

**GNSO  
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC)  
Constituency Operations Work Team  
06 November 2009 at 14:00 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 06 November 2009 at 14:00 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-20091106.mp3>

On page:

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

**Participants present:**

Olga Cavalli - work team chair – NCA  
Michael Young – Registries – vice chair  
Rafik Dammak – NCUC  
Chuck Gomes – Registries  
Claudio Digangi - IPC  
Tony Harris – ISP  
Krista Papac – Registrar c.  
SS Kshatriya - Individual

**ICANN Staff**

Gisella Gruber-White - GNSO Secretariat  
Rob Hoggarth – Policy Staff

**Apologies**

Victoria McEvedy - IPC  
Zahid Jamil – CBUC  
Julie Hedlund

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you very much. Gisella, good morning, good evening everyone. For those who are in Seoul, I hope you have (nice trip) back home. For me was very long but quite good and safe. So luckily I'm back at home.

I sent you an agenda for our call today. We had a very intense exchange of emails yesterday. And I would like to talk about that in our last item of the agenda, Number 6.

And I would start by Number 1 which is Rob do we have something new from the Board or some activity that you want to share with us? If we have something or we can skip this point.

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry to interrupt Olga. Would you like a quick roll call?

Olga Cavalli: Oh I'm so sorry. Yes. Thank you so much. I'm so sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning. Good afternoon. A quick roll call. On today's call we have Olga Cavalli, Rafik Dammak, Chuck Gomes, Claudio Di Gangi, Tony Harris, Krista Papac. From staff we have Rob Hoggarth and myself Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from Zahid Jamil, Victoria McEvedy, Julie Hedlund. And if I could just please remind everyone to say their names when speaking. Thank you very much. Over to you Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Gisella. My apologies for forgetting the roll call. Is someone joining? No. Okay. I was asking Rob if he had something new to share from the Board or from some other (unintelligible) activities.

Robert Hoggarth: Yes. Thank you Olga. There was some activity at the Board level, at the Board meeting on Friday of Seoul week. A relatively brief item that the Board handled on its consent agenda that acknowledged that the reconfirmation of existing constituencies was still an item that the board had to resolve.

I it would be useful, I can read the resolution into your minutes for the benefit of those folks who didn't attend and what I'll do is also send around a link to the working group members.

The item was Section 1.3 of the Board's agenda called approval of updates to the (listening) GNSO constituency charters. And the resolution reads the Board directs the staff and the community to continue their collaborative efforts to substantially improve the existing GNSO constituency charters to reflect the GNSO improvements adopted by the Board and to seek Board reconfirmation of the existing GNSO constituencies by the Nairobi ICANN meeting.

The Board otherwise extends the time periods for constituencies to update their charter documents as described in the bylaws Transition Article 20 Section 5.3 and ask the staff to coordinate those efforts as soon as practicable.

Some of you may recall that when the GNSO Council approved its transitional plan to seating the new Council, there was an expectation that the existing constituencies would do the bare minimum update to their charter documents to reflect the new stakeholder group's structures.

That was done by a couple of the constituencies. A couple of them were not able to complete that work. So the Board gave us some flexibility to give those groups some additional time to complete that work.

The important substantive piece of the resolution for purposes of this work team is that the Board acknowledges that the reconfirmations

have not yet been completed and that the Board is still going to be substantively reviewing the existing charters and any, you know, updates that have either been done or will be done by the constituencies going forward.

That was partly as a result of some dialog with the staff where we identified the work of this work team, the fact that you guys were continuing your efforts to establish some general playing field levelers in terms of expectations for constituencies and stakeholder groups.

So the Board is aware of your efforts. And they're setting a timetable for the Nairobi meeting for a lot of this work to take place at the constituency level. And so, you know, essentially that takes I think some of the immediate time pressure off this group but also acknowledges the important work that you're doing.

And I hope that you all take note of the fact that the input that you provide that's ultimately reviewed by the Council and goes up the chain of command here will certainly have an impact on revisions to the charter document and to the reconfirmation process in addition to the other work that you're doing. And (I can) take any questions on that.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Robert. Let me clarify the timetable. So this revision to the charter of the constituency and stakeholder groups could go on until Nairobi. Is that the deadline for that?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes. The specific language says the charters should be improved or updated and the key here is to seek Board reconfirmation of the existing GNSO constituencies by the Nairobi ICANN meeting.

So I think, and I have not personally gone through and put together a timetable yet but sort of working back, I would think that, you know, the constituencies would have some usefully - they could have some useful guidance by the January timeframe. That would probably work to everybody's benefit.

Obviously earlier than that would be better in terms of specific input and feedback, you know, that's the work product of this team. And just a (self-edit) if I can say when I set up the chain of command, that was a colloquialist's (net) on expectation of how this is working.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So in terms of our - of our work, we could perhaps think about generating a good time for sending recommendations and outcomes to the GNSO and to the Board. Is that time could fit in their needs?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes. And that's something where I think the benefit of having you a Chuck in on these calls would be useful in terms of, you know, agenda setting and if the new Council goes forward, you know, trying to work through timeframes with expectations of longer agenda announcements and things like that.

