GNSO
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC)
Constituency Operations Work Team
30 April 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 30 April 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-ops-30apr10.mp3

On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#apr

Participants present:
Michael Young – Registries – Interim Chair
Claudio Digangi – IPC
Debra Hughes – NCSG
Tony Harris – ISPCP

ICANN Staff
Julie Hedlund
Glen de Saint Géry
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies
Olga Cavalli – NCA – Work Team Chair
Chuck Gomes – Registries Stakeholder Group
Rafik Dammak – NCSG
Victoria McEvedy - IPC

Coordinator: Please go ahead.

Gisella Gruber-White: Good morning. Good afternoon on today's constituency operations call on Friday the 30th of April.

We have Michael Young acting as chair, Claudio DiGangi from staff we have Glen de Saint Géry, Julie Hedlund and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. Debra Hughes has just joined as well and we have apologies from Chuck Gomes, Rafik Dammak and our chair Olga Cavalli. If I could just please remind

everyone to just state their names when speaking. Thank you. Over to you Michael.

Michael Young: Thank you very much. So I do apologize. I tried to send out an agenda and it doesn't seem to have left my computer. I am working from a hot spot so I seem to be having a little bit of trouble with that. Regardless I will read off the agenda if that's all right with everyone and we'll see if anyone wants to suggest changes to it. What I had sent out to the group included the following and I can't open it up but I will try and draw from memory.

I suggest that we start by going through Julie you had a task item from last week to do further edits on our consolidated document for Task 1. And that included doing some work on intros and tossing around some basically aesthetics and comprehensive edits versus any kind of content editing. So I thought we'd start with that document and look at the - have you walk us through the changes with that it Item 1 on the agenda.

Two I was going to suggest that we get an update from the Task 2 sub team and then following that walk into the - I believe the - we were looking for comments this week on Debbie's document but I think we only had formal comments submitted by Chuck. But I didn't notice if anyone else submitted them as well.

Julie Hedlund: Mike this is Julie. Rafik also sent changes.

Michael Young: Oh perfect. Okay. Thanks Rafik. So if we could go through those comments and edits. And Item 4 I'd like to attempt - I know we may not have all the information to do this but I'd like to attempt for us to review what's in Debbie's document, consider the updates from the sub team and see if we can't assign some time-based milestone objectives for getting Task 2 completed.

And then of course fifth item was new items or new business. Does anyone want to add anything to the agenda? Okay. Hearing no one else

(unintelligible) that's adequate for everyone. Julie could we start with having you walk us through the changes that you made and the edits you made on the Task 1 document in last week?

Julie Hedlund: Sure. Michael this is Julie. I'll be happy to do that. And I did send the document around to everybody last Friday. The changes were - the requested changes appeared in a couple of different places.

We added in the recommendations section - the beginning of Section 2, recommendations sort of a guide for how the recommendations are arranged. We say that that the recommendations are arranged in three sections.

And Section 2.1 being recommendations for the set of participation rules and operating procedures, 2.2 for clear operating principles for each group to ensure that all the groups function in a representative, open, transparent and democratic manner. And Section 2.3 recommendations for creating and maintaining a database of all group members.

And so that was to help people to understand how the recommendations are grouped in sections. Are there any thoughts concerning that before I move on?

Hearing none I'll move on. At the beginning of each section I put in a sentence, this one sentence to say what - again to sort of reiterate so that it's very clear what each of the recommendations, the following recommendations pertain to.

So under 2.1 participation rules and operating procedures I have a sentence that says, "The following sections address the BGC work group recommendations that groups shall establish end abide by a set of participation rules and operating procedures." And then I did the same for each of the sections.

So similarly at the beginning of the next section, 2.2, operating principles I note - the sentence notes that, "This pertains to the BGC recommendations for clear operating principles," et cetera and thus the same at the beginning of the third section of recommendations on group membership database and that those recommendations pertain to the creation of the database, et cetera.

So that was the - not substantive but clarifying text that was added to each section. Are there any questions or suggestions concerning that additional text? Any changes that anyone would like?

Claudio DiGangi: Julie this is Claudio.

Julie Hedlund: Yes.

Claudio DiGangi: I thought this was actually all good. My comment or question and I think it's just a minor point. But I was looking - the language that w have there for Section 2.2 says that, "The recommendations for clear operating principles,." and maybe I'm just - maybe it's the term is not 100% clear to me. But I kind of - I guess I'm not understanding fully what the distinction is between operating procedures and participation rules as they're sort of spelled out in Section 2.1 in comparison to Section 2.2 which references operating principles.

Because when I got to Section 2.2 it seems to me that these are - it sort of operating procedures just like Section 2.1 are. It might be - maybe, you know, they're on different topics or subject areas but I was just wondering, you know, I was just sort of throwing it out there for the work team like whether this - should this section be actually just - like should it just be a recommendations on principles or is this really, you know, any different than operating procedures?

