

**GNSO Working Session – 2 of 2**

**25 October 2009**

**Seoul, South Korea**

Olga: Okay, good morning, everyone. Welcome to the Constituency Operations meeting. Before we start I would like to welcome new council members that are with us this morning. If we can instead of doing a roll call perhaps each of you could say who you are and present yourself and then tell us what's your name. We can start perhaps with Terry.

[Inaudible - 05:08.9]

Olga: I think I couldn't hear you. I don't know if the rest of us could hear you. Thank you, Terry.

Tony Holmes: Okay, I will just talk loudly. Tony Holmes, Chair of the ISPCP.

Tony Harris: I am Tony Harris from ISPCP, departing councillor and I am also in this working team.

Male: [Inaudible – 05:58.9] from ISPCP and I'm new councillor.

Claudia ?: Claudia [Inaudible] I work on staff for the international Trademark Association and a member of the IPC.

Crystal Papic: Crystal Papic, Iron Mountain and I am a member of the registered stakeholder group.

Zegere ?: Zegere [Inaudible 06:16.7] from the VC councillor and member of the group.

Julie Headland: Julie Headland, ICANN staff.

Mona Cavalier: Mona Cavalier. [Inaudible 06:29.2]. I'm chairing this working team.

[Inaudible]: [Inaudible] Ballack, NCUSC team member and appointed by the board as GNSO councillor.

Michael Young: Michael Young, member of the Registry Stakeholder's Group and co- chair, Vice Chair of this working team.

Rob Hogarth: Rob Hogarth, ICANN staff.

Debra Hughes: Debra Hughes, new councillor for the GNSO appointed by ICON.

Olga: Thank you everyone. Do we have someone on the line? I don't think so but we have apologies from SS. He's from India. He's a member of this working team and he is a leader of one of our sub-task working teams. We also I think we have apologies from Victoria. She is also a sub-working team leader for one of our partial documents that we are preparing.

So as I see nobody on the line I think we are- the people present in this meeting thank you for been here. I sent to the working team list an agenda. Let me find it in my computer. We usually start with an update about any policy, board update or something that is relevant which is usually done by Julie or Robert if we have something to be aware of or if you want to share with us. Do you have something to talk about?

Rob: Thank you all, guys, this is Rob. There is not any tremendous breaking news at this point but there are developments both in the new constituencies arena as well as the existing constituencies' arena. The board has been discussing new constituency petitions here in Seoul. They'll undoubtedly do so throughout the course of the week. It's not clear though whether they will move toward any final decisions here in Seoul.

With respect to existing constituencies, the reconfirmation process is still pending. You may recall that that process slowed down when the board really began to focus on the stakeholder group and constituency relationships. So that reconfirmation process continues to be somewhat delayed and will be dealt with in the post Seoul environment.

The existing constituencies have been asked to update their charters by the board to reflect the new stakeholder group structures and that work is ongoing. The four remaining existing GNSO constituencies may be done with that before the board meeting next week in Seoul.

That's not clear as of yet and we are working with the board that if the constituencies can't meet or reach that timeline that they will get an additional time period after Seoul to complete their work in that respect.

Olga: Thank you very much, Robert. Do we have questions, comments for Robert, Claudia?

Claudia: I just had a question, I am not even sure if it is for Robert. Are the registrars or registry constituencies still in existence? And is there any, because I know they have sort of been absorbed into the stakeholder group structure. I was just wondering if there was any news about what might happen with their groups.

Rob: Yeah. The effect of the approval of the stakeholder group charters in practical terms dissolve those constituencies and you may have gotten, you know, Krista representative of a stakeholders group. That's really how they are operating and from staff perspective that's what we've advised those groups. They are now stakeholder groups.

Hence, the work of this team more broadly now looking at constituencies and stakeholder groups rather than just constituency operations.

Olga: Thank you, Claudia. Any other question to Robert in relation with policy ongoing processes? Okay. Thank you very much, Robert, for the update. Any comments to the agenda, any additions, anything that you want to change or add?

Wolf, go ahead.

Wolf: Olga, just the newcomer. I have some problems where to find where we are, the link and so on?

Olga: That's a good question. You are not on our mailing list right?

Wolf: No.

Olga: So you don't have the agenda. What we can do, I will ask, Julie, you can send it to Wolf?

Julie: I can send it.

Olga: We are trying to show things in the projector but we are not getting that for some reason.

Wolf: Okay.

Olga: So perhaps, but I'll read it to you. It's not a very complicated agenda. It's quite simple.

Wolf: Okay. So just as an addition, I learned yesterday we have people here, newcomers that even don't have a laptop with them, because they didn't know how the working teams are working here. So if possible, if you do have some written texts, if you are to documents and so on it would be really helpful to such people to follow otherwise it's really difficult.

Olga: Sure. We have a Wiki. We have all the documents uploaded in the Wiki. I think that they may have updated, they don't have?

Julie: Not the most recent.

Olga: Not the most recent ones?

Julie: No, because we just got them and so.

Olga: We usually share all these documents and the agenda in our working team list. I totally understand your concern and I really was not aware that you are going to actively participate in this meeting. So, my apologies for not having that sent to you. Julie will send it to you maybe perhaps, can we send it now perhaps- can we send it now? Perhaps to Wolf, that he has a computer...?

Julie: I can send it, okay.

Olga: What we were trying to do is to make some projections but we are not getting into that for some reason. Wolf, if I may read the agenda to you as we go by or you can perhaps share with Claudia, okay, in the mean time.

Should we add both of you to our working team list, are you interested in working in this working team? Please share with us your thoughts.

Debbie: This is Debbie Hughes. I would absolutely love to join this working team.

Wolf: Well, for me I can't because I am a member of other groups so it's not from the time spent. It's not possible but I am interested today to share with you.

Olga: From my personal perspective, I want you to know that I always welcome participation. We have a charter of our group that was approved in April. What we will do is to share this information within the group. From my personal perspective you are very much welcome to work with us.

But we have to share this with our group and we'll let you know. We will share with, of course it's an open group. But we have already an ongoing work so perhaps you have to review all the documents that we have been doing. You are welcome to do any comments and consultations with me, with Julie, Robert and Michael. He's the Vice Chair so we are happy to assist you with that.

Debbie: Thank you, Olga. I am just happy to listen in and hear what's going on. Thanks.

Olga: Thank you very much. You are welcome. Okay. Wolf, Julie already sent you the documents perhaps if you can check in your computer you have the agenda and all that.

For the new people in the meeting we have divided our two main tasks. We first focused on the first task and we divided the work in four different sub-tasks. We divided our working team which has twelve active participants, in-between four small sub-working teams. Each one has one leader and we are developing different documents.

Each sub-working team is developing a sub-working draft document. Some of them, one of them is already sent to the OSC for consideration. The others are on an ongoing process of comments and development.

What we will try to do now is to give you an update about these three sub-working team draft documents, and then we'll review the situation of one of the documents that it's already sent to the OSC.

Unfortunately, we don't have the leaders of the sub-working teams one and two online. They were not going to participate in this meeting but they usually participate in our conference calls. They could have made it on the phone today, but unfortunately the time of the day for them was not very convenient, especially for Victoria. She's in the United Kingdom. So they apologised, SS and Victoria. We have their documents sent to our working team list.

I must confess just the day I was leaving and the other was sent just when I arrived, and I am honestly saying I had no time to review all of them. But as this meeting is being recorded and the .mp3 will be available for them to be heard soon and is also transcribed, I would suggest if some of you have comments or things to share with SS and Victoria, although the fact they are not here but perhaps we can share those thoughts here in this meeting. Then they have the opportunity to hear the comments and revise the document or incorporate your ideas.

About sub-task one, SS sent the document I think it was two days ago or one day ago? And it has two documents he sent, one with some comments sent by Claudia, am I correct? And then this, his document. Perhaps, Claudia, you want to comment about your comments to this sub task draft document.

Claudia: Sure, thanks, Olga. Yeah, so SS had circulated a final draft version of his document. He's been circulating them and we've been providing comments. He's been making provisions along the way. He had circulated a final draft, and I had responded with some comments in some areas where I had a different view on some of the recommendations.

SS then basically forwarded the final where there is an agreement amongst two of the other working group members to the work team. He included my views in a separate document, and that's basically the status of where we are.

Olga: Sorry. Thank you, Claudia. So this draft, the draft that SS sent does incorporate your comments?

Claudia: Yes, it does. I was just taking a look at the document. I think he sent two documents and one of them has my comments in them.

Okay. I think as the document has been just sent perhaps we should set up a due date for working team revision. For the new participants in this meeting, let me tell you that the sub-task one is about developing recommendations for a set of participating rules and operation procedures which all constituencies should abide by. The sub-working team is led by SS who is an individual living in India. It's Claudia, it's myself, who else is in this sub working team? I don't recall at this moment. It's Raffiq and Michael, no, we are in the number two.

Claudia: Victoria is the other person.

Olga: Victoria, yeah. Okay. This document has already been reviewed by sub-working team and is ready for comments from the whole working team. I would like to know from you which date you think it could be a good due date for receiving feedback from the whole working team, considering that SS sent the document two days ago?

Claudia: December of 2011?

Olga: Can you tell us why you said that date?

Claudia: Just an expression of desire. Let's, well, 15 days.

Olga: Okay. We should have our next conference call, please, Julie, could you help me, do you have a calendar there?

Julie: Yes.

Olga: Krista, you want to comment something?

Krista: I just want to clarify the members of this is sub-task one, correct?

Olga: Yes it is.

Krista: The members at least according to SS's document are SS, Victoria, Claudia and Raffiq? I feel like I heard more names than that right now. Is the document, can we just confirm who is on that working team? I think I heard more names a minute ago than I see--

Olga: I have to check in the Wiki, I have to check in the Wiki.

Claudia: Victoria?

Krista: Victoria. Yeah but I thought Olga said she was a member of the team and...?

Olga: Myself?

Krista: Yeah.

Olga: I think I am in team number two.

Krista: Okay.

Olga: But I have reviewed all the documents that have gone back and forth. So Raffiq is so kind to show me the Wiki and sub-working team one is led by SS and participants are Victoria, Claudia and Raffiq; so I am not there.

Krista: Thank you.

Olga: Okay. Great we have the screen. Okay.

Male: Olga?

Olga: Yes?

Rob: I am sorry I am probably sleepy today but I can't find SS Chaudhry's last draft. Do you know what date it was sent out?

Olga: Julie will send it to you. I think it was sent two days ago, I think I saw it just the day I was leaving, on?

Krista: Wednesday, this is of course specific time United States but it was Wednesday morning.

Olga: Yeah, it's the same day I was leaving from Buenos Aires, yeah, Wednesday morning. Thank you, Krista.

Okay, what about November 13th as due date for receiving comments for this sub-working team draft documents? Do you think it is a feasible date for reviewing the document? Some of them are long perhaps we have comments so I would like to know your thoughts about it. I also think by that time I may be travelling to Sham El Sheikh for the IGF, and Chuck is also travelling. Who else is going to Sham El Sheikh for the IGF?

Rob: I am as well.

Olga: Zahir, Raffiq, also many of us, so we should take that in consideration for our agenda. Which is the next Friday, it's the 15th and the next is? And I will be there also because I have to stay for another week. So the next Friday I will be in Sham El Sheikh leaving on 21st.

Tony, go ahead.

Tony: I'm sorry for suggesting a back step but now that you have got it up on the screen and since there are some people who have not participated in these discussions we've had and the drafting of this document, perhaps somebody at the table might like to point out at least a couple of points of contention or that we should be concerned about. Is that too much to ask?

Olga: Perhaps some member of the sub-working team could do that? Claudia?

Claudia: Sure. No, no, thank you. I relish the opportunity. Let me just pull it up.

Olga: Okay. In the meantime let's keep in mind this next conference call date issue because at least for me the November calendar will be quite complicated. Rob, oh, sorry, Michael?

Michael: I just wanted before Claudia walks people through the contentious issues, I want to reiterate a concern that both Victoria and SS have raised just to make sure that we are playing very cleanly by the rules here. Because both of them raised concerns with new members to the group that if you are going to comment or debate something that's in the document, you have to have read all the relevant documents.

That is something that we put in our charter originally. It's a basic expectation that you are aware of, yeah, that you have gone through the mailing lists, that you've read the documents and you can make a reasonable argument.

So I think its fine to ask questions, clarifications but if you have a strong point of view then you need to come in to it having been able to honestly say you've read the documents in completion.

Olga: Thank you, Michael. Claudia, do you have it?

Claudia: I do. Okay. So the first part, let me see here. Okay, well, the first area where I had a different view had to deal with, I believe the membership criteria. The draft basically recommends- it states, "All group members shall have equal and have the same rights and duties and responsibilities, in particular, the same rights to vote."

The issue I had with that recommendation is whether groups might have members who join as observers, and by definition don't have voting rights. And then other

groups who might have tier voting systems where they allocate a different number of votes based on different criteria of membership.

I saw basically a disconnect there between the recommendation and what I think currently is in place. What I thought made sense for some groups to be able to have that sort of flexibility in setting up that criteria within their constituency or stakeholder group. So that was my difference on that particular recommendation.

Olga: Yes, Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck: Is it okay to talk about these as we go? Because this is one, this is an area where I commented months ago on this particular document. As I recall, I don't have my comments in front of me, but I pointed out that there are very different types of memberships. I asked questions like, "Does an association that has 1,000 members that's a member get the same vote as an individual in the registry constituency?" "Does VeriSign get the same vote as a brand new registry that has 3,000 registrations?"

Those are all important issues and we have covered that, by the way, in our, for example, in the registry stakeholder group charter and we have some ways of dealing with that. There are cases, in our case there are two types of voting that are combined together. One of them is one vote for every member. but members are registries not individuals.

Then another type of voting has more of a weighted voting and it's a combination of the two that makes a decision. So this whole concept of every member gets the same vote doesn't have much meaning depending on the type of membership.

Michael: Chuck, just to add to that, I agree with your comments and your concerns but I am reading the language on that SS put in here. It says literally, and in particular, "the same rights to vote". Now it doesn't say to me that it's actually everyone gets an equal vote; it just means whatever mechanism you come out to determine that vote should be applied equally to all members.

If you have a weighted voting system it just means everyone should have that weighted voting system applied to them equally. In other words, assessed the same way.

Olga: Sorry, it's Krista who is ahead first, go ahead, go ahead.

Claudia: That's, I'm glad if that is a distinction it needs to be clearly spelled out. That's what I would recommend. If we are just saying he has a right to vote, "a member has a right to vote" then that's all you are trying to get to. We are not saying he has an "equal right to vote". There's a distinction and as a lawyer you can interpret it in many ways.

