

**GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work
Team 09 October 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 **09 October 2009** at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-constituency-ops-20091009.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/index.html#oct>

Participants present:

Michael Young – Registries – vice chair
Rafik Dammak – NCUC
Chuck Gomes – Registries
Victoria McEvedy - IPC
Claudio Digangi - IPC
Tony Harris – ISP
SS Kshatriya - Individual

ICANN Staff

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat
Julie Hedlund – Policy Staff

Apologies

Olga Cavalli - work team chair – NCA
Krista Papac – Registrar c.
Zahid Jamil - CBUC

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

Michael Young: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: I see an email from Zahid that he won't be able to make this call.

Glen de Saint Gery: He's going to try.

Chuck Gomes: He did send in some points it looks like still.

Glen de Saint Gery: Shall I do a roll call, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Michael's in charge, not me.

Glen de Saint Gery: Michael, shall I do a roll call?

Michael Young: Absolutely, please. Thank you.

Glen de Saint Gery: Pleasure. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. One the call we have Rafik Dammak, Chuck Gomes, Claudio Di Gangi, Victoria McEvedy, SS Kshatriya, Tony Harris and Michael Young.

And there are apologies from Zahid Jamil and Olga - we're not able to get her on the phone. Thank you Michael.

Michael Young: All right. So the first time we have on - well...

Glen de Saint Gery: Sorry. And for staff we have Julie Hedlund and myself Glen de Saint Gery. Thank you.

Michael Young: Excellent. Does anyone want to add anything to the agenda before we get started? Okay. Hearing nothing let's go to the first item. Julie, perhaps you can run with this?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. Michael, I don't actually have any updates on board activities. There haven't been any new developments that I have heard of so I'm afraid I don't have anything to add here.

Michael Young: Okay.

Man: We probably - Michael, it might be helpful if people aren't aware that the board in their 30th meeting did take some actions with regard to restructuring at least in terms of it was more from the SIC than the board.

But the process for restructuring is happening and the SIC is supportive of that process.

Claudio Di Gangi: Julie, this is Claudio. Do you know what the status of the constituency confirmation is?

Michael Young: Go ahead Julie.

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry. This is Julie. The status of new constituencies?

Claudio Di Gangi: No, the existing ones that...

Man: Claudio, Denise or I guess it was Rob really that gave an update on that in our council meeting yesterday. And basically the staff has given - had suggested some things to the constituencies on their charters.

And so they're basically it's a process of waiting until the constituencies respond to that.

Claudio Di Gangi: Okay.

Michael Young: Does anyone else have anything to add to the first agenda item? Okay. Hearing nothing, let's move to the second one. So I think what's important here is for us to actually just as a priority here just agree on due dates for receiving minority reports.

This is something actually I don't have an indicator in our charter for not specifying an expectation for turnaround on minority reports although I think the natural assumption is that the time should not be extensive to the point where it feels its obstructive to moving forward with something we have rough consensus on.

So I'm open for comments on what people think is a reasonable deadline for this.

Chuck Gomes: Please put me in the queue, Michael.

Michael Young: Hey Chuck. I'm not hearing anyone else. Why don't you go ahead?

Chuck Gomes: All right. It would be very helpful for the OSC if those were available with some lead time before the OSC meeting in Seoul. So in other words that would give us if we plan seven days in advance of that meeting, which I believe is on Sunday afternoon.

Then they would need to be due a week from this coming Sunday so that the OSC can have the chance to review those and discuss them in the meeting in Seoul. That's not just the minority reports. I'm talking about the whole package.

Victoria McEvedy: Can I ask you a question, Chuck, about this?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Victoria McEvedy: The OSC is responsible for steering these three committees, cooperation, what is it, PDP, what's the other one?

Chuck Gomes: The council operations, the constituency operations and communications.

Victoria McEvedy: So what does steering entail? I mean to be honest I have to say that myself, I would like a formal - I quite like - I don't myself think it's that appropriate that we have to have these sort of - I've made this point before.

It would be nice for us to - perhaps someone could point to where we can find what steering means just so we have an understanding of what happens at the OSC level.

Chuck Gomes: I suggest that you look at the OSC charter.

Victoria McEvedy: I've looked at the OSC charter before and it really doesn't clarify for me. I mean I know that this is a concept in some flux itself because the GNSO Council role is moving steering, right, or policy development?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. The council tasked the OSC with developing the work team as needed and facilitating the work that we need to do to come up with recommendations for implementation of the board recommendations.

Victoria McEvedy: That I understand. That I can understand and of course we are a sub-committee of the OSC and we do the work.