Just I wasn't - because we are using different terms there and I wasn't clear on how we were sort of making that distinction between two point...

Julie Hedlund: Hi. This is Julie. If I could Michael just make one point there and then of course you can open it up for discussion from others. But I just to remind the work team that these were terms that were pulled directly from the BGC work groups report not ones that we created ourselves. And I'm looking through the report right now to pull the exact language.

But the BGC had separate recommendations and that's why we separated them out, you know, into our various subtasks one being on, you know, on principles and one being on operating procedures. And that was why we, you know, separated the work because that's the way the recommendations read. And that's just a point of clarification on my part but holding that up to you Michael to...

Michael Young: Right. Julie I think you did a very good job of actually pointing out exactly what I was going to point out myself. Claudio what do you think of that?

Claudio DiGangi: No. I mean that makes sense. I mean I recalled that from the report itself. It said that, you know, there should be, you know, recommendations developed for operating principles. And I guess maybe if I went back and looked at how we split it up on - when we initially formed the two subtasks that might - maybe that might, you know, shed some more light for me.

So - but yeah, Julie's comment was definitely helpful. I just I guess I'm still trying to, you know, fully grasp the difference between these two sections and - yeah I'm okay with it maybe we just need to modify the language a little bit. Like on...

Man: Can I suggest this? I think it's confusing. And I think unless you have the whole kind of history and - so let's say someone's looking at this document more in isolation which is more likely to happen let's say since not everyone goes back and reads all the precursor documents to these things. Perhaps what we should do is include, Julie, in this document a little preamble

explaining exactly what you just articulated as part of the introduction -- why the sections are split up this way, how it refers back to the BCG report.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie, Michael. I can certainly do that. It is there actually but it's perhaps it needs to be further clarified. Because in the beginning of our - in the beginning of that document under the - and I'll just go back to that section and perhaps you can assist me in where we should put some clarifying language.

In the executive summary we talked about the BGC report of improvements, preparing this recommendation documents, let's see, formed the steering teams, created a work plan and broke it down into tasks, "Task 1 the subject of these recommendations was split into the following four subtasks." Maybe at that point we can say, "Four subtasks as were delineated in the," you know, or, "as correspond to the four specific recommendations from the BGC you know, work group report."

Because that is exactly what they are, you know, Subtask 1, you know, the wording of it, "Develop recommendations for set of participating rules and operating procedures," is of course the language from the BGC report. And then the following says, "Develop recommendations for clear operating principles for each constituency," is again from the BGC report.

So perhaps I can add some language there that makes clear the correspondence of the recommendations and perhaps I can add a foot note of course as well to, you know, for each of these. Because each of these have, you know, of course corresponding tasks within the BGC report where they're spelled out in this way. So I could footnote each of these so it's clearer where they're taken from.

Michal Young: I think you've done a great job in answering your own question Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Well I'm putting it out there in case you would care to help me say it differently. But that's what I was thinking.

Michael Young: I think that makes a lot of sense. I think, you know, it's unfortunate two things happened that we have to really be aware of in any kind of working group. We become quite familiar with the materials over time and we become quite familiar with the issues.

But we have to keep looking at these documents and ask ourselves, "If I was to read this cold and not necessarily be up to speed could I take something completely in a different way than the working group did because I am lacking that background and content?" So I think these things help a lot. I think your suggestion is good. Does anyone have any other comments on that?

While we're on - so while we're on the subject of I guess language in this document Julie maybe you want to finish the review. But one of the things I did want to make sure we cover is can we at some point circle back and there was a bit of a discussion on the list again about the terminology "should" and "shall" and so forth. And I want to see if we could wrap that up and get a full agreement so that we can wind that particular discussion up with a - and follow through with an action.

Julie Hedlund: Right. Michael this is Julie. I didn't have anything more to add on the textural changes. And thank you for your guidance and I'll make some additional changes as we've discussed here.

So I agree that - I know for myself I'll need some direction on how to proceed with respect to the terminology particularly "should" versus "shall". I did note that we have received responses from several work team members with respect to the usage of "should" versus "shall".

And with Chuck not being here I'll also note that he has suggested that while, you know, "should", you know, might be acceptable then there would need to

be a definition of if we're using that word differently then "should" meaning optional. And I'd certainly - if that's what the team ends up deciding then I'll need some assistance on what that definition might be.

Michael Young: Sorry I was speaking on the other phone. I think - I mean let me ask everyone are we okay with standardizing on the words "should"? Well I mean I'm - we're just trying to collate all these e-mails in my head and going through the last couple Chuck came back and was trying to clarify with Claudio that "should" would be optional and "shall" be required.

