

**GNSO  
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC)  
Constituency Operations Work Team  
26 March 2010 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 26 March 2010 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-20100326.mp3>

On page:

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

Participants present:

Olga Cavalli – NCA – Work Team Chair  
Claudio Digangi – IPC  
Debra Hughes – NCSG  
Chuck Gomes – Registries Stakeholder Group  
Rafik Dammak – NCSG  
Krista Papac – Registrar Stakeholder Group

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund  
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies

SS Kshatriya – Individual  
Zahid Jamil – CBUC

Coordinator: The call is now recorded, please go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Julie can you help me make a roll call?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I'll make a roll call. Good afternoon, good morning, good evening to everyone. Today is Friday, March 26 and this is the Constituency and Stakeholder Group Operations call. On the call we have Olga Cavalli and Michael Young, Krista Papac, and from staff we have Julie Hedlund and I see that Gisella has joined us as well.

Gisella Gruber-White: My apologies for being so late.

Julie Hedlund: Not at all. And Gisella let me ask you just very quickly, do you have...

((Crosstalk))

Gisella Gruber-White: I'm sorting that out now. I'm sorting Rafik out now.

Julie Hedlund: Oh, lovely. Thank you very much.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, I didn't get it, Rafik is joining?

Julie Hedlund: Gisella is working on dialing out to him.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Okay, great. Okay, thank you very much for joining, and I don't know if you saw a message I sent a week ago on March 19, I have - I got an email from the new chair of the OSC who is Philip Sheppard and the OSC has set up a deadline for receiving the documents from the working groups. So this deadline is 1st of June, 2010, and I've been exchanging some emails with Philip, especially in relation with our Task 2. He asked me if I thought that we could be able to deliver something for that due date and if not, we should tell him in advance. So I sent an email proposing some action items to try to comply with this due date.

So I think we have spent some time reviewing our subtask - Task 1, sorry, a different document, 1 and 4 are already done. I think that the third document that the sub-team was led by Krista. It's not a long document and shouldn't be complicated to agree in the final text. So Krista I would ask you if you could send to the list the last version that you have.

Maybe we - me and Julie can help you find out which is the last version that we worked with. And we have to finish our second document. Although we may not agree in all the text, we may add some minority reports but we have to deliver our work.

And about the Task 2, I have been - I contacted Debbie on a private mail, perhaps she could give us some ideas on how to draft the first version of the document. And then after that she said also that other members could join a sub-working team, it was an idea that I had that I shared with her before to see if it was possible, and my suggestion was that we could perhaps try to prepare a draft document trying to achieve the due date, which is very challenging and I am not sure that we will make it for Task 2 which is outreach.

So I would like to know if you think these are feasible ideas, if you like the ideas or have other suggestions. I have two emails. One from Rafik and one from Tony Harris that they thought it was good.

Man: Yes.

Krista Papac: Olga, it's Krista. Yes, I will resend to the list. And yes, I yes, I agree.

Olga Cavalli: Great, thank you.

Krista Papac: I agree with your...

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Krista.

Krista Papac: You're welcome. And yes, I agree with your outline of how we should proceed.

Olga Cavalli: Michael, any comments?

Michael Young: No, I think it's a good idea. I'm fine with it.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Okay. I don't know if you have a chance to review the comments Krista was so kind to send as proposed text as we agreed in our last

conference call in - well, I was not there, but it happened in Kenya and it was (unintelligible). She redrafted a part of the text of the sub-working team Text 2 and there were some comments in the list. I would like to know perhaps Michael you have the chance to review Krista's document. I think they are good suggestions, but your experience from constituencies is very valuable.

And also Chuck sent some comments about the - how long a member can - let me open the wiki and review the text. I have the text sent by Krista. Could it be good if I read it again? It's Number 4, Elections. Or you have it on the email and you can read it directly from there. What's best?

Julie Hedlund: This is - Olga, this is Julie. I have Krista's suggested text in front of me. I'd be happy to read it for people if they would like.

Olga Cavalli: Oh yes, if you can do it so it's in the record, so if people hear us the record after...

Julie Hedlund: Exactly.

Olga Cavalli: ...we can know what we are talking about.

Julie Hedlund: That would be good. And so it's - I'll try to see if I can get it right. Additions are bracketed in red capital letters and the deletions are stricken through in red, but I - I'm not - the strikeouts not showing, so let me -

Olga Cavalli: I can read it quite well, so...

Julie Hedlund: Yes, okay because see the strikeouts not coming up...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: I can see it clearly.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...clear enough. It's not entirely...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...so let me do it. It's 4, Elections, "All group," group it's in curved brackets and in curved brackets it's also, "charters shall clearly designate how elected positions including representatives to stakeholder groups, executive committees, and the GNSO council shall be elected, what the term limits are for each position, and maximum numbers of consecutive terms in the same position. Any other procedures related to the elections or exceptions to elections procedures must also be described in the group charter." Then there is a whole part of the text which is strikethrough. And that's it.