So I guess my questions are really and I don't want to use legal language but I mean my real question is that they can offer it like an appellate court. They won't redo our work de novo as we would say in the law; like they're not going to - I mean this is not steering as I understand it.

But I'd be very interested just for my own understanding to understand a little better about the nature of that process.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well, it's simpler in my mind I guess or clearer maybe is a better way to say it in the sense that we're trying to facilitate the making sure that the work gets done and assisting the work teams in areas where they may be having difficulty. I would say this is one of those areas.

Victoria McEvedy: So what does that mean exactly? I mean if they are facilitated - I mean if the committee has been formed, the work group, which is us, has been formed and we have carried out the work or parts of the work. And then you're talking - I mean the thing is...

Chuck Gomes: For example, okay, right now there are a majority of people in the work team that think that Task 1.4 should be moved forward in the process. And there are I believe three people who believe it shouldn't.

That would seem to be a very appropriate area for the OSC to provide their feedback and recommendations to the work team.

Glen de Saint Gery: And that's provided for in their charter, is it?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. May I get in the queue?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: So I have the operations steering committee charter in front of me and it seems fairly clear. It says the OSC is responsible for coordinating, recommending and reviewing changes to certain operational activities of the GSNO and its constituency with a view to efficient outcomes.

And it also says further on that the immediate goal of the OSC is to develop recommendations to implement operational changes in DBGC work group report. So the development of the recommendations sits with the operations steering committee.

And the operations steering committee is then coordinating and recommending based on the work of the GSNO operations stakeholder group and constituency operations and communications work teams at least as far as I read this.

Chuck Gomes: And so the ultimate responsibility for the recommendations is with the OSC. And the OSC has tasked work teams to develop initial recommendations in that regard. So that makes it about as clear as I can imagine.

Victoria McEvedy: Well, I'll just thank you for the clarification. I'll take a look at that language. I mean it's going to be interesting to see how the GNSO interpret this in relation to their steering function going forward.

But I mean I'm just saying I think these are relatively new concepts, the steering function as opposed we're seeing this in the PDP context as well, aren't we? So I thank you for clarifying that and I apologize for taking up too much time from the group.

Myself in terms of the timeframes, I wouldn't have thought we'd need anything like that time to submit minority reports. I certainly won't and perhaps you'd like to ask I think SS has indicated he's also submitting a minority report.

Michael Young: I think that's correct.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I can tell you - sorry Michael. I can tell you that as Chair of the OSC it's my plan in Seoul in our meeting to request guidance from the OSC on this matter.

I'd much prefer that was done with the minority reports because the OSC has a responsibility for things to get done in a timely manner too, as quickly as possible. And so I will be asking the OSC to weigh in on this issue in Seoul and I would prefer that with the minority reports.

But if we don't have it I would be irresponsible if as chair of that committee if I didn't try and move this thing forward one way or another because it's needed in the GNSO. The improvements need to happen as soon as possible and if some can move forward.

And let me tell you Victoria, I do not plan to abuse my chair role in that regard. I would really like to rely on information coming from this work team

without my input so that it's independent of my opinion on this because I'm the one that suggested we expedite it.

Michael Young: So Chuck, let's move to it and see whether or not everyone is okay with a due date that will accomplish what judicious and timely impact to this. So is the 16 okay, Victoria, SS, to put the minority report in by?

Because I think that gives then Olga and ourselves a couple of days just to make sure basic housekeeping and make sure that the minority reports are nicely packaged with the original 1.4 and that everything goes in together.

Victoria McEvedy: I mean I would have thought Monday or Tuesday would be perfectly satisfactory myself.

Chuck Gomes: I'm okay with that. The council's general practice for things like this is seven days. That's why I suggested that. I'm not going to object if it's a few days after that.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah. The only thing I would note Chuck, about what you've said is that my understanding was that it was to go to the council. I mean I'm surprised that you're expediting only to the OSC when I thought your whole intention was that it should go to the council.

Chuck Gomes: Well, the OSC will determine when it goes to the council. That's the ultimate goal, yes. But keep in mind the council tasked the OSC to do this so that the council doesn't need to be involved every step of the way.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Victoria, do you mean the 12 or 13 or the 19 or 20?

Victoria McEvedy: Next Monday or Tuesday.

SS Kshatriya: No, this is SS. If I could please - my name is also there.

Michael Young: Yes.

SS Kshatriya: You suggest the 16 for myself, the 16 is okay.

Michael Young: All right.

SS Kshatriya: And I'll try to submit it as early as possible so that I don't miss the date.

Michael Young: Okay. Very good, SS. Let me ask the entire group one more time because if both Victoria and SS get their minority reports in early then we will certainly pass the materials along as soon as we have them.