I would recommend that that be clarified because I would chime in with a comment that Chuck just made and I'm sure that I'm [Inaudible - 30:07.1] Even in the BC we have tiered voting, we have different members, we have associations who are members who don't expect to have the same vote as a single member company.

Chuck: I agree it needs clarification.

Olga: Krista?

Krista: I would just add- this is Krista. In the register of stakeholders group we have members, as an example Iron Mountain is a registrar or a member. We could have as many members of the registrar of stakeholders group as we like but we only have one voting member.

The way that this reads saying that everybody is equal, while I am for equality in general, if everybody, if Iron Mountain has with 18,000 employees, if we have 18,000 members of the registered stakeholders group we are certainly going to have a lot more influence if everybody is equal than a very small [audio break - 30:57.7]

Chuck: I think that the point is raised about same rights as opposed to equal. If you look at H, if you go down to H, you will see that the intent is different from the way maybe you were trying to interpret, sir? It says "equal rights" in H, if you see the last four words. "Have equal voting rights" Now that's a very different meaning. I think that sort of gives us the idea what was been intended at the [inaudible 31:28.2]

Michael: I agree the language in H is definitive. I don't think we can leave it as it is. I don't think it is reasonable or realistic.

Chuck: Yeah. One of the things that is important to keep in mind, obviously stakeholder groups are designed to represent the stakeholders in their category. One of the key issues with regard to representation there is the level of impact that policy decisions may have and the impact. I know all the issues registries for all used registrars since Krista was just talking about that.

The impact on a very small niche registrar with regard to a particular policy is probably not nearly the same as the impact on a registrar that has ten million names. It's an important thing. I'm not saying that the small registrar shouldn't have a say. I fully believe the small registrar should have a say and should have a right to vote.

But just to assume and make a statement, if you say "equal" you are going to have to define it. What does that mean? Most of us would probably come up with different definitions for equal so we do have to deal with that I think.

Olga: Any other comments. Claudia?

Claudia: Yeah. I agree with Chuck. I was just going to say on H, I think SS did try to make an amendment here because he put in, "All members unless otherwise stated shall be eligible to participate in the business of the group and have equal voting rights."

I think he was aiming to put in that language to reflect that if the group states otherwise that there could be a variation there. My concern with H was that it seemed these were different topics that were being combined into that that one recommendation.

But when you look up at the one we were originally talking about, I think it was 2B, it does say, "All group members shall be equal," yeah. That's where I saw- that's why I was interpreting that to mean that, yeah, they would have all the same voting rights.

Chuck: And what would that mean? Yeah. Saying everybody has a "right to vote" and saying that they have "equal rights" are very different statements and we have such

that. You know one of the things that is good about the GNSO is that we have a lot of diversity. That's healthy, but you have to be able to accommodate that diversity in an effective and fair manner.

Olga: Any other comments to SS's document especially, considering that he will review the mp3 and the transcript of the meeting? Okay. I suggest the following: We will have the chance to review the document as a working team. And we agreed reviewing it and sending comments to the sub-working team leaders.

So I suggest that we do that exercise during perhaps the next two weeks in spite of the fact that we are unable to meet in a tele-conference call on that Friday on November 13th. Perhaps we can set up a date for sending him this feedback. Do you think that is a reasonable date?

Chuck: Yes. Sounds like it gives us a week after these meetings because we don't have much time this week.

Olga: I am also asking because of that. Perhaps this week is, I think it's reasonable, but?

Chuck: You are talking about two weeks from today? Yeah.

Rob: Chuck, it's three, three weeks.

Chuck: It's actually three weeks, okay.

Olga: Yeah, because next Monday is the 2<sup>nd</sup>, November the 2<sup>nd</sup>. So it would be two weeks after next Friday, is that okay?

Chuck: I'll probably try to do it on my flight home.

Olga: Okay. Also Tony made a very interesting suggestion this morning that we should have printed all these documents. I really- I am not that in favour of printing many documents because it's a lot of paper going on. But perhaps we should have done that. I really I didn't realise that. So my apologies for that.

Do you think it is useful if we make them print for you to take them home and read on the plane? Could it make sense? Claudia says "no". Okay, just have them in files in your computers and you can comment there.

Any other comments to sub-task one draft document? Oh, I am so sorry. I didn't see you.

Michael: It's okay. Maybe Claudia can shed some light on this. There are certain recommendations – it starts as a recommendation section and participation rules it quotes, it seems to quote the BGC report page 43 and says that, "The rules must adhere to the following principles..." It's further up in the draft document.

And it lays down, "Admission decisions should be transparent, general information about each participating application etcetera, etcetera, etcetera." Now the document I pulled from the web has different sets of principles mentioned in it. It talks about general information.

I am looking at the GNSO Improvements Report, the BGC working report, which is approved by the board. So my question basically is where did this come from? Because what I have got doesn't match this, do you know?

Claudia: I think that was pulled from the document. It might just be from another part of the Board Governance Committee report, but I think that's where that language comes from.

Michael: Possibly and this is why I just wanted to sort of flag this because that report is in different sections. This may be principles applying to, other than constituencies, being applied to constituencies. Because what I have got in front of me in Adobe that I have pulled out has a different set of principles.

I just wanted to highlight and flag that. Maybe someone wants to look at it.

Olga: Yes, Rob, go ahead.

Rob: This is Rob. Just as a practice you may want to have citations in the document when you have quotes.

Olga: Good comment. Any other comments to sub-working team one draft document?

Okay, great. We have a due date and hopefully SS will hear our comments and read the transcript. We will have the opportunity to send these comments to him in the email list, okay.

Going to our agenda, then we have a document sent by Victoria. She is the leader of sub-task 1.2 and she sent the draft document. It has been re-circulated by Julie an hour ago.

Victoria in her email also states some members of the working team who are in agreement and some members of the working team who are not in agreement with this final draft. She states in her email in agreement with final draft, SS Katriya from India, Raffiq Talmac, Non Commercial User Constituency, Victoria McEbedee, Intellectual Property Constituency, Michael Young, Registrars Constituency, Tony Harris, ISP and five members in favour. These are five members in favour, and not in agreement is Claudia.

Could we exchange some ideas? I know that you have been exchanging emails and comments with Victoria about this sub-working team document. Perhaps it could be useful if we can comment them on this meeting and so she can review these comments and mp3 recording.

Tony, go ahead, please.

Tony: I am not aware that I disagreed with Claudia but, well, I'll have to take a second look at this. I haven't had a chance yet.

Olga: Michael?

Michael: Yeah. I would like to clarify I am actually on the list with Claudia in disagreeing with a couple of things on this document.

Olga: Okay. Can we show the document for those new? It's already there?

[The slide is up.]

Olga: Okay. Could someone be so kind of the working team to kind of summarise what the document is about, and some comments of agreements or disagreements that may arise in this meeting? Claudia?

Claudia: Yeah. Basically, this document relates to one section of the Board Governance Committee report that is quoted up in the beginning . Basically, was one of the Board of Governance Committee recommendations that the constituencies work together to develop a set of common operating principles that they could all live by.

I think that the idea there in the Board Governance Committee report was that that would facilitate more participation, and some of the other goals that they were trying to accomplish in the GNSO prudence effort. This basically goes through a series of different elements of stakeholder group or constituency operations on almost all areas in fact are covered within this document.

There are recommendations basically on each area that would basically apply across the board. Similar to the last document there is a lot of cross issues between this document and the one from sub-task one.

There are a number of areas where I had some different viewpoints. I actually just noticed that. I don't think the document has- I think Victoria was intending on putting in a part five that had some of my comments that were not agreed upon. I think she left that section out in this final version. That's just something she has to just make an update on.

Olga: Thank you very much, Claudia. Anyone else want to comment or say what they agree or not?

Michael: Yeah, if you pop down to...I think its page 19, you'll see Annex B,I think it is, if I remember correctly. This is a section that I edited heavily and suggested some compromise language, this code of practice and--

Olga: Can you repeat the section and the page please?

Michael: Yeah. It's Annex B, Code of Practice for Constituency Relations with ICANN Staff. This is it on the screen now. I felt there were, while following the list and talking with the group there was some strong disagreements, some strong concerns raised around some of these statements.

So I submitted to Victoria an edited version of this. I actually did quite a bit of editing to this. In particular, I think this annex is very problematic. I am very close to really recommending that it be struck altogether, to be honest. But at the very least I think the suggested language, I don't know how Claudia feels. But the suggested modifications I made to the language are necessary.

The way this reads it removes very basic abilities for people to argue their position and debate, which is what ICANN is supposed to be all about. We are supposed to advocate positions and opinions and concerns and represent our constituents fully.

This actually I have one, in particular, that really bothers me...which one is it? Number, basically I can't remember which one of these but it says that constituency members cannot basically represent their interest or their concerns to ICANN staff, which just doesn't make any sense. That's what we are supposed to be doing right?

Olga: Tony, you want to comment? Thank you, Michael.

Tony: Yes. I would like to follow up on what Michael has said. I heavily agree with him. This was quite a point of contention with Victoria. My main point was I scanned the BGC recommendations and I found no, let's say, recommendation that we should suggest something along these lines. I still can't find it but I may have some problems reading.

There is, a couple of things which are interesting in her comments on why she has set up this Annex B. For example it says, "Staff should be protected from pressures, particularly in relation to contracted parties who may regard themselves as the employers of the staff," which is quite...

Chuck: Well, what's wrong with that?

Tony: Well, it's...

Chuck: Just kidding.

Tony: Okay. Then she does say, "However, it is within our limit to suggest operating procedures that meet best practice going forward. We think it is appropriate to take this opportunity to recommend certain minimums in the way constituencies deal with staff.'

Again, I never saw that called for in the BGC recommendations. I think Michael made an excellent effort at editing and softening this document. But I think I'd also go with one of your comments, Michael. I would vote to strike this completely from the report. It's not in our limit to do this in my opinion.

I think staff should get instructions from the people they report to and that's not the GNSO or any working group. That's their superiors within the ICANN structure.

Olga: Thank you, Tony. Any comments, any reactions to Tony, Krista?

Krista: My comment is not a reaction to Tony. It's just a reaction to the section as well. On behalf of the Registrars Stakeholder's Group we also find this section very problematic and limiting our ability to work with staff. It doesn't even make sense. I just wanted to put that on the record.

Olga: Any other comments? Claudia?

Claudia: Yeah. I just wanted to say that I commented at one point that this could be something voluntary if one of the groups wanted to create their own code of practice. That, of course, they would be free to do that. But I kind of look at that separately than it being mandated on them.

The other comment I just wanted to clarify, Victoria did include a part five that's on page 14 which had, or page 15, I believe that had a summary of my comments on her final draft. I just wanted to correct the record.

Olga: So, your comments are included in the final draft?

Claudia: Yeah. She did include, these were comments that I submitted on the final draft. She does have them in there.

Olga: Tony?

Tony: Yes. I would add that in our last teleconference when I brought this matter up again about Annex B, I was told in no uncertain terms that most of the members of the group agreed that this should be in the document. So perhaps we have an occasion before the next teleconference to clarify if that is true or not.

Michael: To add to that, Tony's comment, I did respond on the list saying that I don't think that the representation of who agrees with this or doesn't agree with these items had been done systematically. As a group and Victoria actually responded and acknowledged that and said we would do that as a follow-up exercise. I haven't seen that happen yet.

I think that still needs to be done. I am deeply concerned that the edits and the comments I put on Annex B weren't represented in Part Five either. I think they should be there.

Olga: Yes, Chuck, please.

Chuck: Yeah. Sorry to belabor this over and over again, but so do we really have the latest version of the document for the full team to work on, or not? If we don't, I would really like us to be at a point when the full working team gets involved where we are really ready to review that document and know it's final. If that's not the case, time just doesn't allow to be on every sub-task team.

Olga: Thank you, Chuck, and following up your comment, this is something that we already clarified many times in our conference calls and our meetings. There should be an effort in every sub-working team to reach consensus, and then offer this document to the whole team.

As far as I can feel from this meeting and not been able to read both documents, really, I had no time as I received them while I was flying to here. What if we suggest for this sub-task two draft document, a new revision from the sub-working team? And then addressing all the comments made in this meeting, see if we have a new version perhaps in one week?

Chuck: Olga, I think that is a very good suggestion. One of the things that might help in terms of process is if all of the sub-task members would agree that this is ready to go

forward. It doesn't mean that they agree with all the points. That's not what I am saying at all. They may not be able to reach consensus and that's okay.

But if at least everyone on the sub-task team says, "Yeah, this is ready for full working team review." There are some areas maybe that they couldn't reach consensus, that's okay. I am not saying they have to be in total agreement with the content. But each member of the sub-task team to the extent that they are participating, obviously if somebody is not participating I wouldn't hold things up. But just confirm, "Yeah, this is now ready for the full work team. Everybody in the work team feels like their comments at last have been reflected." Okay.

Olga: Thank you, Chuck. Are we in the same stage with sub-working team draft one draft document, with SS document? Do we need further revision in the sub-working team or it's okay for the whole working team revision? I have the feeling that it is okay for full working team revision. Do we agree on that? So sub-task one draft document full working team revision.

And for sub-working team two, let's have a new opportunity for the sub working team to review the document and see if all the comments and concerns are included. We will send the minutes of the meeting to Victoria so she will know from there and she will hear the mp3, but perhaps one week is enough? What do the members of the sub-working team think? Perhaps one week after this meeting? Okay? That would make Friday the 6<sup>th</sup>, that sounds reasonable for you? Krista?

Krista: I have a question. I feel like we have had this same conversation several times, and the same people are commenting on the document within the sub-working team, but the document keeps coming back without their comments. While I agree with Chuck that let's review the final document, at the same time if we keep getting the same final document, we are sort of in this circle- it has no beginning and no end. I feel we could go on like this forever.

Chuck: Well, that's why I suggested that maybe we can avoid that because your point is very well taken, Krista. If that keeps happening obviously we have to stop that cycle. But if the sub-task teams would, if the active members would confirm that, yeah, this all ready, this is ready for the full working team, that's a way of I think stopping that and experiencing what we are having here.

Olga: Thank you, Chuck, thank you, Krista. Yes, Krista?

Krista: Yeah. I just want to say, I am not on the sub working team but I feel sorry for these people that they keep submitting the same comments. So they are going to review a twenty-page document again, say, "Again, here are our comments. Please include them." I don't know, it's...

Olga: Okay. Do you have any other suggestion, perhaps?

Krista: No, of course not. I'd have to think about it. I don't know if it makes sense for the entire working team to just comment on it now. The people that's comments are maybe not included can include them to the greater group. Then we can make sure that those are included in the next draft or at least noted if it is a minority view, that sort of thing.

Olga: Julie wants to comment.