Since the Council's keeping the three week interval between meetings, I would think that you'd have, you know, several opportunities between certainly now and the end of the year to pass things on to the Steering Committee and then on to the Council. But you guys will have a better sense I think in the coming weeks of the - how the Council is going to be operating (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Rob. Any questions to Rob?

Chuck Gomes: Chuck.

Olga Cavalli: Go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Rob, I think it'd be helpful if you clarified what constituencies still have to have their charters revised and approved.

Olga Cavalli: Robert.

Chuck Gomes: Did we lose Rob?

Olga Cavalli: Robert. We lost him.

Woman: His line disconnected I'm afraid.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

SS Kshatriya: Olga, this is SS. I have just joined about a minute ago.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: SS, Good evening. How are you? Welcome.

Chuck Gomes: Well what I'm getting at while we're waiting for Rob to call back in is that I don't think that all - I think some constituency charters have been approved if I'm not mistaken. But it'd be helpful for us to know which ones are still waiting to be revised and approved. The...

Tony Harris: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, is that Rob?

Tony Harris: No. No. I'm sorry. Didn't mean to interrupt. This is Tony. I have a comment on that when you finish.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Just the last thing I was going to say Tony and then I'll turn it to you. The - regardless of whether any charters have already been approved, the - any recommendations that we make and that the Council passes and the Board approves will ultimately be reflected in additional revisions to the charter.

So at the same time, I agree that if we get some of our recommendations in before some of the charters are finalized, that could facilitate the process and maybe minimizes the changes that are needed later on.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Chuck. Tony.

Tony Harris: I just wanted to say in responding to Chuck's asking about which constituencies would still be pending approval that we are - we are about to submit our - to resubmit our charter to the - to the Board.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Tony.

Tony Harris: In other words, we have not gone through that process - we have not completed that process yet.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Tony Harris: That's the ISP constituency.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Tony. Rob, you're back?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes. My apologies. Just sitting here at my desk. I don't have to be in far flung part of the globe.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Rob, did you hear my questions? This is Chuck.

Robert Hoggarth: I did not but hearing Tony's answer, I can imagine you asked who has submitted and who has not.

Chuck Gomes: Correct.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: It was a little different than that. Which constituencies still do not have approved charters? In other words, are still being worked.

Robert Hoggarth: Well technically they're all still approved. Remember the reconfirmation process was a system set up by the Board where they said gee, if we're going to be accepting new constituencies, we should certainly review the existing constituency charters.

With the creation of the stakeholder group and the registry constituency and registrar constituency morphing in the stakeholder group and the Board approving those charters, those are sort of off the



table at the moment. That leaves the remaining non-contract (unintelligible) constituencies subject to the reconfirmation process.

The NCUC and the ITC submitted their changes but because of various workload and other issues, the (ISPCT) and the commercial and business users constituencies were not able to submit their documents before the October quote unquote deadline established in the transitional bylaw section.

So the Board acknowledged that and said okay, let's give them some more time. They didn't commit to a specific timeframe but based upon feedback I got from Philip and Tony Holmes, they figured it would only be a matter of two or three weeks after Seoul to get that work done.

Once those come in, we'll go through the review process. But again, these are only supposed to be very bare minimums to basically make some changes to acknowledge and reflect the fact that they're now, you know, providing Executive Committee members to their stakeholder groups to things like that.

So they weren't supposed to some real substantive changes. Although I have been advised by (the BC) that they are working on some broader changes to their charter document. All those changes that are submitted up and before the reconfirmation would undoubtedly be reviewed by the Board. That's probably a much more long-winded answer than you expected.

Chuck Gomes: No. That's helpful. Thanks.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Rob, I have a question. What if a charter of constituency or stakeholder group is already approved by the Board and we then submit our recommendations. Should be changes made if necessary to this charter is the process that we follow?

Robert Hoggarth: That's - yes, that's correct Olga. If the work team comes up with a recommendation that the Steering Committee and the Council then sign off on, the recommendation and expectation to the Board would then be that these would then be (unintelligible) of all the existing constituency and stakeholder group charters. They would then need to go through another round of, you know, reviews and updates.

I think the hope that the Board has in setting that Nairobi timetable is that we could dovetail both efforts. You know, you guys would be finished with your work team recommendations. Those could go through the process and be approved.

And then as the charters are updated for the reconfirmation, the work team's input to that could be dovetailed in and it could all be approved at once rather than putting the constituencies and stakeholder groups through constant rounds of administrative changes or updates to their charter document. I think that's the hope of the timetable. But again, if it doesn't work that way, then I'm sure the Board would be understanding in terms of setting additional timetables for the...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Robert Hoggarth: ...constituencies and stakeholder groups to make their changes.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Rob. Any other question for Rob? Great. Number 2 in the agenda is some comments about our face-to-face meeting we had in Seoul. We met in Sunday morning. There was some of us had worked - Krista, Tony, Claudio help me. I don't have the list with me.