And then I think Claudio you came back and indicated that "should" just has an intrinsic meaning of mandatory more than an optional type of inference.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Michael Young: And Chuck was okay with that as long as we put a definition into the document of how we're using "should" So can we can standardize - is everyone okay with our standardizing on "should" meaning we intend for it to be compiled to or mandatory and we'll put a definition of that in the document. And what was the word that we ended up using for the optional? There was another term that we were bandying about last week for optional. Does anyone recall?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. Michael actually - and I was just doing a quick search in the report in several cases we use the word "may" to indicate optional.

Michael Young: Right.

Julie Hedlund: And I think that, you know, we may want to have, you know, if we have "should" and "may" - "should" and "may", you know, might be taken by some people to be interchangeable.

So we might want to clarify that we're using "should" to mean something that's obligatory and "may" - if that's what we want, and "may" to be something that is optional. Because we're pretty careful I think when we put in "may" to definitely mean, you know, in our discussions optional.

Michael Young: Right. I don't think "may" - there's any confusion around "may'. So if everyone's okay we'll continue to leave "may" as our optional term. And unless someone objects I think we could wind this up by just agreeing that we'll use "should" but we'll put a definition in the document explaining our use of "should" and - so that it's consistent. Is everyone all right with that?

Man: Yeah. I'm okay with that.

Claudio DiGangi: Yep. I think it's a good idea Michael.

Julie Hedlund: Sounds good.

Michael Young: Great. So then that wraps that up. Fantastic. Julie can you adjust the document accordingly?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. I just had a question. What exactly do we want to say "should" means? I know that seems rather obtuse of me but I mean Claudio I know this has been, you know, a particularly important point for you. And I know that in one of your earlier messages you had some language that you suggested including as well.

And I can refer back to that but do you have any thoughts on how we want to say this? I mean do we want to be just very, you know, brief and say, you know, "Throughout this document the term "should" indicates an obligation on the part of, you know, the group unless otherwise specified."

(Tony):   (Unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: Or do we want to say more than that? I just want to make sure that I get it clear.

Michael Young: You could jump in there (Tony) if you want to make a comment.

(Tony):   Yeah. I just want to make sure you hear me because I usually get muted on these calls due to the echo or something. But why would we say obligatory? I think "should" has more of a sense of a preferred practice.

Michael Young: Well I've actually - as we've been speaking I just pulled up a series of suggested definitions for the word "should" and about half of them tie it to recommended, like you suggested. But the other half have definitions - well let me give you an example, "Use the word "should" where conformance is expected."

     So I think it's kind of half and half. I mean I'm kind of indifferent. If we want to use another word that's fine but I think we should just pick one and move on. Right?

(Tony):   Okay.

Michael Young: So if we use the word "should" I think we're all agreed we're using that as a mandatory and our definition should say mandatory. Claudio do you want to take a shot at writing a definition for the use of "should" that indicates it's a mandatory term?

Claudio DiGangi: Yeah. Yeah. I could do that. I mean I think Julie - I think how Julie kind of just described it I thought was pretty good. So I mean I'm okay with going with Julie's straw man definition.

Julie Hedlund: Although - and this is Julie. I think I heard (Tony) object to the term obligatory. So I could put to that mandatory. That "should" indicates an action is mandatory unless otherwise specified.

Michael Young: I (unintelligible).

(Tony):   Yeah. That would be all right. Unless otherwise specified would probably be okay with me.

Julie Hedlund: All right (Tony). Yeah. Because I think we've been pretty careful about making it clear, you know, specifying otherwise in cases where it is, you know, optional in which case we've made that pretty clear.

(Tony):   Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Okay.

Michael Young: Good. So are we settled on that? Are there any other...

(Tony):   Yep.

Julie Hedlund: I have what I need and I'll put that right up front. Actually that'll be right prior to the recommendations section I think. And of course I'll send that out and redline it so that everybody can see it.

Michael Young: Okay. Julie is there anything else in the section that you want to review?

Julie Hedlund: No. I don't think so. And it goes without saying but I'll mention it for the transcript I will of course change all the "shalls" to "shoulds".

Michael Young: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: So they'll all be "shoulds".

Michael Young: So I'm going to suggest to everyone then that once you've made these changes Julie that we - as an action item for next weeks agenda we table putting the document up for final maybe group approval.

Claudio DiGangi: Oh Michael I'm sorry. I actually - I had some further comments on - I was going to submit them. I didn't get a chance actually to submit them to the list but if we have time now there's just a few of them that maybe we could run through and...

Michel Young: Sure. Let's knock them down if we can. Go ahead.

Claudio DiGangi: In Section 2.1.1b we list the languages there but we don't have English. So I wasn't sure if we wanted to specify that or not but I thought it might make sense to list it.

Michael Young: I think that makes a lot of sense. It's interesting that we are so careful about being considerate of multiple language bases we forgot English. Interesting. Okay.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. This is Julie. I think - and that's great, thanks for pointing that out. I think we were - the assumption was English and other languages but I don't think we should make that assumption. I think we should make it clear. You're absolutely right.

