Operations Steering Committee
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 15 December 2008 14:00 UTC

Note: **The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee meeting on Monday 15 December 2008, at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:**
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/operations-sc-20081215.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#nov

Present for the teleconference:
Chuck Gomes - GNSO Council vice-chair, OSC group chair
Olga Cavalli - NCA alternate chair
Stéphane van Gelder - Registrar
Philip Sheppard - CBUC
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben - ISP
David Maher - Ryc
Ken Stubbs - Ryc
Bertrand de la Chapelle - GAC Liaison (to be confirmed)

Staff:
Ken Bour
Glen de Saint Gery

Robert Hoggarth - absent aoplogies

Coordinator: The recording's been started sir.

(Chuck):   Thank you. All right, welcome to everyone. Let me quickly go over
                 who's on the call. Glen's on, Olga's on, (Ken)'s on, and Ken Bour will
                 be filling in for (Rob). (Rob) might be able to make part of the meeting,
                 but it's not- but maybe not. He has been asked to fill in for another
                 meeting that conflicts with this.

                 Philip's on, (Wolf)'s on and David Maher's on. So I'm going to go ahead
                 and start because I know everybody's time is important. And welcome
                 to Steve Metalitz who just joined us.

Steve Metalitz: Hi (Chuck).

(Chuck):   And we'll go ahead and get started. Any questions about the en-
                  Bertrand, thank you for joining us.

Bertrand de La Chapelle: (Unintelligible). As I said, it's provisional pending formal
                  nomination by the (GAC)'s liaison. But I thought it was useful to join.

(Chuck):   Sure, you know, I - Glen, can you fire off the agenda and the Wiki link
                  for Bertrand so that he has that.

Glen DeSaintgery   I'll do that now, (Chuck).

(Chuck):   Because I'm on Pacific Coast Time, I didn't have very much time to
                  send them. I did send them a meeting info, but that was it.

                  So Bertrand de La Chapelle has joined us from the GACfor the rest of
                  the people on the call. And like he said, that's pending GACapproval. I
                  don't think there's too much risk that the GACwouldn't approve that.

                  But I'll leave that to the (GAK). The - so Bertrand for your benefit since
                  I just had gone over the people on the call, Glen DeSaintgery is on the
                  call as the GNSO Secretariat.

                  Olga Cavalli, from our - as a non-com representative on the counsel,
                  (Ken Bower), ICANN staff, Philip Shepherd from the Business
                  Constituency, (Wolf Noven) from the ISP, David Maher from the
                  Registry Constituency, Steve Metalitz from the Intellectual Property
                  Constituency.

So welcome to the call, and just first item on the agenda really is to see if there's any suggested changes to the agenda.

All right, and again for Bertrand's benefit we will keep this call to an hour or less. So we will move through efficiently here.

The, no changes to the agenda, all right. The - I have not heard back from (Cheryl) from the ALAC regarding the possible representative from the ALAC. I did send her a reminder, but I haven't heard anything there.

Now Glen did everybody respond to that last doodle for a regular meeting that I think zeroed in. I don't - everybody clicked yes on this day and time as a possibility if I recall.

Glen DeSaintgery   That's correct (Chuck).

(Chuck):   And is this okay, just as this would be a last chance, can we - we can always change it on a case by case basis as needed. But unless people speak up differently we will go ahead and plan this time on Mondays as a regular meeting time.

Now I'm hoping as you probably saw from the agenda, that we will not need to have weekly meetings after the first of the year. And it may not even be possible to have a meeting next week. We'll come back to that in a moment.

But our key thing is to get the three working teams going. And once we, our next big task, our two big tasks are to finalize a mess - an intimate invitation for work team members and get that out.

And combined with that would be the need to, you know, have the draft work team charters in good enough shape so that people at least have a good idea of what they, of what their choices are for a work team.

And we're going to work on both of those today. So any comments on using this day and time for our meetings? Again, anticipating that after the first of the year we will not need weekly meetings.

Okay, good. That's great. Going then to the next item. And let's talk about next week. I, you know, we may need to come back to that at the end of the meeting to see how much progress we make.

So let me suggest that we do that just because I think we'll know better at that time where we're at and whether we even need a meeting next week.

So, all right.

Philip Shepherd: It's a good idea (Chuck) to come back to it just I mean since it's one way or the other, I won't be able to make a meeting on that, next week (unintelligible).

(Chuck): Yes, and then under the same agenda, thanks Philip, under the same agenda item notice we're not going to meet definitely on the 29th of December, okay.

And is, are there any objections to meeting on the 5th of January after the first of the year? And by the way, I'd like you to think a little bit ahead because we'll maybe start a bi-weekly meeting at that point.

So we could either start that on the 5th of January or the 12th of January. Are there any preferences? Does it matter to people?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I won't be available on the 12th of January.

(Chuck): So is anybody opposed to doing the - starting a bi-weekly meeting on the 5th?

