

**GNSO – ICANN Nairobi Meeting
GNSO Open Working session
OSC Constituency Operations Work Team
07 March at 10:30 local time**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing at the Constituency Ops Session held in Nairobi on Sunday 07 March at 10:30 Local time. 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.

Julie Hedlund: Okay Olga, this is Julie. Evidently the recording has started. Perhaps I can ask for those who are on the telephone to please announce themselves and then we will do a roll call of those in the room.

Olga Cavalli: That's a great idea. Thank you.

Mike O'Connor: This is Mike O'Connor (in Restin) along with (Jonathan Frakes), (Anne Boor) and James Bladel.

Olga Cavalli: And it's myself Olga Cavalli on the phone.

Julie Hedlund: Anyone else on the phone that we have missed? Thank you. Then we'll do a roll call here in the room and I'll begin. This is Julie Hedlund from ICANN staff.

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco with business constituency.

Andrei Kolesnikov: Andrei Kolesnikov, Nom Com.

Rafik Dammak: Rafik Dammak, NCSG.

Tony Harris: Tony Harris from the ASP constituency.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben - ISP constituency.

Jamie Wagner: Jamie Wagner, ISP constituency.

Aisha Hazan: Aisha Hazan, business constituency.

Stéphane van Gelder: Stéphane van Gelder, registrar, stakeholder group.

Margie Milam: Margie Milam, ICANN staff.

Liz Gasster: Liz Gasster, ICANN staff.

(David Olive): (David Olive), ICANN staff.

Marilyn Cade: Marilyn Cade, NCSG.

Debby Hughes: Debby Hughes, NCSG.

Marika Konings: Marika Konings, ICANN staff.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you everyone. Olga, would you like to have me go over the agenda or would you like to do so?

Olga Cavalli: I would like to do that. Thank you everyone for joining remotely as myself and presently there in Nairobi. I'm so sorry for not being there. I had some family complications but luckily I am here on the phone with you and I appreciate that you're in the meeting right now.

The idea for today's meeting and we have enough time to go through different documents, we have finalized revised a (Text 1, Subtext 1 document). It is already with all the changes in the wiki, it has been there for more than two weeks. Deadline for submitting comments or any deletions or

suggestions of changes was correct me please Julie if I'm wrong, it was February 26.

And we haven't received anything so far but I would like to ask those in the meeting remotely or presently if they want to suggest any changes or comments as a last chance to change the document or we accept it as it is and we move forward to the second one, which is Text 1, Subtext 2 document.

We have been revising it up to about the middle of the document also changes and suggestions were expected until February 26. We as far as I remember we haven't heard anybody suggesting anything. But we have the chance today to do it.

And the idea if there are no suggestions for the one complete document and part of the second one, we can go on revising the second document and hopefully we can do a lot of work today because we have (a lot of people) and more time. So this is the idea for today's call. Julie, do you want to add something?

Julie Hedlund: Thank you Olga. This is Julie. No, I think you have covered it.

Olga Cavalli: Great. And I really want to thank Julie. She will be so kind to read the documents. It's better that she reads them instead of myself doing it from distance. So first I would like to ask if someone wants to make suggestions or changes or modifications to Text 1, Subtext 1 document.

This document was prepared by the working team led by SS. SS is on the line? Okay. We don't have SS but I would like for the record and for everyone here to commend his work and his dedication to this document and also for all the working team in revising it. So I would welcome if someone wants to make any suggestions of changes or if we all agree that the changes went so

far through the first draft are okay. Julie, is someone raising his hand or something like that?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, I hear no comments from this end. Are there any comments on the phone? Olga, this is Julie. It appears there are no additional comments.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Okay. Congratulations for the working team and for the whole team for revising the document. So the first document is done. About the second one, it was led by Victoria McEvedy. Victoria sent her apologies. I think she was not able to join the call.

But I would also like to commend her work and all the working team that prepared the document. It's a very detailed and complete document. We have been revising it up to the middle. I would like to know if up to Part 3, Communications, if someone has any suggestions, changes or divisions they want to make or propose? The document has been in the wiki for more than two weeks and comments were expected to be sent by 26 of February.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. Victoria McEvedy did send a comment via email concerning Section 3, Communications. (Would you like me to read it to you?)

Olga Cavalli: (I don't have it here). Sure please.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. I'll go to that email. Hold on for a moment.

Olga Cavalli: It's about communications. It's Section 3, Communications, right? Part 2.3 - okay.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that's correct. Hold on for one second. I'll pull up that message.

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Julie Hedlund: All right. This is taking a few moments. So Olga, this is Julie. I apologize for the delay. I do have Victoria McEvedy's message that she sent on Thursday, March 4, with respect to the changes that have been made through Section 3, Communications on Task 1, Subtask 2.

Victoria notes, "As to the revisions I am troubled by the deletion in 3C. If the work team is not in favor of disclosure policies then could we state the reasons why relevant information can be withheld from even group members? For transparency these ought to be on enumerated grounds only, not discretionary or arbitrary withholdings."

"Methods should be provided for members to seek information on what is withheld and which of the enumerated acceptable grounds is claimed with an avenue of independent review provided."

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Julie. As far as I remember the discussions we had in the group and unfortunately Victoria was not present in the last conference call, some of the group members had issues about not all the information should be disclosed.

But I would welcome comments from other members of the working team about this because as I don't believe to a specific constituency and they are accustomed to manage this information, is (Claudio) on the line? I think that we discussed with him this paragraph or with Tony. Tony is in the meeting, right?

Tony Holmes: Yes, I'm here Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Do you recall the ground of the deletion in relation with constituency operations and daily communications?

Tony Harris: Are you asking me Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. I don't know if it was you or (Claudio) that we discussed this part of the document and you had some concerns about constituency disclosing all the information or not. So I think that Victoria is writing this point from her perspective. I think (Claudio) is not on the line, right? I know he was not going to Nairobi but he is not - is (Claudio) on the line?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. I don't believe he is on the line.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Tony Harris: Olga, this is Tony.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Tony Harris: I believe the last I recall, I've been traveling the last three days, is that (Claudio) was working on that text you're mentioning.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry. I didn't hear the last part of your comment.

Tony Harris: (Claudio) apparently, as I recall, (Claudio) was going to suggest some wording on this point that you just brought up.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I think that he was going to send some comments. So I would suggest that we take it as an action item to Review 3, Communications Part B and review it with (Claudio) and take into consideration of Victoria's comment.

I would welcome those participants in other constituencies to say what they think about this subparagraph. Do we leave it as it is and see which is the outcome of (Claudio)'s suggestions and maybe Victoria's agreeing or not? Did she send another comment about the rest of the document, especially considering that she has been the one leading the sub working team?

- Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. This is the only comment that I saw with respect to this document.
- Olga Cavalli: So I propose the following - after Number 4, Elections that we could start reading now, we take 3, Communications B as a text to be redefined in between the working team and we move forward. Do you think this is a good suggestion?
- Tony Harris: I agree with that.
- Olga Cavalli: Thank you Tony.
- Krista Papac: Hey Olga. It's Krista.
- Olga Cavalli: Krista, how are you?
- Krista Papac: I'm good. How are you?
- Olga Cavalli: Very good.
- Krista Papac: So just one thing I wanted to bring up at the end of this section is D is an incomplete sentence I think.
- Olga Cavalli: As it's written now yes, I think you're right.
- Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. Krista has pointed out an important correction. D should actually read all constituencies shall have a published privacy policy providing for the protection of private data of members. And it appears that a bit more got deleted than should have been. I will correct the wiki and refresh it here shortly.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. I think that's probably what should have been struck through as I think this is a mistake. So Julie, just for the record and for (proxy), could you read D as it would remain the final text?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Olga, this is Julie. D should read all constituencies shall have a published privacy policy providing for the protection of the private data of members.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Krista, are you okay with that sentence?

