ICANN Cartagena Meeting
Toolkit Discussion
TRANSCRIPTION
Saturday 04 December 2010 at 1200 local

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much for joining us again. For those in the last, would you join us. Adrian? You can sing it. Let's do it. Yeah.

Thank you very much. And what we are going to talk about now is the document that GNSO approved a month ago - less than a year ago. The Toolkits Service Recommendations for GNSO Constituencies and Stakeholders Group. That's the document that was prepared by a working team that I chaired.

The name of the working team was Constituency and Stakeholder Group Operations Work Team. And the document was approved by the GNSO. And the document - the basis of the document was a survey made by the staff and it was the starting point for the sub-working team that prepared the document and then GNSO approved it, so you can review the whole document.

Now the - Rob will explain us how the toolkit of services will be implemented and which are the next steps for this help and toolkit of services that stakeholder groups can profit from in the ICANN process.

So Rob, you want to start?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes, great. Thanks Olga. As Olga described, the GNSO Council directed the ICANN staff to review the implementation items, what we're calling the toolkit, and to develop an implementation plan.

We produced that preliminary report, basically the first report that we're going to go ahead and roll out with additional community input on November 19. A number - I extended the invitation and a number of the stakeholder groups and constituencies have invited me to participate in their sessions this week so I'm looking forward to some additional dialog, but we wanted to use this session to brief the Council, get some of your feedback, both in your capacity as Councilors, members of stakeholder groups and constituencies.

The agenda for the next 50 minutes or so is to give you a quick background and concept of what the toolkit is and what it's being used for. We'll review the 11 menu items of the toolkit, talk about how we've set up a process for how you get them, requesting, modifying, canceling and then we'll talk about some next steps.

Because as you'll see, the toolkit items as passed are very general, and as we all know through some of the work of the various work teams, the challenge becomes the implementation; the quote, unquote, the devil is in the details.

The background Olga already went through so I'll just jump over that slide. The real key element I think that you should all take from this presentation is that the environment is still flexible.

One of the challenges, as Olga noted, is that the Council approved the toolkit back last December, but that was before a number of the work team recommendations had fully - been fully fleshed out with respect to various operating procedures and rules.

And as we know, there are still some work to be done. And as a result, the environment is still flexible in terms of some specifics, clearly individual stakeholder groups and constituencies may have different perspectives, want to apply things differently. So it's an environment where there is room for change and modification.

I had a discussion with someone actually a couple of days ago about the whole budget concept. And as we look at FY12, there may be also additional modifications that members of the community might want to look to.

From a Council perspective, there's not really a process in place right now for modifying the toolkit list, that menu item list, but that's also something that you all can talk about as we go forward.

But let's just focus right now on what we've got in front of us. The toolkit concept came from the board governance committee working group on GNSO improvements.

And their report in 2008 focused on some general concepts. We as staff always go back and feel constrained to do our best to follow the BGC report and some of the text in there is interesting in terms of the concepts.

You know, one of the concepts was, you know, to lower constituency costs and fees by providing, you know, standardization outreach, the administrative work that goes into just managing these processes. And so that was an important element in the board's approval of the recommendations that we've tried to look at.

The other interesting part, and I didn't highlight it, but was interesting to me going back and looking at the document is this concept of fostering free participation and policy processes.

I think a number of the toolkit items get us in that direction but it's a very interesting concept, particularly when it talks about reducing barriers and trying to improve entry into the policy process from all interested parties and players.

The other important element is this focus on in-kind assistance rather than financial aid. The initial concept was that the services would be supplied by ICANN staff. But in conversations with a number of you and quite candidly conversations within our staff discussions of this, as well, the concept you'll see later of financial aid or other packages is beginning to look much more attractive.

In general, and I'm not going to read them all in details because we'll talk about them all individually, but there are 11 toolkit items ranging from assembling background referenced materials for working groups and how they operate to the individual administrative aspects of stakeholder group and constituency like, like organizing face-to-face meetings, reporting the organization of telephone conferences, how you report the results of those meetings, how we assist the volunteer leaders and the GNSO with respect to interacting with other members of the community and the organization, the whole concept of Web site hosting and maintenance and how that's handled.

There was a concept, as I noted earlier, where the work team said we do want to have considered grants or funding for constituencies to provide their own administrative supports. That was part of the toolkit.

Organizational record keeping; in August you all approved a set of operating procedures and concepts for stakeholder group and constituency affairs, so there are issues there about what organizational recordkeeping there is and how it's done.

Membership contact information; the tools for having members of the community participate in mailing lists and on discussion lists, the production

of recordings of meetings and then elections of constituency and stakeholder group leaders.

Let's talk a little bit about the work of working groups. We realize on the efforts of the GNSO work team that was focusing on working group guidelines. We currently provide this service, so this service is immediately available. That's where we have one policy staff liaison and one member of the secretariat team who collectively assist working groups with drafting, editing and all the administrative functions of setting up meetings.