Julie: Yeah. In sitting here, I thought what I'd heard was, Michael, please correct me, that Michael your comments had not been included in Part Five. I just see that Claudia has mentioned there, is that correct?

Michael: That's correct. I had submitted- Tony, I think I went back to a few people, didn't it, Tony? Tony?

Tony: I am terribly sorry somebody asked me, could you repeat, please.

Michael: I believe that the comments I put in the edits went back to the list of us. Did you not see those, those suggested changes that I made to Annex B?

Tony: Yes, I did and as you say, I don't see them reflected in the report.

Michael: Okay, thank you then. That's exactly correct. I just wanted not to trust my own memory alone so, okay.

Julie: Then a suggestion could be perhaps a more pointed action item which might be that it was noted in this meeting that at least Michael's comments are missing, perhaps to ask the work team to make sure that their comments are reflected, and to confirm that and have that resolved in a week. Perhaps if we are very specific, maybe that those comments need to be included. Maybe that will be addressed within a week's time.

Olga: I think that sounds reasonable. I think that Krista is making a good point but if, I don't know, if someone else have another suggestion of how to move forward. I think that we perhaps deserve some more comments in-between sub working team number two and see if one week it's enough for being all these comments reflected in the final draft.

And perhaps if there are some minority views, explicitly included in the document, that's okay, fine. Any other comments for sub-working team number two draft document? Suggestions, reactions? Claudia?

Claudia: I just had a comment about the substance. The voting issue again is present here. It's in section 3.6 and the recommendation is, "We recommend that one member, one vote." And so it's basically very similar to what's been recommended in sub-task one.

Something I had just thought of was, which I didn't, I don't think we discussed earlier which is, these groups, the structures that they create, for the stakeholder groups or the constituencies, ultimately have to be approved by the board. That was one of the comments that I had submitted that basically these groups should be free to set their own parameters, and that basically the safeguard in place is that the board is going to review their structure. The board that if they have concerns about the system that the group's set up that that would be an opportunity for I think for that to be addressed essentially. So that was just something I wanted to add about the voting.

Olga: Thank you, Claudia. Any other comments? Okay. Should we move to our next point of the agenda? Krista, what's the status of your document?

Krista: I hang my head in shame. I am very close to having the final draft to send out actually. I apologise to the group that it's not ready. But you will see it in the next, maybe even today, I am very close. So, apologies.

Olga: Anyway, we have a draft document sent by you and with some comments sent by Chuck. I think that you are already incorporated some comments sent by myself. I think it is a document that is already kind of being reviewed by the whole working team and I don't feel that there are much comments.

Tony, you want to comment something.

Tony: No. Just getting to what you were saying it is my understanding, Krista can correct me if I am wrong, but the work has being done on this, and is basically now up for the entire work team to look at and comment.

Olga: I think Krista must make an adjustment with some comments by Chuck, but it's only that, okay, I am right?

Krista: That's correct. They are mostly grammar, some clarifications like constituencies versus stakeholder groups and being more inclusive that way. But basically what the working team is saying is very, very similar to what the final product will be. And again I will have it to you guys very shortly.

Olga: Thank you, Krista, will you give us an estimated date?

Krista: Yeah. One moment...I can actually get that out this afternoon.

Olga: Right, that would be great. You can send that to the working team list. If you are putting the document for the whole working team revision, just please let us know in your email.

So we will start with that process and perhaps we can make the revision by November the 13th, with, you think that's reasonable? It's not a long document, it's a shorter document, it's easier to review. So we could add that due date also for November the 13th, is that okay, it sounds reasonable?

Krista: Great.

Olga: Okay. We have point number four, revision of due dates for the delivering outcomes. I think we already talked about that. It's November 13th for sub-task one, and sub-task three once Krista has sent it to our working team list.

And then we have a sub-working team revision for number two which is led by Victoria, which is Friday, November the 6<sup>th</sup>. In relation with sub-working team document number 1.4, it is already submitted to the OSC for obviously revision. I think we will talk about that afternoon. Chuck, am I correct?

Chuck: Yes, you are correct. What I will be doing just so that everybody on this work team knows, since I am the one that recommended moving it forward and I'm also chair of the OSC, I plan to minimise my participation in terms of any decision-making that the OSC makes. Sso that there is no perceived conflict of interest, and will rely on the rest of the OSC membership to evaluate and make a recommendation.

Olga has promised me she will be there to respond as chair of the working team, and Michael if you can, too, that will probably be good. In fact any of you are welcome to be in the OSC meeting of course so hopefully we will get a response from the OSC on that today.

Olga: Yes. The document was sent on a Sunday, one week before today, or? Yeah, I think one week, so hopefully the members of the OSC had the chance to review the document. Perhaps we can exchange some documents and ideas. Krista?

Krista: Just a point of clarification on sub-task 1.2, the sub-team is going to comment within one week or within two weeks?

Olga: One week, Friday, 6<sup>th</sup>, November.

Krista: That's two weeks.

Olga: Well, I'm not counting this week, sorry.

Krista: Okay.

Olga: I'm so sorry. It's my mistake. I'm not counting this week because I have no time to review documents this week.

Krista: No, no that's fair.

Olga: I think that other members of the sub-working team will have the same problem. So sometimes I set up time in my mind and I don't remember that the rest of the people don't know that. I'm so sorry. It's two weeks from now and considering that some of us are very busy this week. Thank you for letting me know. Claudia?

Claudia: I just had a question for Chuck about what else is on the agenda for the OSC meeting later today?

Chuck: That is really the primary item because...now that may extend into other issues. Interestingly enough the communications work team they are moving right ahead and working on- they are actually ending implementation of the website improvements and stuff like that, so there doesn't seem to be a hang up there.

I think that's the way it should be because an improved website will help all of us. That is the main agenda. It's a very simple agenda, that's an issue. I don't think any of the other working teams other than just update status on the website, which is coming along really well. There may be some discussion of the procedures, the council procedures as well.

Olga: Krista?

Krista: That actually brings up a good point. I didn't realise they were moving ahead literally with the implementation of the website. But sub-task 1.3, which you don't have the final draft of yet but will very shortly, ties into that. Maybe this is also an area where we might want to submit these recommendations once we have the whole working group's final review. They can sort of piggy back on what the communications team is doing?

Chuck: When I say moving ahead, they are actually developing requirements and some models and stuff like that. I don't want you to think that that impacts other issues that may go into the website.

Olga: Let me ask, toy Krista. You are suggesting that we send your sub-working team document as a separate document that's your suggestion?

Krista: It's an idea just because if they are developing requirements even if it's at the very initial stages, the database is tied to the website. I think whoever the developers are would very much appreciate having, knowing what all of the pieces of this new website they are developing are, rather than getting this.

Maybe, I don't know how much longer we anticipate our working group continuing on until we have a final document. If that's going to be shortly maybe it's not an issue. But if we go on maybe another several months that could maybe set, have some impact on the development of the website.

Chuck: Putting my OSC chair hat on, if that's okay, it might be very good if you coordinated with Mason as chair of that other one in regard to this. And it also might be good if, it sounds like there may be a similar issue with regard to what you are doing about whether or not some sub task could move forward without the other. So it is kind of related to the same issue that we are dealing with on sub task 1.4 that Julie and I did. So it might be, I don't know if you can attend that meeting but that might be helpful.

Olga: Julie?

Julie: Yeah. That meeting is scheduled directly following this one at 11:00 and you are welcome to look at the recommendations. I think Mason's sense was that they were going to discuss this in detail with a view to finish off on them as soon as they could. I think the deadline to finish them was the 30th of October, so I'm sure he'd welcome your input.

Olga: Michael?

Michael: I just want to excuse myself a little early from the meeting, I have a conflict so I apologise. But it sounds like we've gotten through all the big discussion points so. Anyways, if there is anything more that people want to hear from me, they can catch me on the list.

Olga: Just one last comment before you leave I think we, I would like your feedback about Krista's suggestion about sending the document as a separate document?

Michael: I am perfectly fine with it. I think that as long as we have got a reasonable argument for forwarding documents on, I don't see why we wait.

Olga: Thank you, Michael. Thank you for participating. Rob?

Rob: Thank you. A comment that Krista made, made me realise it's important probably to update this work team as well. A number of you in the council are aware that the council approved a transition implementation plan at their 24th September meeting. The last component of that plan was to extend the charters of the steering committees responsible for coordinating these activities until the next ICANN meeting.

That would have an impact on your agenda going forward, the timing of various things, and the chairs of those committees may have further discussions with you all after Seoul.

Olga: Thank you, Robert. That's good to know I heard that yesterday. Okay any other comments about the idea that Krista just pointed out about sending the document as a separate document? Any other feed back? So I think we like the idea okay. Krista, so we are looking forward to reviewing your document as a working team and hopefully we agree in the text and we can move forward with that idea of sending it to the OSC.

I included in our agenda some comments about the format of these documents but I think perhaps we can keep this item for next conference call as we will still have some work in some sub-task draft documents. You think that's a good idea? Okay.

Any other comments, any other business, any other ideas? Are we okay? Okay. Thank you very much for your participation. Thank you for been with us this morning, welcome to the new people and looking forward during this day.

Michael: Thanks, Olga.

Chuck: Thank you.

Olga: And also we will present this afternoon as Chuck said in the OSC meeting, which is in this room at 3:15 pm. You are mostly welcome to join us in the afternoon.

Thank you very much.

Scott: Start the recording now, please. Okay, yeah, let us know. Good, okay. Thank you.

Female: (*Voice too faint to hear* – 00:08.4)

Scott: Right. Is there anyone on the phone joining us? Okay. Okay, Crystal, can we start with you?

Crystal: Crystal Paback. I am with Iron Mountain and I am not a member of this working group but part of the Constituency Operations Team sitting in today.

Rob Hogarth: Rob Hogarth, ICANN staff.

Steve Holsten: Steve Holsten, I'm with VeriSign and the Vice Chair of this work team.

Julie Headland: Julie Headland, ICANN staff.

Male: (Inaudible name 0:49.1) NCES representative.

Male: (Inaudible name 00:53.9) with the International Trademark Association. I'm not on the work team but like Crystal I'm on the Constituency Operations Team.

Rob Lafferty: I'm Rob Lafferty (01:03.4) with Donna Lance. I'm just visiting.

Helen (?): (Inaudible name 0:01:09.9) with Donna Lance and I'm sitting in, too.

Scott Penzahn: Scott Penzhan, ICANN staff.

Ken Bauer: Ken Bauer, ICANN staff.

Steve H.: Great. Do we have anybody on the phone? I believe Chris Chaplo was going to join us by phone...Okay. At any event, I guess let's get started. We have, what, about an hour and a half? Is that right?

Scott: That should do it.

Steve: That should do it. Firstly, we've made some small edits to the document. Apologies for getting them out quite late last night, but later late than never. I made some edits to the document that Mason was good enough to put together. I know Julie improved it measurably. So with my edits and Chris Chaplo also added some last night, but I don't think they are in the hard copy, but we can look at them on the screen.

I would suggest we actually make this a working session. I guess I wasn't expecting quite so many people. We could have huddled around the document and actually accepted or rejected. But I think the objective would be let's talk through any of these final edits so that we can then accept or reject and sign off if we can do it at the end of an hour and a half, great. If we need to break out for a little bit to actually read the document, it's tough to work on a document in a big session like this. But let's give it a try.

Julie put together a Table of Contents which was very helpful. I do think that the document itself would read a little better if we had some good subheadings and Roman numerals that will show people a little bit better where it's going.

I think remembering what the overall objective was here, I think we can split it out a little bit to the website and then the other feedback and communication improvements. I think most of us have treated the website as the really big ticket item but I want to make sure the other doesn't get lost, too.

Identifying what the problems were and then coming up with the recommendations are I guess the two big sections of the document. If folks can – can people actually see what the edits and so forth suggested are on the screen? It's pretty difficult.

Julie: They don't have changes so I don't know if Mason...(Inaudible 04:16.9).

Steve: Okay, no. No changes for the Table of Contents.

Female: (Inaudible 04:22.5). Those changes are here...

Steve: Okay. Okay. That first parenthetical simply saying that we could use some better formatting. Julie, perhaps we can work on that together after this. I don't think we need to take everybody's time with that. So go ahead and keep scrolling down.

Remove that thesis. I'm not sure what – that that adds too much. Yeah...

Female: (Inaudible 05:01.7)

Steve: That was Mason's.

Mason: I wrote that.

Steve: I know. Well, sorry, Mason.

Mason: It's up to this group about whether or not to take it but the idea was to establish a reason for – the main reason for a need for improving communications. It's not worded very well or it doesn't really add anything. I'm not – my ego is not tied down within there.

Steve: Yeah, I had a sense that the Executive Summary sort of stood on its own at that point. Julie, can you, I guess can you reduce that a little bit so that we can see what the edits are that were taken out?

Julie: It's reduced (inaudible 05:41.1)...

Steve: I wonder if it's – can you take it out of the bubble edits and have them just part of that? Or I can pull it off. Not really?

Julie: Oh, no. I know how to do it. I can get in Draft. Hang on...There

Steve: Yeah, that's actually a lot better. We can see it. That'd be great. Yeah, go ahead and keep scrolling down. Most of these are simple language edits. I think everybody can have a chance to take a peek at this document. If they have other final recommendations we can change those.

I think let's pause really only at the bracketed items where I want to make sure that we've covered certain things or sometimes there are just suggestions for consideration... Keep going...Okay. Okay.

Can you scroll up to that, that heading right there? "What is communication in this context"? CCTL has carefully weighed the idea of communication in the context of GNSO. It would be very easy, for example, to make one set of detailed recommendations on the website and leave it at that. However, we believe that to be insufficient.

The rest of the good communication is equally deserving and it's important not to simply focus on that. I had noted, "Consider pulling this. Not sure that the other recommendations are thorough enough to warrant touting in this way."

I think, in my opinion, the recommendations apart from the website are fairly light. This seems to suggest that, well, there's almost more hyping about what we believe and perhaps it is actually in the recommendations, in my opinion.

Mason, what do you think?

Mason: I can't do it.

Steve: Okay. All right. I think we can –

Mason: No, I think it's fine to remove that if it really doesn't – if the other recommendations don't add up to as much weight as the website recommendations do. When we talked as a team about, when we first started this and established our charter, the idea was, "Let's not over-rely on technical solutions to problems, and let's make sure that we talked about the entire scope of communications, and how to improve that."

Rather than just saying, "Let's throw up a new website and be done with it." So that was the attempt at highlighting or reasoning why there was something beyond just

building a new website. But again, I'm wide open to the team and how do you want to proceed.

Steve: Okay. I guess that I should ask at this point, Scott and Ken, did you have an opportunity to take a peek at any of these suggested edits and so forth? Did you have thoughts, plus or minus on them?