Krista Papac: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: The rest of the working team?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. I see no other dissensions here so I would say yes, it's correct.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Any way perhaps for Part 2/3 on, we could list this text as to be revised and recommended by the working team or other people that may want (to do that). Great. Julie, would you be so kind to read from Point 4, Elections?

Julie Hedlund: Certainly Olga and I should note that there was some discussion of Point 4, Elections.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I remember that.

Julie Hedlund: Right. But I think that it was still under discussion. I'll read it with the suggested changes and note it as part of the text. Section 4, Elections. A, all constituency elected positions striking offices including representatives to stakeholder groups and the GNSO council shall have a maximum two-year limit and a maximum of two consecutive terms added in that same position.

An officer who has served two consecutive terms must remain out of office for one full term prior to serving any subsequent terms added in that same potions stricken as an officer. Constituencies stricken can inserted may elect terms and term limits below these maximums at their discretion.

And added text is when circumstances demand exceptions to this requirement exceptions may only be made with support from a 2/3 majority of the membership.

Olga Cavalli: Yes I remember we had discussions and yes, who is - I couldn't hear. Who wanted to talk? I'm sorry. Okay. Yes. I remember the discussions we had in one conference call.

We made these additions and some deletions. Do the working team members on the call present now agree with this proposed text, which by the way was the one finished in the week before several weeks.

Tony Harris: Yeah. This is Tony. I agree with this text. It was what we discussed on the call two weeks ago.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Tony Harris: And I think it is a far more adequate framework for what we want to achieve with this particular point.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Tony. Other members of the working team, Krista, Rafik?

Krista Papac: Olga, it's Krista. So I missed the last couple calls because the time is a time I can't make it and so I'm going to apologize in advance that I may not have the context of the previous conversation.

But I think generally our stakeholder group feels like the group itself, the stakeholder group should make determinations about what are voting

thresholds and not something that should be dictated by the GNSO or set by the GNSO.

And so that's one comment. The second comment is I think there is Annex A, which also has references to percentages for different things and I think they differ from what's here if I'm reading it correctly. So those are my comments.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Krista. One question. Would you like to revise the text in light of your constituency and propose a different wording?

Krista Papac: Sure.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Could we have this text before the next call so we may see it as a group and discuss it and perhaps include it or just review it as a group? I think we will have our next call not this Friday but the other one. So it would be an acceptable timeframe for sending this text?

Krista Papac: Yeah. I'll get it in the next few days probably but definitely before then.

Olga Cavalli: Great. So Julie, could you be so kind to add an action item that Krista will revise this part of the (stock)? And we'll perhaps send some suggested changes.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, I'll add that as an action item but I think Rafik, did you have a comment?

Rafik Dammak: So I agree with this part with (the comments).

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Rafik. Okay. Are we okay if we move forward and wait for Krista's suggestions about this text?

Tony Harris: Okay with me, Tony.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Tony.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, you're unable to see here but we have a couple of people from the council who would like to make some comments. Please Mary Wong.

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Mary Wong: Are we still on Section 5, the voting?

Olga Cavalli: No, we are on Section 4, Elections.

Mary Wong: We're still on four. Okay. Then I'll hold my comments until we get to five.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you Mary Wong. Other comments?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. Would you like me to read Section 4B as well?

Olga Cavalli: Yes please.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you. Section 4B - it is recommended and then the text added was going forward that constituencies publish and maintain a list of all office holders past and present, deleted are the words since inception, to inform new members of the experience of other constituency members and to provide transparency for term limits.

Tony Harris: This is Tony. This is what we agreed on when we discussed it on the call. The idea is to do this as from now and not go back in history 12 years or so.

Olga Cavalli: Exactly. Thank you Tony for commenting. Sorry. I interrupted someone talking.

Krista Papac: It's Krista. I just wanted to say that I agree with Tony.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you Krista. Other comments?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. We have another comment here.

Marilyn Cade: Olga, it's Marilyn Cade. I have just a question. I'm a member of the business constituency and I'm not actively following this issue. But I have a question about what B means.

In the - this is saying that all constituencies, all members within all constituencies shall have equal voting rights. Can I just - sorry? Sorry. I was reading that as related to elections so I'll hold my question until then.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry. I'm so sorry. I didn't follow exactly your comment Marilyn. There was part of it that I couldn't hear.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. Marilyn was actually commenting on Section 5, Voting, the next section. Should I perhaps read that section?

Olga Cavalli: No problem. Are we okay with B? So no comments for B?

Tony Harris: Okay with that here.

Olga Cavalli: Great Tony. Thank you so much. Julie, someone else wants to respond?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, I see no more comments on (this side).

Olga Cavalli: Great. Let's go for five.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. Section 5, Voting - all constituencies shall permit all voting members in good standing to vote in an election. B, all members whether natural or legal persons shall have equal voting rights. C, members shall be entities to appoint proxies. D, no legal or natural person shall be entitled to vote twice.

E, no legal or natural person shall be entitled to join more than one constituency as a voting member. And perhaps I'll go ahead and repeat A again if we want to take these in order.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Let's go one by one and start with A please.

Julie Hedlund: Right. A is again all constituencies shall permit all voting members in good standing to vote in an election.

Olga Cavalli: Comments - please note that this part of the document was not revised by the working team. So comments are welcome.

Julie Hedlund: Any comments here in Nairobi?

Krista Papac: Olga, it's Krista. So inside B it should be at least from our perspective all voting members, not members because we have voting members and non-voting members in our constituency. Sorry. We're on A. Never mind.

Olga Cavalli: Krista, are we okay with A? Shall we move to B? No comments for A?

Tony Harris: A is okay, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you Tony. Julie, could you be so kind to read B?

Julie Hedlund: Certainly. Olga, this is Julie. B, all members whether natural or legal persons shall have equal voting rights.

Olga Cavalli: Krista had a comment.

Krista Papac: Yes. Now that we're on B, this should be voting members at least from our perspective because we have voting members and non-voting members. And so we don't want to give voting rights to people who are not voting members.

Olga Cavalli: That's a good comment. Any other comments from other constituency representatives?

Debby Hughes: Hi. This is Debby from the NCSG. My other question kind of related to Krista's question is do all voting members have equal voting rights? And I don't know if that's the question so maybe from a point of clarity you might want to (write something).

Krista Papac: Sure. All voting members have equal voting rights.

Olga Cavalli: Let me remind you that this is proposed text by the working team. So the idea is propose changes or amendments or this is our opportunity to change it before it goes to the council.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. I should note that Zahid has joined us and he does have a comment.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Zahid, welcome.

Zahid Jamil: Hi. Thanks Olga. The point we were discussing earlier (in our working group), there are other constituencies that just do not have equality as regards certain voting.

There are weight of votings for certain members as well. The associations have had a long conversation about this. I'm just wondering how this will be represented in (Slide) B because it says all members whether natural or legal persons and associations are naturally of course in certain jurisdictions, shall have equal voting rights with other individuals or companies.

So that sort of will go against many of the things that the IBC and the WVC and many others are probably doing. And I'm just wondering how we would address that. And I see Tony sort of shaking his head and maybe he wants to comment on that.

Tony Harris: My suggestion would be that we strike this. I mean it doesn't make any sense because it goes against constituency practices.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. Other comments? I think Marilyn, you had your hand up. Okay. Marilyn's comment has been taken care of. Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Any comments about the suggestion made by Tony, deleting RSV?

Krista Papac: Olga, it's Krista. We would be fine with that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Zahid?

Zahid Jamil: I'm fine with that.

Olga Cavalli: What do you think about deleting it?

Zahid Jamil: I agree with it. Thanks Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Jamie Wagner: This is Jamie. Are we proposing to remove everything?