The extra concept that came into this with the toolkit and the work of the working group guidelines team was this initial briefing package. Essentially what the staff does now in terms of presenting an issues report, but an additional concept that will as individual policy staff liaisons be doing in the future, eventually creating a package providing an overview to all the various working group members whenever a working group is just kicking off or getting started.

And then we'll continue the typical thing that we do in terms of instructions from the chair and from the working group through the work team in terms of providing drafting support and assistance.

From just a logistical standpoint, please feel free to raise your hands or ask questions as we go through each of these individually. By the same token, you can save your questions for the end.

But when I look across the room and see quizzical looks from the likes of Adrian and the rest, and I want to encourage feedback and immediate responses.

Adrian Kinderis: That's just my normal face.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay, yeah. I don't see that on conference calls.

Menu Item 2 is the support for organizing face-to-face meetings. And the way it was written up by the work team and interpreted by the staff is that this is arranged in the date/time location and telephone bridges for face-to-face meetings.

Now the proposal was in certain venues accommodations. Right now Glen is providing the service in terms of assisting the Council, working groups and, you know, the constituencies and stakeholder groups and offering the face-to-face sessions, so all the prep work that goes into the pulling together the support for an ICANN public meeting.

But the real critical element of this that I think from a Council perspective but more important from individual stakeholder groups and constituencies is this concept of it's not limited to public - ICANN public meetings. So, you know, is there a concept for a possible expansion in FY12 and would that include intercessional type meetings?

We see that in the context of ICANN's contracts or relations with registries and registrars, there are regional meetings, you know, the message here is that I think there is potential in this service item to look at different types of meetings, different types of support. That's something that's going to have to come from the community. And so it's something to be thinking about in the context of the FY12 budget discussions.

You know, if this model has worked well for registries and registrars in the context of the contractual relationship, are there benefits for some of the other stakeholder groups or houses. That's something to think about.

Menu Item 3, support for organizing teleconferences, this already exists, certainly for the Council, for working groups and work teams. The additional element here, of course, is extending that service to stakeholder groups and constituencies.

We made plans for FY11 to, you know, provide that service for at least one monthly call; an average of one a month for all stakeholder groups and constituencies where Glen would provide you with the conference bridge information, you'd have the recording capability, she would announce that in terms of the schedule.

We don't - it doesn't appear that she has the bandwidth to be able to do that live monitoring, but we would be able to have staff there to help set up the call and get things rolling.

So that's available to all individual stakeholder groups and constituencies, again, on the order of at least one per month with the thought that we'd see how things are going this fiscal year and see if that needs to be expanded, you know, additional support.

I already got feedback. We don't do one call a month. We do two. And so trying to figure out how that manages. We just took a general number saying we were assuming for budget reasons you probably have about 15 people on a two-hour call. You would - you know, when you sort of start to average between those people who are getting relatively toll-free service compared with those who have to get dial-outs who pay a lot more per minute, the calls were going to be averaging anywhere between $300 and $700, again, depending on the community.

So that's where we sort of came to this one per month. Working with the IT team, with some of the new work that they've been doing with the (Adigo) telephone company, you know, their conference facilities I think they've been able to get some good deals.

Marilyn and then Adrian.

Marilyn Cade: One per month would be 12, but I think you actually only budgeted for 9.

Robert Hoggarth: That's correct.

Marilyn Cade: And I just want to note that I think that's actually an error because actually in preparation for the face-to-face meeting, I would assume certainly we do in the BC and I would assume probably the other groups that use the service, Rob, might - their utilization might go up in preparation.

So the number I think was under. And secondly I just wanted to ask did you assume that that includes the SG calls, as well or were you only...

Robert Hoggarth: Yes. That was based on the fact that stakeholder groups would be having separately monthly meetings...

Marilyn Cade: Okay, okay.

Robert Hoggarth: From constituencies. But you're right, Marilyn. And actually in preparing this slide presentation I also sat there and went...One of the rationale for 9 instead of 12 was, well you're meeting in person. But I should have known based upon my remote participation experience that even if you're meeting here face-to-face there's still a call bridge and there's still active participation.

Now, you know, that varies. And part of the reason for going for that average was that some of you, for example, an executive team of an SG or even some of the smaller SGs, you're not going to have 15 people or you're not going to talk for two hours or you're going to have fewer dial-outs.

So it was really more of just trying to get in the right ballpark. But you're right. With experience we'll see we need to change some of that.

Adrian you were next and then Chris.

Adrian Kinderis: I just had a question on the definition of live call monitoring. Can you just elaborate on that a little? I'm already if you've already said that.

Robert Hoggarth: The concept there was that there - we use the Verizon bridge. And if you're doing that, you have an operator. So the person is on there and when someone puts the call on hold and you get the music or something else, you have some immediate capability to improve the audio quality.

Adrian Kinderis: Right. Yes. I just know that there's been a couple of examples in the registrar stakeholder group where funny noises come over and, you know, and there hasn't been anybody there and it's kind of, you know, ended the call abruptly. It's been a number of times that we've had to deal with that. So...