SS Kshatriya: I will certainly try as early as possible.

Michael Young: I want to make sure that nobody else wants to submit anything beyond those two outstanding items.

SS Kshatriya: Yeah. If I can interject for a moment, I will definitely try to send it as early as possible. I'm already working on this.

Michael Young: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I'm confused because I was suggesting the 18 and you guys are suggesting a sooner date now.

SS Kshatriya: Sixteenth is as good. And better (unintelligible) - I think you can ask him on how it (is good for him).

Michael Young: Yeah. So is there anybody else whose materials we should be looking out for other than SS and Victoria?

Chuck Gomes: And Rafik also.

SS Kshatriya: Rafik is Rafik.

Michael Young: Okay and Rafik is one? Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Is that okay with you, Rafik, the 16?

Rafik Dammak: Yeah, that's okay.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Michael Young: Okay. So we've got the 16 as the final due date and everyone has agreed to at least try to get it in a little earlier if feasible. Any objections to that statement or do I have that right?

Okay. So it sounds like we're done with Item 2. Does anyone have any further comments on Item 2 of the agenda? Okay. So we're going to move on to then three and perhaps we could go through the sub-task leaders and ask them to give updates on their progress. Would someone like to volunteer?

SS Kshatriya: Yeah, SS.

Michael Young: Sure, SS. Could you start this?

SS Kshatriya: Yeah. I have already sent updates for this meeting that on (draft fee) I have received comments from key persons. And I'll accommodate them as far as possible.

And also so I'll reply separately but in general just the run of the mill working meetings as far as possible. That is those comments, which go against BGC (unintelligible) - or directions. I think that nobody (unintelligible) - even the persons who are suggesting (that they should not be there). So otherwise...

Chuck Gomes: I would totally agree with you, SS, that they can't go against the BGC recommendations but it probably should be the responsibility of the full work team to decide whether that's the case or not.

SS Kshatriya: That's okay. That's no problem.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

SS Kshatriya: We can deliver it first. We can give minority report if supposing everybody (prefers formally) then I'll give minority report.

Chuck Gomes: Keep in mind that there is no need for minority reports until you have some final recommendations from the sub-group.

SS Kshatriya: Yeah. Again let me tell you because Claudio is also there. So maybe sometimes things are more clear and sometimes probably when we talk it is more clear.

So uniformity does not mean that everybody (agrees on the) structure or rather everybody has agreed to follow uniform rules and somebody wants to defer. They will put it to the very charter follows, they get pulled by council, GNSO Council.

So if GNSO Council does not find it in order they will point it out or I mean this is to be decided probably later on or if just the (routine) (unintelligible) - consolidated report, then this if they are differing from uniform, this will be pointed out in their letter to the GNSO.

So uniformity will not mean that everybody should accommodate registrars (unintelligible) - it's not that. So but I mean (unintelligible) - should be accommodated will be accommodated. I think that's what nobody will object to.

But basically these will agree that if the BGC wants or ICANN or GNSO wants the uniformity, yes, we agree (absolutely) in uniformity. The (GNSO may require this). Okay. You can go ahead, please.

Michael Young: Does anyone else want to add to SS's comments?

Claudio Di Gangi: SS, this is Claudio. I'm not sure exactly if I followed. It sounded like you were responding to the last email I sent around.

SS Kshatriya: Yes because that's uniformity. You said no, it has to be different. I think we should at least agree that uniform and then comes the (key). One is like generalities, standards if there is a special case.

So they should follow this not yet precedent to that standard case. So uniformity is the first thing and once somebody can't agree then it follows as an alternative I mean reasonably.

Claudio Di Gangi: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Claudio Di Gangi: I sort of just have a different interpretation of it. From how I interpret the Board Governance Committee report, they were looking that they were suggesting that in certain areas there might be...

SS Kshatriya: It is to be read how and where it is written. These documents I will appreciate whoever drafts, they are very - so in Italy everywhere uniform, it is that time and again it is stressed.

And that will not fit all, that is just at least something is given for I mean just to the (ES) don't get along or it's possible.

Michael Young: Actually I don't think Claudio was done with what he was saying. Perhaps he can finish.

SS Kshatriya: (Unintelligible).

Claudio Di Gangi: Thanks. Yeah. Well, I mean essentially my thought was just that there might be areas that would be susceptible for uniform rules that all the...

SS Kshatriya: Yes. See, we are at the basic - we are recommending that there is even they are responsible. And we will when everything is made - there are people to object in others. I mean (unintelligible).