Ken Stubbs: This is Ken Stubbs.

(Chuck): Hi Ken.

Ken Stubbs: Hi (Chuck).

(Chuck): Welcome. Okay so we have right now I'll put it down as the 5th and then we'll tentatively start having meetings bi-weekly.

Again we won't have a meeting every two weeks if we don't need one, okay. There's no need in doing that. But I suspect probably early on as we get the group up and going we may, although we'll see.

Okay, let's go onto Item 6 on the agenda, this is mainly just a confirmation. On the list we confirmed the charter. Everybody, all of the primary members approved the charter.

And we sent it to the counsel. Philip, I used the approach as you probably saw that you suggested in terms of asking them, just saying hey, if you don't have - if we don't hear any objections we'll go ahead and assumed approved.

(Aubrey) had some concerns about that. But you can read my reply on that and we'll see where that goes.

But I think that it's important that we keep moving forward on that. And I will find out in our counsel meeting on Thursday whether she wants to have a specific motion for that or not.

She also thought that three days notice, it's actually a little more than three days notice. But to the counsel was insufficient. I think that the charter is brief enough that that should have been okay. But we'll deal with that. We don't need to get hung up on that I think.

So any comments on the charter? Okay, then let's jump right to Agenda Item 7. The issues raised on the OSC mailing list regarding the draft charters of the three work teams.

And again for Bertrand's benefit, we have as recommended by the planning team several months ago, we did agree on this group to initiate three work teams.

GNSO Operations, Constituency and Stakeholder Group Operations and Communications and each of those teams would be responsible for developing implementation plan for the ICANN board recommendations for improvement related to those particular areas.

Now some of the issues regarding the specific draft charters that came up on our list since our last meeting a week ago or six days ago, whatever it was. I just added to it, the agenda, just to make it quick to go through them.

The first question I jotted down, should we recommend that the work teams should be share - should be, excuse me, that the team chairs should be OSC members?

Now (Wolf) had suggested this quite some time ago. And the, so let's talk about that idea right now. I put some comments out on the list on that. And there's been a little bit of discussion.

But what do people think on that?

(Wolf Noven): Yes, it's (Wolf) speaking here (Chuck). Well I explained, you know, what the reason is. The intention was only well to strengthen dealing between the OSC and the - and working teams.

And so I came up also with the, this is, with the idea that they could do that not let me say to select let me say the chair people from the OSC rather then to establish the working teams.

And then let them select their chairperson and those chairpersons should be members or joint members or what else to the OSC.

(Chuck): Thank you (Wolf). Come - let me get others chime in on the discussion on this.

Philip Shepherd: I mean I think the objective is clear. We simply want to have a communication link between what the teams are doing and ourselves.

I think the prime communication I think of course should be ICANN staff because that is what they are there for and what a normal secretary would do.

So the second question is do we need additional links besides that. And I think just in terms of making the link - the secondary suggestion I think is just saying that whoever ends up being the chair of each of those teams is invited to be a member of the Steering Committee next (unintelligible).

I mean keep it as simple as that.

(Chuck): Other thoughts?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I agree with that point.

(Chuck): You think?

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga I agree with Philip.

(Chuck): All right.

Bertrand de La Chapelle: (Chuck) this is Bertrand.

(Chuck): Go ahead Bertrand.

Bertrand de La Chapelle: I apologize for the rest of the group as I'm coming in late and actually (Chuck)'s invitation to join this conference call was following a quick mail that I was sending upon reviewing the material that is available on line.

And I was sharing a concern and apologize for being as usual the late coming troublemaker in terms of methodology.

But when I looked at the whole structure of having two group the two committees, the PPSC and the OSC and each of the groups being sub divided into three sub groups and so on.

First of all it was incredibly difficult to get a grasp of the whole thing. And the second thing is that I'm wondering whether this two early sub division of issues is not getting us to move away from the clear focus.

And I must say that the mechanism by which the staff would be the conduit to coordinate basically or to (unintelligible) of information between three sub groups is going to be hard to follow.

And in a nutshell, my concern regarding this process, and once again I realize that I'm coming late. But this is a result of the fact that the invitation actually did come late after the working methods have been established.

But I consider that the whole issue, both for the OSC and the PPSC is one single thing, is how do we reform the policy development process and the corresponding elements.

And I think, and I just wanted to share it with you, that putting everything on the same level and having all this sub groups starting at the same time in a separate manner is not conducive to having an appropriate focus.

So I was thinking that it might be useful to maybe have, and I don't know how much discussion has been going on in that respect, but to have a clearer understanding of what is the goal.

Which is to basically reform NXA of the buy lows, and make the corresponding consequences. So I'm wondering if we're not starting everything at the same time, making it very hard to coordinate afterwards.

And this echoes the difficulties I had with previous processes that I participated in. So apologies again for coming in late. But aren't we sub dividing things a little bit too much to early?