I note here you say it may not be provided every instance, but I certainly, you know, would like to see that...

Robert Hoggarth: Okay.

Adrian Kinderis: As maximum as possible I think because, you know, you've got 10 or 15 people that have organized their schedules, the last thing you need is a logistical error.

Robert Hoggarth: Exactly.

Adrian Kinderis: Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Chris?

Chris Chaplow: Chris Chaplow, Vice Chair of the BC. This is one of the areas from the BC we're using at the moment, and I think it's something that works quite well. And recently I've been in organized some of the calls.

It might be just an idea to share with us at some point the cost or the way the costs are allocated. You know, we don't just want to spend ICANN's money to for the sake of it, so knowing that if the cost breakdown is so much standing charge, plus so much a line, then we can just help organize a little better. Thanks.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks. That's an excellent point. We've had some internal discussions about that just from a general perspective. The more transparent that is, even for those of us when we come to an ICANN meeting to know how much is it costing you a minute is something that would definitely get costs down. Thanks.

Item 4 talks about preparing minutes for formal meetings and teleconferences. And as all know as Council members, Glen currently offers that support as the secretariat for the Council.

And generally what we've been doing as policy staff liaisons is producing action item reports coming out of working group sessions where we say here's the next steps, here's the to-dos, here's who participated.

The secretary doesn't have the resources right now to provide the full minutes, you know, because - a number of you I think who have worked with Glen in the past have seen the tremendous amount of work that goes into producing the minutes, generating the transcripts and the rest.

We don't have the bandwidth right now to do that for an additional nine, ten calls a month. The question then becomes, and this is something for additional discussion is, from a community standpoint as working group participants, does the action item format work better, is that an alternative to quote, unquote full minutes.

Are transcripts enough? Are MP3 recordings enough? Or what combination allows the staff to provide the best possible service without just generating work when no one even goes back and looks at something.

So what - you know, and I think that's something that from a working group perspective, it would be a useful discussion for staff members and chairs to have, as well, you know, from a Council perspective you all get the full boat load and it seems to work very well.

The issue is when you get into your individual stakeholder group meetings and constituency meetings, you want the same, what's the value for that. Getting that information, getting that feedback will help us from the perspective of planning for FY12.

Yes, Adrian?

Adrian Kinderis: I'm just concerned Rob when - just from a point of view of putting it out there like that is getting understanding of the bottomless pit that is the ICANN budget. And, you know, I would hate to think that - I mean for the moment, you know, let me draw up on the registrar stakeholder group experience again is that, you know, we take our own minutes and, you know, and I think we do what we need, you know, internally while we believe supports our processes.

You know, I'm just concerned with you telling, you know, and God bless, but (turnaround time), well, you know, what more can we do, I think there's also got to be a responsibility put back on the stakeholder groups to, you know, also do what you can do should you be, you know, stretched or should you not be able to do it then how can we help.

I just - I'm just conscious of the language that we're using here is, you know, let's not just drop what we're doing and then say ICANN staff can get set up and give you other able work to do or be more cost.

So I'm just conscious of that. That's all.

Robert Hoggarth: That's helpful. That's appreciated. Yes, (Jaime)?

(Jaime): I would like to answer your direct question. My opinion, personal opinion, is that the working groups need both the transcripts and MP3 recording. At least my participation in the working groups was important - this feature was important to maintain continuity from sometimes I could not participate in one conference and call and this was very helpful for me.

On the other side, on the constituency meetings and they are more focused and they don't need the - many times they don't need the continued effort. So sometimes if what is discussed can be reported in a direct communication between an exchange of emails between the participants of the groups.

So I think it's more important to the working group than to the SG meetings.

Robert Hoggarth: Great.

(Jaime): This is a personal opinion.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you. That's helpful. There's one other aspect of it and we'll touch on it a little bit farther down the list. It's this general concept of organizational recordkeeping.

And, you know, again, one of the goals, concepts and expectations of this process was to allow better communications between different parts of the organization.

I don't know, and you all again can help us in this regard, there's the management of your own SG and constituency. There's also your interest as a member of our group in looking at what someone else is doing.

And so there's this balance between, you know, generating enough information that others can understand what you're doing in your internal work in processes. There's the whole concept of, you know, what do meeting reports look like. Are you providing them in a consistent manner across the stakeholder groups and constituencies? Are you getting enough information so that there's transparency across the community so you can know and understand what's going on?

It will help your discussions at a Council level, it might help you in debates or other discussions about other policy issues at ICANN.

So those are - that's an important consideration to think about, as well. Don't think just about your own management of some of these things, but the value that you will get in terms of information from other parts of the community, as well.

Menu Item 5, assisting volunteer leaders by identifying scheduling liaison contacts. This was fifth on the priority list of toolkit items. And this is currently available in discussions with Glen and just basically seeing how things have worked over the years.

Right now the instances are infrequent, not labor, time intensive, and this is something that some of you have already been using and will continue to use. It's available. We don't see a lot of budget or staff resource implications there at all.