It was a quite good meeting. Unfortunately we didn't have in phone SS or Victoria and other - was Michael also. We reviewed all the work done so far by the different working teams. I will refer to that in other point of the agenda. But in general we set up some due dates for revision of different parts of our document.

We agreed that the - that SS document was going to be reviewed until the 13th of November. Then we had several comments about Victoria's document on Subtask 1.2. I will refer to that later. But in general, the work team suggested many changes to Victoria's document and perhaps going again to revision by the sub working team.

That was the general comment. And also we talked about Subtask 1.3 with Krista there. And I think she has already received some comments in our email list about her document. We still have some time to review so that Krista's document - this is in revision by the whole working team like SS document.

About document 1.4, we already submitted it to the OSC and it was already reviewed in the OSC meeting that was held in the same day in the afternoon. (Is this) okay? It was the same day. Sunday. Sunday afternoon I think.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That is correct.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Any comments in relation with our face-to-face meeting that I am forgetting? Someone that was there and wants to comment something else?

Tony Harris: Olga, this is Tony. I just had to rejoin because I have this great line in Argentina. It has the echo. So I'm being, you know, (pasted) off every five minutes.

But we're talking about our working team meeting, right?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I was...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: Not the (OHC). Our own...

Olga Cavalli: ...commenting about especially for SS and some others that were not present maybe to exchange some comments and some feedback for our meeting. So if you want to add something.

Tony Harris: Well no, actually I would be jumping the gun because when we get to the actual subtask reports, I do have comments there. But this would not be the right time.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Okay. Any other comments in relation with our face-to-face meeting? The echo is quite strong (I mean). Anyway, in the meeting we had a new - a new Council member present who expressed interest in being a member of our working team which is Debra Hughes. Debra has been recently appointed by the Board to the non-commercial

stakeholder group. And she works for the Red Cross in the United States.

In general there was no opposition to - for her being part of our working team. I personally think that she has a very interesting experience. Perhaps she can add some of this experience to our next task to be - that we have to work on which is outreach.

But anyway then I asked Julie to put her in the - in the list and some of the (unintelligible) think that we achieve yet so far because Glen is in (convocation).

Chuck Gomes: Olga, this is Chuck. Can I comment on that?

Olga Cavalli: Sure, please. Comment Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I also think that Debra, as I said in a couple emails, that Debra can certainly serve as fresh eyes to the things that we're finalizing right now. Not at the subtask level so much but at the...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...working team level.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I totally agree with you Chuck, yes. But I mentioned this because it was some concerns before of adding new members or old members that were not active participating and again and bringing old issues.

I think that the spirit of newcomers into the group should be having the commitment of reviewing all the documents and being constructive in

making comments to the present documents, present draft documents, and of course be part of the new tasks that are going to be developed. But I totally agree with you Chuck. Yes, I agree.

I don't recall any other specific important things from our meeting.

Krista Papac: Olga, it's Krista.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Krista please go ahead.

Krista Papac: One thing I wanted to bring up is we briefly discussed the idea on Subtask 1.3 of possibly submitting that ahead of the other subtasks...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Krista Papac: ...because of the work that's being done on the communications team as well.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Great. I was going to bring that in - then in Point 4 of the agenda. But it's a very good comment. Who's this?

Krista Papac: Oh, it was Krista again. I just said oh, okay, sorry. I didn't realize that...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: No, that's - but it's perfect because it is - it was something that we spoke in the meeting. And I think that Krista made a very good point during the meeting as to her document is pretty much reviewed by all the working team members and sub working team members. We still

have some days to review it. But I think that in general we all agree with it and I think it's a very good document.

We thought about the possibility of sending it to the OSC as a separate document and also I think Krista you had meetings with communications and working (group), right?

Krista Papac: Correct.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. And...

Michael Young: (Michael) joining. Sorry to be late.

Olga Cavalli: Hi (Michael). Good morning.

Michael Young: Morning.

Olga Cavalli: We are in Number 2 of the proposed agenda. Item 2.

Michael Young: Okay. Well I don't have a computer in front of me. That's...

Olga Cavalli: Yes. You told me.

Michael Young: ...part of my problem. So sorry.

Olga Cavalli: This is why I told - we are talking about the face-to-face meeting that our working team had Sunday morning.

Michael Young: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: And Krista was just reminding me that she raised the idea of presenting her sub working draft document 1.3 as a separate document especially considering that there is a working team working on communications and she already had a meeting with them. And we discussed that. So she was right in this point now and I think it was very good idea.

And perhaps you remember something else that we talked in that meeting. We spoke about how the rest of the documents were going. We set up some due dates for revision for the whole working team. There were some comments about Victoria's document for being revised again by sub working team. In general this was discussed in the meeting.

Michael Young: Right.

Olga Cavalli: And someone else want to add something? Julie sent some minutes after the meeting. I hope that you had the chance to see them and some next steps to be followed. I think I have already gone through them in my - in my talk.

Krista Papac: Olga, it's Krista again.

Olga Cavalli: Krista. Go ahead please.

Krista Papac: Thank you. The - back to Debra Hughes joining the group. I didn't - are we still on that topic too? There was something I just wanted to add there as well.