Scott: Thank you, Steve. This is Scott. In this particular, "What is communication in this context," I think what is said here simply reflects back to the board what was already in the charter. So, it doesn't strike me as necessary. I mean, I don't have any objection to it being there, but if you're wondering whether to strike it, you certainly could in my view.

Steve: Okay. Thanks. Okay, Julie, let's keep scrolling...Keep going until we get to any edits...Okay. Regarding the terminology in diplomatic speak we note that people tend to speak in diplomatic tones and decorum is always helpful but overreliance on it confuses issues and prevents candid discussion.

I had noted that a little further on we talk about the degeneration of things not being civil. I just felt that that was a little bit in conflict as in one sense saying, "Everybody is so diplomatic that they don't want to step on toes." On the next section, a couple down, we say that, "People are not civil."

Mason: I'll whisper to that point. I think both happened at the same time actually. I think there are areas of communication with ICANN where things are formal and diplomatic. There are other areas where, as I think Ken pointed out, they're not so formal and diplomatic. In fact, it's a difficult communications environment.

So, maybe I can clarify to say that in certain areas of GNSO operations things don't go as smoothly as they should.

Steve: Okay, anybody else? Comments, questions...? Julie, do you mind continuing to scroll?

The next one with a bracketed item, indenting or italicizing or something to make the example set apart. Mason, you had given an example of, I guess with respect to time-critical issues and how I think the GNSO so often bites off more than it can chew. I think that that example is a good one but I'm not sure that we close the loop fully as to what the "therefore" is.

Mason: Okay.

Steve: Highlighting critical issues, impeding communication, re-establishing a reasonable capacity for conducting business. So the example is, "The registrar constituency asks for feedback." The discussion produced a couple of categories of answers, one dealing with the structure of Constituency Day and how to officially interact with the board, the other with the issue of workload.

I'm not sure – what I'd like to see with that example is closing the loop to say, "Therefore, part of this example, X, Y and Z," and just little formatting.

Cool. Let the record reflect that Mason has signaled, “Okie dokie” with his finger.

Crystal: May I clarify some and Mason, maybe you can just like raise a finger or something and you know, like “okay” or something. Are you going to do some language to clarify because I’m not sure I quite understand what the language means?

Steve: Yeah. I think so. I think after this we ought to just spend a few minutes to sit with the document and accept and reject the changes. This first portion of the session, I think if there’s any discussion as to the open bracket items we can have it. I want to be efficient about this but if anybody has suggestions as to how we proceed rather than just trotting through the document, I’d be very open to that.

Crystal: I’m not suggesting that this isn’t a good format. I just – in cases where new languages is suggested I’ll probably need some direction on what that language will be, and it doesn’t have to be in this meeting, but sometime thereafter.

Steve: Sounds great.

Scott: I have a question. I frankly don’t understand the passage. It says, “Thus provide an example” and I’m not sure. For me, I’m assuming it’s going to be an example of how there are too many issues and not enough time to address them.

And then it gives a high-level statement of a constituency that was asked a question and they gave two answers. I didn’t understand how that supports the notion that there’s too many issues and not enough time.

Mason: You make a good point, Scott. It’s probably not as clear as it can be. *(Clears throat)* Excuse me. So I think the idea was because the GNSO tends to bite off more than it can chew, therefore the community doesn’t have enough time to thoughtfully consider everything. Therefore, that tends to lead a breakdown in communication.

And if the GNSO were more careful about how it prioritizes its’ work, communications would improve, at least some, because there wouldn’t be this risk of skipping over issues all the time in just trying to get all the work done.

But I think you’re right. It’s not as clear as it can be, which is ironic considering this is a communications team.

Scott: The point you went to enforce is there is kind of too much to deal with. Maybe a simple listing of how many open issues the GNSO is asked to comment upon in the last month compared to what maybe they were a year ago, or something would help plan the point.

Steve: Okay. That’s a great idea.

Crystal: Scott, do you have that information, by any chance?

Scott: You can find it in Policy of Date.

Mason: Also, I was going to say the public comment are called the Public Comment Periods have basically everything right there.

Steve: Okay, and I think, Mason, you made the point in a few different spots that there should be more goal-setting and contacts for the GNSO work so that people know what they're driving towards. I think a lot of times we get lost in the details without having a framework for where everything fits together. I think that's a theme that is emphasized throughout this document.

Let's go through the examples now. Chris Chaplo has added a section on Document Management. I know that we are largely deferring the issue of document management. It is contained I guess within the website improvement issue.

Scott, can you or Ken speak to the document management issue and how that will be addressed either in the recommendations or in the future within the website improvement project?

Ken Bauers: Ken Bauers. We're just conferring. As you all may remember, we separated out into two phases the sort of website – even in the business requirements. We broke out those things that were doable in the short range versus those that were not. The document management elements were in that second phase.

I'd have to go back to the business requirements documents. But I think we've already addressed that essentially in the way we constructed that document. True to form, as this website project is now in sort of in implementation phase, there are no document management elements that are specifically being addressed.

And by that we have to also be careful of terminology. "Document management" in this context means the ability to check in a document, check it out. Control its life cycle through creation and versioning and then a final production. That's the element that there are plenty of things that with a small d, small m, document management, that will be done in this site in terms of better organization and better taxonomy, gosh...yeah, finding documents in multiple ways, tagging.

So there are plenty of things that we're doing to improve document management. But I think the reference in this case is much more narrow and specific and that's sort of in Phase II. Does that help?

Steve: That helps a lot. Did you have an opportunity to read what Chris had suggested in this? Okay. Afterwards maybe you can do that and let's make sure that it's in keeping with the rest of the document. Great.

Yeah, that's great. Chris also noted some additions regarding languages. I'm not sure that we did too much more than citing to the rest of ICANN's translation policy. Helen, do you have anything with regard to the translation issue?

Helen: The only thing I was going to agree with was we should add Korean as a translation language because I think it is quite commonly used. That was one of the things that was suggested I think by the ICANN of Korea, was a good a language to add.

Steve: Okay. Okay. If you have an opportunity to review this document and insert any comments like that, that would be very helpful.

There's some references to summaries that we believe that would be helpful to have summaries of GNSO documents that are subject to public consultation. Also in a few

places, Mason, you noted that sometimes there's unnecessary duplication of histories. I think that is a very good point.

If it's possible perhaps to have summaries and histories that are capable of being linked to then people could find them in one central spot and wouldn't need to restate it in each and every document. I think that might be a helpful thing to do. Anybody have any thoughts about that?

Okay, hearing none, let's keep going.

Scott: Summaries and Tags.

Steve: Summaries and Tags? Yeah. Scott, what about that? Is that feasible? Can we have, let's say there's a summary of a particular issue. We haven't posted somewhere on a website when certain communications are sent out rather than repeating all of the history. We can cite to a link that has it sitting there. Does that sound feasible?

Scott: That sounds highly feasible to me and even recommended.

Steve: Nice. Okay. In the section – what's that title of this section, Julie? Okay. Feedback Solicitation. We want to improve the GNSO's ability to solicit meaningful feedback. I had put a note to verify that we actually did all of these things. It seems to me that our recommendations ought to be clear that we have done – we have prepared revised document or a revised process for gathering and addressing public comment on policy issues.

I think we've made a lot of recommendations in this. But I think we ought to verify that we have checked off each of those items. I'm not sure that we actually did. I don't know that we came up with a revised process, for example. Julie?

Julie: Yeah, this is Julie. What we have is a document that Svenic had submitted for the work team to review that had several recommendations relating to this item. They did address some recommendations to prepare a revised process for gathering and addressing public comment.

It did speak to taking in account elements and technology. It did not prepare a translation plan because it referenced the translation plans, the translations procedures that ICANN already has in place. Actually maybe I should turn this over to Svenic. Have you turn this over to Svenic and see if he would like to comment on this section.

Steve: Great, yeah. Svenic just sat down and he's already on the hot seat. Svenic, welcome. Glad you're here.

Svenic: *(Voice too faint to hear.)*

Steve: That's no problem. We are walking through the document with recommended changes. I sent out a version late last night. Chris Chaplo made some edits as well. We've paused at one spot regarding feedback solicitation. I want to be sure that we either have addressed each of these bulleted items as the recommendations of the report and what we should do.

That we either address them or explain why we didn't, or just leave a placeholder noting that we've run out of time or it's not feasible at this point. But for example, there is a bullet regarding Preparing the Translation Plan for Documents Associated with Policy Development. I think that we have noted that we will generally follow the ICANN website scheme for translation.

Do we have any further recommendations on that translation plan? Were you and Helen able to develop a translation plan?

Svenic: *(Voice too faint to hear - 27:03.1)* –

Steve A: Will you speak into the microphone? Thanks.

Svenic: Yeah, thank you. We have not developed any plan. We had in my view very productive discussions with the ICANN team responsible for the localizations. As I indicated during our pause, etc., I was satisfied with how I attend this proceeding. So the only thing – and I think that I have had some experiences with localizations.

So I really think that I'm going into the right direction. So the only thing which I would stress is that I should keep it, the GNSO wants consistence and (inaudible 28:00.1).

Steve: That's, I think that recommendation can simply be, "We subscribe to the translation plan that ICANN is already forward on. Does that sound reasonable to everybody? Yes. Okay, great.

Go ahead, Julie.

Julie: Svenic did submit a nice document with some thoughts and recommendations. Do we want incorporate those here or attach that as an appendix?

Steve: I think I'll ask Mason to use some sign language which we can interpret to describe...do you remember the document that Svenic had prepared and when you were synthesizing everything into this recommendation document, did you pick and choose some of those things, or just generally what was the scheme with that? You picked and chose? Okay, great.

So it is your recommendation, Svenic. I'll reflect it in this document. Terrific. Thank you.

Male: *(Voice too faint to hear - 0:29:14.5)*

Steve: And that's also a good point. If it's not representative enough, if you believe, Svenic that there should be other portions of that that should be clicked in or edited in, we can either make it an appendix or...

Sabinic: That's fine. I have not had the latest...(inaudible 29:37.9), and it's fine.

Steve: Okay, great. Thank you. Skipping on to Board Communications. Mason, you had made a note that you wanted to be particularly careful here about adding to the Boards or the Council's burden already unbearable. I think we'll get more of making what's already there more efficient versus adding new communications.

I had sort of bracketed in that what you had recommended are good and certainly not overly burdensome. I don't think that had been added, incremental workload to the Board.

Mason: That's good. I just wanted to make that point. Excuse me. I just want to make that point so that either the GNSO or the Board – forget it. I'm not going to talk. I'm sorry.

Steve: Duly noted and nice of you to be looking out for the Board's welfare. Okay, again, with the issue of time demands and compression, I think you made the point very well. I noted that time management in any context requires flexibility to address exigencies. But the GNSO would be well-served to set big picture goals that will keep it directionally on track and avoid getting mired in distractions.

I think each of us as we are trying to manage our time, look at big picture goals that you want to make sure you don't lose sight of. You still have fires that you have to put out and whack them all exercises. But I think certainly if the Board gives us better context and actually sets some goals...

I know in the GNSO meetings yesterday, that point of prioritizing issues was put both to Chuck and Olga as potential chairs but communication is much easier when you know the framework that things hang off of, otherwise you tend to get lost. The time-demand issue, people are overwhelmed with work and it doesn't allow for detailed enough examination of issues.

I don't think anybody would disagree with that premise...Okay, same point there regarding linking to summaries and histories. Julie's still scrolling through the document here. Okay, and then we're back to the Index, or rather to the Appendix.

Chris has noted that we should list call attendance as in the IRTPA recommended document. Do you know what that is referring to, Julie? Is that...

Julie: No, I don't. I think we would have to go to Ken – I mean to Glen to – we're back in the various transcripts. I don't know if he's suggesting that we indicate an Appendix which calls people attended.

Steve A: I'll be honest. I'm not sure that I see tremendous value in that. I think what we have recommended kind of stands on its own as opposed to a general roll call. Anybody else disagree with that? I guess Chris who's not on the phone recommended it so we can try to circle back with him as to whether he feels strongly about it.

The next Appendix is regarding the Website Business Recommendations. I think that those are to be celebrated. I think they are terrific business recommendations and huge thanks in particular to Ken and Julie and Scott.

Julie: (*Voice too faint to hear - 0:33:57.6*)

Steve: Oh, that survey, okay. First we'll look through this survey; also good that that was done...I'm not sure if there were additional edits. I did not have additional edits in the Appendices. You can scroll through quickly to see whether Chris had any. I think we all signed off on that earlier on in the process.

So that completes the sweep through the document. While we're at it perhaps Chris – excuse me, Scott or Ken, do you want to give a brief summary as to where things

stand with the implementation now? You've been pulling together the wire frames. Can you tell us what progress has been made beyond that which we have discussed in the last meetings?

I know you're also going to do some booth events out here to show off the new website. Can you report to the group on that?

Scott: Certainly. This is Scott. I'm actually quite pleased to see how the web development at ICANN has taken the recommendations and really kind of run with them. The wire frames that we have – I should back up and say that we put on an hour-long webinar earlier this month so that all constituencies could have a look at what we're doing and understand the foundation for the proposed enhancements to the GNSO website.

It so far has been met with just tremendous enthusiasm. Ken and I will be presenting a shorter version of that on Constituencies Day to the ISPC and the Registries Stakeholder Group. Then we will be available also at lunch hour basically in ICANN's booth in the reception lobby, for people who have further questions.

So many of the wire frames that we've shown in all of this have been implemented in a beginning stage by Mark and the web dev team at ICANN. I will be meeting with him later today and we should actually have some stuff we can show this week for people to click on and interact with. It is not designed in pretty colors but it's functional, so we're definitely moving ahead.

Steve: Great. Thank you.

Female: (*Voice too faint to hear - 37:00.6*).

Steve A: Yeah, I think that's – Julie is raising a good point which is we should set some deadline for when we come up with final edits to this document so that we can then push it out. Mason, you had had a goal to try and get this out and done by October 30th, I believe. I know that that is during the time period of this Seoul meeting.

I don't think that there are whole lot more edits that are required. The edits that I added and Chris as well were basically clean up items. I think we can all work together to make one final pass here but otherwise I think the recommendations are in pretty good shape.

Do you think we can still meet that deadline? It would be helpful as it could be Helen, for you to look through this. Scott can as well. Any feedback, input, I would intend having made some of these open brackets to sit with Julie for a little while and make some final language changes.

But anybody else who has things I think we'd better have the edits in, let's say, What's today, the 25th? If you could get any edits in in let's say the next two days. Today's Sunday. Please have them in by Tuesday evening. Then we can polish it up and get it ready to send out by October 30th.