Item 6 is a real challenging area; Web site hosting and content maintenance. And the challenge there is, again, in some of our discussions with members of the community over the years, there are some groups who are very strongly interested in maintaining their own presence, getting their own hosting, doing all their own management of a site.

Others when we looked originally back at this in the constituency evaluations almost 18 months ago, that some SGs, most of the time constituencies hadn't updated their Web site in 18 months or two years. And so here the concept is to be able to provide a balanced level of resource so that everyone can do it with some sort of management or interface with a member of the community who's designated for that.

For FY11, all of the budget resources and staff resources have been devoted to improving and providing the new GNSO Web site. And Scott Pinzon and Chris will be talking about that later during your meetings here. And so that exists.

What we can immediately offer and we've got some issues that I think just in terms of timing, but those of you who are interested, staff would be delighted to, you know, engage with you on doing an initial inventory to get a sense as to what you're doing now, what you're capable of doing, what sort of additional support you would need, not only provide the basic information that the GNSO operating procedures now expect to get from stakeholder groups and constituencies, but also to help assist in trying to find out what the best tools are for doing that and giving you the resources and capability to follow that up to date.

So our concept here with respect to web hosting and content maintenance is for those of your groups who are interested in this, for us to have some additional dialog and get together a group of all of the stakeholders and constituencies with a representative from one group or another and have a conversation about this that what are some of the key critical elements that we can do collaboratively.

Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Rob, I would actually suggest that you consider consolidating the proposal of maintaining the mailing and discussion lists and being able to archive those.

Web site maintenance costs are - and the capability to do that is much more generally available than the much more expensive email list maintenance with archives.

And you know, I think in looking at the things that have been approved for improving transparency or communication, being able to archive lists and being able to distinguish between publicly acceptable archive lists versus archives but available as an exception, right, those are functions that may really be of help to some of the constituencies and particularly if they need to - we need to maintain multiple lists for different purposes.

But I'm - I just am a little confused on the issue of when you say continent maintenance - content maintenance, your focused just on the kinds of documents that need to be maintained for transparency purposes, not on the development of a content rich Web site, right?

Robert Hoggarth: That's correct. Yeah. Do you have your latest meetings minutes posted, you know, helping with that sort of work.

You make some very good points about the interrelationship of some of these menu items. And as you'll see, as you probably read in the report, there is that relationship between this item in organizational recordkeeping and the membership contact information, as well, as the mailing list and we'll touch on that, too.

Philip and then Adrian.

Philip Sheppard: Thanks Rob. In the past, there had been issue about the - I suppose it was the legal liability of ICANN in terms of what is on their Web site. If I can just to offer simply hosting facilities for constituencies or other groups who would wish to update them, of course, themselves directly, has that issue been overcome?

Robert Hoggarth: No. And that's part of these additional discussions. Our IT guys have been, you know, carefully looking and seeing what I'm writing and saying. Yeah, so that would be something if, for example, the BC came forward and said yes we'd like to some help.

Then what we would do is we'd get together and talk through some of those issues to make sure because, you know, you have different laws in different countries, you have different impacts of whether it's an ICANN site versus an individual group site. There a lot of those issues that we are still struggling with.

Philip Sheppard: Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Adrian and then (Jamie).

Adrian Kinderis: I'm - this is completely unrelated Rob. I apologize. Just got an email that Chuck is on his way for emergency surgery by helicopter to Bogota or something. So maybe folks we can just spare a thought for him right now, just keep him in your thoughts and prayers. I think it's probably a good idea. Thanks.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you.

(Jaime).

I didn't think there was a moment of silence. I thought it was just a - okay.

Adrian Kinderis: Sorry. No, no, sorry. Absolutely not a moment of silence.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay.

Adrian Kinderis: I'm sure he'll be fine. I just thought maybe let's think some positive thoughts whilst we're engaging in such stimulating conversation. That's all. That's all.

(Jaime): Sorry for coming back. But I think this issue of Web site maintenance is one that - where the toolkit is very far from where it should be. And this improves for me the priority of this item.

I wouldn't put this in number 6 because I think a very specific initiative could improve dramatically the point and that is the appointment of somebody on staff that is responsible for each constituency or each stakeholder group have one person on staff or - who report - to report - request and I think each constituency or stakeholder group should have equally one person in charge of that.

The responsibility being what - right now would dramatically improve the situation here.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you. I think that's a really good point and that is, you know, what hasn't happened and may just be, you know, bandwidth or resources is just having a designated person.

I've seen it in just observing the BC meeting in Brussels the tremendous shift and impact that just, you know, in the case of Chris, you know, stepping forward volunteering as part of a constituency saying I will take that on and immediately seeing improvements in keeping things updated and the rest was tremendous.

Now that's a resource issue within the group but at least an individual can be identified. I think it provides some - it can provide some immediate benefit.

And then to coordinate too from our side to have somebody...

(Jamie): Yes.

