

**GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC)
Constituency Operations Work Team
04 December 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 04 December 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-ops-20091204.mp3>

On page:

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

Participants present:

Michael Young – Registries – vice chair
Rafik Dammak – NCUC
Chuck Gomes – Registries
Krista Papac – Registrar c.
SS Kshatriya - Individual
Victoria McEvedy – IPC
Zahid Jamil – CBUC
Debra Hughes - NCSG

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund
Gisella Gruber-White
Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies

Olga Cavalli - work team chair – NCA

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's call we've got Rafik Dammak, Chuck Gomes, Zahid Jamil, Krista Papac, Michael Young, Debra Hughes, SS. From staff we have Julie Hedlund, Gisella Gruber-White. Glen DeSaintgery will be joining shortly. And we have apologies from Olga Cavalli.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking.
Thank you very much. Over to you Michael.

Michael Young: Thank you. Welcome everyone. So we have a fairly short agenda today. But I'd like to start by doing an agenda bashing and seeing if anyone has any further items.

I just sent a email to the list before the - about five minutes before the call. We've got four items to cover here. So before we begin, is there anything that someone would like to add?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Haven't seen your email yet. Has anybody else seen it?

Julie Hedlund: Michael, this is Julie. It's not showing up on the list unfortunately.

Michael Young: All right. Well let me read through the items then and if people feel there's something missing they want to add, they certainly can. And I'll do another call for items at the end of the agenda again just in case someone thinks of something during the call.

So SS had put out a couple of questions really for discussion. One, has the OSC considered minority views on Subtask 1.4? Two, has the OCS attached minority views while sending its recommendations to the GNSO on Subtask 1.4? And where should we look for that?

I have added three, discussion of timelines for finalizing Task 1 work; and four, volunteers for scooping Task 2 work.

(Victoria): This is (Victoria). I just joined the call to let you know.

Michael Young: Hi (Victoria).

(Victoria): Hi.

Michael Young: So (Victoria), did you catch those four things that we've got on...

(Victoria): Sorry.

Michael Young: Okay. I'll do it real quick. SS had a couple of questions, both around Subtask 4; whether or not the OSC has considered minority views and have they attached those minority views when sending its recommendations to the GNSO. If so, where to look for it.

Number 3 was discussion of timelines for finalizing Task 1 work. Number 4 was volunteers for scoping Task 2 work. And do you have anything else to add or does anyone else have anything to add at this time?

(Victoria): Thanks.

Michael Young: Okay. I will ask that question again after we get through these four items. So let's go ahead and proceed. Chuck, it seems to me you might be able to - might be one of the best candidates here to address the first couple of questions.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And if I recall correctly, the first question had to do with the...

Michael Young: Consideration of minority views on Subtask 1. Has...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Michael Young: ...the OSC considered?

Chuck Gomes: And the OSC members discussed the minority views in the in person meeting in Seoul and elected not to include them verbatim because of their length in the actual report but rather to provide a link to the - to those minority positions.

So they are - a link is provided to them in the report that the Council will be voting on on the 17th.

Michael Young: Okay. Thanks Chuck. Does any - SS, you threw these questions out. Does that answer them adequately for you?

SS Kshatriya: Yeah. What I understand - I mean that they - OSC discussed it and they decided not to include into their recommendations but give a link and which GNSO will see it.

Now, I'm not sure whether GNSO - when they take up this item as an agenda (item), on the surface they will come to know that there is a minority view on this item.

((Crosstalk))

SS Kshatriya: ...link being all right. But that - see many time we don't open the links. So I mean how is it in the Council (voice)?

Chuck Gomes: It will state in there that there are minority positions and provide a link. If somebody doesn't look at it, they don't look at it. We can't force people to do that.

(Victoria): Can I - can I...

SS Kshatriya: Okay.

(Victoria): ...ask a question?

Michael Young: Right ahead (Victoria).

(Victoria): Is this - this seems highly unusual to me to exclude minority reports at any level and rather unprecedented I would have thought. I haven't been able to

get hold of the OSC minutes. Are those minutes publicly available? Does anyone know?

Chuck Gomes: The MP3 was publicly available.

(Victoria): It is. Are there precedence for this removal of reports?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Precedence - nothing was - nothing was removed. The OSC had to prepare a report for the Council for consideration of the recommendations and by the way, I will repeat again that I did not take part in that decision. That was a recommendation by other members of the OSC.