Claudio DiGangi: Okay. My other one was - I think this was just a spelling it was in 2.1.2f - 2.1.2.f, yeah, publicly is - I think publicly is spelled wrong there.

(Tony): Yeah. That's right. It is spelled wrong.

Julie Hedlund: Two point one...

Claudio DiGangi: Point two f.

Julie Hedlund: One two - I don't.

Michael Young: F.

Julie Hedlund: Oh okay. I see it it's down there.

(Tony):   Status (unintelligible) on a new application on the second - on the second line it says publicly.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. You're right. Okay. I'll get that fixed.

Claudio DiGangi: The other comment was under term limits - the term limit dealing with the counselor because that's already in the ICANN bylaws and there's already language, you know, I guess sort of covering that exactly how the term limit works. I would just suggest that we really don't even need to include it in our recommendation. I'm not...

(Tony):   Could you - what is the exact point number on the - so we can find it?

Claudio DiGangi: It's 2.2.1 term limits.

(Tony):   Two point two one. Okay.

Claudio DiGangi: Two point two point one. I'm sorry. It's a term limit for GNSO counselor position and, you know, since that's already in place.

(Tony):   It would be what, A - letter A on there?

Claudio DiGangi: Okay.

(Tony):   Yeah. That's right it is in the bylaws.

Michael Young: It does seem redundant so I'm okay with striking it if everyone else is.

Woman: Yeah. I think that makes sense.

Michael Young: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie, I've stricken it. It'll be noted and redlined in case anybody has any questions.

(Tony): So effectively B would become A and C would become B and et cetera.

Michael Young: Yep.

Claudio DiGangi: I think that was it. The only other one I had was on the appendix which I don't - we really haven't even like - I don't think we've sort of gotten to yet. But I was going to suggest that we actually just like remove the entire Appendix A for a couple of reasons. One, I think the document is already very long and there' s a lot of information in it.

And since we're really just, you know, we're basing our recommendations on the board's recommendations and I feel like it's just - we don't need to provide all this extra supporting analysis.

And then also, you know, I was looking over it and it's not really tied into the recommendations anymore. Like if you - when you get into this analysis it's actually inconsistent with a lot of what the recommendations above are saying. Because I think that analysis was drafted before we did a lot of the editing and so now after we've, you know, we've changed a lot of things around it's just - it's not lined up anymore with the recommendations.

I'm sure maybe in some cases it still is. But - and so I don't know rather than, you know, actually go through the entire appendix and make edits to it to sort of bring it more consistent with what we're saying above my suggestion is just to not include it at all.

Julie Hedlund: Claudio this is Julie. I'll just mention for the record that in the meeting before the last meeting Rafik specifically asked that that detail be included in the appendix. Of course if the group here requests me to delete it I'll be happy to. I just thought I'd mention that.

Man: Yep.

(Tony):   I support Claudio's suggestion. We should remove it. And I assume appendix B is being removed also. Right?

Woman: Appendix B is the minority reports and we are obligated to keep those in.

(Tony):   Oh yeah. That's - if it's a minority report that's fine. Just so long as it's not in the main body of the report.

Julie Hedlund: Actually this is - this is Julie. This is not a minority report. It's just additional detail that Rafik had asked be retained. Monitory reports we actually do not have yet. I know that (Victoria)'s preparing one and of course when we have them they'll be included which will now become Appendix A since this Appendix A will go away and there won't be an appendix B.

(Tony):   Okay.

Michael Young: Well let me ask this guys are we going to have a show stopper with Rafik? Are we going to cause a lot of turmoil and re-debate if we remove Appendix A?

Claudio DiGangi: Well Michael you know what I was...

Michael Young: Is Appendix A harmful?

Claudio DiGangi: Michael I was thinking, you know, if some of the work team members are really, you know, I'm not sure if Rafik has recently reviewed it or if he's basing it on his, you know, his understanding of when he last looked at it.

But I was thinking if some, you know, if some of the work team members wanted - if they support this then they could sort of just sign onto it and submit it either as part of a minority report or just, you know, some sort of separate submission that they support this. But I just - I don't think it should be part of the, you know, the full document. Just because I - it just doesn't seem to line up with what we're saying above.

(Tony): Yeah. I agree entirely. Because if as Claudio is saying you have some discrepancies with the previous part of the report that report becomes ambiguous.

Michael Young: Okay. I understand that line of argument. If we were to keep this it would have to be reedited to line up with the changes we've made in the main report. And therefore since it's really somewhat superfluous in the first place the argument is to remove it altogether.

Claudio DiGangi: Yep.

Julie Hedlund: Claudio it's Julie. And it'll be pretty obvious that it's been removed and we're asking all the work team members to review the document with these changes. I'm leaving these in as tracked changes so everybody will have a chance to respond (unintelligible).