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

Jamie Wagner: Yeah, okay. But so members will have different voting rights?

Olga Cavalli: Who was this?

Jamie Wagner: Yeah but it remains kind of undefined (as it stands). That's my concern.

Olga Cavalli: I cannot know who is calling. I'm sorry. I don't know if it's Jamie or Rafik or who. Julie, could you please tell me who is (on the phone)?

Jamie Wagner: Hello? It's Jamie speaking.

Olga Cavalli: Jamie. Great. Thank you Jamie. Jamie, do you have a text? Maybe perhaps you can propose a text for this Part B paragraph?

Jamie Wagner: I would just - this is Jamie again. I was just arguing with Tony about this proposal of removing entirely this item B. And I was rationing if different voting rights did not remain undefined.

Tony Harris: If I might make a comment, this is Tony.

Olga Cavalli: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear very well Jamie's comment so perhaps Tony, you can rephrase it. I can hear your voice very clearly but not Jamie's.

Tony Harris: Okay. Perhaps I can interface with you then. I think that Jamie was just expressing legitimate concern that we may not have left this point duly clarified.

Basically my suggestion was since some constituencies have different bylaws or their constituencies are set up in certain ways as far as voting members, this B statement would not be applicable. So it might be wiser just to leave it out. That was what we were discussing.

Olga Cavalli: And which was Jamie's concern because it was very hard for me to understand? It was not clear in his voice.

Jamie Wagner: My concern is that if this item is just removed then the voting rights will remain undefined. Did you understand that Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Now I got it. Thank you so much Jamie. I apologize. Some of you are more clear than others in the distance. It is my opinion and please know that I don't belong to or work with any constituency.

I think that each constituency has their own rules so it is not that we are not taking care of the issue. It's that each constituency will do by themselves. This is my point. So I don't see problems in deleting it. But of course it's only my opinion.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. We have several people in a queue here. I think that Jamie would like to respond to that. I see Mary, also Zahid and also Marilyn.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. Please go ahead.

Jamie Wagner: My suggestion then is to refer to these constituency to keep item B but rephrase it as to refer to the constituency's bylaws and say that the voting rights of different members will be defined by each constituency.

Olga Cavalli: That's a very good suggestion. Thank you Jamie.

Julie Hedlund: Who else is on the queue?

Mary Wong: This is Mary, Olga (and I have a question).

Olga Cavalli: Mary, go ahead.

Mary Wong: Hi. Nice to hear from you too. I was going to make the same suggestion as Jamie and maybe the provisions that are being stricken could say something like all constituency charters shall clearly delineate the voting rights of all of its members.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Great suggestion. Could you please draft something with Jamie perhaps and others that agree with this idea and propose it to the group? Who else is on the queue?

Julie Hedlund: And I should note Olga, this is Julie, that we also have Chuck joined the queue. So I see that he is ceding to Chuck. Chuck, please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Julie and Olga and I apologize for being late. I killed my alarm a half hour too late. So I didn't get up until 2:30 when you started. So on this issue I agree with many who have said every constituency and stakeholder group are a little bit different in terms - first of all in terms of what a member is.

For example in the registry members are organizations always. And we have very different sized organizations that are members.

So in our case we have a rather elaborate voting system that involves in one case every organization having one vote and in another case organizations having votes proportionate to their size but certainly a little more weighted depending on the number of registrations.

So we try to balance both sides of the issues and anybody can read that if they want. Of course that is one of the reasons why making equal voting just doesn't work and I know that is true of quite a few other constituencies and stakeholder groups as well.

Now if we can come up with wording that accommodates that, that very ability and flexibility while at the same time ensuring that every member has some voting rights within the group, then I think that works and that's fair.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Chuck. Your comment is similar to what Jamie and Mary suggested so I encourage you to perhaps craft a new Part B including that issue.

Chuck Gomes: I would as soon as I can get (some time off).

Olga Cavalli: I know. I think that perhaps Jamie and Mary can propose it to the working team.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, we have other comments on this issue here on the floor.

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Who is next?

Julie Hedlund: Zahid.

Zahid Jamil: This is Zahid. Olga, I'm just thinking usually being from a common law background, if you leave something unsaid it means that you can do it.

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Zahid Jamil: If we deleted it I mean there is nothing to prohibit weighted voting. But understanding in certain we want to be clarifying this saying that weighted voting is protected and safeguarded, maybe all we need to do is say constituencies may provide for weighted voting in their charter full stop.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Zahid Jamil: And the reason I say may is because some do have it and some don't.

Olga Cavalli: Comments about Zahid's suggestion?

Krista Papac: Olga, it's Krista. Just a comment on the general discussion, so I agree actually more with what Mary is saying. I think even just saying that it should be defined in their charter, then you can have weighted voting, you can have equal rights voting.

You can have whatever but people know by looking at the charter of the group what the voting structure is and hopefully that also addresses (how these can work).

Olga Cavalli: Other comments?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. Yeah. Marilyn Cade has a comment.

Olga Cavalli: Marilyn, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. The last language offered I think also allows for a constituency to have members who do not vote because they are in a special class of membership. That may be an associate member, it may be an observer status or something else that is established.

As long as that is established in the charter and the agreed to and accepted, I'm assuming we're not trying to dictate that all - so the last language merely says that the charter will define as I understood it, will define the voting rights - may define. Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Marilyn, when you - I'm sorry. When you mentioned the last text, you mean the one suggested by Zahid?

Marilyn Cade: Yes. Thank you Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, Jamie has a comment here.

Olga Cavalli: Jamie, go ahead.

Jamie Wagner: I would like to ask Mary to (do this). I think the wording she gave was okay with me and good.

Mary Wong: Thanks Jamie and not being a member of this work team, I really appreciate it for all of you letting me butt in right now. I think the language I proposed was something along the lines of all constituency charters shall clearly delineate the voting rights of its members.

Jamie Wagner: Voting members I would say.

Mary Wong: Well, if you delineate or you clearly delineate the voting rights of all your members you can say that some don't or that some might have differed in the past or that there is weighted voting and so forth.

And all the incidents that Zahid and Marilyn mentioned - Marilyn said the idea is not to impose on constituencies what they should do but to tell people where they can find their rights.

Jamie Wagner: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Olga - can I - Olga, this is Chuck again. I'm sorry I haven't been able to log in yet to get (in line).

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Hold on Chuck. Is someone else going to talk before Chuck, Julie?

Julie Hedlund: There is no one else in the queue here on this side.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Chuck, go ahead please.

Chuck Gomes: I think we're on the right track but there are two succinct issues here. One of them is whether or not every eligible member should have some voting rights. That's one issue.

And the other one I think we have pretty much accomplished is and I think it's right that those whatever the voting rights are, they should be clearly

communicated and publicly available on the constituency or stakeholder site. Now I think I heard Marilyn suggest that some eligible members might not have any right to vote at all.

And I'm not sure that's the right way to go. Now maybe it's a distinction between what we might call regular members and like she referred to as associate members. I know that for example CNTR has that kind of a provision where they have associate members that don't vote.

But as far as their regular members I think all their regular members have some right to vote. So that's what I'm getting at in that regard and maybe Marilyn can see if something like that, like regular members, have a right to vote. Not equal votes but regular members have a right to vote in some capacity is what I'm suggesting.

Marilyn Cade: Let me respond to Chuck. Chuck, thank you. It's Marilyn Cade. I'm also not a member of this working group but have been trying to follow its work. When we get into the use of terms like regular member then we have to define what regular member means.

I was using the example of associate member because that is an existing construct in some of the commercial stakeholder group constituencies or is a concept that might evolve within the GC, for instance a non-paying member hypothetically association could extend non-member status to their qualified members who are participating as members but they are not voting members. They are in a different category.