And there was concern expressed that the minority reports were significantly longer than the report itself, which they found - they found no precedent for that either.

So the decision was made by the group without my vote in that regard to provide a link. And there's lots of precedent in GNSO reports for doing that in cases where the information is lengthy.

Michael Young: (Victoria), I was at that meeting in person and you can see this in the MP3 but I can attest that Chuck did very carefully step back and that decision to provide a link rather than keep everything together was driven by the other members.

(Victoria): I wasn't making any suggestion about Chuck. I'm just - it's just, you know, just a practice that is - I'm not familiar with.

Chuck Gomes: One of the things (Victoria) that not only the Council but the Board as well within ICANN in the last year or so has been trying to do is to make documents that need to be reviewed and decisions made upon them more

concise, because of the tremendous number of documents that people at the Board level and even at the Council level have to review in doing these things.

So part of it is related to that particular kind of general objective. The idea is not to minimize the total information because that's available but what happens in working groups over time that work over a period of months or sometimes even years is that documents get so cumbersome that it becomes almost impossible for those who are having to review all these different ones to keep up.

(Victoria): I mean if a summary of the minority report could have been included, that might be one thing but removal of minority reports obviously raises some issues I think. I think the GNSO's own goal is to always ensure that minority views are heard. And anyway I think there are dangerous precedents with not attaching minority reports. So I think it's a real issue of principle.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: So (Victoria)...

SS Kshatriya: Michael, it's SS. I'd like to offer (unintelligible) (Victoria).

Michael Young: Sure. Go ahead. Go ahead SS and then I'd actually like to say something afterwards.

SS Kshatriya: Yeah. Okay. Just what Chuck mentioned, well, I mean I appreciate what is the precedence and all that. And he talked about minimizing some things. So I do feel that once it is not given - this is not given - it is not written there, it is just a link. So importance of (unintelligible) was (never introduced). I mean that's my view.

Michael Young: You know...

SS Kshatriya: So it should be - it should have been - even if it's not read now, that once they read agenda, I mean Council members know that yes, it is there - there is a minority report (for this). Then if they are interested, they would look into the link or something like that.

Michael Young: Right. So SS, (Victoria), I can see your point and I think that there's definitely some validity to it. Perhaps the way to approach this going forward is to make sure that when there is a minority report at least in our group that the minority report starts off with a short paragraph or short summary statement or executive (unintelligible).

And - so that there's a natural piece that could be included and a natural more lengthy piece that could become a link for things that we forward in the future. That would like encourage exactly what you're talking about which is include a summarization of the minority position.

(Victoria): Right. I'd like to review that MP3. I think it's a good point you make Michael. I mean I think it's just a real concern because of the work that we're preparing now. If we can expect to see those minority reports excluded, basically scrubbed by the OSC, then I think that would be a matter that we ought to be raising a formal concern about.

So I do think that something needs to be - I think we need to (determine) on some kind of way to manage that situation...

Michael Young: Yeah.

(Victoria): ...not reoccurring.

Michael Young: Sure. And to be - you know, I can't remember - a couple of people actually support this but I can't remember who actually, you know, brought it up first. But the whole group was - to Chuck's point about the body of the minority

reports added up to a great deal more writing content than the actual report itself.

And I think that's what the group got really hung up over and felt was kind of confusing about the document as it was. There was so much content to the minority reports, they felt that it actually detracted from people understanding what was the actual report; what were the actual recommendations versus what was the minority component.

So having, you know, a little executive summary or paragraph like that that they can extract and include in the main body of what goes forward and then have a link for all that content I think is probably a nice compromise.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Has Glen joined the call yet? Not yet. Okay.

Michael Young: What do you think about that?

(Victoria): I mean I'm still uncomfortable with it. I mean (SCS)' minority report and my own were very similar. We had obviously discussed the issue. So I mean if anything might have been appropriate, it might have been to come back to us and ask us to perhaps combine or summarize, you know.

I think there are appropriate ways to deal with these things. I note your suggestion of a summary. I'm rather uncomfortable about that because there's always a potential for selective editing.

And anyway, you say there are precedents from GNSO. I think it's a very, very unusual act for the OSC to take. And I myself am very surprised about it. I'd like to look at the MP3 and understand why it was done. I'm not - I'm not - like I said, I suppose I'm coming from a legal perspective.