I'm not sure that the reduction is clear. Let me read it again, "All groups charters shall clearly designate how elected positions including representatives to stakeholder group executive committees and the GNSO council shall be elected, what the term limits are for each position," that what word doesn't sound to me, but I am not a native speaker, so I may be mistaken. Are you following me?

Julie Hedlund: Which word, Olga?

Olga Cavalli: When it says, "...and the GNSO council shall be elected what the terms limits are for each position," the word what, but again I'm not a native speaker, I'm just - English is my second language.

Julie Hedlund: Well, sometimes it seems like it is to me also. Yes, I mean the point there is just, you know, that the charter should also decide what the term limits are. So maybe the word what doesn't belong there. Maybe it's just the term limits, yes, maybe it can be better worded. But, you know, the point is that the charter should also describe what the term limits are.

And, you know, my general point here is that different groups have different capabilities on what kind of term limits executive comm. - officers on executive committees can hold, and, you know, to have the GNSO, you know, through this particular set of recommendations saying that people have to commit to a two-year term, you know, might be more than a particular group is comfortable with and that, you know, as long as their charter says what the term limits are and how long each term is and how many times people can be reelected to the same position, you know, that should be the point. Not that it's the GNSO coming in and saying, you know, people will have two-year term limits. And - or here's the maximum number of terms.

Rafik Dammak: Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, who's there?

Rafik Dammak: Rafik.

Olga Cavalli: Rafik, how are you?

Rafik Dammak: Fine...

Olga Cavalli: Welcome.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you. Yesterday we got to sit there, I think with Krista and (Dave) and the chair (unintelligible) the problems. I don't think really was Krista but that we need time limitations. Okay, maybe I understand (unintelligible) and there is limit also three terms, but I think at least we need term limitation of four years. If we just tell one three terms or two terms or even one term, it's up to them and it can be up to each constituency and stakeholder group. But I think for time limitation it's very important because it's more than four, it's too much and we cannot expect -- and I agree with the points that - made by Chuck (unintelligible) about representatives and also if a group has a problem to find

committed people to volunteer, it's - there these groups of with constituents or stakeholder group has a real problem of - to be really a representative. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Rafik. So you propose in the change in the text that it's - as written?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, at least to have a clear term for the time limitations.

Olga Cavalli: So you'd like to include a specific time limitations?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. It - well - we - you said also, I remember, to Krista that we have the GNSO as (models) if (unintelligible) before GNSO councilors who from all the constituency and stakeholder groups they can only be for - councilors for four years, so the model and each stakeholder group should follow that model.

Olga Cavalli: Are there any other comments?

Krista Papac: Olga, it's Krista. I mean, I just think if it's in the charter it, I mean, you just don't know what different groups capabilities are going to be. I mean, maybe there's a group that's got four members and they want to have six year limits because, you know, they've only got four members or a maximum of six years. But, I mean, I don't...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Yes, I like it in the Q2 as well.

((Crosstalk))

Claudio DiGangi: Olga, this is Claudio. I just wanted to let you know I joined the call.

Olga Cavalli: Who's there?

Claudio DiGangi: It's Claudio.

Olga Cavalli: Claudio, how are you?

Claudio DiGangi: Hi.

Olga Cavalli: Welcome. Krista, are you finished?

Krista Papac: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Krista. Michael.

Michael Young: So I guess I'm just trying to catch up a little because prior to the last call I thought what we had done is put down some guidelines or recommended guidelines for term limits, but that it also said that these could be extended or accepted if the stakeholders' group or constituency or working group deemed it appropriate and they voted as a two-thirds majority kind of was where we had left it. What went wrong with that? Why did people feel the need to revamp that?

Krista Papac: It - Olga, it's Krista, can I get in the queue?

Olga Cavalli: Sure, go ahead, Krista. Yes.

Krista Papac: So just, you know, from my stakeholder group's perspective, Michael, it's - so first of all, you know, putting down term limits, I mean, again, like my whole point here is that stakeholder groups or constituencies or whatever it, you know, the structure is should have a charter that says what the terms are and what the limits are. That the GNSO shouldn't come in and say you have two year terms with a maximum of two limits and then if you want to change that, you know, you have to have some sort of voting threshold. It's just - it's, I



mean, that should be up to the group how they're going to structure that and, again, clearly outlined in their charter. And as a written...