Julie: Actually, if I could add to that...I probably will not have a chance to work on this document until Thursday. I'll be tied up with SAC activities Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. So, if you could have everything prior to them on Thursday I will try to incorporate everything.

And I might suggest to you that if you do have language changes, if you wanted to go ahead and work with the document accordingly then I can go ahead and accept everybody's changes, make the changes to the Table of Contents. Then I think we're pretty much good to go.

Steve: Great. I think that that sounds like a great plan. Okay. I know Christette has been sitting over there very quietly. Do you have anything else that you'd like to talk about? Have you had the ability to take a look at this document and the recommendations to see how fits into the broader effort?

Christette : This is Christette. I have just looked through it briefly, while I've been sitting here. More than anything just want to let this team know that part of the Constituency Operation Team's, one of our tasks or sub-tasks is to make recommendations for a database of all GNSO members, if you will. So, we're not – our working group is not quite as far along as you guys are, and coming up with a final set of recommendations for the entire tasks of the group.

But we are very close actually in respect to the database aspect. I think we discussed today, trying to send those recommendations forward outside of the rest of tasks of the group. Just to the extent that as the website requirements are being developed, we felt like it would be helpful to whoever is actually developing those requirements to understand that there is a database of GNSO group numbers. That's associated in that.

So I don't know how – what's the best way to coordinate with you guys on that. But wanted to make sure we're all keeping the communication open.

Steve: Okay. Very good. How about you, Rob? Anything, any thoughts or input?

Rob: No, thank you. I don't have laryngitis but I have no comment.

Steve: All right, well, I think that rather than dragging the meeting on for an additional forty minutes we can give people a little bit of time back. I would like to set perhaps, Julie, and we can look over the document for a little while towards the polishing up of it. But I would like to commend the team on actually pulling a deliverable together on schedule through the strong hand of Mason's leadership. No voice but actually came through.

Scott: The strong, silent type.

Steve A: Whatever you say, Scott. So, thanks as well to Helen and Svenic and particularly ICANN staff on this because, well, we helped to provide good direction. Certainly the heavy lifting was largely on Ken and Scott's shoulders, and again, Chris Chaplo who did an amazing with helping to pull together the website.

If we can make the GNSO website even half as good as andalucia.com minus all of the pictures we'll be doing very well. So, thanks to everybody. Mason, unless you have objections, let's adjourn the meeting. Okay, very good. Thank you, everybody. Meeting adjourned.

Ray: Okay, this is Ray Fasset, Chair of the GNSO Council Operations Work Team. We're going to start our meeting here in Seoul, Korea. I'll do a quick roll call. There's a few

of us in the room of work team members. We have Tony Holmes, Wolf, Noben from ICANN staff, and Julie Headland, Ken Bauer, and Rob Hogarth.

We have our agenda today really comprises primarily the Rules of Procedure, the status of the Rules of Procedure, some elements, open points for us to yet discuss of the Rules of Procedure.

If time permits, we want to double back to also the KITE document that goes back a few months ago, that had to do with GNSO Council structure and then we will get into any other business.

I want to jump right into the Rules of Procedure document. There is a document that went out for public comment. It is to be voted on by the GNSO Council on Wednesday, prior to seating the new Board. There is one motion involving that document that pertains to abstentions. It will be up to the Council to vote on whether to amend the Rules of Procedure for the new abstention language.

I'm wondering if anybody here would like to have a discussion on the abstentions. In fact what I'm going to do is I'm going to invite Ken Bauer to discuss a research item that he did on this exact point. If you don't mind just briefly summarizing what you've found on this issue.

Ken: Yes, thank you. Ken Bauer. It's too loud.

Rob Hogarth had asked me, we had several discussions concerning this whole subject of conflict or essentially abstentions and what it may or may not do to the voting thresholds. Clearly in the bylaws the denominators talk about each House, or both Houses. Those Houses have fixed numbers, seven, thirteen.

However, an issue was raised, it might have been Steve Metalise who first brought it up, that said, "There are certainly situations when people have material conflicts of interest, or conflicts of interest", and the concept that I don't vote should not be effectively treated as a "no". All of the thresholds, of course, are set up to be 'yes' votes, and so if you don't get a 'yes', everything that isn't a 'yes', is what? Is a 'not yes', and 'not yes' is equivalent to a 'no' essentially in terms of the effect on the resolution or motion.

I did do some Internet research to see what other organizations do about abstentions, how it affects their voting tabulations, how does conflict of interest fit into all this. Then I wrote a paper which Rob then published as a response to the public comment form on the procedures. So it's sitting out there- one of the three or four comments that are there. I have it open in front of me.

In essence almost every organization I looked at on the Internet that addresses conflicts of interest, some don't, but a whole lot of them do. They actually do change their voting calculations for conflicts of interest. A lot of them also make a distinction between a voluntary abstention, and an involuntary abstention. This is dealt with in the paper.

I might abstain, and I might even claim a conflict of interest, but it's irrelevant. If I don't really have my family, or me, is not financially connected somehow to this issue that the GNSO is considering, but I don't want to vote anyway, so I abstain, right?

That voluntary abstention would not have an effect in most organizations on the calculations. However, if I present a case when my voting is materially related to my financial well-being - Christina used an example where she's voting on something

and representing a client that happens to be - she's a lawyer - you get into those situations, right? And you present that case, that's a material conflict of interest, in which case almost all organizations change the denominators.

I did not want to find that when I did the research, but that's what it is. However, the other thing I found, too, is organizations tend to want to eliminate the conflict of interest first, if they can.

In our case, GNSO, because people like Christina, and other counselors represent constituencies, one option that we have here, and we wrote about this in the paper, is ask your contingency to tell you how to vote. So, if I have a conflict and I walk into vote what I can do is eliminate the conflict by saying to my constituency, "Look, I've got a conflict here, you tell me, and write it down how the constituency wants me to exercise the vote."

So it would be some strategies around how to eliminate the conflicts, strikes me as a good thing to do, and that's what a lot of organizations also do.

Let's see, the other point was, "If I can't resolve the conflict, internally, and I still have it," we sort of made a provision that maybe you get the opposing house to vote that, "Yes, we want you to abstain", because it affects the denominator, and because there's potential gaming situations that could occur, maybe that would be another opportunity.

I think that's pretty controversial. Steven Metalise approached me at the other session and said, "I know best whether I have a conflict. I don't need to have the other House telling me that it's okay." That isn't exactly what we were going after here. It's more of, "Does your conflict present a problem for somebody else?" And you have to ask somebody else –

Okay, I'll stop there. That's more of a summary than you wanted maybe.

Ray: This is Ray Fasset. I have question. Rob, go ahead.

Rob: If I can provide a context for Ken's research, I did speak with him about this and asked him to conduct it. It was prompted by input from Council members as they were reviewing the procedures, and as Ken notes, issues raised by Steve, issues raised by Philip Sheppard and others. What we were asked to do was to examine this very broadly. Ken's done a very good job sort of outlining the issues, and a lot of the issues he's raising are wonderful fodder for additional discussions to take place within the work team.

Moving forward, how do we deal with issues like conflicts? The particular issue, though, with respect to approving the procedures, and what I had asked Ken to do as well, that ended up in the document that was produced for public comment was, and this may be a product of some of the document challenges we had that were ultimately posted, but we needed to provide some clarifying language, or at least suggested to staff some substitute language to the original recommendation that provided the community with a little bit more general colloquial consensus to what a common denominator meant.

That was in direct response to the discussions that took place at the Council meeting on September 24<sup>th</sup>. As a result what was presented in the comment forum was the original work team recommendation, some substitute language, and then at the Council's request we submitted in the forum these staff comments, supported by Ken's research that indicated more broadly how we suggested how this issue should

be addressed in the future. Although we've been very, we hope, and it appears based on the motion, and certainly based on the comments submitted in the forum that the community likes the substitute language.

It doesn't address the fundamental question of, "Okay, well, what happens when you do have a conflict?" And that's clearly something that would be in the purview of the work team to have further discussions on.

Ray: Right, let me bring some focus and clarity to that exact point. Our aim is for the Council to vote and approve the Rules of Procedures that were put out for public comment.

There was really three scenarios, right? Either they are going to vote and approve it with the motion, with regards to abstention, or they're going to vote and approve it without the motion of the new language for the abstentions, or they're going to vote to not approve it at all, the Council Rules and Procedures.

It's that third option that we really want to avoid. And really the feedback we're getting is I think it's going to be approved on Wednesday, and then whether they approve this language will be up to the Council.

What Rob is bringing out is exactly the point, which is, "Okay, that's where it is at that moment in time, as of Wednesday it gets voted on, it gets approved, does that mean it's completed? Is there still some questions that have to do with abstentions that we need to look at?"

One of the things that I've been focusing on here, as the Chair, in regard to this issue is we don't want to be in conflict with the bylaws. I'm going to ask a question of, if we go down the path of trying to solve the conflicts, for example, the involuntary, versus the voluntary abstention - I like that approach.

That's interesting to me, but regardless of what we come up with, if we come up with some level of exception for abstention, or allowing the fixed denominator to no longer be fixed would we in the procedures be violating the bylaws? So, the question that I'm asking here, if anybody knows the answer, do the bylaws require to be modified in order for us, at the procedural level to be able to focus on this?

Ken: This is Ken Bauer again. I'm not a lawyer so we would have to subject this to Dan Heller and Company, but the bylaws do say abstentions are handled in the GNSO Council Procedures. I'm almost sure of that. Right? The bylaws defer that subject, and so if in the GNSO Council Procedures we say, "In order to handle abstention we change the denominator," I think we're covered.

Ray: Okay, here's where I think I have a conflict on that point. My understanding is on certain things that are basically scripted out, voting things, that are scripted out in the bylaws- I don't have one handy in front of you- but the assumption is on those voting thresholds that it is based on the total number of seats available in each House.

If we came up with an exception on the abstentions, voluntary, involuntary, whatever the exceptions that we came up with can't apply to those thresholds in the bylaws, without a bylaws change, or yes or no to that?

Ken: I think it's arguable. One of the interruptions I would make is, the bylaws simply refer to 'House', they say, "To pass issues report requires 50 percent majority in each House," that kind of language. The abstention language could modify the definition of

'House'. Could modify the definition of 'House', when a conflict of interest occurs. See what I'm saying?

The abstention language could supercede, I think, just because the bylaws make a provision that said the Council operating procedures can in fact create their own abstention, and I presume, conflict of interest. Lawyers will have to settle this, I think, in the final analysis, but I would suggest that the team deal with the real situation of a conflict of interest, and try to get that right and then we'll worry about the bylaws thereafter, rather than say, "Well, it's in the bi-laws. We can't do anything about it."

Honestly just based on my research, everybody, pretty much, treats conflicts of interest in a way that causes the voting calculations to be altered. A majority of 'X' is a majority of 'X minus 1', if one of the members abstains due to a involuntary conflict of interest. That's what I would say.

Ray: Rob, please.

Rob: I did pull up a copy of the amended bylaws. I think the applicable language is, "Accept as otherwise specified in these bylaws, and acts, [? adheres to- 15:09.3], or the GNSO Operating Procedures, the default threshold to pass a GNSO Council motion, or other voting action requires a simple majority vote of each House."

I think the context, again, in which the discussion came up is what do you mean by 'of each House'? And that's what created some discussion in the context of abstentions. The lawyers have looked at it in that context for us, and said the language that was provided, both the original language of the work team, and the clarifying language were substitute language that the staff suggested, both meet the terms of that.

Now, subsequently, post-Seoul, you all may decide to further clarify the issue of abstentions. I think Ken's point on that is right. As a work team you should make whatever appropriate recommendation you think is necessary. If then the Council agrees then steps would likely be taken to recommend a bylaw change to effectuate your recommendation.

Ray: So, here's my suggestion for action, step forward. Christina Rosette has some level of language that she feels that she would like to put forward post-Seoul. I think we will reach out to her for that.

Then I would like to investigate this concept that Ken has brought forward with regards to involuntary, and voluntary. Maybe Christina's language will speak to that, maybe it won't. If it doesn't, let's work on this concept that I think it makes a lot of sense. If there's no disagreement this will be our approach post-Seoul.

Wolf?

Wolf: Wolf Gillman speaking. Do I understand and correctly that this approach means that the voluntary/involuntary approach maybe, that means a flexible solution then with regards to the denominator? That's my question.

The other- my comment is, I personally, I have preference to a clear solution. That's my preference. Point it out several times. My question is can we discover later, again, or do we have to find solution right now for the Council Chair election? For example...

Ray: Clarify in what regard, in what context? For abstentions?

Wolf: For abstentions. Yeah. For example if somebody is going to say, "I have a problem to vote on Chair election because I'm affiliated to him, or to her or what..."

Ray: Let me try to address that real quick and then we'll get to Rob's point.

What we have now is language already in the Rules of Procedure. The Council is going to vote on those on Wednesday. There's also a motion put forward on this alternative language. It's up to the Council to vote on that language. It is sort of out of our hands at this point.

Wolf: Yes. Okay.

Ray: Rob, go ahead.

Rob: The language, the quote unquote "substitute language" doesn't change the meaning, but was just intended to clarify. Under the way this was written if the Board approves either the original language, or the substitute language, the rule would be, "If you abstain in the vote of the GNSO Council Chair we still have the same denominator. It doesn't change." That's what that rule would say.

Now, you may be raising the additional point that we talked about earlier Wolf, that the issue that's more important is maybe absentee ballots because of the lack of availability of one the Council members for the GNSO Chair election, but that's a different issue.

Wolf: In addition, I would prefer the second amended version, because the first version is for me, it sounds if you tell them the effect of abstention, it's counted like voting against. Is this okay, because the rules are set in that way? You have rules, in any case you will have rules, which are a compromised solution, in any case.

You have to either accept, or you can't accept, but afterwards it has been accepted by the majority, so we all have to accept it now. So that's the way to go. So, for me it's not intended to be vote against, but it's okay, it's the effect because of the rules. Okay. That's it.

Ray: Okay, so let me ask a question for those in the room here. Sometime Wednesday morning I'm going to be giving the Council an update, similar to the update that was yesterday that I gave, the Power Point, etc.

Would there be any objection if I said based on our discussion today, Sunday, our work team meeting we feel the proposed language is actually better than our original language? Would anybody have a problem if I actually stated that to them at that time?

The amended version. The Council is going to be voting on, again, there's three options here to vote for the...

[Cross Talk]

To vote for the Procedures without the modified language, to vote for the Procedures with the modified language, or to vote against the Procedures all together.

I thought it might be useful for the Council to know that as a work team, based on our discussion today, and talking about this exact point, it might be useful for them to

know that as a work team we actually feel the modified language is better than our original language, just to let them know.

Any objection to that?