But it's obviously very uncomfortable because the only people can selectively edit statements and what have you. And I thought the idea was, you know, as we've been discussing in this group, there's much information even about minority and majority positions should go up to fully inform the groups about us and at least, you know, save time or at least put all the issues on the table.

So, you know, I really regard it as a very serious issue and I think that - I would hope that we're not going to see it again. And it would - also I don't know how the other group - members of this group feel. But it questions the - it raises issues about whether it's worthwhile participating if one's views will be removed if they are not in the majority.

Chuck Gomes: Julie, I'm having trouble with the length to the final report that the Council's acting on. Do you have there handy the wording of the reference to the minority report?

Julie Hedlund: Chuck, actually I just went on to the GNSO Council work space and I know that we had sent to Glen the most recent version of the toolkit of services, that is the version that came out of the OSC and was sent around to the Council on November 5.

I know we had sent that as the document for Glen to link on the - on the Council agenda. But as I look at the Council agenda right now, the document that is linked is the document that was submitted to the OSC, which has the minority report. It's dated 18 October '09.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: You have the latest though, right?

Glen DeSaintgery: This is Glen.

Julie Hedlund: And let me just pull that up.

Glen DeSaintgery:Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery:This is Glen. That report is on the front page of the GNSO Web site as well.

Chuck Gomes: Well the link isn't working for me Glen. I don't know what's going...

Glen DeSaintgery:Isn't the link working for you?

Chuck Gomes: I just sent you an email on that regard. I clicked on - I click on that. I'll tell you what I get. Page not found.

Glen DeSaintgery:Okay. Well I'll go and look. There was a problem this morning Chuck though with many of the links on the GNSO Web site when I looked at it. And I got that for practically every page that I looked for. So there might be something and I will alert the IT department about that right now.

Chuck Gomes: (Technical). Thank you very much.

Zahid Jamil: This is Zahid. Can I just - (can I say something)? Is it possible for someone to just circulate that document right now so we can just quickly look at it a minute - a minute or so?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That's what I...

Glen DeSaintgery:I'll do that for you right now.

Zahid Jamil: All right.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks. Thanks.

Michael Young: And shall we move on? While the document's coming, shall we go through the rest of the agenda items and then circle back again so we can keep momentum.

Man: That's fine.

Woman: Yes.

Man: I'd agree with that.

Michael Young: Okay. Let's do that. So I want to talk about a timeline for finalizing Task 1 work. (Victoria), thanks for sending out a rework of your document yesterday. I haven't been through it yet. I apologize. But it looks like we're getting close to having that work completed.

Perhaps we should go through the subtask leaders and just have them report on their status and what they think is remaining. (Victoria) shall we start with you since you worked - I was just citing your work?

(Victoria): Sure. Sure. Well I'd be very - I haven't heard back from anybody for about three rounds now. So I'm assuming although I might - I'm not sure that - people can (unintelligible) to jump in. I'm assuming that people don't have further comments at this stage.

If people do have further comments, then I'd like to hold a call and discuss them within the subtask group. But if it's - if the silence means that people don't have anything else to add, then it would - it would seem that we might be - have reached a certain point with that work.

Michael Young: Well (Victoria), I suggest a good idea might be to try and end off the work with a call just to make sure everything's clean. I'm happy to participate next week if you can organize something.

(Victoria): Okay. Great.

Michael Young: I think we're almost there. Anything else (Victoria)?

(Victoria): No. That's it for me.

Michael Young: Okay. So...

Chuck Gomes: Is there a doodle needed on that for the subtask members to...

((Crosstalk))

(Victoria): Good idea.

Chuck Gomes: ...everybody (unintelligible).

(Victoria): Yeah. That's a good idea. I'll circulate one after this call.

Michael Young: And SS, your document looks like it's pretty wrapped up as well. SS, are you there? I believe we lost him.

SS Kshatriya: Excuse (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Oh there you are.

SS Kshatriya: Hello. Can you hear?

Michael Young: Yes. We can hear you now.

SS Kshatriya: Yeah. So once my task you're discussing is over, I'll be leaving the meeting. That's one. Second, I won't be (want editing) for Task 2. Third, coming to Subtask 1, the final one is circulated and I got some more suggestions from

Chuck which I'll be incorporating. Maybe if necessary I'll be in touch with him in person about supposing if any differences there.