Michael young: If we remove it can we specifically - what I'm trying to do is bring everybody to - help move everybody towards a consensus position as quickly as possible. I'd really like to see our reasoning for removing it which seems rational and responsible to maybe the top of the e-mail then Julie, you know, when you put out the revised document so people understand why we took

that appendix off. You know, I'd hate to see anyone, you know, react versus understand the reasoning why we remove something before they...

Julie Hedlund: Right. And...

Man: Well the..

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. This is Julie. I will - I had planned in any case to make it clear which substantive changes I'm making in the document at the top of the e-mail that I normally send so it will be clear. Because I imagine that (Victoria) also would probably have some concerns.

(Tony): Well but I think the main point here is we haven't gone through the Appendix A as a whole group and agreed upon it. So if you just leave it there after the rest of the document which we have been through, you know, word by word it doesn't seem to me like we're doing the right thing.

Michael Young: Well I agree with your thinking (Tony) completely. And you're right we either have to go through the Appendix A and modify it to stay in line and be true to the main document or we...

(Tony): If not it becomes a minority report. If there are discrepancies then it's a - it's a different opinion and it deserves to be a minority report I think.

Michael Young: Agreed. So, you know, it comes down to we have two choices we either go through Appendix A, we try and line it up so it's not a differing option but it's a consensus with the main report. Which is a lot of work and a lot of effort and I don't know that it does anything other than frankly reiterate what the main report says which is I think the point you were making earlier. So I think it's a fruitless task really.

It needs to stand as is - if someone feels it needs to stand as is with the differing opinions then like you said it can be submitted as a minority report and then we're done.

Claudio DiGangi: Yep. I agree with that.

(Tony): Yep.

Michael Young: So Julie I think our action items then are to scratch it and give that explanation that I just ran through in the captioning e-mail.

Julie Hedlund: Right Michael. I'll be sure to do that.

Michael Young: Okay. Thank you. Yes. Because realistically if we had to try to go through this document and align it it's another month's work. So - and I don't see the added value. Okay. Maybe someone will submit it as a minority report. It's quite possible. So are we done with this document or Claudio did you have more...

Claudio DiGangi: No. Those were all of mine Michael. I don't know if we should go and discuss Chuck's and Rafik's comments because they're not on the call or how you would want to handle that. But I think there was - we started discussing Chuck's last week and I think there was some left that we didn't get to.

Julie Hedlund: Actually I think we covered all - this is Julie I think we covered all of Chuck's comments in this document last week. But Chuck and Rafik have sent comments to the Task 2 document which I think, you know, may need to be discussed today.

Claudio DiGangi: Oh okay. Yeah. I'm sorry I didn't realize. I thought - I thought...

Michael Young: Yeah. I think we're up to par on this document now with your comments. So that's why I was suggesting that if we're done processing everyone's

comments and we put out this next version - it might be a little bold Julie but I'd like to table it next week as the action item to try and - but if we ask people to put a final approval on it in next weeks meeting as an action item it may not get done next week but at least people are now moving towards that goal.

Julie Hedlund: Right. And Michael this is Julie. I could - could I suggest that we also request a final approval and if there are any for people to submit their minority reports?

Michael Young: Okay. Perfect. And what's a reasonable - is everyone okay? I'd like to suggest a timeline for minority report submission because when we've had these before they've - people have been late on them and they've dragged on a bit.

And so I'd like to suggest if we make a call out for any monitory reports today or even Monday Julie that we give people - is two weeks reasonable or is that too short of a time? What does everyone think?

Claudio DiGangi: I think that's good.

Michael Young: Okay. So let's say we'd like them for two weeks please Julie if that's okay.

Julie Hedlund: Michael I've noted that and I'll be sure to include it.

Michael Young: I'm just trying to roll everyone along. I know we've - some of this stuff is very difficult to wade through but it's, you know, it's - from a project manager's mentality which is what I'm taking at the moment we're just trying to keep the momentum going and keep the progress rolling forward as well as dealing with all the issues. So if no one else has anything further on this document for now we'll move onto the next agenda item.

Okay. Is there - would someone like to step forward and give an update from the sub team on Task 2? Can anyone do that? Does anyone have - was there any work done by the sub team in the last week?

Julie Hedlund: Michael this is Julie. I think, you know, the document was out for comment and Chuck and Rafik gave comments. But is Debra on the call?

Debra Hughes: Yeah. I'm sorry. I was speaking and I was on the - I apologize. This is Debbie. So I haven't received any other additional comments Julie other than the two that I saw, you know, that were circulated by Chuck and Rafik.

And just wanted to first find out if there were just any general thoughts about the framework and the approach that I was proposing for this task before we start to really drill down.

Michael Young: Okay. Debbie should we go through and start to try and process Rafik and Chuck's comments?

Debra Hughes: Sure. Sure. So what's the protocol? Do you usually just go step by step or...

Michael Young: Yeah. I think if everyone gets the documents up - Julie if you could walk us through them that would be helpful.