Robert Hoggarth: ...who will, you know, being the position or with the expectation that they're going to be the one reaching out to members of the community and say oh I know this. Do you need some help on this? You haven't posted the last three times or how is the process working?

The good news about being halfway through FY '11 is that we will very quickly be able to see I think some operational issues that we can begin to address as opposed to having to wait for a full (unintelligible).

(Jamie): We have - just a comment in here. We have right now person from staff to whom we can refer and have (unintelligible) that are fulfilled in a timely manner?

Robert Hoggarth: No.

(Jamie): Okay.

Robert Hoggarth: And part of that is internal staff issues. But some of you may have known Scott Pinzon transferred from the policy team as our Communications Director, ICANN's Communications Team. So we currently have that loss of resource at the present time. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to leap ahead to your next topic Rob because someone...

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you. I'll quit.

Marilyn Cade: ...who is very familiar with budget cycles and downsizing and headcount and all those kinds of things, my assessment is -- and I may have my own views about whether I want something done by ICANN versus I want to have resources to do it myself and to direct those people to be accountable to my constituency.

So the next item I think is the idea of what I would call a initial - a stable amount of funding that a constituency could use in order to hire its own administrative resources if those resources are not available either in kind or self-funded.

And I want to be really clear that it is a real burden to do the administrative work of a constituency.

We are very fortunate in the BC that we've sub - we've broken the workup and spread it across several people. But it's a real burden to do it well and to do it effectively.

I'm a big fan of the idea of ICANN piloting at least the idea of a set amount of funding and the constituencies presenting the proposal and saying this is what we're going to procure and then assessing.

Because I - my view is it's going to be less expensive to do that and more timely than waiting and headcount approval.

Now (unintelligible) not that interested in time contention because I can't envision ICANN hiring more than one person and spreading them across all of the groups. So how practical and realistic is (unintelligible) and what would the timing be?

Robert Hoggarth: We didn't include that as an available mechanism for FY '11 in for two reasons. One, because there wasn't a mechanism in place. And that's why am very interested in this pilot concept that you've mentioned.

The second is that the BGC recommendation said administrative support is opposed to direct funding.

And so I think that that's something that now, you know, two to three years later members of the commission look towards particularly in light of the FY '12 budget process coming up.

And I think that you'll certainly find some sympathy on the staff side as well as we've looked at the real impact of doing this well with - because we want to do everything well to say gee how can we, you know, provide this resource?

I can't give you my assessment on what's realistic or not. Those are a much higher paid rate but I think that concept is not something that should be abandoned. It's clearly something that has been contemplated. It wasn't something that we are able to do for FY '11.

So some developed proposals in this concept I really like of a pilot project where perhaps we identify a discrete amount or level of funding that folks can then apply to with the appropriate sort of governing principles or monitoring would be great.

I know that again, there are different views among stakeholder groups and constituencies. Some members of the community have told me that we don't want to take a dime from ICANN. Others are saying it would really help.

Some of you have models for fees and fee structures, others don't. And so how all those different pieces fit into that I'm not sure.

All I go back to is this concept in the BGC report that talked about free participation and so then what are the right balances for all that? Marilyn then Chris.

Marilyn Cade: I just want to do one thing Rob and I think I missed it earlier. But in this document we are asked to translate documents. And I would be an expert

and how expensive translation is. And I don't really consider that practical for consistency.

You know, the cost of translation would - even the UN agencies do not translate more than six languages and technical study groups that the IP use do not translate their documents.

So can you - it - I mean that would kill ICANN's budget. So someplace maybe at the end we go back to what's really practical because I don't see constituencies being able to do that routinely and I think that would be a huge burden for ICANN.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you. And I think, you know, members of the work team can talk about this. But I think that's why the recommendations ended up being styled as best practices and guidelines rather than a mandate. Chris?

Chris Chaplow: Chris Chaplow, HSBC. The one area that I don't see in the toolkits and that's outreach. And this is the only Section 7 where it might be that the BC reproduce documents. You know, this is a fact sheet we've just done specifically for Cartagena in English and Spanish.

Would outreach be in the (seven) possibly or is that absent (unintelligible) objective?

Robert Hoggarth: I'll let Olga address that.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you for your comment. The - our working team developed an outreach document which is now under revision by the OSC.

We will have a session tomorrow at 9:00 if you want to join. We will discuss it. There are some details that still want to be discussed by the OSC. But I hope that we have a pen version by tomorrow 10:00 in the morning or during the morning.

Thanks for all the staff that helped us, especially (Julie) and others that helped us in drafting that.

And also we had the working team (leaded) by (Debbie). And that's the answer for your question. So it's a very interesting document. I encourage you to review it. Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Yes Chris, I mean part of it is that in the BGC report one of the major areas that the independent review group as well as the board said is improvements in outreach but because this work teams work hasn't been done we haven't been able to define or even start talking about implementation.

We do know that the work team will make its recommendations to the steering committee and the steering committee will come to the council so I'm sure there will be ample opportunities for discussing what - we've had these internal discussions at staff. What does outreach mean?