And then this week that updated was (of) the final recommendation. I'll circulate that (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: So fantastic.

Chuck Gomes: It looks like Zahid sent another suggestion too. Is that correct Zahid?

Zahid Jamil: Yeah. I just sent that. It's just I don't know if I've missed the boat on it. But if it can be incorporated, that'd be great.

SS Kshatriya: Did you send an email to me?

Chuck Gomes: It just came SS.

Zahid Jamil: Yes an email.

Chuck Gomes: It just came.

Zahid Jamil: Yeah. Just now. Just now.

SS Kshatriya: I've not seen. I'll look into (unintelligible). Yeah. Sure.

Chuck Gomes: And SS, did you have any - did my comment - my edits I think were all just editorial except for one with regard to the executive team and the executive team being open to everybody. That didn't make sense to me. Did I articulate my concerns there from a practical point of view clearly?

SS Kshatriya: I'll speak on executive team. Now executive team does not come into Subtask 1. So I'm just - once - it does not mean once a person has like working (unintelligible) and this and that. It does not mean that he will have working (unintelligible) for every type of committee.

So I mean these committees are formed. It's very each like executive body. So once we discuss into executive body, you go there. So my recommendation just does not touch that part at all.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Well it does...

SS Kshatriya: So I need comments on that (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: It does say though - let me - let me actually go to the actual language.

SS Kshatriya: Yeah. Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: It says that - hold on one second. That's not the one I guess. Where is it? Let's see - hold on. I'm trying to find the exact language. The way I interpreted it, maybe I interpreted it incorrectly was that it said that any member of a constituency or stakeholder group could participate in the executive team.

SS Kshatriya: Participate or something like that is there.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

SS Kshatriya: So...

Chuck Gomes: And they should be. I mean...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...being eligible - if you're saying being eligible to be on the executive team, I have no problem with that. The way I interpreted it, it sounded like everybody - any member could participate in the executive team regardless of whether they're on the executive team or not. And that seemed kind of unpractical.

But now...

((Crosstalk))

SS Kshatriya: No. No. It's not...

Chuck Gomes: ...if you're saying that they have to be open, it's different.

SS Kshatriya: Yeah. Is eligible to be executive committee member. Not executive committee work by 1.2. So I'm not (unintelligible) into that.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay. So we're - it's probably just a matter of fixing the wording. So the, you know, so that's fine. So we can work on that offline.

SS Kshatriya: Yeah.

(Victoria): It does use the word eligible I would just note. So it's kind of raising eligibility on the face of it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Right. And I have no problem with that. It sounded like if everybody in the membership wanted to participate in executive team, they could from a just a day-to-day manner. Not being - eligibility is fine.

Michael Young: So sounds like we've wound that up on the rest of the discussion. Chuck you guys are going to work offline?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And with Zahid's too I think we can do that offline.

Michael Young: Okay. All right. So let me try and wrap up what I've just heard in terms of timelines. Sounds to me like we should be prepared and I'd love to hear if anyone disagrees with this.

If we do another meeting in two weeks, we should be prepared to move realistically 1.1 - well, SS' work and (Victoria)'s work. It should be - it should be possible for the larger group, the larger team to clear it and say that we're complete with that.

Man: Yeah.

Michael Young: Does anyone disagree with that at this point?

Chuck Gomes: Well we're a little bit further ahead on Subtask 1.1 because the larger team has already reviewed it.

Michael Young: Right.

Chuck Gomes: That we're not quite there yet with Subtask 1.2. So that may take a little bit longer.

Michael Young: Well, you know, I'd really love for us to try and push and see if we can get 1.2 done for the next - for the next meeting. I think it's a worthwhile target. Set a goal. We certainly won't make it.

(Victoria): Yeah. I would agree with that. And I welcome that comment Michael because, you know, it's been a year now, isn't it. I myself would particularly like to, you know, complete my work and be able to move on to other things.

So anyway, perhaps we'll try and schedule the call very early next week with the subtask group and see then if the wider group could make comments.

Michael Young: Perfect. Okay. So let's try for that anyways. And if we don't make it, we don't make it but I would dearly love to see - because I think we're within a hair's breath at this point of wrapping up Task 1 altogether.