But I'm going to try to avoid defining categories of membership because looking at this I think we're trying - the goal of this group is to provide a framework of consistency without dictating in a top-down manner the parameters or conditions of how a constituency will deliver services to its members.

So I'm trying to stay away from regular members and I think the language of we're going to be putting this forward and asking for further comment on it. We're trying to just create a framework of consistency, not absolute consistency, right?

Chuck Gomes: Well, Marilyn, I'm not sure that's totally correct because I think what some of the members and I don't think they're of this working team, wanted to make sure is that no eligible members were excluded from voting in some capacity.

And I think what you're suggesting and I understand the difficulty of defining regular so I'm with you on that, that if somebody is eligible to vote and I agree with you that that means that if they have paid their fees like for example in the registry stakeholder group someone who doesn't pay their fees loses their right to vote at some point.

But for example, let me use the business constituency. If there is a business that meets the eligibility requirements including they have paid their dues and so forth, one of the intents that we were trying to accomplish in the work team was that business should have a right to participate in the voting of the group.

Now how do we accomplish that without being overly rigid because I also totally support the need for flexibility in terms of the voting structure. Did that make any sense?

Tony Harris: Hi Chuck. This is Tony. I think we're getting a little jumbled up with B because if you read A again it says all constituencies shall permit all voting members in good standing to vote in an election.

If we're saying voting members by implication then there may be some members that do not vote. Otherwise why don't we just say members? So we've covered that in A. I don't really see the need to have B, which goes back to that, revisit it and perhaps begin to open up into the details of what we actually want to do.

Because basically as has been said by other people at the meeting, I mean this is at least in my understanding of this work is we are providing a framework and not really getting into very specific dictates through how a constituency should operate in this instance.

Chuck Gomes: And Tony, I think you're right on that. I think that's a very good point.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. This is Olga. It's a good point Tony. Again, about B, should we rephrase it, delete it? We have a proposal from Mary and Zahid. We have two different languages or perhaps we can try to find one language that fits both proposals.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. I think (Mary)'s proposed language perhaps I could read it again and we could have comments on that again. So everyone the proposed language - Zahid, did you have a comment first?

Zahid Jamil: Yeah. I put some language up there on the chat screen. I don't know if all of you and everybody else can see it. We're basically trying to address I think the same issue in A as in B, saying one that everybody can vote and that it should be provided in the charter.

All you need to do is look at some of the language that I put up that says all constituencies shall permit all voting members in good standing to vote in an election as delineated in their charter. And that's just A.

Olga Cavalli: Julie, could you read it because I cannot read it. It's so small in the Adobe.

Julie Hedlund: I'll go ahead Olga and read it again. Some language from Zahid - all constituencies shall permit all voting members in good standing to vote in an election as delineated in their charters.

Olga Cavalli: And could you please read the proposal made by Mary?

Julie Hedlund: The language from Mary is all constituencies' charters shall clearly delineate the voting rights of all of their members.

Olga Cavalli: I think both are somehow close. So perhaps we can find one text from both proposals. Zahid and Mary, could you please perhaps work on this wording and send it to the working team maybe not today if you're very busy but any day this week? Does it sound a good idea?

Mary Wong: Anything for you Olga.

Zahid Jamil: Yeah Olga. Absolutely.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you so much. So if the group is right with this idea perhaps Julie, you can enter an action point saying that Number 5 voting B will be - we will have text proposed by Mary and Zahid hopefully putting both ideas together. I think they are very similar so it would be easy to find a text.

Chuck Gomes: So Olga are you saying to include both statements?

Olga Cavalli: Well, what I'm trying to - I think both are close so perhaps they can...

Chuck Gomes: They are subtly different. I would support including both statements. Now maybe we need to fix them a little bit so it's smooth but one says, (Mary)'s says that the charters have to clearly communicate what the voting procedures are and requirements.

The other one says that all constituencies shall permit all voting members in good standing to vote in an election as delineated in their charter. Now that may be covered by the previous bullet so we can decide that but I think they both say something that is significant and I think good.

- Olga Cavalli: Yes. This is why I'm trying to find a text that includes both. (I thought with the both of them) maybe you disagree and you want to propose something different.
- Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. May I ask a question.
- Olga Cavalli: Sure.
- Julie Hedlund: I have a question for Zahid. Zahid, I'm reading your language again and I'm looking at the current language for A, which says all constituencies shall permit all voting members in good standing to vote in an election. Did you mean for your language to replace the language in A?
- Zahid Jamil: It reproduces that and just adds something on. That's it.
- Julie Hedlund: So in addition to A.
- Zahid Jamil: It's an addition sort of rather than sort of have two separate sections for it we could just leave it at one and that would leave the aspects of what kind of voting that would be open. That was the intention. We can continue to work on it. Maybe we can come up with some sort (of compromise).
- Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. My point in asking Zahid is that I think that (Mary)'s language was suggested to replace the language in B. So I'm wondering if we could consider Zahid's language for additional language for A and (Mary)'s as a proposal for language for B.
- Olga Cavalli: I think it's a good idea. What do others think?
- Zahid Jamil: (Okay).
- Chuck Gomes: Olga, what about putting (Mary's statement) in A and Zahid's in B? in other words replacing the language that is there because I think that still maintains

the concept of what was in A in I think Zahid's language. But what about that approach?

Olga Cavalli: I like it. Julie, could you be so kind to read in A the text proposed by Mary and in B proposed by Zahid? Is that your proposal Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Could you read it so we can think about it as a whole?

Julie Hedlund: Yeah. This is Julie. So the language would be the new A would read all constituency charters shall clearly delineate all the voting rights of all of their members. And the new B would read all constituencies shall permit all voting members in good standing to vote in an election as delineated in their charters.

Olga Cavalli: Comments?

Jamie Wagner: Much better. This is Jamie.

Olga Cavalli: Jamie, I just heard your name. Which was your comment?

Jamie Wagner: Much better, perfect.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Any other comments?

Julie Hedlund: Tony, this is Julie. Did you have any comments on that?

Tony Harris: No, not now.

Olga Cavalli: Other people wanted to comment Julie in the room?

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I see no more comments from the room.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Great. Let's do the following. Let's leave this new language - thank you Mary, thank you Zahid for your suggestions and thank you Chuck for also your suggestion about putting the language a different way - and let's leave it as a draft and see if other members of the working team comment about it. Do you think that's a good idea?

Tony Harris: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Hearing no comments, Julie, can we go to 5B?

Julie Hedlund: Actually I think that we have addressed B in this standing.

Olga Cavalli: I meant C.

Julie Hedlund: C - that's what I meant. I shall read 5C - members shall be entities to appoint proxies.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. I would like someone to explain this sentence to me because I don't understand it. Maybe I'm so ignorant about something but if someone explains it to me.

Julie Hedlund: No Olga - Olga, you're correct. Actually this is a typo. It should read members shall be entitled to appoint proxies.

Olga Cavalli: That's different. I didn't know about entities to appoint proxies. So members shall be entitled to appoint proxies. Could someone tell me what is a proxy?

Tony Harris: Olga, this is Tony. I may be wrong but I believe that this is useful if there is some voting to be done and that's the reason for the proxy but I could be wrong.

Olga Cavalli: Is this a useful - this is usually made in constituencies? I mean could someone comment and say if this is okay if we include this language or not?

Zahid Jamil: Hi Olga. This is Zahid. I'm just getting some feedback from here. One of the things is is it possible for us to change this to members may be entitled to appoint proxies leaving it up to their constituencies to do so, they don't have to so that we're not dictating to the constituencies per se? And that language can give some space?

Olga Cavalli: Well, this is found in my comment - shall is very strong. So you're suggesting may instead of shall?

Zahid Jamil: Yes I am.

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments? Are we okay with this stanza with the change suggested by Zahid?