To you it may mean a couple of handouts. To somebody else it might mean and translating them into 12 languages and then flying to conferences funded by ICANN to hand them out.

I think there's some balance and there's a variety of different ways to look at that and subsequent budget implications as well.

Item 8 is organizational record-keeping. This was part of that initial comment I made about flexibility.

The new GNSO operating procedures that the council approved in early August have chapter 7.2.4 which outlines a whole list that weren't going to fit on a slide. Without my slide advisors thing I had too much information.

But there is a lot on to look at in terms of what organizational record-keeping could be. For our purposes organizational record-keeping doesn't include membership information. That's another menu item.

But I give all that premise to say we don't have a defined process for collecting the information or how it's made available in the GOP, the GNSO Operating Procedures and the toolkits very general in this sense.

And Glen and the rest of our secretary team don't have the resources to actually figure out ways to collect this data or to do it on their own.

So what we need to do is have further dialogue. And that is again stakeholder groups or constituencies who are interested in this capability or in this support, we're looking at once we get back -- and you'll see later the check sheet and the schedule for that.

Once we get back that information we'll pull together representatives from the various groups and have a discussion about do we have a common understanding about what we should have collectively on our Web sites?

And again this gets back to my point earlier, it's not only the challenge of your individual management of your Web site but what do you want to see from others? What's the, you know, this concept of transparency, a common not an exact design necessary but a common way of ordering your information or having information available.

It would be unacceptable -- and this is just Rob's personal view -- for one group to have, you know, 12 pages of updated information, another good to choose not to put it on there.

So particularly if - there's that support so having some consistency I think is the key.

Marilyn Cade: (Unintelligible).

Robert Hoggarth: And for - (Christina), Adrian and Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Would you just tell us what Chapter 7.2.4 refers to because...

Robert Hoggarth: That's the GNSO Operating Procedures not the toolkit.

(Christina):   I might be coming to this realization a little late but it sounds as if one part of
                 this system is so that we can all monitor each other and that is the intention
                 and that some of these capabilities should be designed such that if I decided
                 that my colleagues and the ISP constituency weren't sufficiently transparent
                 that I could monitor their site and lodge a complaint to someone.

                 And that conversely, you know, the NCSG could decide the same about the
                 IPC and so on and so forth. Is that really the intention here?

Robert Hoggarth: The intention isn't - in my interpretation of the BGC report that it's a got you
                 principle. It's more of a principle of transparency one of the goals of the
                 GNSO improvements effort.

                 So it was to say if there's information it should be up to date and it should be
                 available.

                 My admonition here was while you're thinking about actively managing your
                 own group there's also this concept of making information available and you
                 having that same perspective if you were to look at someone else's Web site.

                 If you are producing a certain amount of information and you're interested in
                 how a certain group came up with this idea or this concept then you would
                 want to look at their publicly available mailing list or the minutes of their
                 meetings to get a better understanding of their point of view.

But the concept of transparency not one of enforcement but I understand I think sort of...

(Christina): All right so...

Robert Hoggarth: ...carried to its logical extreme I guess you could do that but of...

((Crosstalk))

(Christina): (Unintelligible) follow this just so that I'm clear.

Robert Hoggarth: Sure.

(Christina): So let's just say that it is for purposes of transparency and I make the decisions that, you know, because for whatever reason I feel I'm entitled to make the decision that some of the stakeholder group or constituency is not being transparent as I would like, well so what? I mean what's the point of that?

Robert Hoggarth: Well the point goes back again to the bylaw principles of transparency, openness, fairness and representativeness.

And in the context of the board on a regular basis three to five years reviewing constituency charters and their operations that could be an issue.

(Christina): (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Robert Hoggarth: I mean it - yes, okay. Adrian and then Marilyn.

Adrian Kinderis: Thanks Rob. I think the transparency part of it is a bit of an issue. Let me explain why. From the Registrar Stakeholder Group we're working very hard to try to build our membership at the moment.

And one of the drivers for membership is that there - if you've (get in) the Registrar Stakeholder Group we have an advocate that will distill information.

If you're a small registrar you'll be able to get access to this distilled information easily and therefore understand what's happening in a policy world. You know, so it's a full, you know, a new staff member for you that you call upon blah, blah, blah, blah.

But when we're talking about trying to make this only available to members and therefore through our Web site this would be the mechanism by which you would get this.

You see that potentially we would be impacted by such transparency. Well we don't - it's not that we're trying to do things behind closed doors or we believe that we, you know, we're trying to be secretive but moreover we're trying to give value to our members that decide to pay their dues.

Robert Hoggarth: I don't see that that's a bad business model or approach to things as long as it's consistent with the operating procedures and principles you all set out in 7.2.4.

Adrian Kinderis: Yes.

Robert Hoggarth: I think that that is - that's the floor for what generally you've agreed on is information that should be shared. When's your next meeting? What did you discussed at the meeting? Oh do you have a public mailing list? What's the access to it?