(Chuck):   I'll encourage others to respond. But let me first say that because I'm on Pacific Coast Time in the US I didn't, I just glanced at your detailed message Bertrand.

And I planned after this meeting to respond in more detail. I did look at your heading. First of all with regard to NXA, actually the redefining NXA is mostly only one part of the board recommendation.

And that's a, with regard, that's a task for the PPSC to revise the PDP. In addition to that there's the task, their recommen- big recommendation is to refine the working group model.

Now that will be closely related to the PDP. But we thought in the planning committee months ago, and did talk a lot about the very point you're making that the - that there's enough work on each of those revising the PDP and developing, refining the working group model so that it's open and effective and so forth -- and incorporating a lot of the lessons we've learned over the last few years and adding new ideas as well -- that it - each of them were big enough tasks that it would be helpful to separate them.

While having the PPSC, you know, serve as a coordinating body between the two as needed.

With regard to the three working teams on this side, on the OSC side we felt like they were again fairly significant tasks. And independent enough that it would be helpful to have different people working on them.

And then the OSC simply serving as a coordinator role. And please understand that the two steering committees are just that. They're steering committees. That is not where the work is going to be done.

It's kind of to say, one of the purposes is to save the counsel from having to stay involved in the detail work. It will be the steering committee's responsibility to kind of oversee that.

That's why we're coming up with all the details needed to get these groups formed and so fourth. And ultimately any implementation plans that are developed, and that's the goal, for specific board recommendations will be forwarded up through the steering committee's through the counsel.

Now let me let others jump into the discussion here. Anyone want to comment? Okay, Bertrand would you like to respond?

Stéphane: (Chuck) if I may.

(Chuck):   Sure.

Stéphane: Sorry, Stéphane here. Sorry I'm late first of all. Hello everyone. Just a quick comment on, I just heard the last part of what Bertrand was saying and your comments (Chuck).

I just wanted to react to your comments. I'm not sure you've got as - I don't know where you are on the agenda for the meeting today. But I...

(Chuck):   We're on Item 7.

Stéphane: Right, okay so you've already done quite a lot. I just wanted to comment on the recent email discussions we've had as well.

(Chuck):   Hold off on those a second. Let's talk on Bertrand's comments right now regarding the structure that we've organized in the - for the GNSO improvements as a whole.

Stéphane: Okay.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve, if I could get in the queue as well.

(Chuck):   Go ahead Stéphane, you can finish.

Stéphane: No well in that case let me come back to that later. My, I was going to go on from your point about the OSC and the (unintelligible) steering committees being just that.

We've had a lot of discussions about OSC members being in the work teams, but maybe that should be held off until we get there on the agenda.

(Chuck):   Well we're kind of there. But Bertrand raised an issue that's a little bit higher then that. So I wanted to allow the discussion on Bertrand's point first.

Stéphane: Okay.

(Chuck):   So we'll be right back to you Stéphane on that.

Stéphane: Thanks.

(Chuck):   Go ahead Steve Metalitz.

Steve Metalitz: Yes I was just going to say that I think we're pretty far down the road on this after several meetings of the steering committee. And I also think that while there may be some question of sequencing as to the work of the different steering committees.

And I think we've talked a little bit about that. I think there certainly are elements of what's in the bailiwick of each, excuse me, the work of the work teams.

There are elements of what's in the jurisdiction of each of the work teams that could be started on particul- could be worked in parallel. So I don't think that there's, I think if the work teams look at their list and figure out which ones they're going to do first, we can probably avoid most of the coordination problems that Bertrand refers too.

(Chuck): And Bertrand another point, even in this committee for example we felt like the one committee, the GNSO operations committee was the most urgent to get going right away.

Mainly because the GNSO rules of procedure and so forth will have to be revised and be done before the new GNSO struc- voting structure is put in place in June.

So, and I think we anticipate that not all the work teams will necessarily finish at the same time. But that some may take longer.

And in the case of for example constituency operations we, you know, know that that's got to get going. But realize that that one's got some special issues that will have to be dealt with. And will need a lot of cooperation from existing constancy support.

Bertrand de La Chapelle: (Chuck) if I may come back in and respond to those points. First of all you have to understand that my understanding of the whole discussion is as old as about three hours ago.

(Chuck): Yes, okay.

Bertrand de La Chapelle: So fundamentally I delved into the mass of information that was over there. And tried to get a better understanding of what it is.

Second, you must understand, and this is a general comment, that the situation by which GACor AC participants for that matter are invited to participate in a process when the working methods of this process are already being established for about a month and a half.

Puts us, and me in that case, in a very unpleasant situation. Because on the one hand, it's like just make no comment regarding the procedures. I would feel very ill at ease in the way it is being put in place.

On the other hand, if I do what I'm doing right now, which is just coming in and saying well by the way, this is not the way I would have thought that this was going to be developed.