Tony Harris: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Tony. Other comments? Does someone want to comment, Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. I see no more comments from the room.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you Zahid for your suggestion. Could you change the language (Julie) and could you read it again, changing the type and changing the verb?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. So C reads members may be entitled to appoint proxies.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Comments? Comments in the room?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. There are no comments from the room. Zahid? No comments from the room.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, should I read D?

Olga Cavalli: Yes please.

Julie Hedlund: So no legal or natural person shall be entitled to vote twice.

Olga Cavalli: Comments? Are we okay with shall in this sentence?

Tony Harris: We could add thrice also.

Olga Cavalli: What did you suggest Tony?

Marilyn Cade: Okay, it's Marilyn. What's it about? What's the purpose of it because I don't understand what it's needed for.

Olga Cavalli: Marilyn, you're suggesting we take it out?

Marilyn Cade: Olga, I am because I just remind all of us that everything we write is then going to be reviewed by the legal counsel and everything we put in that is ambiguous is just going to come back to us.

Is this serving a purpose? Is somebody concerned that a constituency would decide to allow double voting - I'm sorry, voting twice by one of their members? Well, in their charter they are going to define that any way.

Tony Harris: I agree with Marilyn. This is Tony. I think it's superfluous.

Krista Papac: It's Krista. I also agree with Marilyn and it's sort of back to the same issue of voting rights and how they are counted and all of that stuff should be in the charters and that is sort of that.

Zahid Jamil: Zahid, I agree.

Olga Cavalli: Great. So we can delete it. Julie, can you strike through?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. Then I will indicate it as stricken.

Olga Cavalli: Are there comments about 5D? Comments in the room?

Julie Hedlund: There are no further comments in the room.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you. Thank you for the suggestion Marilyn. I think it's a very good comment. 5E.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, it's Julie. I will read E. No legal or natural persons shall be entitled to join more than one constituency as a voting member.

Tony Harris: Julie, I don't think this is very fortunate wording. Why would we refer to joining more than one constituency? I mean it's not involved in the title. We're talking about voting, not about joining constituencies.

Olga Cavalli: Hello. I lost the audio. Can you hear me?

Marilyn Cade: Olga, it's Marilyn again. I'm not looking at our bylaws, at the ICANN bylaws but I am unfortunately burdened by corporate memory or ICANN memory, whichever one fits here.

We debated this extensively at the time we set up the constituencies and there was a significant concern about entities joining multiple constituencies and obtaining votes in multiple constituencies and therefore actually losing diversity of representation.

So within just speaking for the BC for instance, our charter does not allow or our charter asks whether parties are joining members of another constituency

and it also requires them to have different representation. But I think this is an important thing to understand.

Many companies have different interests and if they are eligible to join multiple constituencies that's one thing. But if they are joining multiple constituencies as voting members I think we are beginning to raise a concern about the representativeness of the votes that are being put forward.

Olga Cavalli: So what is your suggestion Marilyn, about 5E?

Marilyn Cade: I think what I would propose to the room is to consider if the intent is to enable companies or entities to be members of multiple constituencies for which they are eligible but you hold voting rights in only one.

If that's the intent then that would be the language that we should try to write about. And let me just say one more thing. For example, contracted parties are not eligible to be members of the business constituency. They are precluded in our charter.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Marilyn. Any other comments? Tony, going back to your comment, would you take it out or would you change the language?

Tony Harris: Olga, I'm thinking about it. Basically I think Marilyn has expanded very usefully on this but I'm not sure I would be comfortable with the sentence as it stands right now. I think it deserves some more thought by the committee as a whole. Perhaps we should sort of leave it pending for further comment and work going forward so we have a chance to think about it and revisit it.

Olga Cavalli: All right. That's a good suggestion. Any other comments from other constituency members? Does someone want to comment Julie, in the room?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. I see no more comments in the room.

Olga Cavalli: So Tony, would you be so kind to revise text and propose different language?

Tony Harris: Okay, I'll try.

Olga Cavalli: You're laughing. I'm giving a lot of work to you but you're a good working team member.

Tony Harris: No. That's okay. I'll even forgive you for not coming and bringing my medicine but that's (all right).

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I fell guilty. Great. Thank you Tony. Please Julie put it as an action item that Tony - perhaps Tony, you may have help from another working team member. Does someone volunteer to help Tony?

Tony Harris: Thanks Olga.

Olga Cavalli: No comments? Okay. You will have to work alone. I'm so sorry. Okay. We are done with 5, Voting and we should move forward to 6, Charter Amendments. Julie, could you please read 6A, which is the only point for 6?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Number 6, Charter Amendments - the procedure for amending constituency charters should be standard and stipulated in the constituency charter.

Olga Cavalli: Comments? I have a general comment. Should this be stated as it is? Is it not redundant? Any comments in the room?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, I'm not seeing any comments in the room.

Olga Cavalli: So we like the language and we'll leave it as it is? No comments?

Zahid Jamil: This is Zahid. I'm just trying to figure out what you mean by the amending procedures shall be standard. I'm not clear what that means.

Tony Harris: This is Tony. Perhaps we could say take out standard and just they should be stipulated in the constituency charter.

Olga Cavalli: So you suggest to take out the word standard? Yes, because we don't define standard so we don't know what it is. I find it redundant any way. Does someone want to talk? Krista, go ahead please.

Krista Papac: I was going to say I agree with Tony. I think we should just strike those two words.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, which was your comment, Krista?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. Would you like me to read it with the stricken language?

Olga Cavalli: Sure please.

Julie Hedlund: The procedure for amending constituency charters should be stipulated in the constituency charter.

Tony Harris: Perhaps we could say therein at the end so as not to have to repeat constituency charter again?

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So what's your proposal Tony?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. I'll read it with the change. The procedure for amending constituency charters should be stipulated therein.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. That's okay. Are we okay with this language? Okay. Great. Any comments in the room?

Julie Hedlund: I shall read it again.

Olga Cavalli: Yes please.

Julie Hedlund: The procedure for amending constituency charters should be stipulated therein. Olga, this is Julie. It appears to be that there is assent with that language in this room.

Olga Cavalli: Great. So we're okay with it. Okay. Number 7, Meetings - we have A and B. Julie, please read 7A.

Julie Hedlund: 7, Meetings, A - it is recommended constituencies adopt simple and accessible basic meeting procedure. An example is at Annex A. Constituencies are also referred to the GNSO bylaws, operating procedures and the GNSO working group operating model.

Tony Harris: There is a wording problem there perhaps. For those who need, could we jump to Annex A so they have benefit to know what they are referring to?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: I see that Chuck has his hand raised. Did you have a comment Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I was back on Number 6 so I lowered my hand because I wasn't quick enough to get back on 6. I'll go ahead since I'm on. I'm not advocating this position but I think the person on our team who is not on this call who drafted the main portions of this document with other's help actually intended in 6 that the procedures for amending charters were consistent across groups.

Now again like I said, I'm not necessarily advocating that but in fairness to that person who is not on the call I wanted to point out that we changed the change that was made moved away from that and as long as there is strong support for that I think I can live with that too. But I just wanted to in fairness make sure that we understand what we did.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry Chuck. This is Olga. So you feel that the changed language is very different from the first one?

Chuck Gomes: In number 6? Yes it is. The way it was worded said basically and it wasn't worded very well but it basically said that all charters have to have standard language for amending their charters.

We moved away from that. Now again I'm not advocating the position that was originally contained in the wording but I'm pointing out that we did make a change that I know one member of our group will disagree with. Okay. So I'm just pointing that out, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: No but it's interesting how you point it out because I read it differently. And if you add the standard you add another word to when you mention it. It sounds so different. So your interpretation of it is different from mine maybe.