Olga Cavalli: You want to comment on that?



Krista Papac: Yes. So...

Olga Cavalli: Please go ahead.

Krista Papac: Thank you. So I agree with Chuck and I expressed, you know, my (forwarder) acceptance of Debra into the working team and I think, you know, Chuck's comments are - I further agree with the additional comments he made as far as her contribution at the working team level and with Task 2 but not so much at the subtask level.

I did because of a little bit of the back and forth on the list. I just went to the charter real quick. And one of the questions I - or I have a question about something in here, which is under work team membership, Number 2. Number 1 talks about there should be a minimum of one GNSO Councilor, preferably two...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Krista Papac: ...to serve as liaisons. And I'm not sure if I understand this correctly but in the second bullet point is the number of counselors be limited to at the most three to maintain separation between the team's work and the Council's oversight role.

And I don't know if Debra - I think I understand who the counselors are correct and what that means. That would put us at four counselors, would it not?

((Crosstalk))

SS Kshatriya: That's I think - there are four on the (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Sorry SS. I didn't get your comment.

SS Kshatriya: ...the Council. That appears to be the (unintelligible) members.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: I have - I have difficulty in hearing you SS. So the question that Krista has (unintelligible) is how many GNSO Council members we have in the working team, right?

SS Kshatriya: Yes. What I'm telling there are more than five in - more than four in (unintelligible) could be up to six.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Yes. I have also been reviewing the charter this morning and have any other comments on this?

Robert Hoggarth: This is Rob, Olga. If I can interject.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. There's a - there's a horrible echo. I cannot even hear anybody. But if you speak slowly, that's okay.

Robert Hoggarth: My understanding is right now you have three. There's Olga, Chuck and Zahid. And so Debra would be a fourth and that would not I guess based on the charter, that would not be consistent with the charter.

Olga Cavalli: So the charter has a limit for the number of Council members? I have it here. Let me review it. Perhaps we should discuss this among our working team. I do think that the new members can bring new

experiences and knowledge that could be helpful. So I'm not opposing to having Debbie or other new members. In general I'm for participation. Not against new members. But should we discuss this among our working team as how many GNSO Council members should we have or if what is in the charter is right or we should change it. Any comments?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Go ahead please. Yes. Sure.

Chuck Gomes: The intent on that language in the charter was to - was I think at least two fold. One of them was is that trying to make sure that Council members don't, you know, get involved in too many things. So by limiting the number, it helps that goal of making sure that counselors aren't involved in most activities and therefore spread too thin.

But secondly because the Council has an ultimate approval mechanism, the idea as was stated in the language that Krista just read is that, you know, you don't want too many counselors because they're ultimately going to be the ones that review it.

Now, and so - first of all let me say that in terms of a - of a charter (something changed) that the request of the working team - sorry about the echo. The...

((Crosstalk))

SS Kshatriya: It's SS. I'd like to comment.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Just let me - let me finish please SS. Now, because I actually have two roles in review processes both at the OSC level because I'm Chair there and I'm on the Council, in fact I'm Chair there now too, I would be more than happy to back out of regular membership of this group and that might be cleaner if I do that as well. So I certainly will put that on the table for the working team to discuss.

Olga Cavalli: SS, you want to comment?

SS Kshatriya: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Krista Papac: Olga, I'd like to get in the queue please. It's Krista.

SS Kshatriya: I'll make a number of points and they are all in the (unintelligible) plans. This will not be connected. One is I'm not against Debbie joining, one.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

SS Kshatriya: Second point is that when some (unintelligible) are there or charters are there or guidelines are there, we must follow it.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

SS Kshatriya: If we want to - if you want to go out of that, it must be approval or changes, whatever so that we should go not changing this just to make a (unintelligible) permanent. I mean if we want to go against the charter, let the charter be amended.

Third point is that basically I'm opposed to even a single Council member being here. If it's particular to GNSO, I'm not sure whether I can (unintelligible). Maybe Robert is hearing. I'd like him to comment.

My understanding is that outside ICANN no single (unintelligible) of Council or Board members because what happens in this working team they will - there is a - this - I mean like no, (freedom) is not there.

And I'll tell you and the fourth point I'm making is that (unintelligible) has been telling that she's a (unintelligible) constituency but that is not true. The charter very clearly is recognized there are Council members, there are constituency (unintelligible) that could be or are taken independent members.

So here the big question that exist that constituency members they are - and is very clearly written in the charter, they are like protecting interest of their constituency. If that is so, who is (bringing the GNSO improvement)?

And what then who's responsible then (GNSO improvement)? So these are my comments. This would be not necessary that we discuss here. But that's what I felt about. But when it comes to Debbie, I welcome.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

SS Kshatriya: And suggest that Chuck not good just to (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, what was it SS? I didn't get it.

SS Kshatriya: Chuck should not leave just to accommodate Debbie.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you very much.

((Crosstalk))

SS Kshatriya: That will not help.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you SS. Do you want to comment Rob? Is it you?

Robert Hoggarth: I'll get in line after Krista.