Then it is antagonistic to the process that you've already been through. So as this is about working methods of the GNSO and also the policy development process in general, it is important to note that whenever a working group is being established, if this working group is supposed to incorporate people from the GACor from AC, from ALAC, it is important that their invited as early as possible.

So that there is a capacity to be part of the development of the methodology of the group itself.

In this case, unless I'm wrong, the invitation was sent on the 27th of November and the 3rd of December respectively for the PPSC and the OSC. It turned out to be right at the moment of the (unintelligible) IGS meeting.

And, you know, as much as I'm very interested in this subject, I understand that work has already been going on for a while before. So it is an unpleasant situation. So that's the first point.

The second point is if I look at the work for instance of Team Number 1 on GNSO operations, I see something that mentions develop statement of interest and declarations of interest forms.

Looking at some of the other documents I understood that there was very interesting comment in exchange regarding the nature of the contributions that are being made at the beginning of a process. Especially by the different constituencies to input in the preparation of an issue paper.

And the comment if I'm not wrong was that it has both an interest in getting the information from the different constituencies. But at the same time, it brings them into a track that forces them to formalize the position and lock the position in.

Making it harder for people to discuss afterwards, which is different from the comments at the end of the process, whether people endorse or don't endorse the proposal.

This is a typical example of something that I personally see as not being addressable at the beginning because you cannot develop the statement of interest and declaration of interest forms through the Team Number 1 on the OSC if you are not, and if I mean the whole group including the PPSC, is not under agreement of what kind of input is being given at the very beginning of a process.

This is the kind of thing where I have a problem.

(Chuck): Well Bertrand first of all, right now you're talking about an issue that hopefully will be dealt with thoroughly by a work team, not by the OSC in...

Bertrand de La Chapelle: That's what I mean.

(Chuck): Okay. Well if we deal with, well okay. I'll accept that. But it's not our task as a steering committee to do the primary work in developing the recommendations with regard to statements of interest and so forth.

It's just a matter of getting a work team developed that will be doing that. And in particular we're talking about GNSO operations work team.

Now back to your comments on the invitation to the (GAK). As you well know and you and I have talked about this directly, you know, the current system we have for GACcommunications are just plan not working.

You know, we have been assuming that there was a GACliaison that was communicating with the (GAK). And so, and the counsel has been involved throughout the process of all of this.

And unfortunately, you know, it was a wrong assumption on our part that the GACliaison would be keeping the GACinformed in this.

And I apologize for that. And what that ended up being then is is that the (GAK), you received late notice because of that. So all I can do is apologize. That is...

Bertrand de La Chapelle: No, no, it's been a miscommunication, I agree. I mean...

(Chuck):   Yes it's not been a miscommunication, it's been a lack of
                  communication. Because the structure we have in place wasn't
                  working. And so, you know, all I can say now, it's going to be very
                  important.

                  And for two particular work teams, under both steering committees, the
                  working group model team under the PPSC, and the communications
                  team on the OSC side, to really hopefully work on that and see how we
                  can make that work because it's not working the way we've been doing
                  it. And so that's going to be - those are going to be very important
                  tasks in my opinion for those working teams and the steering
                  committees to make sure that those things happen.

                  Now what I'd like to do is to move on to the agenda. And we'll come
                  back. The question I had raised was is that should - and we've talked
                  about a little bit.

                  Hope, Stéphane, you may not have heard all of the discussion. But
                  (Wolf) shared his point and his alternative idea of having the work
                  teams elect their chair and that person be a member of the steering
                  committee there.

                  So, and several people voiced their agreement with that. Stéphane let
                  me now let you make your point.

Stéphane: Well could I just get actually first of all, (Chuck) the plan is to - for the
              interim chair of the working groups to be an OSC member. Is that
              correct?

(Chuck):   We have not decided that yet. We're at that point right now on the
              whole issue of what we would recommend for chairs of the work team.

Stéphane: And the consensus from the group is what?

(Chuck):   We haven't reached any consensus.

Stéphane: You haven't reached, okay. So I can weight in there freely.

(Chuck):   Absolutely.

Stéphane: Okay. I just wanted to say that I feel it's a little too much to ask OSC
              members to be on the work groups as well.

              I mean if some OSC members want to be on the work groups then
              obviously, you know, good luck to them.

              But I think the workload would be quite intense. I also think that the
              actual idea of having a steering committee, and this is me coming back
              to what you were saying earlier on (Chuck) about explaining the role of
              the steering committee as just a facilitator for the work groups.

              And an organizer for the work groups. If we are to have the role, then it
              would be in our interest to have other people on the work groups. So I
              would just like to push for that. See if that's possible with the amount of
              volunteers that we get.

(Chuck): That, that, thank you Stéphane. And by the way I don't think the intent is that there ever would be, the work teams would be made up of mostly others.

I think the only idea of having a steering committee member on the work teams would be just kind of as a liaison role.