Krista, can you talk about 1.3 because I think we're there with 1.3 as well?

Krista Papac: Yeah. I have received comments - this is Krista by the way. Received comments from Chuck and I think Claudio might have sent supporting comments. But yeah, we're almost all the way done with 1.3.

One of the comments that Chuck provided which I think makes a lot of sense, I'm just not really sure how to address it, is in respect to this database. I mean I'm not sure if everybody's read the document. But the database administrator, the database, GNSO members, who that should be.

You know, what kind of authority they should have. Those kinds of things and I'm not - I actually - if anybody's got suggestions on how to approach that or where to find (those kinds of answers), that would be helpful. I just don't feel like I'm qualified to come up with that kind of an answer.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. One of my concerns on that was - and this is Chuck speaking. One of my concerns on that is that the - it sounded like we're giving the database administrator an awful lot of authority and that typically doesn't happen.

The database administrator is fulfilling what someone else or some other group makes decisions. That was I think as I recall my concern there.

Krista Papac: Yeah. Chuck, it's Krista. I mean I completely agree with you. I think it's a great point and a - and a very valid concern and needs to be addressed. My issue is not that as much as I just don't even know how to - I mean I've never structured a database in my life.

So I - while I agree, I'm not sure how to - how to address the issue or how to solve the problem and/or, you know, where's a good place to go get help in solving that problem.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Krista, I can - I can take a look at the document from that perspective. I do have a lot of experience in that regard.

Krista Papac: Okay. That would be great. Thank you.

Michael Young: Yeah. I'll volunteer to do that and try and get comments back to you. It's Friday. I'll try and get comments back to you Monday.

Krista Papac: Okay. That'd be great. Thank you so much Michael. And then the other piece of 1.3 is coordinating with the CCT, the Communications C Team. And - because they're actually in the process of making their recommendation for - it's improving the GNSO Web site itself as part - as part of their recommendations I believe to improve communications.

And so the database of course is something that will appear on the GNSO Web site. We certainly want to make sure that we are included in that - in that plan that they're putting together. And so I've been coordinating with them.

And also, just as a reminder, we mentioned in (where were we last), Seoul, that it might make sense to submit this Recommendation 1.3 at the time or, you know, earlier than the rest of the recommendations since we still have Task 2 to work on so that it is included with the communication team's recommendation related to the Web site.

Michael Young: Let me ask the loaded question here. Does anyone have any objections with trying to submit all the task - the remaining Task 1 work prior to really

proceeding with Task 2? Do people feel that Task 1 and Task 2 need to be tied? Because I would see them as quite separate pieces of work really.

(Victoria): Yeah. I would agree with you Michael.

Michael Young: Yeah. So I'm not hearing any objections. So I'm going to take that as - that the team is okay with that. So Krista, it looks like - looks like we have support then to - so if we wrap up, if we can take your document and also target it for the next meeting, two weeks from now, you know, everyone really pitches in and gets their comments in and we can work through any remaining issues. We have a chance to submit all the Task 1 work prior to the holidays, which I think would be a great goal.

Chuck Gomes: And Michael, that's very consistent with the opinions expressed by the members of the OSC in Seoul that the idea of separating Task 1 and Task 2 and submitting - go ahead and submitting Task 1 first. Because they thought it's very helpful to spread out the review of all these things.

And of course from a Council point of view, it's very helpful too because the Council's going to be getting just huge numbers of GNSO improvement recommendations in the next few months. And spreading them out a little bit makes it a little bit more doable.

Michael Young: Well I can certainly see that addressing that - those recommendations and understanding how they interact with one another is apparently a large responsibility if you ask me.

Okay. So unless someone wants to add anything on those agenda items, I'm going to move through - that was Number 3, discussing timelines for Task 1 work. Then move to four. Any objections to move to four?

Okay. So I'm looking for please volunteers for scooping Task 2 work. The reason I've put it this way everyone is some of the - I feel that some of the

negotiation, discussion and confusion amongst our work so far has been what the scope of work is.

Different members of the - of the sub team, sometimes the greater work team have had different impressions or opinions on what the scope of the work is around either, you know, a subtask or an element of the subtask work.

So I'm suggesting where we start with this is we get a few, you know, at least a couple, I'd like to see at least two, possibly three volunteers to work together on scoping the Task 2 work. And by scoping I mean creating a provisional list of areas we should consider, work we should do, a framework of a work plan.