Olga Cavalli: It's Krista? I don't hear very well and I have a big echo. So my apologies if I am missing your names and your voices. Go ahead Krista, please.

Krista Papac: Thank you. So this is Krista. I just want to be clear in why I bring it up and I again want to stress that I also welcome Debra to the group and think that she brings a lot of value. And I just - because of the challenges we've had with topics, issues, et cetera, within this working team, I feel like, you know, we need to be cognizant of what the - of what the charter does say.

And if we're going to change something about that or not follow it, we should follow the proper procedures to, you know, sort of prevent some of these challenges from continuing to create problems that really just end up being distracting.

And so I don't want to leave the impression Olga or with the work team that, you know, I'm opposing Debra in any way. I'm just trying to keep us from getting in trouble for not following our charter, if you will.

Olga Cavalli: You're right Krista. Thank you for bringing this up. Who else want to comment?

Robert Hoggarth: This is Rob. I wanted to clarify one of my earlier statements and address a couple of SS's points if I may.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Go ahead please.

Robert Hoggarth: First I misspoke. There are currently - when I said there were currently three Council members, there's actually four. The four presently on the list are Olga, Chuck, Zahid and Rafik. So, you know, with Rafik's appointment, that now makes four. Tony Harris was a Council member and is now off.

So it's still four which is permissible on the charter. Again, you guys can seek to amend your charter by approaching the GNSO Council and asking for that revision to be made if you want to admit Debra.

But again, that - the other point I'd like to make is in Section 2. It says team membership guidelines. So I guess you guys could choose to interpret that as purely guidelines and not as a specific prohibition on more counselors. But I think if you were to do that you'd want to be clear that you're doing it and indicate why you think having more than

four helps to maintain separation between the team's work and the Council's oversight goals.

I didn't completely understand your third point SS. But I did want to address your fourth point. And that is that the GNSO Council was given specific responsibility by the Board as part of the GNSO improvements process to engage in this activity.

The charter does note the importance of having individuals from the outside community and from the broader Internet community participating in the work teams. But as a function of the GNSO Council, this work team and the Operating Steering Committee will put together specifically at the Board's direction where the GNSO Council is supposed to be taking a collaborative role along with the staff for implementing a number of these improvements.

So I just wanted to clarify that. You know, the - I think the Board's thought was that it was important to have a combination of broader interests participating in the improvement effort but it was very important for the existing Council to provide guidance and insight primarily I think because of the experience and the fact that many of the improvements and changes were actually recommended by members of the GNSO community.

We're just trying to get this process as smooth and efficient as possible. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Rob...



Tony Harris: Olga, can I get in queue?

Olga Cavalli: Sure Tony, go ahead.

Tony Harris: Yes. I'm just rejoining for the seventh time. I'm on a paid call now. I just want to say that I object to what SS just said. I don't - I don't think it's accurate to equate constituency members with an effort to stall all improvements on the - on the GNSO. That's just not true. So I'd like to leave that on the right court.

Olga Cavalli: Any other comment?

Chuck Gomes: Chuck please.

Olga Cavalli: Go ahead Chuck, please.

Chuck Gomes: It's two things. Number 1, my offer to remove myself doesn't mean that I wouldn't still be - couldn't serve as a resources as the - as the working team needed. So please understand that. So you could still contact me, consult with me. If I can be of help, I would still be of help.

But for appearances and I think there's some validity to what SS is saying in that particular regard especially in my role since I'm Chair of two oversight bodies over this group. I think he has a - has a good point there. But I would still be willing to - you could still contact me and ask me questions. I'll still help however I can just maybe in a little different role, maybe in my Chair role of the OSC.

So now, secondly, just would like to balance one thing that I - that I think I understood SS to say and it would not make sense in this particular group to have only newcomers, only people that are not part of a constituency or stakeholder group. Because ultimately what we need to be able to come up with in a - at least a rough consensus approach is recommendations that are broadly supported for implementing the improvements.

The Board has already defined the improvements that need to happen. We just have to come up with the implementation plans. And if we try to implement those without adequate input but from both outside people and inside people, we'll never succeed.

So we need to try and find ways to implement the improvements that as best as possible accommodate the needs of all stakeholders. That includes existing constituencies and stakeholder groups. And it includes those outside those groups. So we need to work together to make that happen.

One last point. If we were to eliminate, which I think I heard SS say, all counselors on this, that would mean that we would not have anybody from the - from the commercial and business users constituency. And I don't - you know, we tried for a long time to get somebody from that constituency and I'm very happy that we succeeded finally so that their interests can be involved in our - in our work.

And so I would not want to have any constituency, stakeholder group not represented on this group.

Krista Papac: This is Krista.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Krista, go ahead, please. Go on Krista.

Krista Papac: Actually - yes. Actually Chuck that also brings up another - makes me realize something else that if - frankly I'd hate to lose Chuck - having Chuck on the - on the working team. But if we don't have anybody else on the registry stakeholder group if he didn't participate - is that correct?

Chuck Gomes: We do. (Michael).

Olga Cavalli: We have (Michael).

Krista Papac: Oh (Michael). That's right.

((Crosstalk))

Krista Papac: Sorry (Michael).