Now if we have the chair of that group on the steering committee, that may not be needed. So we can talk about that this morning.

Stéphane: Okay.

(Chuck): Thank you. Other thoughts on the role, the selection of chairs for the work team?

Philip Shepherd: Well (unintelligible) stay back to where we were about 20 minutes ago. When maybe the (unintelligible). I mean I agree with what Stéphane is saying in terms of number of people available for things.

And like I said, I thought the simplest approach was just to ask whoever ends up being the chair of each of those teams to be on the OSC. Leave it up to the constituency in terms of who they appoint people there.

In the case of the BC, I think I'm right in saying there are alternate member for the OSC who will be one of the team people. But that's how they're going to be practical because to some extent, once the teams are up and running, there's not much for us to do on the steering committee until any of the teams start enforcing (unintelligible).

And therefore the things move in a certain sequence.

(Chuck): Thank you Philip, anyone else? What I'm getting a sense, and let me test it, is is that the idea of letting the work teams choose a chair, an alternate chair if the want.

And then the chair would then be the, would be a member of the steering committee automatically. Is there anybody opposed to that idea?

All right, well I think then that that part of the issue is resolved. The other question then comes up should we try to have existing steering committee members, whether they be primaries or alternates, try to have at least one on every work team?

Or is that not necessary? What do people think?

Ken Stubbs: (Chuck)?

(Chuck): Go ahead Ken.

Ken Stubbs: Yes it's Ken. I think it's frankly not a bad idea. I think if there's an issue on methodology or there appears to be deviation in direction from the original intent of this charter.

I think it would be much easier for those issues to get resolved. Also I think it enhances communication in the long run. I know, I believe that (Stella) made the comment that's one of the functions of the secretary.

But at the same point and time I think, you know, it just to me, I prefer a more direct line in a case like that.

(Chuck): To keep that, to keep this relatively simple, are there - according to what - where people's heads are right now, are there any members that have thought that they'd like to be on any of the three OSC teams?

And plan on doing that? If so, that would make this issue really easy.

Olga Cavalli: (Chuck) this is Olga. I would like to be involved in the constituency's stakeholder group if...

(Chuck): Okay.

Ken Stubbs: (Chuck) this is Ken. And I was questioning an interest in either the stakeholder group operations or GNSO operations yes.

(Chuck): Okay, all right and you don't know which one necessarily. But you're...

Ken Stubbs: Well I mean if Olga has a strong desire for the stakeholder group operations, then I would be willing to take active participation in the operations.

(Chuck): Thanks. Is there anyone, and by the way, that's - this doesn't restrict any of the rest of you from being on one of those. So, but is there anybody that is kind of interested in the communications one?

And that's the one that's going to be communications within the GNSO, like the Web site and stuff like that. And, but very importantly,

communications with other ICANN groups like the GACand the ALAC and advisory committees, etc.

The - is anybody particularly interested in serving on that one? Okay and we can work that issue as we go. But it sounds like we have at least one person for two of the other groups.

So we can continue to see if there's somebody interested in the communications one. If not we've got the chair role that will become part of the steering committee group.

And I don't, I think that would probably still work so...

Bertrand de La Chapelle: (Chuck)? (Chuck)?

(Chuck):   Yes go ahead.

Bertrand de La Chapelle: This is Bertrand again. Sorry to hammer the same point over and over again.

(Chuck):   That's okay, go ahead.

Bertrand de La Chapelle: The reason why there is a problem with the third group is that it is incredibly closely linked to how the PDP itself and the working group methodology will engage the other ACs.

How can you discuss in a sub group, and if I am not mistaken, Team 3 of the OSC, mechanics for communication with other constituencies.

Whereas at the very same time the working group methodology on the other side of the APSC is going to be discussing how these constituencies are going to be engaged in the working group processes?

This is the same issue mostly.

(Chuck): Yes and...

Bertrand de La Chapelle: Why is it separated?

(Chuck): And like I already said, there are reasons we decided to separate it. But at the same time we fully realize that there needed to be coordination and cooperation between the different groups.

And the, and so your point's well taken. None of the working team's work can be done in isolation.

Stéphane: (Chuck) can I just make a comment.

(Chuck): Sure.

Stéphane: Sorry, it's Stéphane again. Just my understanding of one of the main areas of focus of the communications team, or what it should be, is to try and make the GNSO more easy to - more palatable, more easy to understand to people who are outside the GNSO because there's so much information there.

And if we're looking at the Web sites, if we're looking at the way we produce documents or the way we comment publicly, then obviously

behind that we must be trying to reach out to those people who aren't familiar with our processes.

And who may need just, you know, easier language or less acronyms or whatever. You know, more primers for the general stuff that the GNSO does.

I mean for example there's going to be a regional registrars' registry meeting in Rome at the beginning of next year.