Julie Hedlund: Sure. This is Julie. I'd be happy to do that. So the document that I have is one that includes Olga's comments, Chuck's and Rafik's. Starting at the beginning...

Michael Young: I'm sorry Julie - sorry to interrupt but which day did you send that version because I've got a few here with different comments and (unintelligible)?

Julie Hedlund: Actually Rafik sent his on - let me just see here. It's been quite recently I think. It was...

Michael Young: There's one on Sunday is that the...

Julie Hedlund: It is - yes. It was on Sunday the 25th and...

Michael Young: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: ...he's added his comments to the document that had Chuck's and Olga's so that is the most recent version.

Michael Young: All right. So if everyone can go to that one. I received it in my time zone as 1:30 am in the morning on Sunday at (BGC). So if everyone could open that one we'll go through it.

Julie Hedlund: And Michael this is Julie. I'll try to be pretty clear as well in walking through it. The first is just a general comment from Chuck that he's attached to the title of the document. And he says that, "This is an excellent foundation for starting the work on this task."

And in actuality I'm - well let's see the comments are in different colors so I'll - I'm not entirely sure - they're not labeled as who's are who's but I'll just run through them.

Under deliverables to accomplish and the statement is, "Reach all current members of the current ICANN community and potential members particularly non-English speakers." At the term reach the comment is, "The purpose of the outreach should be made clear as is stated in the bullets below."

Debra Hughes: And Julie this is Debbie. I can say because I was the document creator the comments are showing as to who made them.

Julie Hedlund: Oh (unintelligible).

Debra Hughes: Yeah. So I can provide you some help with that.

Julie Hedlund: (Unintelligible).

Debra Hughes: So the first two comments in that section are from Chuck and then the final one in that brownish color, that's Rafik.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. Very good.

Debra Hughes: Sure.

Julie Hedlund: So - yeah. So Chuck is I think maybe asking for perhaps a bit more detail here. And then his second comment is, "I understand the focus on reaching out to potential members but not current members unless the focus on current members relates to inactive members. There should not be much need to reach out to currently active members. Maybe it is because I do not understand why current members would be contacted." And that is a comment around the words current members.

And then the third comment is as Debbie notes from Rafik which is around the words non-English speakers. He says, "I think that the outreach is not limited to language issue but more geographical diversity too and especially developing regions like Africa."

Debra Hughes: So Julie this is Debbie. Can I make a couple comments?

Julie Hedlund: Oh plea end please take the floor I'm simply assisting.

Debra Hughes: No. No. No. No. No. So that sentence or that bullet was pulled - I pulled it directly from Task 2 just to kind of give everybody a background of where that came from. I went to the Task 2 definition and that's what it said. So that's not Debbie's creation. Does that make sense?

Man: Yep.

Debra Hughes: Okay. So I guess maybe - I don't know why current members are included but that's why it's in there. And so I guess the question becomes do we have to address that or not? I'm new to this so I'm trying to understand.

Julie Hedlund: And Debbie this is Julie. I might suggest that perhaps what we can do because I think this is a similar issue to the one we just discussed in Task 1 is that we can provide a little bit of background that, you know, this is a - and I'm happy to assist you with this, I'd be happy to provide this text.

That, you know, a little background that this is a recommendation from the BGC working group and the recommendation reads - and we might even, you know, I could pull it out of the quote so it's clear, you know, where it comes from and then that's the way the recommendation was worded and we can footnote it accordingly.

And I think that as a work team we do have some leeway on how we - sorry I'm getting another call. I'm just going to ignore it. Sorry about that. You know, in how we, you know, address this particular recommendation. And we may want to add, you know, more clarification or terms or something like that.

Claudio DiGangi: This is Claudio. I was going to suggest maybe like if we - maybe if we want to amend this language we could say, "Reach all relevant members of the public."

I think what's a little confusing to me is when you sort of qualify to fall in the - as being part of the ICANN community or not. I'm not sure how that's defined. And maybe that's what's maybe what's making it a little confusing with current members and potential members. So I don't know that's just a suggestion.

Michael Young: Anyone having a issue with that suggestion?

Debra Hughes: This is Debbie. I think that sounds good and I think I can work to try to define as Claudio mentions what the relevant public means. Right?

Man: Yeah.

Michael Young: Okay. I think particularly Task 2 - let's face it Task 2 is a more - has more vague objectives as compared to Task 1 in general. So we're going to have to keep providing context around how we decide to shape the responses.

Debra Hughes: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: So this is Julie. Shall I continue?

Michael Young: Please.

Julie Hedlund: All right. So the next set of comments and I think these actually - well changes are in blue, well they are on my copy. But they're further down in the bullets that appear under the section strategies for outreach to current members and - at the bottom there. And I think these additions - I'm not sure Debbie does it indicate who made these additions?

Debra Hughes: No. And I'm trying to figure out how to...