((Crosstalk))

Krista Papac: ...you know, by way of example in the register stakeholder group we have one year terms with a maximum three years in each - consecutive years in the same office. You know, we have to go out and get a two-thirds majority now to actually do the term limits we've been having for many, many years, first of all.

And second of all, you know, if you put the caveat on here it has to be this way unless you want to do it differently, what's the point of even having it specified what the term limits should be here? I don't know, my ultimate point is that it should be in the charter and, you know, not up to the GNSO what's appropriate for any group's particular term limits.

Rafik Dammak: Olga, again...

Olga Cavalli: Sure, it's Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, yes, yes. So...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: So to respond to Krista, in the case of (unintelligible), if I understand well the (unintelligible) time limit was a three years. So but at least we can define in the (unintelligible) that no more four years as time limits. If there exist however one three years or even two years or just one year it's up to them, but at least you have a limits of four years. Because it's more than four year, it's not really - hard to say. I'm not sure if I can say it. It's not really healthy way because five or six year is too much and that's - it may create a problem of (capture).

And, you know, when people want to volunteer, if they think that they don't - well, that they don't have the assurance to get a leadership position for because the term limit is not really limited, it's - it only may have create problems for people to volunteer. So at least to have a limit of four years, but if a (unintelligible) group want to have only three it's all - it's up to them. So no more than four years.

Olga Cavalli: Someone else want to comment?

I would like to say something, if I may. I think it's an interesting discussion. I personally am in favor of rotations. I've seen many groups captured by people that are there forever and then after a while it's quite difficult to remove them just because they get all the networking and it's difficult to move forward. But I also understand Krista's point that sometimes it's difficult to find people and some people are really valuable and it's good that they remain.

So why don't we add some wording that could leave us having this exception that having a specific term limit of perhaps two terms, but in the case - adding somehow the text that allows an exception that if needed then a person can remain. Do you think that's a good idea?

Michael Young: Wait, Olga, it sounds - it sort of sounds like what we had before, but - and I didn't have a problem with what we had before because I think it did tend to capture the - what the gist of the board recommendations were, however has everyone looked at Chuck's email that he sent I guess...

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I saw it. I think it's a good suggestion, but it speaks about having a term limit, which is the issue that we're discussing. This is why I wanted to find out...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young : Yes, I mean, my inclination is to kind of combine maybe what Krista's saying with what Chuck's saying with what we had, so...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Chuck says...

Michael Young: ...you know, I'm going to suggest something maybe we all can live with that would be, you know, a statement in general that the groups involved, be it a stakeholders group or a constituency or a working group, must make a definitive policy around term limits and rotation and they must post that, they must do that. The term maybe require set not a minimum term but a maximum term, any given term cannot be any longer than four years, which I think is a pretty long time so I think that's pretty reasonable. So, maximum term of four years and a maximum number of concurrent terms of two, gives you someone that can be running a group for literally eight years.

As well as that I still think we leave the exception clause in there that if there's exceptional circumstances, the entire group really wants to leave someone in there for, you know, nine, ten, eleven years in a leadership position they can if they have a two-thirds majority. So but I think, you know, it gives you some indication that people should rotate out, but if it's really advantageous for the group, if the group really feels strong about the current leadership that they have, they have the option to keep it going.

Krista Papac: Olga, it's Krista, can I get in the queue?

Olga Cavalli: Sure, go ahead, Krista.

Krista Papac: So I, you know - so I can, yes, my preference is to not have - to stick with term limits are described in the charter. With that said, you know, a maximum of four years, four consecutive years in the same position I can get comfortable with.

Putting a restriction on two term limits, if you have one year terms now you've limited it to two years instead of four years, so I don't know if what you're - I think if we go with - it's sort of - what Chuck has said is a maximum of four years, at least as I'm reading it in his email. Maybe I've - I just looked at it a second time, so maybe I missed something in there, but - and generalizing that's what Rafik was saying too, is to limit it to four years.

As far as the exceptions, I mean, I agree with you Michael, we should leave that in there, and I did leave it in the text, it's in the last part of the sentence, which basically reads, "Any other procedures related to elections or exceptions to election procedures must also be described in the group charter." I just, again, I don't think the GNSO should be setting what thresholds are, you know, to vote for different things within a stakeholder group, but that they should be clearly be outlined in the charter.

Michael Young: Yes, I hear you. I'm trying to stay within the focus of what we've been tasked to do, which is deal with the board recommendations, right? The board recommendations clearly state we're supposed to do something around this to set a momentum toward rotation, reasonable rotation.

What if we did this, Krista, what if we - not to be - I could do some wording up for this, but you could say something like concurrent term limits shall not exceed a total of eight years of leadership in the same position. So that means it could be seven one year, you know, term limits permitted or two four year or, you know, four two years. But, you know, it's the - that - would that solve the problem if you guys go with short term limits?