Michael Young: So can we please let Claudio finish what he is saying? And Claudio, can you tell us when you have completed your thought just so it's clear to everyone that you have said everything you would like to say? Thank you.

Claudio Di Gangi: Sure. So it was basically just that I thought in certain areas of group operations that the Board Governance Committee was suggesting that the constituencies and the different GNSO participants could develop common rules that all the groups would follow in certain areas.

What I was suggesting in my note was that membership criteria was not one of those areas essentially, that because of the diversity of interest and the participants who are involved, that that's just something that's sort of outside the scope basically of an area where we might develop uniform rules. That was basically what I was suggesting there.

SS Kshatriya: No Claudio. See, it says very clearly that this BGC report (unintelligible). It is there. I don't have right now to read it out.

Victoria McEvedy: I have the language if that would be helpful. I have the language here if it's helpful. I just note that on Page 43 - this is very short language so I'll just give it to you.

Constituency will develop participation rules for all constituencies that encourage openness, transparency and accountability. The rules must adhere to the following principles and then of course they give us the principles. So they are talking about rules that apply to all constituencies, so arguably that's common, is it?

Chuck Gomes: But they are not saying that all rules with regard to participation fall in the category where they have to be the same for everybody. Don't read more into it than it says.

So there is some flexibility there for us to determine which things apply and need to be uniform across all constituencies and which things may not.

SS Kshatriya: I have given enough room for this point.

Chuck Gomes: I agree, SS. I have seen that. I'm not arguing with you.

SS Kshatriya: It is very clear that phrase. Only thing is somebody can suggest a different phrase, which is more clear, I'm for that.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: So it sounds like everybody here is in agreement and the action item is if anyone has, as SS is saying, if anyone has suggested language that is even more clear than what he has attempted, so Claudio perhaps you have an idea, we should put the language forward to him.

Claudio Di Gangi: Yeah. I did actually. I suggested some language in my email. I mean it was just an improvement over what I thought SS had proposed. It's not that I'm objecting to I think what SS proposed is...

SS Kshatriya: I will again see Claudio's email, what phrase he has used. If it is clear then I'll use it. Otherwise I'll continue with this.

Chuck Gomes: One of the concerns I have and I'm speaking as OSC Chair right now, is that we seem to be making this way too complicated.

SS Kshatriya: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Now let me use this specific example with regard to membership. There has been some great interaction and that's what there should be and all viewpoints should be put forward.

But what needs to happen then is that I don't know how many members there are on this particular sub-task. I don't have that in front of me right now. But then with regard to this issue and the language, there should be an effort to reach rough consensus in terms of which language most of the people prefer.

If that position is if there is a minority position that can go with it. But the working team needs to decide on each of these issues what they want to put forward - hold on.

SS Kshatriya: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Put forward to the whole working team and then the working team can chime in once you have achieved that on your full report. And then the same process will be repeated from the working team to the OSC and on to the council.

So we're going to have disagreement and that's okay as long as we properly reflect the views of everyone in it and that we identify where there is agreement in first, the sub-task group or where there is not and so forth.

SS Kshatriya: Okay, Chuck. I agree with you. So I'll - I mean I'll write my comment, what I have put there and what Claudio suggested for others, Claudio, Victoria, Rafik and myself.

I'll circulate to us (unintelligible) - and that goes to the whole committee to see next steps. That will be okay I think,

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. And one more just word of advice is that keep in mind that the OSC and more importantly the council ultimately are going to have to support the recommendations that we have put forward.

So input from existing constituencies and stakeholder groups is really critical. That does not mean that the constituencies and stakeholder groups should be able to block things that are consistent with the board recommendations.

But keep in mind that that input that we're getting from the constituencies and stakeholder groups is very important because their representatives on the council are going to ultimately decide whether they agree with our recommendations or not.

SS Kshatriya: Mike, can I take one more minute to talk to Chuck?

Michael Young: Sure go ahead.

SS Kshatriya: I think in this committee how I do is that the member, whether he belongs to this either council or (committee) chair or he is a represented constituency or independent or someone like me who is only a person.

Our first in is GNSO improvements. And next comes getting feedback and third comes protecting the interest. I mean if I am wrong probably I may be definitely told to me by email. So I'll just listen whatever you want to tell me for this.

I won't - I mean I am working with this interest that first whether it is Chuck or Claudio or Victoria, that the first aim is GNSO improvement then the next, see if anybody has (unintelligible). And third that they see that whatever is being done, it does not go against the interest of their constituency.

And that's who I have seen and taken the view and I am working on that basis. If I am wrong then I will change the whole outlook of my work.