Julie Hedlund: I think they're actually from Olga. Because I think if I remember correctly...

Debra Hughes: There you go.

Julie Hedlund: ...the e-mail from last week said that they were pertaining to...

Debra Hughes: Yes. That's right. That's right.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. So anyway the additional two bullets are contact at large structures already part of the RALOS - Regional At Large Structures that are part of the ALAC - At Large Advisory Committee. Contact members of the fellowship community, fellowship program existence, the ICANN meeting in San Juan, Puerto Rico June, 2007.

And then continuing down under Section 2 strategies for outreach to potential members Olga has added a bullet at the bottom: Identify universities which focus of study and investigation is related with DNF/Internet governance. And then there is another addition which I think may be from Chuck.

Debra Hughes: Yeah. That is Chuck.

Julie Hedlund: Great. To ask for assistance from stakeholders groups, constituencies, other supporting organizations and advisory committees.

Michael Young: So I should have put it in the document this week but I've been thinking about an idea - a bullet that would apply to both - well all of these areas actually. How far are we supposed to go with these strategies? Are we supposed to actually suggest fundamental mechanisms or specific ways to do this or are we supposed to just recommend general strategies? Does anyone have a sense of that because I have an actual specific idea?

Claudio DiGangi: I'm not sure. I don't have a sense of that Michael.

Debra Hughes: I would love somebody to give me some direction because I have no clue.

Michael Young: Yeah. I feel like this one was really kind of vague. Well Julie first of all I mean if - I guess we could go back to the OSC and ask for some clarification and some direction about how far we're supposed to take this one. So could we formally ask for some guidance from the OSC on that?

Julie Hedlund: Michael this is Julie. I think also what we could do first and I'd be happy to do this would be to - I think there was a fair amount written about this in the BGC work group's report and maybe I could try to parse out some details there.

But I think, you know, and if that's not sufficient to guide us and it certainly may not be because I think you're right I think this one is probably the least defined of the various recommendations then I think we could certainly ask the OSC. And in fact actually I think that Chuck probably would be able to give us a sense there as well.

Michael Young: So, you know, I'll throw out the idea I was having anyway. I'm not sure if we're supposed to go to this level of detail. But I'll throw out the idea and if we are then we can consider incorporating it Debbie.

But my thinking was - well let me give you a little bit about my background. I - some of you are aware, you know, how I've been involved with ICANN and the Internet in general and some of you know very little about me.

So I actually started an Internet business back in 2000/2001 when things were reregulating and we were starting with the NTLDs at the beginning . And I was involved with (unintelligible) from it's initiation.

So - and I was working very heavily in various ICANN related activities really from kind of a combination of operational policy side implementation issues and helped a lot of early players around ICANN make things actually functionally work.

So about two or three years ago I changed my role at Affiliates quite a bit, and part of that was getting more actively involved in these groups. I had been a background player but I became a visible player and I had to learn ICANN. Really the ins and outs and what the real structure meant. And I found that very difficult to do.

The only reason I think I was successful was there were a number of experienced, established people that I knew already from my previous dealings who really did understand the ICANN space environment and all the different groups and how they interacted with each other who were very kind, and mentored me and taught me the ropes a little bit and helped me find my way around.

Now if we want to get new people into ICANN activities, working groups, environments in general I think it would be extremely helpful as an outreach tool if we built a guide to ICANN booklet. And I mean something that is, you know, more than just the few Web pages that frankly don't do a very good job of explaining how things really work at ICANN.

You know, what we have available to us now is a bunch of documents and guides that different groups have put up. They're not necessarily consistent with each other and there's no solitary, really, you know, I'm a newcomer orientation guide to ICANN. So I think an orientation guide that was updated annually would be a really, really useful tool and it would make it a lot less intimating for people to participate.

I also think some type of maybe quarterly publication - electronic publication that basically, you know, I hate to use the word newsletter because newsletter's always seem to kind of die on the vine - wither on the vine But maybe some type of quarterly publication that gives a synopsis of, you know, what's hot at ICANN. What's going on. What meetings have happened. What meetings are coming up, you know, what's being debated, what's being discussed.

And it's something that obviously needs to be neutral on all positions but, you know, just basically a reporting document. So that people that are trying to track the very many - very, very many these days meetings and sessions and, you know, there's all kinds of very short notice meetings being correlated around hot topics these days.

You know, vertical integration is an example of that and all the various concerns and items around the new TLD process. There's been many, many meetings called amongst different community players and ICANN participants with very short notice over the last couple of years. So it would be really good to have that information streaming someplace.

So instead of having to follow, I don't know, seven or eight mailing lists, you know, or more in some cases to get a sense of what's going on and reading minutes from many different meetings at least you have a sense of what's happening and what's (unintelligible) people are discussing and where decision making is happening.

So that's kind of my two cents and my idea. But, you know, a getting started guide or, you know, an orientation guide and then a regular electronic publication that gives ongoing information about what's happening and what meetings are going on and where decisions re being made.