Michael Young: That's okay. I'll get over it.

Krista Papac: Never mind.

Claudio Di Gangi: Olga, this is Claudio.

Olga Cavalli: Claudio. You're finished Krista?

Krista Papac: Yes. I'm finished. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Okay. Claudio go ahead.

Claudio Di Gangi: Yes. I just wanted - just on the topic of whether we need to change the charter, I just wanted to follow up on what Rob said which is that I think this is kind of scoped out in the charter as guidelines and it pretty clearly says in that - in that section that these are recommendations for how we constitute the work team.

So I don't think we need to - or I don't think we'd be required to change the charter if we wanted to constitute the team a little bit differently than how it's recommended in this area.

Olga Cavalli: Rob, this interpretation by Claudio, do you think it's feasible: It's okay? I agree with it but maybe it's from the - my common sense idea.

Robert Hoggarth: My point Olga in noting that they were guidelines is that they are still guidelines. And my comment was that if you were choosing to exceed the guidelines that you explicitly acknowledge that you're doing that and explain why doing so would be beneficial and why, you know, you think that it would be better - you know, there's a guideline that says your - the guidelines exists because you want to maintain separation between the teams working the Council's oversight role.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Robert Hoggarth: So if we explicitly decide that you're going to exceed that, then you need to come up with a rationale, a legitimate rationale that says yes, we understand that there is a potential imbalance there but we think

that the benefits outweigh the concerns here. And I just think you all have to be explicit in doing so.

It seems to me though that you have a potential solution with Chuck, you know, taking a back seat, still being invited to participate in the calls when necessary in a Chair role. I think you may want to revisit the request with Debbie to see if she still is interested in participating or not.

I think you still have the real issue there of, you know, coming in late to the game but also providing some very useful objective perspective having not served on a constituency before and being brand new to the Council process.

So I think, you know, again you just have balancing issues on both. I just think you need to be clear if you are going to exceed the guidelines.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Rob.

Chuck Gomes: Can I add something to that Olga? This is Chuck.

Olga Cavalli: Sure Chuck. Go ahead, please.

Chuck Gomes: Rob pointed out something that I hadn't thought of before. Debbie is really not an insider like some of the rest of us are, like me, okay. So that's a very good point. She is coming in from the outside. So that's a real healthy thing.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Chuck. And this is exactly what I was going to say. Although she's a Council member, she has been appointed by the Board so she - and she brings new experiences outside ICANN process. Somehow yes she belongs (to be) part of a constituency or stakeholder group. At the same time, she brings some new ideas from outside.

Also let me tell you that I'm a Council member but I don't work in any specific constituency. (Unintelligible.) One mathematical question. How - following our charter, how many Council members should we have on our working team if we don't change it? Three, four?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I think it's best two, three.

((Crosstalk))

Robert Hoggarth: It says the number of counselors be limited to at least - to at most four to maintain separation between the teams...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: And if Debbie comes, we are five?

Robert Hoggarth: Correct.

Olga Cavalli: I agree with some of the working team members that I would like to have Chuck on the working team. I really appreciate his knowledge and his involvement and for me being Chair of the group, his

involvement has been very important and his experience. So I would appreciate if he remains part of the working team.

But would let the group decide if we make changes in our guidelines and draft and charter or if we have - we'll remain with only four Council members in our working team. I think we should discuss this in our email list especially considering that there are some working team members that are not in the call right now.

Any other comments about this? I will...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Who is this? (Michael?)

Michael Young: This is (Mike). Yes. I'd like to...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Yes, please (Mike). Go ahead.

Michael Young: ...suggest a couple...

Olga Cavalli: I didn't hear you. Sorry. Go ahead.

Michael Young: That's okay. I'd like to suggest a couple of stepped actions. I think, you know, as Rob said, the first thing we should do is Olga perhaps you

could start - before we get too carried away, just start and checking with Debbie again and to make sure she's still interested.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Michael Young: And - right. Because otherwise all this discussion - if she's no longer interested, all this discussion is definitely interesting but it serves no purpose at that point because the issue's off the table.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Michael Young: If she's still interested, you know, my preference would be to see - if you could take a shot at drafting a justification letter.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Michael Young: Rather than going back and trying to revisit the charter itself, just we have some - it's a guideline versus a hard stop. So if you could try drafting a justification letter based on the arguments that Debbie's new, you know, to the whole environment really, the whole ICANN environment, I think is a very good one. And therefore that benefit outweighs potential harms. And then send that out to the list and we could all review it and comment on it and say if we agree with it or not.

Chuck Gomes: By the way, (Michael), I think that Debbie did confirm her interest in her latest emails yesterday.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. She did yesterday.

Michael Young: Perfect.



((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So then we should go to the step of drafting that letter I think.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I can send an email anyway and reconfirm that. That's easy. And I think it's a very good way to proceed. If the rest agree, I'll do that. I'll draft a justification letter and contact Debbie just to reconfirm that she is willing to serve in our working team. And we'll review the checks that I'm preparing the list.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Someone wants to work with me in drafting?