Chuck Gomes: I'm not sure I understand the question but let me try to respond, SS. Thanks. Ultimately the Board Governance Committee, which is really or the it's probably now switched over to the Structural Improvements Committee, will ultimately be the judge whether the GNSO implementation plans that are approved by the council and sent to them meets their recommendations or not.

So that's the ultimate test. It's not if the GNSO Council because of the interests of stakeholder groups and constituencies goes against what the BGC intended in their recommendations then they will put it back to the council. So the ultimate authority in this is the board itself in terms of whether what the GNSO Council ultimately approves for an implementation plan meets their objectives. And if it doesn't they're going to throw it right back.

SS Kshatriya: Well, that is (unintelligible) - one it opens whether this committee has been told this to look that part also and make all the compromises. (Unintelligible) - GNSO ICANN has given the responsibility to GNSO to improve itself.

And GNSO has grabbed that responsibility now to do improvements. This is just - I mean it's (unintelligible). So I think let us not talk on those (things). I mean our guidelines, what is this that we are looking for this improving GNSO, whatever information is given to us or guidance given to us or we are protecting our interests and to make improvements.

Victoria McEvedy: Could I ask a question?

Michael Young: Well, guys, we're going a little off topic here and I want to take us back to the agenda. If we want to circle back to this I think we (should have enough) time left in the call.

SS Kshatriya: Yeah. I think I should be (unintelligible).

Victoria McEvedy: Can I ask a question at some point? I could ask it at any other business but it's a procedural question that's just arisen from that exchange and (it requires a check). And I could ask it at the end of the call but it just arises out of that.

Michael Young: Victoria, I think it's probably best. I just want to make sure we get through our agreed upon agenda and then we'll circle back.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay.

Michael Young: So if you could hold that if we don't run out of time we'll certainly come back to it.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Thanks.

Michael Young: Okay. So SS, do you have any other updates?

SS Kshatriya: No. Only three I have and I'll update (unintelligible) - final document.

Michael Young: Okay. Perhaps Victoria, you would like to go next.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Fine. Well, I don't need to take very much time. I mean just to give you a status of thought on where we are on sub-task two, those people who are on the sub-task two list would already know this.

But basically we have a compromise draft, which has some agreement and there are some points still under discussion. I just noted on the list this morning and it really is - I'm agreeing with what Chuck just said on something that people shouldn't expect necessarily that they will succeed on every point raised.

It will depend on the rough consensus in the group. But I have to say if I can just thank all the members of sub-task two because I have been I have to say almost genuinely surprised at how constructive everybody's input has been. And I think we have made an enormous amount of progress.

And I don't see us taking a lot of extra time but I did note that people can't expect to necessarily without the support of the group, succeed in having every change they get adopted. But I would expect that maybe by our next meeting we might have completed our work in this group.

Tony Harris: Can I get in queue, Tony Harris?

Michael Young: Anyone else in queue? Go ahead Tony.

Tony Harris: Yes I agree with Victoria. We have made some interesting progress. The only thing I think we haven't done yet is take a good look and comment on Part 1 of the report.

We have done some - made some progress on the recommendations and there is a discussion on NXB but I think I would like to take some this week, which we have until the report is finalized, take the opportunity to maybe make some comments on Part 1.

Victoria McEvedy: Well, Tony, can I just answer that? I mean I think that's a really great point and I haven't looked into that.

I was hoping to finish our work on recommendations but I didn't plan to circulate a vastly, vastly different version of the surrounding language taking onboard the comments you have already made and something much, much briefer.

So if I try to do that early this week then you could comment again on the revised - I saw that as secondary trying to agree on fundamental recommendations but I entirely agree with you it's a next step. And I'd just like to circulate you have already given me quite a lot of input and I really take those points onboard.

So I play to circulate something quite different and much shorter and more condensed and less contentious than was the proposal. Would that work for you?

Tony Harris: Perfectly, thanks. I mean I'm happy you want to do that work. But that works fine for me. Sure. Thank you very much.

Victoria McEvedy: Thank you.

Michael Young: Victoria, it's Michael speaking. So I have come up with some suggested edits following the concerns raised back and forth. I have some suggested changes that might satiate everyone's concerns. So I'll forward them to you today as well and perhaps some of them will be useful.

Victoria McEvedy: Thanks Michael.

Chuck Gomes: It sounds great the progress you guys are making. Good work.

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah. I think it's interesting when you get into it and when you start having conversations. A lot of these things...

SS Kshatriya: Michael, I have not followed what you said please.

Michael Young: In simple language, SS, I just said I had some suggested edits after reading everyone's concerns and comments. It gave me an idea on some modifications that might address everybody's concerns possibly. So I'm going to send that over to Victoria for everyone to look.