Krista Papac: Yes, I mean, I think, I don't know if Rafik - how Rafik feels about that because I think he wants to limit it to four. My - I think we're saying the same thing, Michael, basically, which is just, you know, there's a maximum number of consecutive years you can serve in the same position regardless of whether if the number is four or the number is eight, if that's a four year - one four year

term or, you know, eight, you know, if it's four years or eight six month terms or you know what I mean, like, let's not restrict to - I don't know.

Michael Young: Okay, so yes, yes, yes. Instead of saying, you know, determining the term limits, we just say maximum concurrent number of years in the same position.

Krista Papac: Exactly. I agree.

Michael Young: Okay. And is that - is four years okay with everybody? Or did someone feel that needs to be longer?

((Crosstalk))

Claudio DiGangi: Michael, this is Claudio. I think that's fine, you know. I've been following this discussion and I see the points on all ends because, you know, for the reasons everyone's stated there's value in rotation and getting new people involved, but at the same time these are volunteer positions and they're time consuming. And if somebody's volunteering for something and having to commit a large amount of time then, you know, I think that's where you come into difficulties with asking people to then serve in these leader position - leadership positions and travel and do all these types of things. And so I see, you know, I see the issue I think pretty clearly.

I, you know, I could - in terms of language I can offer some language I think just based on what you guys said that's pretty straightforward, which would be something along the lines like no person shall serve in the same constituency or stakeholder group leadership position for more than four years - for more than four consecutive years. And just sort of leave it at that and...

Michael Young: And can we leave the exception there in case there is a circumstance in which the entire group really wants somebody to maintain the leadership position?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes, yes I think so. I thought that was a good idea as well. You know, maybe the issue is we don't need to get into the specifics with saying two-thirds, but maybe we could just say, you know, leave the language that we had in there and, you know just not get into the specifics about the threshold, but, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: So how do we want to describe it? A majority? Or a super majority and not describe what the super majority is? How about a super majority as defined by the charter of the working group, stakeholders group or constituency.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes, well, that might - I think that might make sense. What's the language that's in there now? I don't have it on...

Michael Young: I think it says just two-thirds majority.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie. I can read the language. It currently says, "When circumstances demand exceptions to this requirement, exceptions may only be made with support from two-thirds majority of the membership."

Krista Papac: And - it's Krista. And my proposal was just that the exceptions must be described in the charter. You know, there can be, but they have to be described in the charter.

Claudio DiGangi: That makes sense to me.

Michael Young: Okay, Claudio...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: ...do you want to try and draft that up.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. I'll send this to the list.

Michael Young: That's great. Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Great, thank you very much, Claudio. So we're okay with 4. Moving forward, we were expecting some wording for Point 5 from Zahid in Paragraph B and Mary. And Paragraph D we had to review the text. We said, as far as I remember, the - is Zahid on the call? No. Okay. As far as I remember, I haven't seen any comment from Zahid or Mary Wong in the list and they were supposed to send some comments about Paragraph B, 5 B about voting.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Who's there?

Rafik Dammak: Rafik. The - I - and let's see, Mary is not a member of our work team so maybe I will ask her to send it as soon as (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Rafik. I know, but she was present our meeting that I attended remotely in Nairobi. She was present there and she made very interesting comments and so this is - she had stated that that she is not a member of the working team, but she was going to send some comments to Zahid. So perhaps you can contact her or we can review the language here among us.

There was some doubts about 5, and let me check, 5 B, which is - 5 B says it's about voting. "All groups shall permit all voting members in good standing to vote in elections as deadlined in their charters." And there are some text

which is striked through. Any comments about this text? Anything that we want to add or change?

Krista Papac: Sorry, Olga, it's Krista, I'm just trying to get back to the text. I lost the page, so bear with me...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: I'm reading the wiki. I'm on the wiki.

((Crosstalk))

Krista Papac: Yes, I know. I lost the connection, I'm just trying to get back to the wiki.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, sorry. No problem. Any comments, Michael? Claudio?

Claudio DiGangi: No, sounds good.

Debra Hughes: Olga, this is Debbie, I wanted to let you know I've been on for a couple minutes. I didn't want to interrupt the conversation.

Olga Cavalli: Hi, Debbie. Welcome.

Krista Papac: It's Krista, Olga. I believe if memory serves me correctly, and it frequently does not, all groups will permit all voting members in good standing to vote in elections...

Olga Cavalli: I think that the issue was about equal voting rights or not. I mean, that was the discussion and there is some text striked through that says, "All members whether natural or legal persons shall have equal voting rights," and that was gone. And - but I would like to...

Michael Young: I'm okay with the way it read right now.