Julie Hedlund: Actually Michael if I might comment on that. The second item there are a couple of tools out there and perhaps they're not very well publicized. There is a policy update publication that summarizes all of the policy work that comes out - a monthly both as a, you know, I'm sorry a hard copy item as well as online.

And then there's a master calendar on the GNSO improvements page that tracks every - all the calls that are scheduled relating to GNSO and when they are. And then that's where transcripts and mp3s are posted as soon as they're available.

Michael Young: You know what I understand that Julie I'm aware of those tools. And I think they're very, very good if you know your way around ICANN, because you understand the context of what you're looking at, you know what those groups are. You know what you're looking for when you look for a transcript

of a particular meeting and you have a sense of, you know, what meetings - what decisions might be made at what types of meetings.

For a newcomer, you know, it's a map of information and you're not sure, you know, which meeting is meaningful. There's not enough information for those people that aren't familiar with the environment to understand the implications of, you know, what this group does or what that meeting means and so forth. The calendar is useful for - it's an experts tool let's put it that way. If you're an expert at ICANN those are great tools and they do the job beautifully.

If you know nothing about ICANN and you're trying to figure your way around you need - you need a dummies' guide to what's going on basically that breaks it down into, you know, there's a meeting on this day, these are the kind of things that are talked about at this meeting, this is the kind of impact decisions made at this level or this group have. If a decision's made here it will go up to the GNSO and have to be approved there as well or ultimately to the board.

But, you know, put context around the importance of different work that's going on if you're ignorant. Which, you know, if we want to get new people in here they are ignorant. There's no reason they'd understand that context. Right?

Julie Hedlund: Right. And I totally agree with you Michael. But I, you know, I'm thinking that you're making me think that maybe we should have someone from the policy side speak to us to sort of hear these thoughts and that is Scott Pinzon. He is our Director of Communications for Policy and his task is to try to get this information out in a way that is useful to newcomers -- to people who know absolutely nothing.

And his job with the policy update was to recraft that document to make it clear and easy to understand for newcomers. So I think that he might have some suggestions or practical ways, you know, practical recommendations

for us to build into the outreach recommendations. And plus I think he would be very interested in hearing your comments Michael on ways to improve what we already have out there and maybe some of those improvements would be written into our recommendations as well.

Michael Young: Well I think that sounds like a great - Debbie and everyone what do you think about having him come in and talk to us on the subject? Because there might be some really great ideas there for us.

Debra Hughes: I think that is excellent. And I'm sitting here writing this and I'm just smiling. I mean I, you know, think I know a little bit about or thought I knew a little bit about ICANN when I joined the GNSO. And I was completely overwhelmed at my first ICANN public meeting and at the exchange of e-mails and everything.

And I think for people for whom we are trying to reach out who are new to ICANN having some sort of guide to navigate not just when you're at a public meeting but navigating the infrastructure I think would be fabulous.

And we've got tons of resources I believe on the ICANN Web site but it's hard to find those things. And if you're new maybe there's a button just like "new to ICANN" you click there and you get those sources. And then certainly also some sort of lighter form of a e-communication or quarterly, you know, newsletter like what's how, what's going on kind of tailored in language for newcomers.

And that if you're more experienced like you said Julie, you know, you've got the more detailed policy updates you can drill down. But kind of like from a news - informational news lighter format I think that's great. I would love if Scott could come and talk to us and we could, you know, get his thoughts on what he's already planning or what he has in the works and figure out how that would all work into what we're all trying to do here.

Michael Young: Fantastic. Listen everyone we're at 10:00. It sounds like that's a great next step. Plus, you know, I'll probably throw my - the ideas that I just made I might as well add them to your document Debbie just so you can get them down on paper for now. Or, you know, maybe I'll just put them out to the list and you can incorporate them in a later document I don't know if the framework documents, you know, the right document for them to go in.

We're not going to get through the entire agenda here but - and I don't know that we're completely done with the comments either. So can we pick pup next week where we left off?

Man: Yep.

Michael Young: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: That sounds great Michael.

Michael Young: Sorry Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. I said that sounds great.

Michael Young: Okay. So...

Julie Hedlund: And I'll - shall I go ahead and see if Scott can join us for next Friday?

Michael young: I think that would be great.

Debra Hughes: That would be wonderful.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. I'll check and see if that will work for him. It's a little early for him he's in Seattle but maybe he won't mind - ha ha.

Michael Young: Maybe we can get him to come in at, you know, 9:30 EDT so that's a little later for him.

Julie Hedlund: In a little bit. Right.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Okay everyone I have to run to another call too but I've got my tasks and I'll summarize them and get that out today.

Michael Young: Okay. Thanks everyone.

Debra Hughes: Thanks everybody.

Julie Hedlund: Good bye.

Man: Bye bye.

Michael Young: Bye.

                                    END