Chuck Gomes: No. It says the procedure for amending constituency charters should be standard. We took that part out.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And that's all I'm saying. That is different now.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. Jamie also has a comment.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Jamie, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: No he does not. I'm sorry.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Well, I don't know if you heard, we didn't know exactly what standard meant in this sentence. Perhaps you can if you see it as a relevant word perhaps you can tell us what standard means in this sentence.

Chuck Gomes: Standard is not that complicated. What was intended here I believe and I'm speaking for someone else who is not on the call, it means that every charter would basically have the same procedures for amending their charters.

The way we changed the wording, that is no longer there and again I'm not advocating that position. I'm just making sure for the sake that we have moved forward and when that person is on the call Olga.

Olga Cavalli: No I agree with you but it's interesting that you the way that you read it and interpret it is different.

Chuck Gomes: How would you interpret standard differently?

Olga Cavalli: Well, for me it's a word that's not defined so I don't know what standard means in this case. What does standard (entail)?

Marilyn Cade: Olga, it's Marilyn. Can I just interject that my understanding of standard is that it means the same. And if you look at how standards are developed in technology or we have a standard approach, it means the same. So I would just refer to others who have been working on this but my concern about...

Zahid Jamil: This is (Ira). Am I in the queue?

Olga Cavalli: Sure Zahid. Go ahead.

Zahid Jamil: Thank you Olga. The language of standard, I understand what Chuck is saying is standard. It should be the same and I agree with Marilyn that that's what it means.

But someone is going to have to set that standard. Is someone going to tell us what that standard is? Is it going to be the legal counsel? Because all constituency charters are going to have to be the same then with regard to

this provision. Now how are we going to decide that? How do we know what to put inside and who tells us?

I understand the point of an individual put that in and we had a comment on this - I don't mean Chuck. I mean the other person but I'm just concerned about what that other language will be. Do we have to negotiate that? Do we have to all get together in different constituencies and negotiate that?

So I'm not sure because they may be different voting thresholds for amending in different constituencies. It's a possibility. I'm not saying that it should be that but it's a possibility. I'm just wondering how do we all get together in all constituencies and negotiate that together if it's going to be standard?

Chuck Gomes: Olga, let me suggest that we go ahead and move on. My main purpose was to make sure that we were all clear on the working team of what we just did because it will be brought up again, understand?

Olga Cavalli: I know and would you be so kind Chuck to rephrase the way that you did it minutes ago? It's not exactly the way that it's written, it's the way that you interpret it, which I totally understood the difference there. But it was a very good suggestion.

Zahid Jamil: (It is a good suggestion).

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I'll see what I can do on that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you. Maybe we can have both proposals, the one change by the group and yours and we can decide later. Thank you Chuck. Well, Julie, we were in 7A?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Perhaps I'll read it again (so it's fresh).

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, sure.

Julie Hedlund: A, it is recommended constituencies adopt simple and accessible basic meeting procedure. An example is in Annex A. Constituencies are also referred to the GNSO bylaws, operating procedures and the GNSO working group operating model.

Olga Cavalli: I would like to move to Annex A to see the example. It's in the end, right?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. I'll skip down to Annex A and read it. Hold on please for a moment. Okay. This is Julie. I am reading Annex A. Basic meeting procedure - organization of general meetings.

1, Attendance and participation; 1.1, Any member in good standing ("member") can speak and vote at a general meeting; 1.2, The executive committee can make arrangements as they consider appropriate to enable members attending a general meeting to exercise their rights to speak and vote at it;

1.3, In determining attendance at a general meeting it is immaterial whether any two or more members attending it are in the same place provided they are able to speak and vote; 1.4, Non-members may attend and speak at meetings by invitation; 2, Quorum; 2.1, No business can be done at a meeting without a quorum;

2.2, A quorum shall be a certain percentage of the membership; 3, Chairs; 3.1, The meeting must appoint a chair as the first business of the meeting; 4, Notice; 4.1, Meetings shall be called on seven days' notice in writing to all members; 4.2, the notice shall give the date and time and the general nature of the business;

5, Voting; 5.1, A resolution put to the vote of a general meeting must be decided on a show of hands by members attending in the same place or by the chair calling the names of those present. Olga, I'm sorry?

Olga Cavalli: I just lost you but you're back.

Julie Hedlund: Okay. I'll finish reading but I think we'll probably want to take these one by one.

Olga Cavalli: (Unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: Zahid has a general comment. Olga, Zahid has a general comment.

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Go ahead Zahid.

Zahid Jamil: Thank you Olga. I think the basic rules here that we were trying to follow through at least in this meeting and I think we have done that earlier is we don't want to dictate seven charters and specify the charter and say here is a model charter and this is what you're going to abide by.

That clause, which was earlier referred to, is speaking about an Annex A, which actually incorporates the whole charter and dictates to us seven days' notice, quorum, etcetera, all those things. I think that's overkill. I think what we're trying to do is give constituencies the right to be able to define their own charter.

But this is a model charter that we are having to take over and I think that as a general idea I think it's just not advisable. I mean we would definitely be in the BC opposed to that.

Olga Cavalli: So you are proposing - what is your proposal?

Zahid Jamil: Delete Annex A.

Olga Cavalli: I think it goes into many details and I agree with you that we don't want to. I mean every constituency will have to deal with their own charters and definitions. Any other comments?

Tony Harris: I agree with Zahid's proposal to delete Annex A.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Tony. Any other comments?

Krista Papac: It's Krista. I agree with Zahid's proposal as well.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Chuck, comments?

Chuck Gomes: I'm okay with that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Me too so I propose that in this new draft we delete Annex A.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, may I read 7, Meetings letter A with the change?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: It is recommended constituencies adopt simple and accessible basic meeting procedure. Constituencies are also referred to the GNSO bylaws, operating procedures and the GNSO working group operating model.

Olga Cavalli: Are we okay with the second part of the sentence? Is the GNSO working group operating model already finished?

Zahid Jamil: Olga, I agree with your question. I don't know the answer to that either. I'd like to ask (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: No I don't have the answer. I'm just pointing my doubt. I remember the process of preparing this document that was in reference of this work in process but I'm not sure if it's done. Yes Julie, do you want to comment?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. I think the GNSO working group's operating model is still under development. We have a comment from Marilyn.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. That's my idea (but it mentions something).

Marilyn Cade: Guys, Olga, it's Marilyn. If your concern is that it's because it's not finished you could just put it in square brackets and remove the square brackets later.

Olga Cavalli: That's a good suggestion. Thank you Marilyn. So are we okay with this second part of A and keeping GNSO working group operating model in brackets as we know that it's evident and useful?

Tony Harris: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Tony. Any other comments in the room?

Julie Hedlund: This is Olga Julie, I see no comments in the room.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you so much. 7B please Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. B, it is recommended minutes be taken at meetings of the general constituency membership and action points, decisions and any resolutions or minutes be published to the entire constituency membership within a reasonable period.

Olga Cavalli: Comments to 7B? This is okay that we recommend the minutes to be published to the entire constituency membership?

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry, I was addressing a question. What was your comment Olga?

Olga Cavalli: You're asking me Julie?

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry. I missed something. Are we okay with the wording on this? Okay.

Olga Cavalli: I made a question to the group and to the room. Are we okay saying that we recommend that the decisions and minutes be published to the entire constituency membership?

Tony Harris: I don't see any opposition in the room. That seems to be okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Great. Any other comments in the room?

Krista Papac: Olga, it's Krista. I just have a clarifying question. I noticed and this may have been discussed on one of the calls I couldn't attend so if it has just tell me and I'll drop my question.

But I notice that we're using the word constituencies in this document and I believe in Subtask 1.1 we defined it somehow as groups. We call it groups as defined as stakeholder groups and constituencies and I'm just wondering if we should just sort of carry that through our entire set of recommendations.

Olga Cavalli: I think your point is well taken, Krista. Yes I think we should do the same. What do others think?