SS Kshatriya: You'll be sending something?

Michael Young: That's correct.

SS Kshatriya: You'll be - yeah. Very nice. Good. Yeah.

Claudio Di Gangi: This is Claudio. I just had a question. I guess it's toward Victoria as sub-task leader. As we're striving to reach consensus on these different recommendations and hopefully we will all along.

But if we're unsuccessful to, if we're unsuccessful in doing so, just so I understand the plan, is it to then basically to send along with I guess if there is maybe an area where we haven't reached consensus, will we send forward two separate recommendations?

Or are we only thinking about sending forward recommendations where we have reached consensus?

Victoria McEvedy: I think Chuck's answer really probably deals with your points earlier because I think at the end of the day it's quite likely that we'll get rough consensus on - we're likely to get a majority and a minority position, aren't we, on language?

Or we're likely to get a majority, a certain amount of people supporting a certain amount of language. And then there may be a minority who are not in favor of some particular language I imagine. And then I think from what Chuck said, that's supposed to all go forward to this wider working group for the discussion.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, Victoria, you are correct. And it's okay for example, in the case where there is not even rough consensus, it's your - I mean you can decide whether you want to just drop an issue like that and not include it or if you think it's important enough to carry the multiple views forward and the supporting rational, that's okay too.

The more information - as this moves up levels this more information and rational that is provided, the easier it is for the next group of people to evaluate and chime in. And they may decide, well, I don't know that we can come to consensus on that.

So they may recommend dropping that or they may say, well, here is our view. So in other words when we get from the sub-task group to the working team it may be that the working team leans towards one position more than another whereas the sub-task group because it's a lot smaller may have been split. So does that make sense?

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes it does.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Michael Young: Okay. Any further comments? Victoria, does that complete your update?

Victoria McEvedy: Yeah it does. Thank you.

Michael Young: Okay. We're missing somebody. I know we have one more update. Please help me.

Chuck Gomes: (Christa) or Tony maybe on 1.3?

Michael Young: Thank you. Tony? I didn't hear (Christa) on the call. Tony, maybe you could?

Tony Harris: Hello?

Michael Young: Yeah, Tony. Go ahead.

Tony Harris: I'm sorry. I had to step away from my desk just a moment. Could you repeat what you were expecting from me?

Michael Young: Do you think you could do the update on 1.3 possibly?

Tony Harris: Now?

Michael Young: Any time. That would be great.

Chuck Gomes: Tony, is 1.3 ready? Are the recommendations?

Tony Harris: I'm sorry. I'm trying to sort out the different emails I've opened here to keep up with everything. That was the one that was with (Christa) for PAC.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Tony Harris: Well, we don't have any further work on that. That is completed. So as the last draft was circulated by (Christa), that's what's standing. We don't have to do - as far as I know we have no work pending with that.

Chuck Gomes: So that's at the work team level now?

Tony Harris: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And sorry for not knowing that but there is so much stuff going on I'm having trouble sorting it out.

Tony Harris: No. That's okay. I was confused too because I keep forgetting which is 1.3 and which is 1.-whatever. There are so many numbers and dots around.

Claudio Di Gangi: Tony, could you...?

Michael Young: We're all suffering from that, Tony.

Claudio Di Gangi: Tony, this is Claudio. Could you remind me what the crux of that document was?

Tony Harris: Yeah. That concerned the methodology to have a database of all members in the stakeholder group available for public information and how that would be put online, handled, how privacy concerns would be addressed and who would be actually doing the technical work on that, which would be ICANN.

Claudio Di Gangi: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I don't know if other people are in the same boat as me and it may be sitting in my email that I'm trying to catch up on over the last couple weeks. But it might not be a bad idea if that was re-circulated to the work team making it clear that this is now for work team review and comments.

I probably can find it if I search through mine. But if anybody else is like me with everything going on now that wouldn't hurt to just re-circulate that.

Tony Harris: I think Olga did that already but I'll take your point, Chuck, and we'll do it.

Chuck Gomes: She may have, Tony.

Tony Harris: Yeah. It's just wild to keep track of everything.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Well, you know it well.

Tony Harris: Okay. I'll get in touch with Olga and we'll do that.

Michael Young: So if we're done there I'll move to next steps, which I think we have been defining as we go along. We have got some action items. So far with - well, maybe who has actually been taking minutes? I guess I should - Julie, you have often done that. Are you taking minutes?

Julie Hedlund: I am actually taking minutes. They are not going to be nearly as detailed as they were when I was first working with the team. But I'll get the salient points out to everyone after the call.

