maybe discuss the next one. And what I'll do for the next few days, I'll (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Thank you so much. Any questions to (Estes)? Well, (Victoria), could you just briefly tell us about the document you exchanged with our - in our mailing list?

Victoria McEvedy Sure. This is a very preliminary draft. And I'm sorry it's taking so long to produce. What I would anticipate now is perhaps, hopefully receiving some initial comments from the other members of the subtask group and then perhaps this week, having a preliminary call with those members to discuss the - and sort of digest their feedback. And also feedback from the wider group is welcome, very welcome because it will save time in the longer run if we get that.

So if anyone has comments on this, please, if they could be submitted over the list. And then I think we would aim to try and reflect all views in this document. And then, you know, try to reach a consensus within the subtask group.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, any comments? Have anyone had a chance to review what (Victoria) sent or wants to make her some questions? Okay, thank you very much, (Victoria). And I think we are looking forward for all of her comments and suggestions to your documents.

Krista, I saw the response from NCUC. So you have them - you have a call to talk to them?

Krista Papac: I requested time - she said that she could meet Monday. I asked her when Monday but I haven't gotten a response yet. So my hopes are high.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. But you're on the way with that, which is good. I'm happy to know. And let's talk on these next two week work and perhaps after this two weeks, we review again how's the whole recommendations that you're building for the database and constituency members and other things going - you think that's a good idea? And let's talk in the next two weeks a recommendation.

Krista Papac: That's what she - yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Julie, thanks so much for the document you sent. I think it's - we already know the content but I think it's a good outcome. Did the working team have a chance to review it? Do we have any comments for Julie about the tool kit in construct and support of the services document?

I have a question about this document. I reviewed it yesterday and about the funding issues and the work from staff to working teams. Does this mean that in the near future or in the future, working teams - all working teams will have support from ICANN staff?

Chuck Gomes: They already have, haven't they?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, but I mean in the future work, stakeholder groups will have more constituencies - that's my question. I know that they already have now but in - with the new structure, that - I don't know. It may be much bigger. That's my - that was my question. I don't know if it's a question for this working team but just I had this doubt.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, this is Julie - and (Chuck), please chime in if you'd like. But the recommendation that we've put forward for consideration by this team is that, you know, certain elements of what will be provided to constituencies and stakeholder groups and then the, you know, working groups, you know, within those groups.

And I think in actuality, I should let you know that we did ask to have this document reviewed by several ICANN staff who were very much involved in staff support issues. And Glen in particular had noted what (Chuck) had just said, that a lot of this type of support is already being provided, although to a certain extent we are, you know, setting in place maybe a little more formalized version of a lot of the support that 's already being offered.

So with respect to your question, what we will be doing going forward, you know, will there be, you know, more work. I mean, we will of course, ICANN staff will have to, you know, consider and part of this recommendation is to consider, you know, the funding and budgetary issues that surround offering this level of support, you know, to, you know, as we go forward.

So you know, that's something that's being considered as part of this, you know...

Olga Cavalli: Thanks, Julie. (Chuck), a thought that came to my mind maybe if we (looks) were become to be so many that it will be really very difficult for your staff to handle all the work. But I thought that perhaps it could be some idea of how many could access in a hypothetical situation. But I don't know if it's a good idea or not. It just came to my mind. Not defining could be somehow problematic. But just an idea.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, I think that's a very - this is Julie - that's a very good point and I think it's one, you know, that we need to consider and perhaps we need to be more specific with respect to that in the document.

Olga Cavalli: Because if you really document it today, it definitely seem to be a limit. In some point it says, if something is available or if there's enough funding, there is a reference. But it's not defined. Maybe any working team should think or claim for support. I don't know if this is really physical. And I don't know really how many working teams it will be. Maybe the real number, it's enough and it's okay with the structure.

Chuck Gomes: Let me clarify a couple of things.

Olga Cavalli: Sure, go ahead, (Chuck).

Chuck Gomes: First of all, the document, the comment about availability of funds was whether or not if the - had to do with whether or not the services in the toolkit could be provided free of charge for constituencies and stakeholder groups or whether, you know, there might...

Olga Cavalli: Hello?

Chuck Gomes: I think Krista jumped off. Anyway, the original intent of the (unintelligible) services was really for constituencies and stakeholder groups. But they can apply just as well to working groups. That's really a task for the working group model team that's under the TPSC to work on.

I'd like to point out also that this particular document really doesn't cover the issue of staff support for working groups. That's not one of the items that are in the toolkit. Staff support for working groups and working teams and other teams is not part of this particular set of recommendations because that's really an issue for the - probably the working group model team to work on under the TPSC.

Does that make sense, Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, (Chuck), that does make sense and I'm sorry, I missed part of your comments because I had to drop again. I'm having some very...

Chuck Gomes: It's Julie, I'm sorry, I said Krista.

Julie Hedlund: Okay, sorry.