Ken: May I ask, Ray, who is the drafter of this? Where did it come from?

[Inaudible - 22:07.6]

Ray: I'm sorry the Chair of the GNSO wrote the motion, the substitute languages, that the staff produced suggested alternative to the original language.

Ron: I wouldn't have, I'm Ron Everet - I wouldn't have any compliant about that that.

Wolf: Just a procedure on the Council meeting on Wednesday I understand that somebody should move it. I would be prepared to move it, as a Council member, then. What I need is a second from the new Council, I understood. So, I'm- should I talk to Chuck or to...? To ask him...? Okay. Good.

Ray: Okay, with that I think we'll move off of the abstentions discussion, and the next item I have on there, it has to do with, oh, I'm sorry, Wolf, go ahead. Please.

Wolf: I'm sorry, Ray. I wonder, did we post-pone the Council Chair question, as to the member question of the Council? Or...?

Ray: That's next.

Wolf: Ah, okay.

Ray: We're on to that one now.

Wolf: Okay.

Ray: We anticipate that the Council is going to approve the Procedures that were out for public comment, and what we plan to do as a work team is double back to the question of post-Seoul, double back to the question of, "Should the Chair be a member of the Council?" There was a lively discussion yesterday on this question.

Most of the feedback that I've heard personally, and this is just my own judgment, seemed to be in favor of not requiring the Chair to be a member of the Council. The Procedures that went out for public comment do not require that the Chair be a member of the Council. There was some confusion on this issue yesterday. We should clarify that, for the record, it is not a requirement today for the Chair to be a member of the Council.

Post-Seoul we will bring this, and talk about this again as a work team, but just for clarity the Procedures that will be voted on Wednesday by the Council do not require a Chair candidate to be a member of the Council. Is there any discussion on this point?

Wolf, please.

Wolf: Yes, now, I have a question, whether it's in or out in the text. I think it doesn't have an effect on the election on Wednesday, which is important because we have to come to the election. It may have an effect in case the election fails. Because then we have a

second round, that's the rules, saying that, but after the second round if the candidate doesn't reach 60 percent of both Houses then the case will be.

And, what does he mean? Does it mean then if that's okay, after a certain amount of days a re-election should take place. In this phase, then this is the question. What should be done?

And you, Chair, from outside of this Council should, a candidate not a member of Council should be permitted or not. I would say, I would like to follow your suggestions of that we say, okay, for the election on Wednesday it doesn't matter, but after that we shall have a new discussion.

We should take into consideration all the aspects, which have been brought up by the Council. Then we should come up with a new proposal as well. It may include, or may not include that version. It could be used as well for the potential re-election phase.

Ray: Yeah, and to your point there, Wolf, we've known all along that this Rules Procedure document was not a finished product in time for Seoul. We just looked and prioritized the Rules of Procedure in order to complete what was necessary to seat the Council as of the Seoul meeting.

It was always intended that we would continue to work on the open points that have to do with the Rules of Procedure. This is one of them. Expansion of Absentee voting might be another, how to recognize abstentions is another, how to dismiss a Chair. We didn't really get into that.

There are a number of things for us to double back to. Along these lines I want to make clear that there is also some clarity of language, some finer points that were made in the final work team document that, for whatever reason, just didn't make it in to the final version document.

I consider these insubstantive issues, but nonetheless important issues, clarifying certain words, certain sentences. For example, I remember in particular we went through and painstakingly found every single area where the voting talked about 'Both Houses', and clarifying that to mean 'Each House'. We caught every single one of those. There were a couple of places in the final version that went out for public comment, that for whatever reason, didn't capture all those edits.

Post-Seoul we're going to double-back, right away, and clean that up. We'll also be discussing these other items. Post-Seoul we'll get the revised Rules of Procedure that do not have any substantive changes, just again, picking up the edits that were made, but dropped off at the very end. Just getting those back in front of the Council for them to approve again. Nothing substantive. So, that's the plan of attack.

Would anybody like to discuss that? Everybody in agreement with that approach?

Tony, please.

Tony: The way I understand it, Ray, is that if the Council agrees then that gives them a way forward, for now. Even when we get to the stage where they could be substantive changes after, providing, I think we make it clear that whatever Council agreed to that sets the rules for that period, until they agree something else.

I don't think there's an issue with this, but maybe that point needs to be made tomorrow, because if they're to the point, Wolf made, with the Chair election there

could be a substantive change that occurs as that process goes through. But the rules should be whatever is the agreed version by Council [Inaudible 29:43.2]. So if it changes before the election is concluded, well, they abide by the new rules from then on.

Ray: Yeah, that's really well-said. So again, it's at a point in time, the Council approves the Procedures, and if we come back with modifications, changes, whether substantive, or immaterial, it's still, Council would have to approve those. Then upon their approving those revisions then those would come into play. Is that correct?

Now, one point of order that I want to ask here, that I want to be perfectly clear on, can the Council, in and of itself, approve new Rules of Procedures as those recommendations come to them?

Rob: You're looking at me. This is Rob Hogarth, so I will answer it. I believe that is the case. I think certainly as a work team you should work at your pace when you make the recommendations. It's for the Council to decide ultimately when they're going to rule on them, or agree to them. They could take them in whatever order you provide. You may want to package them to be more effective, but it's ultimately their call.

Male: All right, so speaking of Chair.

[Cross Talk]

Ray: Ron, go ahead.

Ron: Ron Andrief. Just wanted to ask, would it not go through the OSC first?

Ray: Yes.

Ron: So the OSC will then review it, so it does go. There is a review before it gets there. My point is if something is a little bit frayed on the edges and not quite as clean as we want, theoretically there should be a review process before we get there.

Ray: That's an excellent point, Ron. Thank you for that clarification.

Here's what I would like to ask, if we have agreement on. There are these somewhat added words that got left out, some finer touching. I would like to work Rob right after Seoul, get those in there. This is just a blocking and tackling thing. This is not substantive discussion stuff.

Get it in there. Get it in front of the work team. Get those, I mean immediately, right after Seoul, get those edits back in, get it in front of the work team, assuming no issues at the work team level, which I don't expect. We'll get it over to the OSC and then in front of the Council as soon as possible.

Is there any objection to this process? I'm not talking about substantive things. I'm talking about the minor edits that just fell off at the end, but that were good for the document.

Tony, please.

Tony: I agree. I was going to make the same point as Ron made, that it goes through the OSC. Forgive me if I've missed something that's happened here, because I've been out for the last few weeks. With the motion that's been made for Council to vote on

tomorrow, that is the result of earlier work. My understanding is that is still dependent upon the results of the OSC meeting that follows this session. Is that correct?

Rob: No, it's not. The work team recommendations went to the OSC. You guys, or Chuck, or whatever had the discussions. There were discussions that took place on the list.

Based upon the responses that Chuck got back on that list he then presented it as a motion to the Council on the 24th of September. The Council said, "Yes. Let's post it for public comment." Consistent with the transition implementation plan that the Council also approved on the 24 September they agreed that the new Council would then take the recommendations and vote 'yes' or 'no'.

Tony: I agree with everything that you've said, Rob. I raise that question- it relates back to the earlier discussion. I wasn't sure that the version that they're getting is based on the output of that document because of the Red-line issue. That's where I got the confusion from, but what you're saying is that is the version that was the output of that process, without any changes.

Rob: It appears that what happened in the process is that the work team recommendations that were produced in the draft of September 17th, somehow got transposed by the time of the final Council motion that took place on the 23rd, and then some of these edits did not make it in.

The piece that was posted for public comments, as Ray noted, reflected the substance, but not some of the finer word-smithing changes. As a result, the public comment has been on that slightly dirtier version as opposed to the polished one. But the substance didn't change, with the exception of the point that Ray has been making about is the Chair a Council member or not.

Tony: Thanks. That's put all the pieces together for me. Thank you.

Ray: Okay, so good. We spent a lot of quality work on getting these fine little edits. I think I'm making a big deal out of it, just because I was part of those edits, and spent a lot of time really fine tuning this document. Based on principle, I want to get them back in there. Again, they're not substantive changes. They're just making it much more professional- I'm not sure what the word is- just better.

I just want to ask, there is no objection to me getting with Rob, post-Seoul, getting those things back in there, getting them in front of the Council to get some more eyes looking at the work team, I mean. I am sorry, getting it back in front of the work team, assuming no objection, getting it back to the OSC, ASAP. Is there any objection to doing that?

Wolf: No objection, but it would be good if after our meeting during the OSC meeting you take the opportunity just to explain to the OSC our plan. We should discuss that maybe there's some new input from them, some advice, maybe we have more background, then, yeah? Okay?

Ray: Yeah, fair enough. The OSC follows us today. I think that's an excellent suggestion, Wolf.

Okay, moving on to the next item.

Ron: Chair?

Ray: Yeah? Ron, please.

Ron: May I beg the indulgence of this work team? I had asked previously if we could move the topic of the KITE to later in the meeting, expecting that I would be coming later. As it turns out I have to go back to the GAC at some point, and I'm kind of waiting to find out when that is, but I may have to jump and run.

So, if we could talk about that first, that would be very helpful, because I know we want to get as a committee, as a team, that kind of resolved.

Ray: Yeah, absolutely, Ron. This is the KITE document. The GNSO structure document that- and I'm going off a little bit of memory here, but it was a fairly involved document. We went and asked for community feedback on this document, which we received back. Unfortunately because of the priority of the Rules and Procedure we were never really able to discuss as a work team the feedback that we got back on this document. Again, it was just a prioritization issue.

I want to open up for discussion, does anybody have any thoughts or feedback on what it is that we've received? Does everybody have a copy of what we received in front of them? Is that one of the things we may copies of, or not?

Julie: I can try to make copies-

Ray: No, it's not necessary. It's not necessary. I think we have it in electronic form. I was just asking.

Let me just give a high- what we did is we- I asked Julie at the time to, as we got these responses in to compile them into a 'yes', or 'no' format. So, how many do we have here... [Counting] We had twelve responses come back from various registries/stakeholder groups.

We had one specific question. Ron, can you refresh my memory? What was the specific question we were asking in that document?

[Inaudible 38:20.4]

We had one specific question. It was a 'yes' or 'no' question. So, of the twelve, it appears ten out of the twelve said 'no' to the question. Julie is looking up what the question was.

Okay, while Julie is looking that up, do we have any discussion on this KITE document. I guess here's a question I have: Where do we want to go from here with this document? Do we want to continue to move it forward? Do we want to spend time- I would have to say that priority-wise we're still on the Rules of Procedure even post-Seoul.

I just want to throw it out for open discussion. Any comments?

Okay, Julie has the question. Go ahead, Julie.

Julie: The question is, "Do you think that the establishment of a new additional body to address specific responsibilities as described herein would better serve the stakeholder groups that make up the GNSO, or not?"

Ray: Okay, so that was the question. Now, let's have some discussion. Ron?

Ron: Well, actually it's a very *à propos* question because that was the nub of the issue. How do we improve the GNSO on an overall basis, as opposed to this misconception that the GNSO is in fact the Council? There is a supporting organization, and we have a Council that debates, and dialogues, and ultimately submits proposals to the Board for approval.

In the dialogue, and in the development of the document, the KITE document, we were trying to explore how we could expand that GNSO to provide for a broader based, two-legs of the stool instead of just the singular one, as it were. I think that the hope was that we would see some support for the idea that we would have another body that would look at horizon issues and so forth.

I have a sense, quite a clear sense that very few people understood the objective of what we were trying to achieve, and the number of responses we received to the question was very, very low. Some put it to their constituencies, some went directly, so we don't really know what the individuals were thinking.

That was the hope that we would get more of that rather than the constituency response. But as I said from the very beginning of this I was not wedded to the success or failure of this idea. I was hoping that we would see more broader participation in that discussion, because my argument was to say that with new TLDs, with a broader expanded domain name space there would be many, many more aspects that we have to look at.

At this point, my feeling is, unless there's any other disagreement with it we should not continue to pursue this idea. We should put it on the shelf, but invite the Council, the new Council when they sit, to perhaps come back and re-visit this concept with the Council looking at it, to give some thought to it.

Do they think it would be a wise idea or not, because there was confusion as to, would you split the existing Council to half do policy, and the other half do the administrative stuff? I think if we give it to the new Council, that's just a recommendation, "You may want to look at this," that might be a way forward. But I don't think we got enough feedback to actually be able to choose one way or the other, as a work team, from my perspective.

Ray: Excellent comment, Ron.

Wolf...

Wolf: Thank you. I remember our comprehensive discussion we had, and frankly speaking, I also did not expect a different result from that. So, in two senses, if the one that we shall get little response on the one hand, and on the other hand that we shall get a negative response, because that is... That was my problem is this document, to sending out this document in that stage, because I saw it.

People will have problems to understand, to read it, and so on, and on the other hand, for example, we didn't give it only to this constituency, we just cast it internally, as well as the constituency. But there is then, as you may understand from your constituency as well, people are happy that, okay, they can see a guideline, but they would like also to have some, let me say, some viewer power. They have a feeling, a stomach feeling, yeah? Okay, if this stomach feeling is then focused so the constituency, they're happy with that, so that's how the result comes.

I would also, I would be prepared, in a new Council, also to discuss it with the new Council. I have some doubts. If I look to other new councilors they are very new, and

they have to learn, and they are just screaming and looking for some guidelines whether they can contribute to that.

The older councilors, let me say in this, they may have that. They may be prepared as well, in part, in parts. We have to be careful how to input that to the Council, and how to bring it forward. Rather than just to send it to the Council and ask, "Okay, for your consideration."

Ron: My only comment to that, Wolf, I don't disagree with what you've said, except for the fact that I would hope that the councilors that are being selected or voted in to their positions have been within the ICANN community for a while. You'll have the non-com or somebody that's very new that maybe hasn't had any ICANN experience, which, you know my feeling about that.

I am always very frustrated about having a person come in without any understanding of what we do, and then all of a sudden they're our councilor. So, I would hope that the newcomers, or the old-timers will all have a look. But quite frankly, if the work team is not comfortable submitting it again, we bury it. No problem.

Ray: Tony, please.

Tony: One of the points that came up when we did discuss this in a constituency is there was a view that some of the things within the document, some of the approach fitted with the way Council had operated in the past, but not necessarily the way Council is now going to operate in the new environment. Whether that's right or wrong, that was the view.

I think that for all of us, we're at that stage now where we're launching not only a new Council, but a new process as well. It's very difficult to ask them to make a judgment on this now, because part of the new way of working is to move towards working groups. The Council has a different role from what it had in the past, if the model works in the way that it's envisioned it would work. But we aren't not really at that stage where we have got that model up and running.