Michael Young: Okay. Thank you. So I mean just for short-term review this week I think we have got some work coming in. Victoria indicates she is moving forward as did SS in their areas.

And for Friday I'm just going to reiterate we are going to have our minority reports in no later than Friday, which leaves Olga and I to make sure that the 1.4 and minority reports are bundled together and prepared to be passed along. And I think that's everything I've got. Does anyone have - have I missed anything?

Julie Hedlund: Michael, this is Julie.

SS Kshatriya: Yeah. You are missing Michael...

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry. Go ahead SS.

SS Kshatriya: Yeah. Still also sub-tasks one and two, due dates for receiving or this is working team comments I see. Okay. Okay. So sorry - I thought it was the due date for us to send you. Due date was already given with those Thursday, last Thursday?

Michael Young: Right.

SS Kshatriya: Sorry - my (mistake). I thought I was to give some dates. Sorry. You can go ahead.

Michael Young: Okay. I would like to after the call try and get a hold of Olga and ask her if she has got anything in terms of next steps that we failed to address on this call.

But if no one has anything further they want to try and define at this time we'll open it up and circle back to Victoria's question and anything else that someone would like to open.

Julie Hedlund: And Michael, this is Julie. If we could simply, I just wanted to make a note about when the next meeting would be. Some of us are traveling to Seoul. So maybe if that could go on to the list as well.

Michael Young: Let's deal with that now. It seems to me I am one of those people. So the next scheduled meeting doesn't make sense then for us. I mean we have two choices.

We can depend on the meeting in Seoul and skip, which will take us two weeks to the next meeting, a little bit more than two weeks to the next meeting. Or we could plan to do one next Friday, which given that we've got some work coming in this week, might not be a bad idea.

Maybe we don't need quite 60 minutes; maybe it could be a 30 minute check in. What do people think of that?

Julie Hedlund: I agree with that. I think it's a great idea to do Friday.

Michael Young: Okay.

Claudio Di Gangi: It's okay for me.

Michael Young: All right. So let's do our regular time then that we have been doing on Fridays but let's try and articulate it as a 30-minute call since we're going to have another meeting just a week later.

SS Kshatriya: Just Michael, one minute. What was the date? Julie, do you have calendar?

Glen de Saint Gery: It's the 16 of October. Friday, 16 October.

Julie Hedlund: And this is Julie. Is there a meeting scheduled for Seoul? And is there a time?

Glen de Saint Gery: There is indeed, Julie. If you can just bear with me one minute while I pull it up, I'll tell you when it has been. It is on Sunday, 25, and the constituency operations work team with Olga as Chair is from 9:00 to 11:00 on Sunday, 25.

Julie Hedlund: Is that UTC?

Glen de Saint Gery: Pardon?

Julie Hedlund: Sorry, Glen. Is that UTC or is that local?

Glen de Saint Gery: No, that's local time. And UTC is midnight unfortunately.

Claudio Di Gangi: Glen, are you saying the 25?

Glen de Saint Gery: The 25, yes. It's a Sunday.

Michael Young: That Sunday.

Glen de Saint Gery: Sunday and it is in Bellevue. The room is called Bellevue, B-E-L-L-E-V-U-E, beautiful view.

Victoria McEvedy: How was that time selected? Did we do a doodle or how did we get that time because is it going to suit everybody?

Glen de Saint Gery: Well, Victoria, it's very difficult when we have our face to face meetings to find a time that is going to be good for everybody. We have to take into account the room space that we have and all the other meetings that are going on.

Michael Young: Yes. Victoria, Glen was very tactful in the way she said that. I think the more accurate thing is it's impossible.

I tried to play with it to find time that would work for the people in the different time zones that weren't going to be able to be there in person and I literally couldn't. Whichever way you went you had terrible times for some of the people unless you're in the Asia Pacific region.

Victoria McEvedy: Do we need two hours though? Why would we want two hours?

Chuck Gomes: That's a good point.

Victoria McEvedy: I mean certainly to be on a call at midnight for me, I certainly wouldn't want to be on a two-hour call but I might be able to make a one-hour call.

Chuck Gomes: And that's really our - excuse me for jumping in, Michael, but that's really our call. We can make it whatever time we want up to the time we have the room. So that's a very good point.

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes because the next meeting is 11:00. So you could make it (a different) time. Olga asked for that time and then can I also just give you the time of the OSC call?

No, sorry - the operations steering committee that you will be chairing, Chuck. That will be from 15:30 to 16:45 in the afternoon in the Emerald Room.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And by the way everybody, this was all on if you go to the ICANN site and click on the Seoul meeting, you can click on the schedule and find the details for any day, any time - not just this one but other things as well.