Chuck Gomes: Julie, wasn't that the global change we were going to make in the whole document?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Julie Hedlund: Actually Chuck, this is Julie. The global change as stated before was that we change the language to constituencies and stakeholder groups. But we can certainly change it to groups for the global change.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's fine.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. That's fine for me. I think we have decided that was going to be a global change a long time ago. Okay.

Thank you Krista for bringing this back and for reminding us of that change. So we are okay with 7B with this global change about groups. And let's go to 8, Policy. 8A, Julie could you please read it?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. 8A - it is recommended that standing policy committees comply with similar rules as executive committees.

Olga Cavalli: Comments?

Zahid Jamil: This is Zahid. I'm not sure what that means. I mean what are we trying to get at exactly? Executive committees work slightly differently, (boss) committees may work differently. I'm not rejecting to it, I just want to know if someone can help us with what this is supposed to address?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Sorry for jumping in without putting my hand up but I think for the sake for those that are observing this meeting and participating as they should, the working team - it shouldn't be perceived that the working team has agreed on any of this language.

That's why we're going through this exercise. There was a small drafting team primarily driven by one person who drafted most of this language. So I want to share that context so that there is no misunderstanding that we as a working team wanted this much detail or all of the in particular details that are in there. That's why we're going through this painful exercise in this regard. And I'll just leave it at that.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Chuck. This is Olga. We already explained why we are going through the document because the sub working team and working team (revision). And so thank you for reminding the group about that. Do you have any comments about 8A because Zahid wants some explanation.

Unfortunately we don't have Victoria on the call. Is someone from Victoria's sub working team that could remind us, which is the purpose of this sentence?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, I'm not sure but I don't think there is somebody from...

Olga Cavalli: No (I don't think so).

Julie Hedlund: No. I don't believe there is anybody, no.

Olga Cavalli: (The rest are) not here.

Julie Hedlund: Perhaps Olga, I might suggest that we ask for clarification from Victoria on this item.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. That's a great suggestion. So put it in brackets and let's add an action point about asking her for clarification about 8A. And so we move forward to 8B.

Julie Hedlund: 8B - policy committees shall be open to all members in good standing and like other committees shall publish their formation, work product and decisions to the entire constituent membership and respond to requests for information by constituency members.

Zahid Jamil: I'm going to sort of hold back my comment on the general concept but I just see that the and like other committees, I just think that's redundant. That's just my first comment. I'm just thinking about what to do with the rest.

Krista Papac: This is Krista. I agree that's redundant.

Tony Harris: I do also, Tony Harris.

Olga Cavalli: So Julie, could you read the paragraph with the change proposed by all the suggestions mentioned by Zahid?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Olga, this is Julie. Policy committees shall be open to all members in good standing and shall publish their formation, work products and decisions to the entire constituency membership and respond to requests for information by constituency members.

Olga Cavalli: I agree it's much better. Comments on this proposed change?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, Mary Wong has a comment.

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Mary, go ahead.

Mary Wong: Hi. Sorry. A very minor comment, not at all substantive unlike the last contribution - could I ask the working team to make uniform the uppercase and lowercase uses of constituency, members and membership? I know that's being horribly (loyally) but I just thought I'd put that in there.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, may I comment? This is Julie.

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Go ahead Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Mary, as Krista suggested and others agreed, we will now change all references to constituencies to groups and there will be a definition at the beginning that will indicate that groups covers constituencies and stakeholder groups. Then we'll be sure to capitalize constituency in that respect. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Julie and Mary. We have been preparing this document in different sub committees, sub working teams so there may be some differences. So we are trying to make them homogenous and this is what we're doing now. Thank you for your comments.

Zahid Jamil: Olga, this is Zahid.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. Go ahead Zahid.

Zahid Jamil: I just had one other (point out). I'm just thinking about this so I just wanted to highlight it for the rest of the work team members. It says and respond to requests for information by constituency members.

I'm just concerned about if they get overwhelmed with requests. I don't know. I mean maybe it's not a problem but are we okay with the language? I just wanted to sort of ask if it's an issue or not?

Olga Cavalli: Sorry. I'm so sorry. I couldn't follow you.

Zahid Jamil: I'm just looking at the language and seeing that it leaves open to the response to every request for information being necessary because (it's so pejorative). I'm just wondering if that may be overkill or are we good with that? I just want to highlight that. I'm not objecting to it.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. You have a proposal or proposed change?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, Debra Hughes has a comment.

Debby Hughes: Olga, I was suggesting to the - I think what about this for 8B if we add at the end within a reasonable period similar to what we said in Section 7 talking about all sorts of proposed things that give some reasonableness and allows some sort of I guess way out for the person who is going to be responding to all these requests and accumulating them.

Zahid Jamil: I agree with that comment.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Debby. Other comments about Debby's suggestion?

Krista Papac: It's Krista. I agree.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Krista.

Tony Harris: It's Tony. I agree also.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Tony.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. Shall I read the amended sentence?

Olga Cavalli: Exactly. That was I was going to ask you. Thank you Julie.

Julie Hedlund: So it reads policy committees shall be open to all members in good standing and publish their formation, work products and decisions to the entire constituency membership and to respond to requests for information by constituency members within a reasonable period.

Olga Cavalli: That sounds very good. Comments to this new language, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Just a second Olga. I'm catching up.

Olga Cavalli: Other comments in the room?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, there are no comments in the room.

Chuck Gomes: What was the suggestion again?

Julie Hedlund: Chuck, this is Julie. Let me go ahead and read it again. The suggestion was that B should be amended in two ways. The words and like other committees would be stricken and the words within a reasonable period would be added at the end of the sentence.

Thus B would read policy committees shall be open to all members in good standing and shall publish their formation, work products and decisions to the entire constituency membership and respond to requests for information by constituency members within a reasonable period.

Chuck Gomes: I think I'm okay with that. Those changes seem fine.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Chuck. Okay so any other comments in the room? So Julie, did you capture the new language?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, Olga, I have captured it.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Julie Hedlund: Shall I read 8C?

Olga Cavalli: Yes please.

Julie Hedlund: Any member of a constituency shall be able to propose the policy committee consider a policy issue provided sufficient members agree.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. Maybe my English is limited but I don't understand this, the last part of it.

Tony Harris: This is Tony. I think the last part is a little risky because how do you define what sufficient members means? It's a little undefined. The idea is not a bad idea.

In fact, I would imagine at least the constituencies I'm familiar with, that's common practice. You wouldn't - if somebody wants to make a proposal you'd listen to him if he's a member. But I could be wrong of course.

- Krista Papac: Olga, it's Krista. To be repetitive, isn't this just another area where we should sort of refer to the charter of the group?
- Olga Cavalli: Any comments to Krista's comment?
- Tony Harris: I think Krista made a good suggestion. Tony.
- Olga Cavalli: Zahid, what do you think about Krista's comment?
- Zahid Jamil: I agree with Krista and with Tony.
- Olga Cavalli: So Krista, do you think we should take it off?
- Krista Papac: Olga, I'm thinking. Sorry. Bear with me.
- Olga Cavalli: No problem. Take your time. I'm also rereading it. Any other comments in the room?
- Krista Papac: I mean I think it has a great...
- Olga Cavalli: Sorry. I interrupted someone.
- Chuck Gomes: Olga, what suggestion are you asking about, deleting C?
- Olga Cavalli: Well, Krista commented that this is something relevant to a charter and perhaps Krista please correct me if I'm wrong, too much detail for this general suggestion/recommendation document. Did I catch you right, Krista?
- Krista Papac: Olga, it's Krista. We could delete it. I do want to be cognizant of the fact that to Chuck's earlier point the person that wrote this and I think if we can even rather than deleting it to sort of try and preserve some of her work. If we can just clarify that basically we give some flexibility to groups to define this in their charter and we're not making it so narrow in this particular document.