At some stage maybe there will be a need to go back and look at this, but at the moment with the procedures still rolling through the new structure and the methods of working beginning untried, the fact that we do have some newcomers on the Council, I think it's the wrong time to pitch this in. Maybe later if things don't work out quite so well, or even if they do.

There may be a point in time when it's viable to get some views on this when the Council is established and understands what needs to be done. We're not at that stage so I think it's totally wrong to throw it back to them now.

Ray: Yeah, let me follow up on that real quick. There's been the DNSO, then there was the GNSO, and then now there's the reform process of the GNSO. This has been a difficult - it's elusive, the whole GNSO concept, the Council. This document that we've prepared with Ron's leadership allowed for us to have some very, very good discussion.

I think a lot of the things that are brought out in this document that has been prepared by this work team, again, led by Ron, the people on the Council are going to run into these things. I think there will be a point in time, in the future, where we will want to discuss some of these separation of duties, which is really the crux of what the

document was all about, the separation of duties, for the Council to be an effective manager of the policy process.

I'm not sure the duration of this work team, how long we're going to continue on. Right now our Charter has been extended to the first meeting in 2010, the first ICANN meeting. But if this work team happens to live on past that, and as we see how the new Council structure is working, and managing the policy process, or difficulties they were having, we're going to have this document to look at. We're going to have the opportunity to explore if there is a proper separation of duties in order for the Council to be effective.

So I agree, it's too soon to probably put this in front of the Council. I think that's the general work team opinion, but I also want to acknowledge that this was a very thoughtful document, a very well-written document. I don't think it was understood, like Ron has suggested. It's an involved document.

The GNSO, the DNSO, this organization has been complex for some time. I would like us to keep this document, and as a work team watch how the new Council operates in managing the policy process, always be keeping in mind whether there is a proper separation of duties, and we'll go that way.

Ron?

Ron: In that case, I'm not sure what the mechanism might be. You mentioned we're still commissioned through the first meeting in 2011, but perhaps we might consider, 2010- the ICANN process has got me very confused- 2010, it's only around the corner.

Point begin that perhaps we might offer this to the new Chair, that he, or she, can hold that kind of in advance to have it as a pocket piece, and at some point in time introduce it when they feel comfortable with it. Because when we're disbanded I don't see that the BC would step forward and say, "Well, this is what we should do," or the IPs, or the ISPs.

I would think that something we might just want to hand off and say, you know, "Here's some work we did. When you feel the time is right, or if you feel the time is right." Unless the community rises up and says, "We need you to do something," which I highly doubt will happen.

Ray: Actually, I think that's an excellent suggestion. Does anybody disagree with that? Or, okay, before I get to anybody to disagree with that - Ken, do you have comment?

Ken: Yes, I do. Ken Bauer. Another possible place for that document. I don't know when the next GNSO review is scheduled, but there's probably going to be one. That would be another, I think, great input to those who would be reviewing the GNSO. Because a structural change, like you're suggesting there, giving it to the Council, it's a little like trying to re-organize the constituencies by asking them, "How do you want to re-organize?" It should be done at a level above, it seems to me, anyway.

Ray: Okay, so with that said, I think we've really sort of made it through our agenda items.

The last item on the list is 'Any Other Business'.

[Inaudible - 51:51.7]

Did you jump one?

[Inaudible - 51:24.0]

There was one ahead?

[Inaudible - 51:25.3]

Oh, yes. Right. Thank you.

[Inaudible - 51:25.8]

Oh, yes, Right. Thank you. Trust me, I have both Chair candidates in the room. It's interesting that we have both Chair candidates in the room. Yeah.

[Inaudible - 51:39.3]

Ray: Okay, so as part of the OC review of the Council rules of procedures, I don't remember the individual, but somebody, an individual that was reviewing it brought up the very good point of, "Well, what happens if a Chair is not performing?"

I'm not sure what the correct term is, but we can all imagine a scenario, even an extreme scenario where, perhaps, there is a need to remove the Chair. There's nothing in the Procedures that even contemplates the idea. That was the question. The question was, "There's nothing in the Procedures that contemplates this scenario? Was that by design?" Of course, no, it wasn't. That was just something we didn't consider.

Now, Avery Doria made the comment that perhaps we could mirror the same language that is used for ICAs in the bylaws, which is basically as I've written here in this agenda item. Simply put, in our case I think it would be 3/4th's of each House would vote to remove the Chair. I believe that is the jest of what she was saying by mirroring the bylaws, but I want to put that up for discussion.

Ron?

Ron: So, my initial question, maybe this goes to staff, why would this not be in the bylaws as opposed to in the Rules of Procedure? That's just a general question.

Wolf: That's an excellent question. I don't have an answer for that.

Ron: Because if we have how to dismiss an NCA in the bylaws, theoretically we should have the same thing for the Chair. So that would be one point, but the second part is I certainly would agree with this language, it should go into the Procedures, because it's one of those things you never expect to have a bad time, but it's good when you got something to protect yourself at the end.

Ray: Okay, Ken.

Ken: Yeah, it's just a clarification. Ken Bauer. I did a fair amount of work on the bylaws originally, and there was language in the original bylaws that dealt with resignations. There wasn't any language that talked about replacing a councilor, but I had the exact same thought. When we got to that point, I actually wrote language that said, "How might you remove a GNSO councilor, any councilor, including the Chair", right? Because there was all this language in there about how to remove an NCA, and the legal council said, "That should go in the GNSO Operating Procedures."

So all that stuff about resignations, and councilors and removing was all taken out of the bylaws, and I said, "So, why did we leave the NCA in," and I'm not exactly sure why that stayed. It may have had to do with the fact that it was an independent body or something like that.

But I would suggest to you if you do consider writing the language, for them to removal of a Chair, I would just broaden it and say, "Any GNSO councilor, including the Chair, or Vice Chair," then you've got it all covered.

Ray: Yeah. That's an interesting suggestion. I like it.

Okay, Wolf?

Wolf: Well, okay, no objections to that. For me, normally, in practical terms, thinking, okay, why don't we use a process vice/versa? How we have elected the Chair, let me say, just going backwards. That's in the back door action, with the threshold. The threshold should be 3 to 4 and then that's it. I think that's, for me, clear.

Ralph: It's Ralph. I have no objection to that.

Ray: Okay. Tony, please.

Tony: I just wonder if those things aren't the same. If you include all councilors in that, because the situation may change, but at the moment everybody elects the Chair. But the constituencies elect their councilors, and now you're provided the rights of all the Council to basically challenge an election that comes through a constituency. Those two things are totally different. So I'm not sure that the same language should apply at this stage, right across the piece.

Ray: Good comment.

Wolf: At least, for this case we need some thresholds like we have in other cases, supported by, let me say a certain threshold from a stakeholder group, depending on the stakeholder group who is ascending the Councilor.

I would accept what Tony says. It seems to me that we have to think over a little bit more about that. In other cases, we have different cases here, the NCA, the people are sent by the non-com so that's the reason why it is in the bylaws, because old procedures don't cover non-com issues, yeah?

And the other thing is the Chair, which could be both, it could be in case if an NCA is a Chair it would touch the non-com as well. We have to be a little bit cautious about that.

Ray: Well, I tell you this is something that came out during the final review of the Rules of Procedure, this question. I think we accomplished what we wanted to today. We've got it now in front of the work team, something for us to pick up on with our next meeting.

We're up to speed on what the issue is, we know that there's something that needs to happen. I think we're in agreement that something needs to be put in place. We've got a start, and I think maybe with our next call we can actually come up with some suggested language.

Tony?

Tony: I think we're almost there with the situation with the Chair, because I didn't hear anyone arguing against that. The only thing that we have to discuss further is broadening that beyond the Chair. But as far as the Chair goes I think we're actually done.

Ray: Good point, yeah. We're in agreement on the Chair, just whether we broaden it to other members. I think we're going to have to have a discussion on that.

Okay, we encroaching the end of the OSC meeting, here. I'm going to call for any other business, and if-

Wolf, go ahead.

Wolf: Absentee voting? Isn't that an item, absentee voting, on the agenda?

Ray: Yes, the expansion of absentee voting is an item on our agenda, I think that's going to be an involved discussion, tie into proxy voting, perhaps even tie into abstentions. I think we're going to have to defer that discussion yet to our next meeting, just to our own time constraints.

With that I'm going to adjourn the meeting. Thank everybody for attending, and end the recording, please.

Chuck: And has it started- do I need a signal? It's started? Okay. Very good. Well, welcome everybody to our OSC meeting, our Operations Steering Committee meeting.

Sorry I didn't send out an agenda, but it's a fairly simple agenda. We have one main item, which is this toolkit of services recommendations that you have a hard copy that I sent out on the 18th, a week ago today. That's our main item.

Beyond that- unless other people have business that they want to add- we will look at the Communications Team Status as well the Constituency Operations team status from Olga, and then raise here for the Council Operations Team as well. They'll have an update, but our main item is this one item that I'll explain a little bit.

Now, if everybody would just glance around the room. Has everyone met Rafiek, who is a new council member, but he's also been on the Constituency Stake Holder Group Operations Team? Okay.

Maybe for his sake- have you met all the people in the room, Rafiek? Should we just go around real quickly and give names? Is that helpful?

Okay, let's do it. Let's start with Ken and work our way around.

Ken: We met at the airport, and rode a bus together, Ken Bauer, from the Policy Staff.

Philip: Philip Shepard from the Business Constituency.

Tony: Tony Holmes, from the ISPs.

Oreka: Oreka Ordin, from the ISPs.

Steve: Steve Metalicks, Intellectual Property Constituency.

Julie: And that's Mason Cole from the Registrar Constituency, and I'm Julie Headland, ICANN Staff.

Ray: Ray Fassed, from the Operations Work Team.

Michael: Michael Young, Registry Stake Holders Group.

Rob: Rob Hogarth, ICANN Staff.

Chuck: Chuck Gomes, the Chair of the OSC.

Ana: Ana Cavalli, Chair of the Constituency Operations Team from the GNSO Council.

Chuck: Okay, now, just so that I know- and I'm not trying to put people on the spot- but it's mainly to know how much detail we need to go into- how many people were able to read, at least skim, this doc? Anybody not able to skim this document before you got here?

Oh, you haven't?

Okay, so we probably should give a little more background. Now, I'm going to warn you in advance, the issue that we're going to deal with in this, I'm going to ultimately, in terms of any decisions we make as a committee, I will be recusing myself, because I'm the one that caused the trouble, so to speak. You'll understand that better as we go through this.

I don't want there to be any perception of a conflict in terms of a decision of the OSC. That's why I was glad to see two more people show up so that the rest of you can really come back with your honest evaluation of the decision.

What I'm going to ask is for Olga, as Chair of that working team to briefly give a little bit of background of the situation that we're dealing with, and that hopefully the OSC can provide some direction on.

Olga: Thank you, Chuck. Glad to do that. Just as a background, let me remind you that the two main tasks that our working team must work on, one is enhance existing contingencies by developing recommendations on constituency participation rules, or operation principals, and database of members.

The other task is develop a global outreach program to broaden participation in current constituencies.

What we have been doing, we have 12 members in our working team. It's kind of an active working team. I'm the Chair, and Michael is the Vice Chair. Chuck is participating also. It's Rafiek, and who else is here from our working team? Krista. Hi, Krista- and Julie, also, and Robert.

We divided our first task in four sub-tasks. The number four is the one named, "Develop a Toolkit of ICANN Staff Support and/or Services For All Constituencies." This is the document that you have a copy. We have already submitted it to the OSC. Although our charter had not specifically mentioned that we must deliver all our outcome documents together, or separate. We found value in sending this document as a separate one, while in the meantime we finish developing other sub-tasks that we have agreed to do.

I can read them, if you want, but I don't think there is a lot of sense in doing that now.

We thought that this Toolkit of ICANN Staff Support was interesting for you to have it in consideration for other working teams in the OSC and also for being submitted to the GNSO. We have some discussions in-between our working team- if it was good or not to send this document as a separate one, or not. The reasons were different. Some members of the working team thought that perhaps as we did not reach final documents for recommendation it was not logic to send this Toolkit of ICANN Services first. Some of us thought that it was useful for going on.

So we worked under our charter, which establishes the rule for rough consensus. We made that process and have eight members for sending it as a separate document, and four members against, so we have a minority report in the document also, if you want to read the reasons that they were not for sending it as a separate document. This is why we submitted the document to the OSC.

Today at the meeting we had, in the morning, I don't know if it's morning or night for me. For me it's 4:00 AM in the morning- sorry- for example, with other sub-tasks, we had an idea of also submitting it as a separate document. We haven't made a decision about that yet, but that may happen also with other sub-tasks 1.3, which is 'Develop Recommendations For Creating and Maintaining a Database For All Constituency Members, and Others', not for money, part of the constituency that is up to date, and publicly accessible.

So, that's the situation of our work. We are dealing with three other documents that should be ready, perhaps in some weeks, perhaps in one month, but this document is already for your revision, and for your comments. I don't know if you had the chance to review it, or you want to ask, or you want me, or perhaps Julie can help me in reviewing the content of it, which is the genesis of it, how we got to this text.

Chuck: Let me open it up for questions of Olga. It looks like Philip has one.

Philip: I'm just skimming through this document, and I'm amazed mean to find there's a three-page minority report, and another minority report. What was supposed to be a list of voluntary services, which strikes me as just bureaucracy going bloody mad, if I can just that somewhat strong expression.

Can you explain to us the nature of these disagreements and why it manifested itself in something as much as minority report of a sub-group, sub-group, sub-group, sub-group, reporting on voluntarily services?

Chuck: Like I said, I'm going to play a backseat role because I was the one, because Julie and I worked on the draft document, and the full working team reviewed it for the Toolkit of Services, and I mistakenly thought it was a pretty simple thing to separate from the rest, and sent it on forward so the services would be available sooner rather than later. But, because I'm the one that recommended that I'm going to ask others on the work team to comment on that.

Michael: I'm happy to take a shot at commenting on that. As diplomatically as I can state it, there was at least one work team member who seemed to expand the scope of what we were trying to do, beyond what we were tasked to do. There were many GNSO-related issues, concerns, disgust on the call that really didn't have anything to do with what we were tasked with.

I think Olga did a lot of very difficult work, and frankly I think I did some difficult work too, along the way, trying to keep people back to the topic at hand, and getting them to produce. I think this-

Philip: I'm trying to be clear- that individual is the one that did the first minority report?

Michael: No.

Philip: No?

Michael: No.

Philip: Okay.

Michael: I mean you can look at our Minutes with Victoria. Anyway, there was a constant tension, and pressure in the group around these sort of discussions which, frankly, ate up a great deal of our working time on the calls.