Bring that to the entire group for us to ratify as a group and then we can hand out those task items, those work items to volunteers to get it done. Does anyone object to that type of an approach? What do you think?

Chuck Gomes: It sounds fine to me.

(Victoria): Yeah. I don't have any objection.

Michael Young: Okay. So do I have any volunteers to scope the Task 2 work? Stony silence. I'll volunteer as one of the members. If someone else could jump in and help me, I'd appreciate it.

Debra Hughes: Hi. This is for Task 2, right?

Michael Young: That's correct.

Debra Hughes: Yeah. This is Debbie. I'm willing to help.

Michael Young: Fantastic Debbie. Thank you.

Debra Hughes: Sure.

Michael Young: Do I have anyone else?

Chuck Gomes: And I'm not volunteering because I don't think it's a good time and I have good position with all my other hats to do that. But just to - just to let people know that I think this is really important because outreach is something I'm not sure we've always done very well in the - in the GNSO.

And of course what we're talking about, not the - not the GNSO or Council particularly but stakeholder groups and constituencies reaching out to potential members and reaching out in, you know, and getting them involved and so forth.

So this is - this is really important. And I think it's one of the concerns that this particular group has expressed over and over again is the involvement as broad a spectrum of the community as possible. So I think the chance of providing some really constructive and helpful recommendations for implementing some outreach approaches can be - can be extremely beneficial to the GNSO.

Zahid Jamil: This is Zahid. Sorry. Can you hear me.

Michael Young: Yes. Go ahead.

Zahid Jamil: Oh. (Excellent). I'm - I don't know how much time I'll be able to give it, but I'm happy to contribute and work with you guys.

Michael Young: Fantastic. Okay. So we've got three and that will give us enough people to get the scoping done. It might be a little optimistic but if we could get a doodle going right away on that, maybe we could get an initial meeting going.

And I'd love to turn back some initial ideas around the scoping at the next meeting. I don't think this is a very - unlike some of the other areas we were talking about, there was a lot of room for differing opinions I think. But in outreach I think it's a little simpler of a task for us.

It's not likely to create the type of contention that other discussion points can. So I'm hoping that we can get the scoping, initial scoping done for the next meeting. That might be a little optimistic but I'd like to give it a shot. So...

Chuck Gomes: I think you're right in your assessment there Michael. I think what is really going to be needed here is some creativity. Because it's quite a challenge considering we're a global organization to...

Michael Young: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...outreach. And so creativity is going to be really helpful in this.

Michael Young: Okay. So I'll volunteer to set up the doodle and end it around to Debbie and Zahid.

Debra Hughes: Sounds great.

Michael Young: Okay. Fantastic. Well we're through our agenda guys. Does anyone have any new business or additional business that they'd like to cover? Wow, hearing nothing, I am going to move to adjourn the meeting. I think this is a record for us, 41 minutes.

Man: Were we not going to look at that report again that was circulated or have I just missed something?

Michael Young: Oh, you're right. I forgot. We were going to take a look at - we were going to circle back to the report. My apologies.

(Victoria): Could we do that on the list do you think? I mean I can't see it right now. And if this is (unintelligible) the call, but could we - do you think we could wrap that up on the list by any chance because some people haven't seen that - just a thought.

Michael Young: Oh, to discuss it on the - I see that Glen has got it mailed out to the - to the list now. So (Victoria), are you suggesting we need a little bit of time for people to look it over and then...

(Victoria): Yeah.

Michael Young: ...it on the list? Yeah. I feel that way personally. I haven't actually looked through its.

Man: That's fine.

Krista Papac: Michael, it's Krista.

Michael Young: Yeah.

Krista Papac: I'm very proud of us finishing in 41 minutes. I actually...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Well we didn't really but that's okay. Go ahead.

Krista Papac: And it's more for Glen and - I don't know if Gisella's still on the call. But there was a report that Denise Michel shared in the registrar stakeholder group in Seoul that basically was a statistical compilation of - a compilation of attendance at various - participation in various work teams.

And so our work team is one of the ones that's cited in there and it's - as I understood it, it's policy is sort of trying to take a look at who participates and

who initiates issues. And, you know, they've got a lot of different reasons for putting this information together.