And I'll be there and I'll be doing a short 10-minute stint on what I do on the GNSO counsel. Which is the whole idea of that is just to explain to people who don't know what this whole process is all about.

That's, that was my understanding of what the communications team was going to work on. And I don't think the PPSC does that.

(Chuck):   Thank you. Okay now let me, there's one other question with regard to the work team charters that I wanted to raise with regard to chair.

Should we have an OSC member serve as interim chair until the team actually selects there own chair? What are your thoughts on that?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I think that makes sense. You need someone to convene at the first meeting. So the first order of business would be to select its chair I suppose.

(Chuck):   Anybody opposed to that? Okay, then let me ask, Olga would you be willing to serve that interim role for the constituency stakeholder work team?

Olga Cavalli: Yes if everyone's okay with that.

(Chuck):   Anybody opposed to that? And then it's an interim role. Now you have to be careful. If you're not, you know, often times as happened with the OSC somebody who's an interim chair, people will automatically gravitate to service the ongoing chair.

And that's okay if you're willing to do that and they're supportive of that. But if you don't want to do that, make sure you make that clear right up front.

Man: Sounds like you're speaking from experience (Chuck).

(Chuck):   I am. The, and Ken would you be willing to do that on the case of the GNSO Ops team? Ken's probably on mute. So Ken Stubbs are you still there? You're showing there on the meeting view so.

I'm sure he'll jump in. And then we would need to find somebody for the communications team even if you didn't want to be on that team long-term. Is there anybody that might be interested in that?

Okay so we have a - we, that's something we need to work on there and we'll get a response from Ken hopefully before this meeting is over.

Ken Stubbs: (Chuck) I'm here.

(Chuck): Okay Ken are you - would you be willing to serve as interim chair on that GNSO operations team until the team works it's - elect's it's own chair?

Ken Stubbs: Yes I would.

(Chuck): Okay good.

Ken Stubbs: Okay now one other thing I was, sorry I was on mute. I apologize. On the communications, I would - if nobody is willing to volunteer I would do it, but only on a stop cap basis.

I can't, I don't want to over stretch myself with that.

(Chuck): And we're really not wanting people to over stretch themselves. So you would do it if we're in a bind.

Ken Stubbs: Only for short-term until you can get someone to step up, you know.

(Chuck): Okay so we need to work on that within the...

Ken Stubbs: But I wouldn't want to get involved in chairing it. I would be more than happy to stay - to be active in the committee, but not as a chair.

(Chuck): Okay. So we'd still need an interim chair for that from the OSC.

Ken Stubbs: Correct.

(Chuck):   Okay, all right, got that. So, you know, and talk to, we don't have too many alternates on the call today. But I think this could be an alternate as well as a primary so.

Ken Stubbs: Yes.

(Chuck):   Let's work together and try and identify somebody who could be an interim share there. So...

Ken Stubbs: I can ask David Maher. You know, I don't want to over, how would I say this, over involve the registry constituency other then to offer us as like you said on a stop gap basis until the committee gets up and going, you know.

(Chuck):   And also everybody in this regard should keep in mind that it's probably going to be very unrealistic to be on more than one work team from a scheduling point of view and a workload point of view.

               So we have to be careful there too.

Ken Stubbs: Yes that's my biggest concern. And that is even on a stop gap basis, if I get conflicting calls, I'll have to take the operations first as a chair as opposed to the communications.

(Chuck):   Yes right.

David Maher: I, this is David.

(Chuck):   David.

David Maher: Yes, unfortunately I, the hour that has been selected for this meeting is
                 a partial conflict for me. So I'm, I really can't take on any further work
                 on this.

(Chuck):   Okay, all right, thanks David. Anyway everybody be thinking about
                 that. Let's see if we can find something there. Otherwise we'll have to
                 come up with an alternative for interim chair on the communications
                 team.

                 So, and again think about even if it's not interim chair, if there's
                 somebody that wants to be an ongoing liaison that, you know, on that,
                 to the steering committee in addition to the chair being on the
                 committee.

                 So, we have that. So, all right let's move on to a, I had put a comment
                 in on the charter. For the steering committees we recommended a full
                 consensus approach unless, you know, that becomes untenable.

                 Does that work for the - is that realistic for the work teams as well?
                 What do you think? Should we just leave the language the way it is?
                 Or should we modify the language in the draft charter?

                 I suggested maybe leaving (Rob)'s comment that he added in there
                 that - about this or was it (My Com). And I don't know that that we
                 could just leave that in there and let the work teams come back with
                 their recommendation in that regard.

Philip Shepherd: Philip here. I think that's a terrible idea. You might end up with six
                 different work teams all having a different approach. I think we want

one approach that's going to be the same for all our teams, all the ones under the policy lot.

And I thought the suggestion of, you know, looking at the - a way it would work saying it worked in groups. And just, and I recommend keeping that. It seemed to make sense.

I mean that works the way we worked in the past. I mean, once you get down to substance, you may well find that this agreement says you need a way of factoring that in.