Olga Cavalli: Okay, with B with the deleted text.

Michael Young: No, I'm okay with the - I'm glad that the text was deleted. I'm okay with the...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Okay, great that was my question. Claudio?

Claudio DiGangi: I'm sorry, I was working on this other...

Olga Cavalli: Oh, sorry, sorry, I...

((Crosstalk))

Claudio DiGangi: Sorry, yes...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...just wanted to have your opinion about 5 B as it's written now in the wiki.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes, it looks good to me.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: I thought that we already agreed about this, no?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, but the issue is that we had some weeks in the middle and Mary didn't send the text and we have to move forward, so I would suggest that if we agree in it now, we'll leave it as it is and we can receive comments from Zahid and Mary afterwards if they want to add something.

Rafik Dammak: That's okay for me.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Debbie?

Debra Hughes: It looks good.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Krista?

Krista Papac: Yes, it's okay.

Olga Cavalli: Great. So did I miss anybody? So we have 5 B and then it was we had to revise the text in 5 D, which says work team members to consider and comment. It says, "No legal or natural person shall be entitled to join more than one constituency or group as a voting member." Any comments about this?

Krista Papac: Olga, it's Krista. If I'm not mistaken aren't people - this is allowed to - people can vote in various groups today, is that correct? Does anybody know?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes, I think they are allowed to do that now. It's Claudio, I'm sorry.

Krista Papac: So we are looking to change that?

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: So this is - so if one person is allowed to vote in different constituencies or groups then this is wrong.

Krista Papac: Why?

Olga Cavalli: Am I correct?

Krista Papac: I mean, I don't know. I'm - I wonder - why would it be wrong? I'm trying to understand the thinking behind it.

Olga Cavalli: No, no, I just - I'm sorry, I don't belong to any constituency. This is why I'm asking you. Is it possible for a natural person to be entitled and join more than one constituency? Is that something that may happen? Or just it doesn't happen?

Michael Young: No, I think it's something that we agreed wouldn't happen because we don't want to create a double voting right within the GNSO.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So are we okay with the text, "No legal or natural person shall be entitled to join more than one group or constituency as a voting member." I take the silence as a yes? Okay, great. So 5 D is done.

Then we had some text that was going to be sent by Victoria about Section 8, Policy. Have you checked yet? Section 8, Policy, it says, "It is recommend that standing policy committees comply with similar rules as executive committees," and there was some exchange of ideas in the list, but I haven't seen a (unintelligible) recall well any proposed text. Julie, did you see some text sent by Victoria that maybe I missed?

Julie Hedlund: Hi, this is Julie. Olga, no, I did not.

Olga Cavalli: Any comments about 8A?

Krista Papac: I don't understand what - it's Krista. I don't understand what it means.

Olga Cavalli: I will say something which is - it sounds stupid, but I don't know, yes, me neither, I don't understand what it means in general, the difference in between executive committees and standing policy committees are maybe ignoring something and that's very possible. So perhaps someone could enlighten us with some comments?

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Olga, it's Rafik.

Olga Cavalli: Rafik, go ahead.

Rafik Dammak: So the policy has many members, the standing policy committee, that it's not (unintelligible) when I discussed with Victoria, it's maybe not only one policy committee, but it can have many, it's (unintelligible) if the members of the group want to start working about new policies so that they can't there may be in many policy committees. But now I'm not sure that it's feasible, that it's possible, maybe just one policy committee is - it's more normal than just to have many policy committees. And during the executive committees, it's about, I don't know, how to - managing the stakeholder groups in the constituency rates, it's all the (unintelligible) et cetera.

Krista Papac: Olga, I...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: My question is that if -- sorry, Krista, just one comment -- if we have to go through such level of details about committees and constituencies or stakeholder, what, just a comment. Krista, go ahead please.

Krista Papac: First a clarification. What is a policy committee within a group?

Claudio DiGangi: Olga, could I respond to that?

Olga Cavalli: Sure, Claudio, go ahead.

Claudio DiGangi: I think what Victoria is getting at here is what we have under Number 1 under Executive Committee, those rules. I think she wants to apply those rules to

the policy committees. And, Krista, I think what she's referring to is, like, if there's like a working group - like right now, like, there's a vertical integration working group, so let's say a stakeholder group had a group of people working on that, that would be their policy committee for that particular issue.

Krista Papac: Okay. Thank you. And I kind of thought that's what it meant, but I wasn't sure. So then, I mean, I agree with what Olga just said - this is Krista, sorry -- which is, I mean, I don't - right now, you know, the registrars stakeholder group has I don't even know how many people on that vertical integration working group, myself included, and it was, you know, whoever wants to get on it, you know, put in a statement of interest. So I think limiting it...