- Chuck Gomes: It was you that was causing that static. My apologies...
- Julie Hedlund: It was my fault. Yes, Julie causing that static. I'm sorry but I have some very strange connection problems going on here. But I'm back.
- Chuck Gomes: So anyway, what I said, Julie, was that the issue of staff support is not a topic in this particular document. That'll come under the TPSC working group model team. And the toolkit of services, to my understanding, was never intended to be - to deal with the staff services to support working groups and so forth. But I think the board recommendations clearly point to staff support for the policy development work of the GNSO.
- Julie Hedlund: And this is Julie, (Chuck), I have to agree with that.
- Chuck Gomes: Yeah.
- Olga Cavalli: Okay, so maybe I - we did again, maybe I misunderstood it.
- Chuck Gomes: I don't think - if you see anything there, Olga, that specifically gives you that impression, let us know.
- Olga Cavalli: Yeah, that's why I brought the comment. If for example, going to take prior to the ability to any toolkit services, ICANN should develop an informed GNSO. So it's very much talk is on the support of the staff to this working group. So this work my impression came from.
- Chuck Gomes: Well, staff is obviously going to provide the services that are listed in the toolkit.
- Olga Cavalli: Yes, that's my question. How much staff - is there a limit? Should we think that there should be a limit of how much staff is devoted to this thing?
- Chuck Gomes: Well, I think we'd like as much as possible.

Olga Cavalli: No, I know. But I thought - I understand it and I'm not saying that they're not doing well their job - totally the contrary. I mean, could this so many working groups that their work could be a nightmare because it's so complicated. That's my question.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And I think that'll be an ongoing challenge and their going to have to tell us where they've reached limits in that regard. You know, we've had that challenge, as you know, very well all along. And it's probably right that it won't get easier.

Olga Cavalli: So my question was, shouldn't we - a certain amount of - the (unintelligible) working groups as of the maximum possibility of handling. That is my question.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, but isn't that the working group model work team under the TPSC's task? I don't think it has to do with the toolkit's services so much.

Olga Cavalli: No, I know. That's okay, just exchanging some thoughts with you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks.

Olga Cavalli: And some concerns that could arise. Okay, any other comments about subtask force? Anyone has a chance to review Julie's document and want to make any comment? Okay - and thank you very much, Julie, for sending the document. I think it's a very good one.

I had thought for the final part of our call to go to Task 2 and exchange some ideas. But I think it's not a good idea and we should focus now in our next two week work and leave this for the - after maybe this two weeks that we will have this recommendations made. And so if you agree, we should put Number 3 of the agenda for the next future. Is that okay?

Chuck Gomes: Yep.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So we have five minutes before we end the call. Should we have any other business to talk about or should we try to establish some things to do for the next days, exchanging some information or just waiting the reaction of the working team leaders and any comments?

Chuck Gomes: Just backing up to the document that Julie sent for the toolkit of services might be helpful if we set a target for feedback for the rest of the working team. Now considering that we - Julie and I had talked about a two week timeframe, I think that we ought to push that out to maybe four weeks, since everybody's going to be really busy to trying to work on their own task in the next two weeks. Is that reasonable, to set a target for two weeks for feedback on the toolkit of services?

That's not something that's critical in terms of charter approval. So I think that it's okay if we don't get that until four weeks from now instead of two weeks. That way, people can really spend their time on their specific subtasks in the next two weeks. Does that make sense, Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, (Chuck), I think that's a good idea. I think we need to really give a little bit more time so that people can focus on the more important task at hand of completing their subteam work.

Olga Cavalli: So it's four weeks...

Julie Hedlund: Four weeks.

Olga Cavalli: Timeframe. Okay, I think it's fine. Any comments?

Julie Hedlund: I should note that Krista unfortunately had to drop off the call. She didn't want to interrupt the discussion.

Olga Cavalli: Great. So we have four weeks to exchange some comments or suggestions to Julie's document. And any other business, any other comments?

Victoria McEvedy Well, while we've got this time, if I can just gauge views. I mean, I'd be hoping to get some feedback on our subtask work this week. Perhaps sort of view to having a subtask discussion on Thursday or something like that. So I just don't know whether or not people feel it might be even initial feedback or perhaps do people feel that they might be able to work with that timeframe?

Olga Cavalli: My only concern would be if we all have - we'll have a time - I will review it and I will make some comments. But if we all have the time to review your document, in the light of each working team, have other things going on.

But I mean, if people have the time, that would be great. I'm not saying it's not a good idea. I'm saying it's perhaps too much to review and to do. But I will make my comments during the next - first days of next week from my side. Any comments about feedback from - to (Victoria)'s document? What do others think about when she could have some feedback?

Chuck Gomes: I can probably comment back by Monday, (Victoria).

Victoria McEvedy Great, thank you.

Olga Cavalli: I will do the same, Monday or Tuesday.

Victoria McEvedy Great, okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, let's do the following and see if we have some other feedback. And then perhaps we can review this in the list by Thursday and talk a minute about this in the next conference call on Friday, just to see if people had a chance to see it and if they're going to give you some feedback and when. Do you think that's a good idea?

Victoria McEvedy Sounds great. Thank you, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, it's one hour by now. Any other comments? Julie, would you be so kind to send us some short meeting minutes about what we have been talking?

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely, Olga, this is Julie. I'll be happy to do it.

Olga Cavalli: And so stay tuned in the mailing list. And Gisella, are you on the call? Or maybe she's on mute. Just to - I'll remind her on the list that we will make our next conference call next Friday, same time, right?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. And I see, Olga, that she has - she's not on the call right now.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, no problem. But we can...

Julie Hedlund: Yes, if you send her an email...

Olga Cavalli: Contact her so that's not a problem.

Julie Hedlund: Right.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, if we are done, I hope you have a very nice weekend and we will talk again in one week.

Gisella Gruber-White: Olga, it's Gisella. I'll send out the call details either this afternoon or Monday morning.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Gisella. Thank you.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, have a good weekend, all of you

END