Glen de Saint Gery: And also these are on the GNSO page. You will find wikis and where we find our for this meeting for example, wikis. And you will find GNSO Council and if you click on there you will find all the days in Seoul for the working meetings, the Saturday and the Sunday.

In addition, I will be sending out probably early next week what I call the GNSO-related schedule where all the meetings that are important for the GNSO will be marked apart but it must of course be read in conjunction with the big schedule.

But it does give you an idea of for example, the specific breakdown of the Saturday and the Sunday meetings.

Michael Young: Thank you Glen. That's very helpful. So I just want to make sure that we give Victoria a chance to follow through on her question before we wind up the call. Victoria?

Victoria McEvedy: Thank you Michael. Thanks very much. It's just a very short question and it's Chuck, it really just arose out of that exchange you had. And just for my own here, I'm trying to learn the ways of ICANN.

So it's only for my own understanding but are you - the OSC, are the members of this working group who are also members of the OSC participating in this group in any capacity other than ordinary working group members on this group?

Chuck Gomes: Good question. I'm trying. You can tell I do wear multiple hats like most of us do but my intent of participating on this team was to participate as a

representative of the registry stakeholder group, okay, previously the constituency.

So that was my primary role on this team. As it turns out we keep having questions that go to process and so forth that so I switch my hat and talk as OSC Chair or council member or whatever. So hopefully I have made it - well, I guess I haven't really always made it terribly clear.

Hopefully it's been fairly obvious when I'm speaking as OSC Chair rather than stakeholder group representative. But my ultimate purpose was to participate in this team as a representative of the registries.

Victoria McEvedy: Well, it sort of answered my question but really because I'm afraid I'm a lawyer, I'm asking you in what formal capacity you participate? What is your formal status? So I think you answered that with the first part of your answer, wasn't it?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Victoria McEvedy: Your formal - your participating quae stake holding group representative for the registries.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That's correct.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Fine. Look, I just wondered how these two - (it happens) quite a lot, doesn't it?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That's an excellent question.

Victoria McEvedy: It happens quite a lot so obviously, as you said, there is duplication of council members sitting on all kinds of things, aren't there? I mean there is no bar to council members participating in working groups and what have you?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Victoria McEvedy: But does it impact - you mentioned you touched on this - does it impact how they have to recuse themselves when the issues come up before?

Chuck Gomes: Well, there is no specific requirement to do that but like I communicated, all of us have statements of interest even on this working team. And so in this particular case it's probably the easiest for me to answer to.

And I have thought this through over the last couple of weeks. One of the things I will do is I will raise the question with regard to for example, Task 1.4 in the OSC meeting that we have and administratively coordinate the discussion but not color it with my own views.

I will answer questions and Julie will be there. She can answer questions. Hopefully some of you will be there as well. So by the way, all of these meetings are open for participation. None of them are closed. So anybody can participate.

The OSC membership itself is obviously going to have to make a decision. But that meeting will be an open meeting, not a closed meeting.

Victoria McEvedy: Right. Because I mean it just strikes - I mean I'm just wondering if there were rules. I mean people can obviously vote twice. You're going to be able to vote on these recommendations at three different levels.

Chuck Gomes: I probably will not vote on this and defer to the rest of the team on that. So I mean that will be my personal decision and that's what I plan to do, to not do I guess is the best way to say.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Look, thanks for answering that, Chuck. Just like I said from my view, I'm just trying to learn how these things operate.

Chuck Gomes: And keep in mind we're in a process in the GNSO where everything is changing. So it creates some awkwardness that all of us are experiencing and will be until all of these GNSO recommendations go forward and are approved by the board and we have got a lot of these things lined up.

So we're having to do a lot of this as we go. And that's part of the cause, probably a big part of the cause of some of the confusion.

Victoria McEvedy: Okay. Thank you.

Michael Young: All right. Do we have any other new business?

Claudio Di Gangi: Michael, I don't. I just had a question. So we're having a call in two weeks and then we're having a meeting on the 25?

Michael Young: Yeah. We're having a call next week.

Claudio Di Gangi: Next week?

Michael Young: Yeah, a short one. We're going to see if we can do it within 30 minutes.

Claudio Di Gangi: Right. Okay. Great.

Michael Young: And then the next one after that will be the Seoul meeting.

Claudio Di Gangi: Got it.

Michael Young: Yeah. All right. Is there anything else from any of the other members of this call? Hearing nothing I will ask to wind up the meeting. Thank you everyone.

((Crosstalk))

END