Olga Cavalli: No, I'm okay. I'm not saying that we have to omit it. I'm just asking if perhaps it's too detailed and maybe it's not relevant for this document. That was only my comment.

Chuck Gomes: Here's a suggestion Olga. This is Chuck.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: How about if we just say any member of a constituency or group, right, shall be able to propose the policy committee consider a policy issue?

Olga Cavalli: I like that because the last part of the sentence, I really don't get it. I like it. Comments to Chuck's suggestion?

Tony Harris: This is Tony. Perhaps if we added something at the end of Chuck's proposed text, which goes back to what Krista proposed, according to the group charter. Then I think Chuck's text would fit into what we were trying to say when we started out.

Zahid Jamil: This is Zahid. I agree with Tony's suggestion.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine. That's a good suggestion.

Olga Cavalli: I like it. Yes. Julie, did you capture the comments made by Tony?

Julie Hedlund: Yes Olga. Shall I read the change?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. Please go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Any member of a group shall be able to propose a policy committee consider a policy issue according to the group charter.

Olga Cavalli: Comments?

Tony Harris: Can I make a modification to what I said? Instead of according to I would say in accordance with.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Julie, could you read it again?

Julie Hedlund: Yes Olga. This is Julie.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you.

Julie Hedlund: Any member of a group shall be able to propose the policy committee consider a policy issue in accordance with the group charter.

Tony Harris: Julie, as far as I'm concerned, that reflects what I was trying to say.

Olga Cavalli: I lost the audio. I'm not hearing you.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, there are no additional comments here. I think the change is accepted.

Olga Cavalli: Great. So we have agreed in a new text or modifications of the text in 8C. So we move to 8D. Please Julie, read it for us.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. D - policy committee meetings should be open for attendance to all committee members and, at the election of the constituency, to the public.

Olga Cavalli: Comments to 8D?

Zahid Jamil: This is Zahid. I just think it's overkill and unnecessary.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry Zahid, I didn't hear you. It's what?

Zahid Jamil: Sorry. I just think it's overkill and unnecessary. If the constituency wants to open up the discussion in public or in the group I think it will do that. I don't see why we need to dictate that to them.

Especially I'm concerned about the last words and at the election of the constituency to the public. I mean how would they elect it? Is it 50/50? Is it a simple majority or I just think we're getting into areas where we're getting too deep.

Olga Cavalli: Do you suggest different language?

Tony Harris: This is Tony. I agree with what Zahid just said.

Olga Cavalli: So you have suggested changes to the language?

Zahid Jamil: Tony, would you agree to a deletion?

Tony Harris: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Other comments?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Rafik. Sorry but I don't understand the point (made by Zahid).

Zahid Jamil: What I'm trying to say is that this says, basically it goes too deep and is too detailed with regard to how whether they are going to keep it open or not.

And especially the last part where it says at the election of the constituency - I'm trying to figure out what that means. Does that mean that they have to take a vote? And if they take a vote is it 51%? Is it a 2/3 majority? I mean you're getting into areas where the charters and you need to let the constituencies work according to their different ways. I mean I'm just finding it a little too descriptive.

Rafik Dammak: If we delete the last part?

Zahid Jamil: That's a bare minimum for me as far as this is concerned I think. But even then I think we're going into areas where we probably shouldn't be going into. That was my comment. But we can definitely delete the last part.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, Mary Wong has a comment. Mary?

Mary Wong: Sure. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Mary, go ahead.

Mary Wong: I take Zahid's point. I think it is important to remember that we really don't want to hamper or tell constituencies how to run their meetings. But I think the idea behind this is transparency.

So especially on policy issues so I mean I'm blanking on language right now but may I propose that we rephrase this particular subsection to preserve the idea without going into process? I mean it could be for...

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you Mary for the proposal. I think you may propose a different text. Are we okay if Mary proposes - sorry. I'm interrupting someone.

Mary Wong: I think I nominate Jamie. I will be happy to take a stab at it and I'll get back to the group as soon as possible.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Mary. Are we okay that Mary is replacing this 8D paragraph? Comments in the room?

Zahid Jamil: This is Zahid. Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Zahid. Okay Mary. Thank you for your comments, very useful. Julie, could we move to 9, GNSO Working Group, A?

Julie Hedlund: Yes Olga, this is Julie. I'll read 9, GNSO Work Group A. Any member of a constituency shall be entitled to join any GNSO work group in an individual capacity and constituencies shall publish and advise all members of the call for work group participants.

Olga Cavalli: Comments to this text? Are we okay with it? Are there comments in the room, Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, I should mention it's come to my attention that we are preparing for lunch here. And we I think probably need to close the session in the next five minutes or so.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. No problem. Okay. Great. So we're finished at the end of 8 so we (are at the end of 8).

Julie Hedlund: Exactly. Right. Olga, this is Julie. I suggest we finish with the end of 8 and take up 9, GNSO Work Groups at our next meeting. Olga, can I ask a question?

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Julie Hedlund: We have been on a weekly schedule for our meetings but I should note that for some people next week after the Nairobi meeting may be busy because people have traveled or are coming back to work.

And I also should note that I will be unavailable for the call next week. Might I suggest that we take up a call at our regularly scheduled time or at a time that is convenient for work group members the following Friday, which I believe is the Friday afterwards?

Olga Cavalli: Just the...

Julie Hedlund: The 26 - thank you Krista.

Olga Cavalli: I'm okay with that. In the meantime the working group can revise these suggested changes and modifications and deletions so we have enough time.

Krista Papac: Olga, it's Krista. Before we close can we just talk about the time of the meetings because I'd like to find a time that we can all attend?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Krista Papac: Preferably go back to the time that we used to have the meetings at.

Olga Cavalli: I'm okay with both times so it's up to the group. I'm okay with both.

Tony Harris: I vote for what Julie is saying. I can get up later in the morning. Thank you Julie.

Olga Cavalli: So what did you say Julie?

Julie Hedlund: So I think Krista was suggesting that we go back to the original time, which was 9:00 Eastern Time. I think 14:00 GTC I believe. Yes. And I am seeing assent from some people on the call.

I should mention that I know we have been scheduling the calls for 90 minutes. I do have a standing meeting at the end of the hour, it would be 10:00 Eastern Time so I would not be able to do a 90 minute call but I could do an hour call.

Olga Cavalli: Let's do the following. I am okay with both times and I would like Krista to join us. Julie, could we perhaps set up a (doodle) again and try to find the best time and so maybe everyone in the working group can express their concerns?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, perhaps rather than doing a doodle, which can be time consuming and because I should note that we have actually very leeway on the times available to us because of other working groups that in my summary for this meeting that I suggest that the time return to the previous time and ask for comments from work team members as to whether or not there are any concerns with that time?

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Hello?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. So Olga, I think that we have agreed on that and did you want to ask if there were any other comments before we adjourn?

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments? I think we finished and comments in the room? Those participating remotely, any comments?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Stéphane has something he would like to say.

Stéphane van Gelder: No. I'm waiting for you to finish and then I will jump in just to introduce what is happening next before you close.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Just want to thank everyone, the working team members and those who are not in the working team that made very good suggestions and comments. So thank you for joining and helping me doing this remotely. Thank you so much.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks very much Olga. I just want to let people know that we now have a GNSO working lunch, which is primarily a GNSO council event. Lunch is provided.

Please give GNSO counselors priority but you are all welcome to enjoy it. I have been told to say that. The working lunch will allow us to discuss our two joint meetings, the one with the GAP later on today and the one with the CCNSO on Monday.

So that session will be open for remote participation so please anybody who would like to join us remotely please do so. WE will now sign off operator and then rejoin in 10 minutes for the working lunch. Thanks very much.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Stéphane. Bye-bye. I'll join again in 10 minutes.

END