Krista Papac: Olga, it's Krista. I just have a point of clarification/question for Rob.

Olga Cavalli: Sure Krista. Go ahead.

Krista Papac: So Rob you said that the limit is four in the charter.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Guideline of...

Krista Papac: I'm sorry, the guideline, excuse me. And I agree with this whole discussion that it's just a guideline. But I'm seeing - I just see the Number 3 so I'm trying to understand where my misunderstanding is.

Robert Hoggarth: Krista, I'm reading - I pulled up the Wiki. I'm reading from the OSC constituency operations work team charter. If I'm reading from the wrong one or it's been changed, I have the approved Version 13 April '09. Looking at Section 2, Bullet 2.

Krista Papac: You know what, I had clicked on the wrong link so I apologize.

Robert Hoggarth: I'm delighted you brought it to our attention to begin with to make sure that the working team is adhering to its rules and guidelines. But yes, that's what I'm reading. I'm reading Section 2, Number 2. And again, it reads the number of counselors be limited to at most four to maintain separation between the team's work and the Council's oversight rule.

Krista Papac: Thank you for clarifying that.

Michael Young: Olga, just on volunteering. I'm happy to help you with that letter.

Olga Cavalli: Oh great. Thank you very much (Michael). I'll prepare first draft and share it with you. And thank you for - I know this discussion was brought by the idea of including Debbie or not. But as we have several new Council members, we may have this circumstance in other moments in the near future. So I think it's - I'm glad to have this space for reflecting on this ideas and this possibility.

So I'll draft this justification letter and I'm sharing with (Michael) and I'll share with you in the list. Thank you very much. Any other comments on this issue? Ah, I lost the agenda. I'm trying to open the...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: The face to face OSC meeting. Face to face OSD meeting...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Oh. Face to face OSD meeting. I think it went very well on Sunday afternoon. Perhaps Chuck you want to brief summary of what happened with. We presented - it was reviewed that 1.4 draft document for (in service) (unintelligible) services. It was quite well received.

We worked on edits suggested to it. And they - all the OSC thought it was a very useful document. Perhaps Chuck, you want to add something to this.

Chuck Gomes: Sure. A few key points I think need to be communicated out of that meeting if anybody didn't listen to the MP3. And but that may be useful for some of you if you haven't.

The - we had good attendance in the - of the OSC team there which was very good. One of the first things I want to comment on is related to what we were just talking about and that's the conflict that exists between counselors and so forth who are also on the working team.

In that meeting and please correct me if my - if I'm wrong in the way I assess this. But I tried to - because of the fact that I was on the working team and I had - I was the one who recommended that the - that the Subtask 4 recommendations be moved forward independently, I played a very quiet role in that meeting other than just chairing it.

And the discussion I tried to pretty much absent myself in terms of opinions, not sharing my opinions and so forth to avoid the conflict situation. So I hope that I did that effectively. I certainly tried to. And it was the rest of the OSC membership that really made the decisions. I did not venture an opinion in that regard in that meeting.

Now, secondly I want to - one of the issues that came up was the general question, not specifically related to Subtask 4 about whether it's appropriate for some of the recommendations to be put forward independently if they're ready to go and have working team support.

And the OSC pretty much unanimously, I think it was unanimous, agreed that that that's an appropriate thing to do. And so this - I bring this up now because Krista asked that question earlier in our call. And so it's very - that is an appropriate thing to do. The OSC, you know, unanimously supported that concept.

So if we get other tasks that aren't in - overly dependent on other tasks that aren't finished yet, then the OSC thought that it was fine to send those forward independently. So I think that answers Krista's question that she asked earlier. Does somebody have a question for me? Okay.

The third thing, with regard to Subtask 4, the toolkit of services recommendations as has already been pointed out, the OSC made a few edits to the document itself and not the recommendation. And again unanimously supported sending that to the Council for Council action and that step has been taken.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Chuck and especially bringing the issue of the OSC finding useful that we can submit our outcome as a separate

document. Krista, correct me please if I'm wrong. We still have one week more to - for the working team to revise your document. Is that correct.

Krista Papac: That's correct.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So we have one week more. Some of us we are - I already have reviewed it and have also commented. Please do review SS document and Rafik's document. I think that SS already received some comments from Claudio, from Chuck, from someone else that I'm forgetting because I reviewed it yesterday; from Krista also.

So we have these two documents for working team revision. Once we have them reviewed by the working team, perhaps we can think about and decide whether we want to send them to the OSC as separate or not. The document prepared by Krista and Tony could be used for the communications working team. So think about it. And let's review those in the next week.

Chuck Gomes: Olga, one suggestion in that regard.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: I think it's fair to give the subtask team a little bit of time to review the comments and suggested edits that were made and then come back with a revised version.

Olga Cavalli: Well, I think that should be done after the due date for working team comments.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: I think they should have like two weeks more.

Chuck Gomes: Absolutely. What I was - what I was reacting to was you suggested deciding whether to send it to the OSC. That would be premature, so.