((Crosstalk))

Claudio DiGangi: I don't...

((Crosstalk))

Krista Papac: ...is just a sort of stringent rule that the executive committee elections, et cetera, have to follow seems pretty outside sort of the general GNSO process for these types of groups. But, I don't know, maybe I'm wrong about that.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Well, Krista...

Krista Papac: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, okay, so it's Rafik, but I don't understand really the last part of what you're saying, but just me before joking I said there are many (unintelligible) member in the vertical integration working group. So but I want to understand what you said at the end because it wasn't clear for me.

Krista Papac: Sure. I mean, I guess my point there is that one of the discussions in the vertical integration group is, you know, should we close the list of members that are able to join and it's like, no, you know, the whole principle is whoever wants to participate in a working group can participate. So if we're going to somehow go back and restrict that at a different group level, a stakeholder group or a constituency level, it's going to go counter to what the model is as I understand it, the overall GNSO participation model, which is anybody who wants to participate can participate.

Rafik Dammak: I can - I think I can verify to this. Your idea is if some people within a group want to start discussing about a policy, so they can, I don't know maybe it's in the charter of the group to define that to - ten people - ten members can - if there is ten members they can ask for starting a policy committee and to work about define a topic. So there may be a need to define that (unintelligible) ten numbers, I don't know, it depends to each group and so people can start to (unintelligible) define these policies. But I don't think there's any way we can limit participation of people or volunteering in any kind of policies.

Olga Cavalli: Again, this is my question; do we need to specify this? It's not such a lot of detail. Do we need the sentence?

Claudio DiGangi: Olga, this is Claudio. I agree that I don't think we need the sentence. I think that - I think policy committees are just - they function differently than executive committees and so I would just if there's certain rules we want for policy committees, I think we should just spell them out. I don't think we should reference back to executive committees because they're just - they just operate in different ways for different reasons.

So I would just strike - I would strike 8A.

Olga Cavalli: Me too. Any other comments?

Krista Papac: Olga, it's Krista. I agree with what Claudio just said.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Krista. Any more comments?

Debra Hughes: This is Debbie. I agree.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Michael Young: Michael.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Rafik, are you okay if we delete it?

Rafik Dammak: Maybe two of the words in other ways so we encourage - I'm not sure that we encourage, we're talking about I think that same people are (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you very well.

Rafik Dammak: On the policy discussion through the - it seems good. I don't know how, but maybe it can work around.

Claudio DiGangi: Olga, this is Claudio. Rafik, is your concern addressed in B? Is that what you're referring to about participation and just ensuring that it's, you know, people can participate on these issues?

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Yes, it is...

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible) does that if there is a group of people within say (unintelligible) groups of constituency, they have interest in some policies so they can ensure it within their own group and (unintelligible) so the policy currently is a

kind of - I mean, not gradual but a way to organize this maybe like you look something, like to organize this process.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. Rafik, did you think 8B address you concerns? It says, "Policy committees shall be open to all members in good standing and shall be able to propose the policy committee consider a policy issue in accordance with the group charter."

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: That's already agreed.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: So are we okay deleting A.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Okay, B is already -- any comments to B?

Claudio DiGangi: Olga, this is Claudio. The only thing I would add here is just maybe eligibility to serve on policy committees shall be open to all members in good standing. That was a clarification of the number we did in some of - various other parts of the document and so...

Olga Cavalli: So you want to add some text?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. It would...

Olga Cavalli: And...

Claudio DiGangi: It would basically be at the beginning of the sentence I would add in "eligibility to participate on policy committees."



Olga Cavalli: So it would read, "Eligibility to participate in policy committees shall be open to all members in good standing and shall be able to..." I lost it. "...shall be able to propose the policy committee consider a policy issue in accordance with the group charter."

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Is that your proposal?

Claudio DiGangi: That is.

Olga Cavalli: Any comments?

Krista Papac: Sounds good to me. It's Krista.

Olga Cavalli: Julie, did you get the language.

Julie Hedlund: Yes I did, Olga. Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Krista Papac: Olga...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments? Who was it?

Krista Papac: It's Krista. I have a comment on a different section when we're done with this.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I know. Let's -- are we done with - this is B, which is now it's A because A is gone. And we have B and I think we already went through it. Do we have

any action items on D? Well now it's not D. Oh, Mary was going to send some comments out but it's strike through.

Julie Hedlund: This is - Olga, this is Julie. I think it's not supposed to be stricken through. I think the original language is policy committee meeting should be open for attendance by all group members and at the election of the constituency to the public. And we had asked Mary to - I think she has some interest in perhaps suggesting alternate language there.