You know, is those types of things. If you choose to have some separate thing where hi, let's have our deliberations of our smaller working group that you've join because you've joined a registrar's SG fantastic.

Adrian Kinderis: Yes.

Robert Hoggarth: I think it's just a matter of you observing and part of the value is that you came to ICANN staff to say I want help in keeping this updated. We need to have a discussion about how we do that, how much of it you've all agreed to do.

Adrian Kinderis: Sure.

Robert Hoggarth: Again we-re - the staff is not the judge of whether the IPC is transparent or enough. The board is.

We may be asked to conduct a review. We want to do it in partnership with you as we've done throughout this whole process. So I think you're not limited is the bottom line.

Adrian Kinderis: And one other question, actually, a silly one. Is this available this slide deck? Is this available somewhere or will it be?

Robert Hoggarth: Yes. It's on only as of 90 minutes ago.

Adrian Kinderis: Okay.

Robert Hoggarth: Yes it's on the wiki and it's on the - it's in the Adobe Connect Room right now so yes you can pull it.

This isn't - this is a slide deck. The official document is more the implementation report and plan that's also on the session.

Adrian Kinderis: I just get a feeling that if - I'm looking at (Tim) and (Stephan) here, if we were able to take this, you know, to our registrar (about our) constituency meeting, you know, this sort of deck true, I think it would really be helpful for our discussion.

Robert Hoggarth: Well as I've offered and some folks have taken me up on it I can come to your meeting...

Man: Do it during our closed session. No I'm just kidding.

Robert Hoggarth: Marilyn I think?

Marilyn Cade: I do Rob. I'm going to follow-up on (Christina)'s comment. And I have sympathy for the comment that Adrian just made as well because I think there are times when constituencies need to act in executive session or in terms of, you know, take up things that are specific to their paid membership.

But I want to make a different point. And I am really concerned about the aspirational and perhaps the interpretation that is possible in some of the statements.

I will note for the record and I hope be transcribed that the board is a - would get a C minus if not a D minus on its implementation of these principles itself including failing to adhere to publishing required documents such as the economic study in time to be considered.

So we're asking for I think a fair amount of burden to add to the constituencies, the stakeholders groups. And I'm in support of our approving all of this.

But I want to be very cautious that we are not setting up report card grading mechanisms that are going to be laid on top of the constituencies by somebody, by the board as you're saying.

So I think we do have to look at what these expectations are and try maybe to assess how realistic they are. And where there are got u's we need to identify those so the constituencies are not are not put at risk.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you. You - that was - you weren't looking for me to reply to that I hope? Okay. Thank you.

Menu Item 9 and we've touched on this on a couple of them. I'm conscious of the time and the food and the drinks over there. And I've got about 8 minutes.

Up to date member contact information mailing list discussion list, as many of you know and Marilyn you touched on this is a request, right now archived community mailing and discussion lists are already available to the GNSO Council and the working group.

You can go right now to the GNSO Web site and see every Bill Drake message and every Rosemary Sinclair message right now.

This is also available now as you asked Marilyn to constituency and stakeholder groups as well.

The more complicated issue is membership database support. And I have up there a.k.a. because I was referring to -- a.k.a. for those of you who don't know all - also known as.

In the BGC report it was community-wide recordkeeping it was also referred to as management of community contact records.

It was a concept in the BGC report that talked about having one central location for information about members of every constituency stakeholder group and other participant in ICANN for the purpose of, you know,

generating discussion groups, discussion lists and the rest to facilitate communication.

The challenge is sort of trying to going forward with this. And we really need to get input from representatives of the stakeholder groups and constituencies because it's a massive undertaking, potentially one that's a complete ICANN-wide initiative.

There have been points -- and I look over to you Alan just for a nod perhaps that the At-Large community has looked to the challenges that have member support and the rest.

To the extent that the GNSO embarks on something like this it would be much more administratively efficient to combine that effort or to make sure that there's some consistency.

And so until we have that clarity, till we really know what you all want to do from an individual stakeholder group or constituency perspective we acknowledge that for the time being you're still all going to collect and maintain this information.

You're going to have it on your Web sites or have it set up in a mechanism that is observant of all the necessary privacy considerations and privacy laws that your members are concerned about.

And then we need to have if there's an interest from members of the community for staff support in maintaining or finding some way to combine that information, we really need to -- I hesitate to say -- have some sort of formal or informal work team or some discussion group or something that really needs to examine that and talk about that in a little bit more detail because that's a potentially massive undertaking that we don't know quite how to handle right now.

And Marilyn you have a quizzical look.

Marilyn Cade: I do. So membership says to me somebody is a member of a group, right? First is that what we're talking about or we talking about trying to collect personal contact details on parties who are individually volunteering to be in working groups because membership is really different.

Membership means you like, I'll use the GAC as an example. You know, there may be a designated GAC member but a number of other government contracts in the BC we would have a primary contact but perhaps other - so what are we talking about?