But setting that sequence would keep it simple but keep it unified.

(Chuck): So would you leave it the way it is right now in the draft charter Philip?

Philip Shepherd: If it (chance) is saying leave it to the work team, I would release that immediately.

(Chuck): Okay and so would - what I'm asking is should we leave that the work teams will work on a full consensus approach language in there?

Philip Shepherd: I you might need to explain what that is if you don't already. (Unintelligible).

(Chuck): Okay so that...

Philip Shepherd: I think explaining it to the person regarding the working groups and making sure all that (Wolf) takes that and communicates that to the other steering committees and make sure they have the same approach so they're all the same.

(Chuck):   Okay, any objection to that?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I would like to see what that looks like. And when you
                 refer to (Rob)'s comment are you talking about what applies to a
                 committee may not work in a work team? But I think (unintelligible)
                 discussion?

(Chuck):   Well my assumption when I made that comment Steve was that the
                 work teams are going to be larger, more people, and possibly even
                 more diverse. I don't know if that's possible, then the steering
                 committees themselves.

                 So I was just raising a (unintelligible) so that we, in the charters that -
                 the draft charters that we prepare for the work teams, that we get the
                 step language there.

                 And by the way with regard to your comments that you'd like to see it,
                 the idea after this meeting would be for (Rob) and Ken to - Ken Bourto
                 draft up, you know, to prepare any changes that we've agreed too
                 today, including Philip's suggestion. So that we could all take a look at
                 it in the next few days.

Steve Metalitz: Okay I mean in general I would support what Philip said. But I, you
                 said something, you have something in the agenda about (Rob)'s
                 comment. And (Rob)'s comment just is what I just read right?

                 What applies to a committee may not work in a work team, but I
                 included this per discussion.

(Chuck): That - was that (Rob)'s comment or mine? I'm not sure. Anyway...

Steve Metalitz: I'm just looking at one of these documents and...

(Chuck): Okay yes. So that may not be the - I'm perfectly fine with Philip's suggestion.

Steve Metalitz: Okay.

(Chuck): And so (Ken Bower), what we need you guys to do on the staff side is to go back to the approach with regard to reaching an agreement that is in - that we've been using pretty typically in the working groups that we've had recently.

And incorporate that into this section. Is that clear?

(Ken Bower): Yes sir. I got it. This is (Ken Bower).

(Chuck): Good thanks Ken. Okay.

(Ken Bower): Excuse me (Chuck), just one quick clarification. I've seen definitions that relate to both full consensus and rough consensus. Are we looking for both of those to be considered by the steering committees? Or should we gravitate toward one?

(Chuck): Gravitate toward what we've been using in the working groups.

(Ken Bower): Okay.

(Chuck): Okay and I don't think it uses the term full consensus. But I'll let you, you know, get that out. If there's any questions, just make notations in that regards so that we can all see it in the - on the list.

And then in our next meeting we'll try and finalize all that.

(Ken Bower): Got it.

(Chuck): Okay, let's go on to Sub Item 4 under 7 there. The - now in some text that (Rob) had deleted with regard to the GNSO operations work team, he deleted a reference to the fact that a restructured GNSO counsel should move away from being a legislative body, etc.

You can read it there. That is a particular operational issue for the GNSO. My thinking was is that maybe as one of the tasks from the board recommendations, that that particular one should be put in their, thoughts on that?

Philip Shepherd: Philip here. And I think part of the process we're trying to develop is sort of attempting to capture some of these ideas where appropriate. So I think it's difficult to include it, the basing, because there's a lot of (unintelligible) before we get there.

It also relates in my mind (a little more) to the policy group than ours. So I would, and it's left out at the moment, so I think that sounds right.

(Chuck): Okay, other thoughts? Okay so we won't worry about - we'll leave that out Ken Bourso that we, you know, on that regard.

And then the last thing, Item 5 there under Agenda Item 7, I thought that we should have a section in the draft charters. I called it work team rules or something.

We've included that in most work group charters. And it would be mainly a matter of cutting and pasting that from those. What are your thoughts on that?

Anybody opposed to that? Does that make sense (Ken Bower)?

(Ken Bower): Yes it does. I, (Rob) and I actually spoke about this yesterday. We haven't yet located the language that's been used in the other working groups. (Aubrey) made it a point when we were having the PPSC meeting.

And so one of the action items right after this call will be to go find those - that language. And then we'll get it circulated.

(Chuck): Excellent. Okay and that can just be enfolded in with the - to the work group or the work team charters, each of them, okay?

(Ken Bower): Correct.

(Chuck): So the action item then Ken out of this is to, based on what we've just decided to do another iteration of each of the charters. And then distribute those as soon as possible to the OSC list. And we can have some list discussion on that, okay.

(Ken Bower): Okay.