But the numbers for our particular group which are the only ones I would be familiar with because it's the only team I'm on didn't - they seem to be quite skewed. And so I had sent off a sort of a - I just - I guess I'm not sure where those number come from. If it's something that is reported, you know, by - whose - if it's from the roll call on these calls.

And I guess I just was a little concerned because it showed like the registrar stakeholder group participation at 30% or something like that. And while I know I've missed some meetings, I think I've attended more than 30%.

And so I just don't know if you're - if you're aware of where that information is coming from or if that's something Glen's familiar with or...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Well I...

Krista Papac: ...cleaned up.

Michael Young: Yeah. I wasn't.

Julie Hedlund: Michael, this is Julie. I can answer that question.

Michael Young: Fantastic Julie.

Julie Hedlund: So that information was compiled by Ken Bour. He is a consultant to the policy development group and reports into Denise. And what Ken did is, as far as I understand it, was went very carefully through all of the transcripts and recordings for all of the work team meetings.

Glen DeSaintgery:Sorry Julie. This is Glen.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. Go ahead.

Glen DeSaintgery:Sorry to interrupt you. No, it wasn't Ken who went through that.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry.

Glen DeSaintgery:...regular attendance sheet of every workgroup call. And it was the workgroup attendance sheets that Ken took and then put into the format that Denise used.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Glen. I - this is Julie. I misunderstood. I thought he had said something to me about listening in on the calls. But maybe he did that in addition to going through the attendance sheets.

Glen DeSaintgery:Okay.

Michael Young: Glen, with this type of report, is there - has staff set up a formal mechanism by which say someone like Krista or someone who has looked at this report and maybe disagrees with or feels there is some error it where they can note that to staff and ask for a reexamination or correction?

Glen DeSaintgery:Sure. There's no formal mechanism that's been set up. But what I can do is I can send you the report and what I will also do is publish it on the GNSO Web site because I think that is probably the place where everybody can have access to it quite easily.

Michael Young: Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery:And...

Krista Papac: Yeah. I mean I - I'm sorry.

Glen DeSaintgery:Yes. Go on Julie. You can...

((Crosstalk))

Glen DeSaintgery:...carry on from there.

Krista Papac: It's Krista. So I have the report.

Glen DeSaintgery:Oh Krista.

Krista Papac: Yes. No. I have the report and I know there's been a number of times in the minutes where I'm referred to Kristy or someone from the registry, constituency or - and, you know, there's been times I've mentioned it.

I guess I don't - I think that the - my bigger concern is that, you know, the policy group I think will be using this to sort of, you know, determine which groups are active and where and how.

And I don't, you know, want that to have an impact. And so if the minutes inaccurate, you know, and again I've pointed out where I was misrepresented not in the, you know, legal sense but like it wasn't my name or my constituency or stakeholder group that was noted in the minutes.

Anyway, I guess, you know, I don't want to create a big ordeal out of this. I just also don't, you know, want this negatively impacting or, you know, reflecting on the registrar stakeholder group on who's participating where. Because certainly - I mean I think it even showed the ISP as having maybe zero percent participation.

And, you know, I know Tony's been on several calls, several meetings. So it just was concerning to me that the numbers were so skewed. If they were for our group, you know, are other groups affected and are we really getting - is policy really getting an accurate accounting of who's doing what?

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay. This is Glen, Krista. I will go into that and I will definitely see if we can re-look at the basic statistics. But I know that where you were mentioned as registry, that was in fact cleared up and corrected before the statistics were put together by Ken.

Michael Young: Krista, do you have anything else you want to raise on that front?

Krista Papac: No. Thanks.

Michael Young: Okay. Glen, perhaps it'd be helpful if you could - after you look into this, at the next meeting you guys could give us a little update of what came of this.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay. I'll do that Michael.

Michael Young: Thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you.

Michael Young: All right. And as per (Victoria)'s suggestion, I was going to throw out to the group that we're going to take a look at this report that's been put to the list and put any suggestions or ideas to the list on it or concerns. Is everyone okay with that? Okay. Great.

So then this time for real I'm adjourning the meeting.

Woman: Thanks.

Michael Young: Thanks everyone.

Woman: Thanks Michael.

Chuck Gomes: Michael.

Woman: Thanks.

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: Thanks Michael.

Man: Thanks Michael. Take care.

Michael Young: Take care.

END