Olga Cavalli: I totally agree. I just wanted to - we have in mind that and try to think about it if that's a good idea or not especially considering what the OSC found as useful. That was my comment. My apologies if it was kind of putting pressure on the working team. It's not the intention.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: So I think that somehow I move to Point 4 about Victoria's document. She's not on the call today. And there was many comments in the face-to-face meeting about further revision in the sub working team about her document.

So also she sent an email yesterday to the - to the list that she was not willing to work in the working team anymore. I think we should contact her again and see if this is the case. And if she confirms this, we should find a new leader for working team 1.2. But again, I think we should get a confirmation from here.

I've been revising the charter and I didn't find any specific comments about who - how - what to do when someone wants to leave the working team. If there's a specific procedure or something like that, I

don't know. Rob, if I am missing something in the charter or you want to point something about this?

Robert Hoggarth: No. I think at least as far as I'm aware Olga, all the guidelines and rules are focused on who's eligible, who participates and how they participate, not in how they leave.

Olga Cavalli: Because what would be the procedure with (just concern) if someone wants to leave the working team, it's just confirmation to the - amendment to the working team list or what else.

Chuck Gomes: Olga, can I comment?

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: And it's not on the charter specifically because I think Rob's...

Olga Cavalli: No.

Chuck Gomes: ...right that it's absent there. But general practice in the GNSO and all of our organizational documents has always been that, I mean, there's nothing to prevent anybody from resigning at any point in time. So in other words - so I think it's fair just based on general GNSO practice to assume that someone can do that. I think your idea's good to confirm with Victoria that in fact - is she in fact resigning and if so, then you're right. We'll need to get a new leader then.

Robert Hoggarth: Olga and Chuck, one other point I'd like to share. There is a provision in the current charter that refers to working group member status. And note that members can be classified as active or inactive

members and provides a process for evaluating whether someone is active or inactive based upon their degree of participation in meetings.

So that's one option for somebody who may because of other job duties or whatever have to step away for a period of time. But it doesn't address, you know, actively resigning from the group because that would just be email alerting everybody to the fact.

But I would hope that in any working team that folks to the maximum extent possible would be discouraged from, you know, leaving and perhaps just going on inactive status if it is an issue of work or anything.

If it's something else though that has to deal with consensus or disappointment with the work team's progress or other work, I think that efforts should be made to deal with that. Again, I think the ultimate working group model of policy development is to embrace differences of opinion and trying to find a way to bring in all the various voices whether they be consensus view or minority points of view.

And so I think all work teams should strive to minimize people leaving because of disagreements and find a way to incorporate those thoughts and ideas.

Chuck Gomes: Just to add on to that - this is Chuck again. The - should Victoria in fact confirm her resignation on the group, we should absolutely still, you know, recognize her contributions in any final reports we produce and any minority opinions or other opinions that she had there. So just because she resigns doesn't mean that she disappears in our report.



Olga Cavalli: No, of course. I think that (Michael) and myself could try to reach her by email or perhaps by phone and probably confirm with her and see if she really doesn't want to keep on working with us or if she want to keep participate in the group. (Michael), perhaps we can do that in a private email. You think that's okay? Or in the list. What would be the right procedure?

Chuck Gomes: Private.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Okay. It's one hour and a few minutes. We should finish our call. I think we pretty much covered everything. I was hoping that we could perhaps talk to (Anica) too but we didn't have the time.

But anyway, I think we had an interesting conversation about participation in our working team and new members of that. That it's I think having new members in the Council brings new ideas and these issues are going to rise someday so it's good that we discussed them today.

Any comments? Any other last questions?

Chuck Gomes: Just one last...

Olga Cavalli: Go ahead...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...comment with regards to my member ship in the group. It really did put me in an awkward situation in chairing the OSC meeting because I - because of my membership in the group. And that is compounded

that like SS pointed out, I think in his comment with regard to my Chair of the GNSO Council as well. So I reiterate my offer to still support the group upon request but not be a member. And I think that solves the problem that you have.

I assure you that I'll help however I can upon request if the group decides to go that route. But I think it is cleaner.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Well I mean Chuck; it's (Michael) speaking. I mean I think - I mean we really value I think your comments on the documents in particular and your experience. So I mean I think it's adequate just for you to recuse yourself wherever you feel conflicted. And if that's fine, if you're doing that on most of the decision points, that's okay.

But that still doesn't prevent you then from actively commenting on the documents and providing ideas and feedback, which I think are - always been very well balanced.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you (Michael). Chuck, it's - I mean it's your decision. If you really think it's - that you want to...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I will go - I will go with the wishes of the - of the working team. Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I just want to make sure I would be comfortable backing away from membership and providing support on a request basis if the working team supports that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. We will keep on thinking about this in the working team and thank you very much for letting us know your - what you think about this. Any other questions or comments? I will prepare some minutes and really next steps in the next minutes and I will share them in our work - email list.

Have a nice weekend and something that we should discuss in our list is the next date for our conference call considering that some of us are traveling to Egypt. So I'll put that in our - in my report and then get some feedback from you to see when would be a good date and time.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. Thank you very much for your participation.  
Thank you

Man: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Have a nice weekend. Bye bye.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: Bye bye.

END