Olga Cavalli: Any comment in this group about this D which is "policy committee meeting should be open for attendance by all group (unintelligible) members and at the election of the constituency to the public." Are we agreed with this language? Is there any concerns? Okay, let's do the following; leave it as it is and perhaps Rafik you can ask Mary if she can add some language in which in the text that we already have which is 8 D or C now. Could you do that Rafik for us?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Which part? D?

Olga Cavalli: It's the last part of 8 which was D and now would be C. I remember in the call - in the meeting in Nairobi, Mary was going to rewrite the text and make it better. So perhaps we leave it as it is now and you ask her to send some - her suggestions.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you so much. Okay. Julie help my memory. Did we revise 9, GNSO Working Group, we just - I don't know where we were...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: No, Olga, we ended at 8, policy. But I think I heard that Krista had some remarks on this?

Olga Cavalli: Yes - she - yes, I remember in the list she also said some comments. Krista, go ahead.

Krista Papac: Sorry, but I hate to backtrack, but I just was realizing as we were talking about 8 of this, you know, same rules as the executive committees I scrolled up to executive committees which is Section 1. I think of Part 2, but let me make sure. And realized that it was language that we just modified in 4 is now going to conflict with Section 1. So in the email that I sent on March 15 with my proposed language that we just sort of reworked, I also, you know, propose changing 1C which also talks about terms limits for executive committee members.

So I guess - I really don't want to backtrack. I'm so sorry, but we're basically going to have Section 1 saying some - one thing about executive committee terms limits and then Section 4 which is an election section also kind of referring to executive committee term limits and they will conflict with one another.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry. I have the text that you sent, Krista, I'm reading it so you think this text would be better now that we have already changed the Part 4 - other section? Is that your proposal?

Krista Papac: Maybe. I mean, I guess what I'm - well, actually I didn't make a proposal, but what my proposal would be is to see what Claudio sends out for 4A and then I, you know, I can apply that to 1C and may make some modifications to it. It may not - just so that they're consistent with one another is my point.

Olga Cavalli: That's a very good point and thank you for bringing it. Let me propose you the following, once Claudio sends the text, could you Krista be so kind to revise it 1C and see if you can send the text to the list and so we can agree on it?

Krista Papac: Yes, absolutely, I'll do that.

((Crosstalk))

Claudio DiGangi: Olga, this...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much.

Claudio DiGangi: ...in the queue?

Olga Cavalli: Sure, go ahead.

Claudio DiGangi: I'm going to go out to send the language to the list now. I was just wondering, can I - if it would be, you know, if everyone supported that I use the language there regarding approval -- I just lost it -- well, any exceptions to this policy would require approval by the membership. And it doesn't, you know, it doesn't specify what the threshold would be. And so I guess that's what I...

Olga Cavalli: So you're sending it now Claudio? Is that what you're proposing?

Claudio DiGangi: I am, but we had discussed like, if - we had discussed an exception and I realized that under the executive committee the language that we used in it didn't specify what thresholds would be needed for the exception. It just has general language there. And so I was going to propose that we use that language there under 4. Is that...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Let's do the following: Send the language perhaps after the call because we have very few time and I would like to make a comment about our Task 2 before we're finished. And perhaps you can review it with Krista and then we all agree in the list. I think we have discussed it enough to...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Olga, this is Chuck, I joined about five...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Chuck. How are you?

Chuck Gomes: Sorry I'm so late. So, I'm good.

Olga Cavalli: That's okay. Thank you, thank you for joining. Great, Claudia, is that a good idea?

Man: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. And the rest agree.

Woman: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Okay. We have five minutes, or no, seven minutes. Julie, we have two - we didn't review 9 GNSO working group right?

Julie Hedlund: That's correct, Olga. This is Julie. We have not.

Olga Cavalli: And let me ask a question. This Part 3 minority and other recommendations and other and. (unintelligible) views and Part 4 and now this is 3, 5, elections, 3, 4, this is - this a minority reports to the text that Victoria prepared. I'm talking about the text that if after point 9, 10, 11, and 12 in the wiki, I'm reviewing the wiki.

Claudio DiGangi: Olga, this is Claudio. All of my concerns that I raised in that minority statement have been addressed by our discussions in refining the document. So that could all be stricken as far as I'm concerned.

Olga Cavalli: So are these concerns still valid Claudio or?

Claudio DiGangi: No, that's - yes, no, they've in fact been addressed so...

Olga Cavalli: Okay, so Julie could perhaps strike them too?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: In the wiki? Julie, did you get that?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, so that would mean that I would strike all of Part 3, just to confirm. And it says Part 3 is minority and other recommendations.

Claudio DiGangi: Julie, yes it does reference other subtask members there until -- I sort of hesitate...

Julie Hedlund: Okay. So just striking your views?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes, yes.