Robert Hoggarth: It's - well you asked a number of questions there. And the answers is it's - are basically yes, yes, and yes.

It's membership in all those types of groups and wrestling with how do you create potentially a database the combines that information with the appropriate levels of access?

You know, if you're going to have a community-wide discussion list do you limit that to members of a list? Do you make it open to all? What happens when Marilyn changes her email address? Is - are there ways to automate that? Is there - you know, there are a number of issues that the bottom line is we're not prepared to discuss in a broader way because we don't know the answers.

The suggestion in terms of implementation is if within your own individual stakeholder group or constituency you want to explore this, then acknowledge or note that in the checklist. We'll get that group of people together and start having that conversation.

And it may include as I noted earlier members of other SOs and ACs to see if, you know, there's even the technical capability to do some of this work.

I mean (Nick Ashton Hart) and At-Large looked at this fairly extensively and there were still some challenges I think that you guys we're facing.

I have Olga first and then Alan.

Olga Cavalli: Just a brief comment. Thanks for the active participation but we have only a few minutes left. We don't have time in-between the session and the working lunch session.

So I would thank everyone for being brief. And Rob at the end of your presentation you can tell us how to address all this...

Robert Hoggarth: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...interest questions that...

Robert Hoggarth: I'll jump to next...

Olga Cavalli: ...people have. Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: ...steps Olga. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes you alluded to problems that (Nick) had. The problems are still here. We're still having problems with our mailing lists. We're - we still never seen the membership database someone has been working on for two years.

I caution ICANN not to take on things that you don't really know how to do yet even if they sound simple. And groups that already have things shouldn't give up their personal ones until we know we have something to replace them with.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you. They're in light...

Alan Greenberg: I could be more dramatic in how I'm saying this. I'm trying to be kind.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you. Let me quickly just jump through the last two to note them because I want to jump to next steps in light of the time.

Menu Item 10, MP3 recordings are already produced. And if you ask for the telephone bridges you'll get MP3 recordings as well.

Item 11 Glen is already doing for a number of you and has done based upon individual requests. That's acting as a neutral election manager.

The only extra twist here is that because there hasn't been consistency among groups is putting the consideration there that you need to have a clear set of procedures and a target of two months prior to your nomination process so that there - so that Glen's not having to work with you to create one when five different groups have asked her for that support at the same time.

How do we get services? We're preparing a check sheet. I committed to sharing that with community leaders here in Cartagena.

We want to get your feedback. We'll have that done in the next couple of days. The idea is to get your interest for FY '11 and then looking for to FY '12.

So we've got a draft document, we'll refine it. We want to share with you all to give us some feedback and perspective on it.

The concept is that as this finally gets rolling that we would have a mid-February target. The idea being that should toolkit menus change, should individual groups decide to take on burdens or add burdens onto staff that for budget planning purposes we should know as early as possible.

So February 15 seems to be an appropriately balanced date by which we get that information and can crank it into the budget process.

Our other interest and concern is to really be able to identify these items in the budget so that you're comfortable with the funding that as existing there.

Modifying services, once you've got them will be just an email to Glen. And she'll work with you on a case by case basis.

Please consider -- and I'll emphasize this one more time as well -- if there's additional stuff that's not already in the toolkit or other ideas that you have incorporate those into any FY '12 budget comments that you have.

Our next steps - oh quickly (Mike) yes?

Our next steps will be to finalize the checklist then get that circulated at - out to all of you, then getting your feedback and information back.

Another step would be for you to comment in the FY '12 budget process. And then depending upon the feedback on the check sheets that we get from you we'll pull together groups to start talking about some of these other issues with respect to Web site hosting or the organizational record-keeping or some of the database lists. And we've got Alan your admonition about that.

Thank you all very much. Did you have a question (Mike)?

(Mike):   One item that I think was - I don't know that it directly fits into the toolkit items as you've describe them up here but it's a notion that I know had pretty much unanimous consensus when we were discussing all this stuff was the notion of getting people leadership and mediation training in the constituency so that for one thing we could have better more qualified candidates for chairs of working groups.

And so I don't see that anywhere in your presentation. I'm wondering what's happened with that idea, whose dealing with it?

Robert Hoggarth: We have that on our goals of the staff for FY '11. But we haven't figured out a way to manage that because quite frankly there is some substantial differences of opinion in terms of how something like that would be done.

Do you hire an outside group, do you - you know, what would the curriculum be. So that's going to be our first step over the next couple of months is identifying curriculums.

And we would be delighted for retiring counselors to perhaps play a role in helping us develop that.

Thank you any others? Thank you Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Rob. Thank you for the work and thank you for responding all the questions on the slides so you - that's easy work for me now. So that was easy for me.

So any other comments or questions about Rob's presentation? We have a working lunch right now that will be chaired by (Stephan).

We don't have time in-between yes so, okay. We don't have time in-between the two activities so we should eat and work, working lunch.

I should say something, you can break something. Let's say something.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Okay thank you very much everyone.

END