(Chuck): All right, Item 8, I haven't seen anything yet from (Rob) on, unless I missed it, on an invitation to join the work teams. So I assume that's still forthcoming.

Do you have any info on that Ken?

(Ken Bower): Yes we spoke about that also. I think (Rob)'s point of view on the subject was that both steering committees would send one consolidated invitation to the general community.

I'm not sure if you guys want to have a discussion about that or not. Nothing has been done to answer your question.

(Chuck): If, my only con - by the way I like that idea unless it delays timing. Because at least in our case in the GNSO operations team, we need to get that going quickly.

So if it looks like the PPSC is going to be considerably behind, even a few weeks behind us being ready, then I think maybe we should go ahead and draft a message.

And in our message, include a comment that hey there are going to be a total of five initial work teams. And you need to be aware of all of them when you select which one to be involved in.

So that would be my thoughts there. Any one else have a comment?

Philip Shepherd: I agree with that.

(Chuck): Yes, okay.

Stéphane: Just a question, Stéphane here.

(Chuck):   Go ahead.

Stéphane: I planned to send out an invite to the - to my constituency. If you're sending out a general invite, how would that be? Would that just be posted on the GNSO Web site? Or how would that be sent out?

(Chuck):   We'd probably send - by the way, that's perfectly fine what you're doing. I would do the same thing. And I'm sure Ken Stubbs and David would as well.

We will be trying to drum up volunteers within the registry constituency. But the idea would be, see this kind of message needs to go not only to the counsel. It would go to the counsel.

But it would go to as many other lists where there are interested stakeholders, whether they're a part of the GNSO or not, or a constituency or not.

So that, because these work teams are going - will be open just like ultimately our work groups will be ultimately open.

So, and you could use the message if you wanted too. Although you don't have to wait for it okay. Does that makes sense Stéphane?

Stéphane: Yes it does. Do you know when the message will be ready?

(Chuck): Well that's one of my concerns. Ken Bourl would suggest that we go ahead and work on the message right away.

And then we can decide whether it's going to work to do it with the PPSC as well as our - because we need to keep moving forward I think, especially because of the GNSO operations team.

Stéphane: Yes, that was the point you just made, sorry.

(Chuck): Does that make sense (Ken Bower)?

(Ken Bower): Yes it does. I got it. So we'll work on the message starting right after this call. I'll get with (Rob) and we'll do some coordinating with the PPSC, but we won't wait on them if they're not ready.

(Chuck): Okay and then the last item we have and our hour is pretty much up. Is it does it - will it work to have a meeting next Monday? I was hoping we, you know, we'd be closer.

I think we're going to need at least one more meeting to finalize the charter and the message. So I'd like to have one next Monday unless there's too many people who can't make it.

Now Steve Metalitz already told us that he cannot. But can (Lee) make it in your place next week Steve? Do you know?

Steve Metalitz: (Lee) is not the alternate for this group.

(Chuck): Oh.

Steve Metalitz: You're thinking of the who is group.

(Chuck): Oh, well that, my apologies.

Steve Metalitz: I don't have an alternate unfortunately.

(Chuck): You don't have an alternate. Well could you participate, you could participate via the list though in terms of where we're at.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, absolutely, absolutely so don't hold it up on my account.

(Chuck): Okay thanks. And my - I'm blending so many things together right now that I often come across totally confused so.

So, is anybody - does anybody object to that meeting next week on the 22nd, the same time?

(Wolf Noven): (Chuck), this is (Wolf). I'm not able to participate. I will be on vacation already. But I tried all that (unintelligible) to the call.

(Chuck): And you're good also participating on the list too. So we may actually have come to pretty good agreement. If we can come to agreement on the message and the charters on the list, I wouldn't be opposed to just canceling the meeting once we do that.

So if everybody will participate actively, we can try that as well. So we'll plan on the meeting for next week, same time, same station, okay?

Man: Excuse me, (Chuck) just I have to let you know, neither I nor the BC alternate's available for next Monday either. So it may be the better

default to suggest we try to do it all on the list and you have a meeting if we fail, rather then the other way around.

(Chuck): Okay, I like that idea. Okay so that's what we'll do. The meeting will happen. Put it on your calendar just in case for those that are going to be around. And, Glen, if you could send out a message in that regard that it will - we'll have it if we're unable to come to agreement on the list.

Glen DeSaintgery I'll do that (Chuck).

(Chuck): Thanks, Glen. And thanks everybody for the cooperation. Have a really good day and a good week.

Woman: Thank you (Chuck).

Man: Thanks.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Bye bye.

Man: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

(Chuck): Thanks Bertrand for joining us.

Bertrand de La Chapelle: You're welcome.

Woman: Can you make next week Bertrand if possible?

Bertrand de La Chapelle: I will try to make it. I'm not absolutely sure I will be able to because I'm on holiday actually. But I will try to join.

Woman: Thank you.

(Chuck):   Thanks everybody. Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye.

END