Julie Hedlund: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: I would encourage the rest of us and the working team to review this minority and recommendations comments because they were sent when document was not already reviewed. So and see if they want to keep them here or take them out or change them. So this will be an action item for the whole group. And we agreed to delete Annex A, right? In the last call in Nairobi.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. That's correct. We have...

Olga Cavalli: So it should show...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...Julie, please. It should show all strike through in the wiki. Could you do that for me please.

Julie Hedlund: Annex A does show a strike through. Annex A is at the bottom...

Olga Cavalli: Oh, sorry...

Julie Hedlund: ...I see it...

Olga Cavalli: ...sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...part of it, I'm sorry. Absolutely right, I don't know why it's didn't strike all the way through.

Olga Cavalli: Great. So let me ask the group the following, let's review during this next week 9 - point 9, 10, 11, and 12, and all the other comments and see if we agree on the text. If I hear no comments, I would take the text for agreed by the group in one week. We will say that clearly in an email sent to the list today; we will do that with Julie. And also Krista and Claudio will send the text for 8 B, I think, or A. And Rafik will consult with Mary if she wants to add something for 8 C.

And so we could be done with this document by the end of next week. And I would - if that is okay; any comments to that? Thank you. I'll take the silence as a yes.

I would like to propose something also. As we have a deadline from the OSC to deliver our work by July 1 which is a very challenging date and we have Task 2 already to be done, I would like to propose the formation of a sub-working team to work on outreach. I would love to volunteer. I cannot chair that sub-working team because I don't have the time.

Anyone in this call would like to lead that effort about outreach?

Debra Hughes: Olga, this is Debbie, I'm happy to lead that group.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Someone else would like to join Debbie and me in this effort?

Michael Young: I'll volunteer, it's Michael.

Olga Cavalli: Great Michael.

Rafik Dammak: Olga, it's Rafik, I want also to join.

Olga Cavalli: Great, so we have Michael, Rafik, Olga, Debbie has been so kind to lead this idea. And anyone else? Great.

Claudio DiGangi: Olga this is Claudio. I'll join that as well.

Olga Cavalli: Oh great. Thank you, Claudio. Thank you very much. So Debbie, could you please perhaps send us some ideas how to start or if you have some first document that we could start working on or could you do that for us? Would you take the time?

Debra Hughes: Sure.



Olga Cavalli: Thank you so much.

Man: Olga, would it help the five -- I think there are five of you -- the five of you to have a little sub-list to communicate on or is that necessary?

Olga Cavalli: I think that the rest of the group could be aware because then they will have to revise the document, and it's not a big group. I don't know what do others think. Is that a lot of bothering you with emails? I would like the whole group no because we have a very short deadline so perhaps if everyone is on -- I don't know, maybe it's a bad - not a good idea. Julie, what'd you think?

Julie Hedlund: This is, yes, Julie. I would recommend maintaining the same list. It's also I think somewhat complicated to set up a, you know, a separate email distribution list for a relatively, you know, small group for a short time. Of course it can be done if you prefer.

Man: Olga, what's the deadline you're working towards? Did I hear you...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: It's -- I had some exchange of emails with Philip. It's the first of June, it's very short.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: I think that we can make it for Task 1. We are already - I think we are done with all the documents. We need some time to finalize the revision. I told Philip that we may not make it for Task 2, so he's aware of that. So what I promise him is that we would do at least one effort of starting the work and see which could be our possible deadline if we don't meet June 1. So this is the start of our presentation with the (unintelligible) - with the OSC now.

Man: Okay, thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. One more thing, so we have the sub-working team for outreach. Krista, please remember to send us the documents for Subtask 1.3 so we review it. I remember that we all went through it, but just we look at it again so we have - we are sure that we agree on it. And I think we're done.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. I wanted to confirm are we on a biweekly schedule (unintelligible) meeting in two weeks or are - do we want (unintelligible) weekly schedule with the workload in mind?

Olga Cavalli: I would recommend that we may work - meet weekly. Oh, we have -- we have holi - Easter next week, right?

Woman: Yes. I'm going to be on business travel next Friday, so I would miss the call.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: And (unintelligible) is Good Friday next Friday and in many countries...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: I know.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, no, no problem. Next Friday it's a complicated date, so let's do it the other Friday and then we - if we can make the effort of meeting weekly until June the 1st and see if we can meet this deadline.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Okay, hearing no comments, thank you very much for joining and Happy Easter, happy weekend, and we meet in two weeks and we have some work to do in the list.

Man: Great, thank you.

Woman: Great. Thanks Olga and I'll get that...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Thank you.

Woman: ...later today. Thank you.

Man: Bye.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Bye

Woman: Goodbye.

END