Both Olga and I have become more and more assertive, if you will, about shutting down conversations during the calls that weren't on our agenda, or didn't have to do with the work at hand. I think what you're seeing in these minority reports is some expression- and this is only an opinion, because I can't read someone else's mind- it is an expression of frustration because we didn't want to go into certain topics or discussions if we weren't tasked with them.

Philip: Thanks.

Chuck: Other questions? Steve?

Steve: Well, I was just wondering since one of the - there are three minority reports here.

Chuck: One of the people that submitted a minority report is here.

Steve: That is what I was going to say. I don't know if Rafiek wanted to say anything or not, but if he did we certainly welcome his input. As I read these there's a procedural issue, which is, "This wasn't ready to go yet, and shouldn't have gone ahead of the other things..." I'm paraphrasing here. Then I'm trying to figure out what the substantive issue was.

I recognize that Rafiek's minority report was mostly focused on the procedural aspects, but, and I don't know if he wants to add anything to this, but I'm really kind of at a loss to see what the substantive issue is that gave rise to the minority report.

Olga: Rafiek, perhaps you could give us your thoughts about your minority report?

Rafiek: So, as I explained in my minority report, it's more about procedural issue. It's not really about the report itself, because I think that it's important that we send Olga the reports related to the same task. The main issue, for me, if we need some review, or update, so it can be more complicated to do that.

Chuck: Rolph, go ahead. Tony, you can be next.

Rolph: I just went through the document. It is a little bit of surprise from my experience with other working teams, so I cannot understand really what's going on, so it's that you have a deadlock right now in your work team that you cannot go forward, or you don't know how to proceed with this item any more?

In our group we had also a task, or one item which has cast heavily, and we could not find an agreement on that. At the end, okay, the agreement was just delivered to

the OSC, and to the OSC member, if the OSC agrees to deliver that as a document and it's fine; if not, then okay. We cannot do anything more.

So I wonder what's going on- do you need advice from us how you should proceed in future? Or, I'm not really sure about that.

Olga: Rolph, if I may explain, most of us in the working team thought that it was a good idea to send it as a separate document. It could be useful for either working teams, and for the OSC. At the same time, three individuals have the right to include their minority report, so this is why they're included there. This is why the document came out, and was sent to the OSC.

The issue of not producing all the documents together was a very long discussion in the working team. Finally, as I mentioned before, we worked under a rough consensus idea. We had eight individuals in the working team for send the document as a separate one, and four against it.

We thought we had achieved rough consensus. This is why it was sent with the minority reports. This is more or less the process.

Perhaps Chuck and Michael can add something to that.

Chuck: Yeah, just to make sure everybody's clear, and correct me if I'm wrong on this, Olga, but the content of the report is not at issue here. The recommendations are not at issue.

What's at issue is whether a part of our task, one part, should be sent ahead and move through the process before all of the work is done. That's really the- is that correct, Olga? Okay.

Olga: Chuck, if I may, and taking your questions to our working team, and perhaps, you oversee could give us some piece of advice in relation to this idea of producing partial document, or not. If you think that's something which is good, that may add value to the process, or you think it is nonsense.

Chuck: So there's- just one more comment- what I want to do after we deal with this specific issue is, there's a principle involved here that might be helpful if the steering committee gave some advice on, with regard to whether or not it might be helpful, because we know sub-tasks take different amounts of time, right? So, that principle we'll talk about later.

Rolph, you wanted to follow up on something after Olga, and then we'll go to Tony.

Rolph: Yes, just for clarification. So, as OSC members we could use it. We could make use of it, or we could also wait for the input of the other documents. So, it's open to us. That's what I understand. Yeah.

Chuck: Remember the role of this group is to be a coordinating facilitator for the whole- all three work teams and so that's it.

Tony?

Tony: Well, just to comment, as an OSC member, on the issue of whether the documents should come together at one time, or whether we should submit them separately just prior to this meeting the other group that was working in this room was the OPS team, and one of the issues that we discussed surrounded the election of the Council

Chair. We recognized during that discussion that some of the issues that we're talking about could change that process.

If we adopted the approach of waiting for everything to be finalized we couldn't even sit a new Council because we couldn't elect a Chair. So the decision that was taken was that we will go ahead with the rules that we have, and if they're amended, and let's say the election of the Chair isn't straightforward, and it takes a longer term, then if the rules change you play by the new rules.

I think holding back on the basis that we have to wait until everything is completed is totally unworkable. As an OSC member I really support the process where we go forward as quickly, and as far as we can, on the documents that we get from each group.

Chuck: Philip?

Philip: Yeah, I concur. I think with that general principle. We created a structure. We had a whole bunch of tasks to do. You break them down into small pieces. The principle behind that idea is that as those pieces are done they rise and they come up, and you tick them off and you've done them, and you move on; otherwise you'd never complete anything.

I think in terms of the basic principle it seems right when each group feels it is ready on a (Inaudible - 19:12.6) task to submit it. The only reason against that would be if a strong case could be made there is such a linkage to another part to the group's work, that in fact you're only getting half the story. You then get misleading information being submitted, then I think there's another reason.

Please, anybody around here, speak and say if there is an overriding connection with other parts of the sub-group's work.

Chuck: Steve?

Steve: I would concur with what both Tony and Philip said. I think it's inevitable. We've seen many other examples in this process that pretty much everything that's done is provisional in the sense that it might have to get adjusted later. Maybe that could have been avoided in some ways by changes in how the whole GNSO Improvements Activity was launched, and maybe it couldn't.

But in any case I think it's just a fact of life, and I think Rafiek's point is a valid one that we should make sure that- ideally we would not put advanced reports that might have to be adjusted later, but I just don't think there's any way to avoid it in this process, because there's too many moving parts, and too many different groups to say, "We have to achieve total perfection on one before we can send it forward."

So, I would certainly agree on the substance of what people have been saying.

Chuck: Thanks. Vanda, would you like to comment?

Vanda: Just to agree with the others. This is really a process, and if we don't start, there's no win, really. So we need to approve and go forward, because in the end there's certainly- we're going to make some minor change. It's unavoidable.

Chuck: Any other questions, or comments?

Male: I guess just to clarify where we are in this process, it sounds as though there's certainly a consensus, in this group, to accept this report on Sub-Task Four, even though the other parts are not ready.

I just wonder do we want to discuss the substance of this report, the contents of this report? Or is there some action that we need to take as far as that goes? Let's assume- okay, having read the minority reports we nonetheless accept this report. Is there something else that we need- is it appropriate then to talk about the substance?

Chuck: Sure, and we can do that one of two ways, at least. We can make a decision, first of all, whether to go ahead and accept it, and then I think it's very appropriate for us.

We could take advantage of our time here to decide whether or not we're ready to forward it on to the full Council for consideration. So you're right on track on that, and then of course we would want to talk about substance. So that's perfectly okay.

Now, should we- would you rather talk about the substance before we make a decision on going ahead and accepting it? Or- go ahead.

Male: I guess my suggestion would be- and it's if necessary I'll move that we accept this report, and thank the working team for preparing it. Then we move on to any discussion on the substance of the report before we send it on to the Council.

Chuck: Okay. Anybody opposed to that?

Female: No.

Chuck: Okay, all right. Okay. All right, let's talk about the substance of the report, okay?

Steve?

Steve: I just had really one comment. If you look at this chart, I guess on the second page, which has a number of different services that could be offered, it strikes me that one of these doesn't fit with the others. If you look at number eight, "Providing grants, and funding for constituencies to provide their own support." That's really a question of how these other things would be done.

For example, if you look at number two, "Support for organizing face-to-face meetings," kind of a meeting/planning function. A lot of people thought that would be a good service to provide to constituencies stake holder groups, whoever.

But the question is should that only be provided by ICANN staff, or should it be possible for a constituency to say, "We'll bring somebody else in. We'll engage somebody else to do that. You give us the money, basically, that otherwise would have gone to the staff to do it." To say that we'll do the first seven things, and then if we have funds we'll go to eight. There's a little bit of a disconnect there for me.

I don't know what- if number eight is worth doing, and I happen to think it is, then I think it probably should apply even if we can only phase in the first four items, or something. Because this is all listed in prior- as you see later in the report this is kind of in priority order, and that's fine, but it seems that number eight doesn't really fit in that matrix.

If one, two, three, and four are worth doing and we have the funds for that, then I guess there should be the possibly of a constituency or stake holder group saying, "Thank you. We want number two, but we want to do it ourselves."

Chuck: What would be your recommendation, and possible change for the way this report is presented? I assume it's not just deleting eight from the table.

Steve: No, it would be basically to say to the extent that- if you look at the recommendations where it says, "As soon as funds are available, and prerequisite actions can be taken," you could almost remove 'G' from there and just put in a sentence at the end that any services that are offered should be offered either through ICANN staff or through grants or funding to constituencies to do it themselves.

Chuck: Did you capture that, Julie? Okay.

Philip?

Philip: I'd like to agree completely with Steve on that. It's an implementation issue that is up to ICANN to do. Now, whether or not they choose to spend the money on their own staff, and provide that service, or find in fact is more cost effective to simply make a grant constituency, I think is purely an ICANN budgeting decision, once have take the decision to support certain services that have been recommended. I think that's exactly right. So, I would fully support Steve's suggestion.

Chuck: Thanks. Yes, Olga?

Olga: Thank you, Chuck. If I may, point five, I think it includes this option, eligible organizations may opt to receive any, all or none of the services as they see fit, provided that they provide sufficient notice as to be defined by ICANN staff. Maybe this is what you're-

Male: I think that's a little bit- if I may- I think that's a little bit of a different question because that constituency is saying, "I know you're offering us 'B', organizing face-to-face meetings, but we don't want that." Instead this constituency would be saying, "Yes, we want that, but we think it's more efficient to bring somebody on site rather than someone at the ICANN office."

Chuck: Thank you. Yes, Philip?

Philip: Just to add to that, Olga, is a very good example. As a result of the business constituency using ICANN services for our mailing lists recently, that resulted in an unintentional breach of European privacy law. It was caused by- ICANN was responding to an internal ICANN request of information, actually that they should have kept much more secure on our behalf.

That would give us pause in the future in terms of- even if all these services were available absolutely free of charge who would we want to do them- we may think, "Actually your systems may need to be improved before we can risk such a thing again."

Chuck: Any other comments on this? Any other thing about the content of the recommendations and the report?

Philip?

Philip: Just one other thing, which I was slightly confused in reading, and only skim reading, the minority report from Victoria, and that she seemed to be referring to an implication built into some of this that may result in the enforced publication of all

Minutes, or whatever, or certain change in the current constituency decisions for communication and transparency.

Was that point explicitly discussed- is there an issue there? Or, was it a misunderstanding?

Chuck: Correct me if I'm wrong, Olga, or Michael, or any of the other working team members. I think that is really bringing in some issues that are being considered in one or more of the other sub-tasks. Victoria happens to be involved in sub-tasks one and two, where some of those things come up. I believe that is just a reference to those, because that was not a part of sub-task four.

Philip: What we're doing- exactly. Yeah.

Chuck: Yes, Michael?

Michael: Yeah, I would just like to reinforce, Chuck. This is why sub-task one and sub-task two, it wouldn't be appropriate to separate those and send them in individually because they are very related to one another. This was one of the four subtasks that really was quite separate, which was why we suggested bringing it forward I think it was a good idea in the spirit of rolling things along.

This work has taken, in general, longer than I think any of us had hoped for. We were getting anxious that we had a piece of work done to at least give the OSC something to progress with.

Chuck: Yeah, I can tell you that this- when was this finished, Julie? About a month ago?

Julie: Yeah, September 11th was when the final draft went to the team to consider.

Chuck: So we've been grappling with this since then. I will just leave it at that.

So- any other questions or comments on content?

Now, you guys might not appreciate this as much as we do, but this is very helpful for Olga, and Michael, and Chairing and Sub-tasks, and Sub-Vice-Chairing, this particular working team, so thank you for that.

Now, it's my opinion that it would probably be okay if we just move this onto the Council with the change that you've suggested. Does anybody disagree with that approach? That will just simplify it in going forward.

Yes, Tony?

Tony: I don't disagree with the approach at all, but just a question related to that. Assuming that we do that, and that the Council could effectively take a decision on this, Wednesday, in their meeting-

Chuck: They probably can't do it Wednesday- excuse me- we probably can't do it Wednesday just because in this case we wouldn't have a good reason to violate our seven-day advanced principle, but-

Tony: Okay.

Chuck: Even though we're going to do that on another issue, but that's a totally different case.

Tony: Right, so let's assume it's the next Council meeting, assuming that it gets support from Council, does that mean that we would expect the implication set out within this document then taken forward by ICANN, that each of these issues, the services can be looked at with the view to provide in-support pretty quickly?

Chuck: That was really my intent in the first place is so that we could allow staff some time-let them get started if the budget is there. I was, of course, representing the registry constituency, and I knew that there was some of these things that we could really benefit from.

We recognize it every time we hold a meeting. The idea was for constituency and stake holder groups, that we might be able to make these services available sooner, and therefore help us in the jobs that we have. So, you're right on target there, Tony.

Tony: That was exactly why I was asking because I design some of these things in here would be extremely helpful, if only for our constituency, and we would really welcome that level of support as soon as possible.

Male: I would say exactly the same for our constituency.

Chuck: And that was my motivation, not just for us, I thought all of us could. So thank you for that.

Now, unless there is anything else on this one...Yes, Olga?

Olga: This is the reason that we wanted this document to be sent to the OSC, but it took us some time. That's okay.

Chuck: Now, it seems to me, several of you made statements that I think are very helpful in a broader sense than just this issue, and that is that to the extent that elements of any of the work teams are distinct enough from, and not interrelated like several of you said, not interdependent, then there's no reason to hold up some part of the work that's done just to wait for everything else to be done.

Is there agreement on the Steering Committee, does anybody disagree with that principle? Again, recognizing that if there are interdependencies that really do meet, and Michael mentioned one of those Sub-task one and two in our case of this work team, so those probably are so closely interrelated that it wouldn't make sense to do that.

Yes, Steve?

Steve: Yeah, I think it's hard to state a flat rule about this, but I think in this case the leadership of the team thought it was sufficiently independent to move forward. I certainly support their decision.

Chuck: Philip?

Philip: If we're now submitting this report as amended by this Steering Committee to the Council, does it become our report? In which case I would like to move that we have a report about three pages long, and is easy to read, and easy to digest, and we make a reference in it to all the material that is unnecessary, such as minority reports, because they were about the process of the sub-group reporting to the Steering Committee. They were all there and linked to (Inaudible - 35:07.7) read them, but we do not confuse our colleagues and repeat all this clarifying

conversation, again, if we're able to do that, and we call it our report, as the Steering Committee.

Chuck: Any objections to that?

Female: No.

Vanda: I do agree that we should send them more compact document with the proposal that we are doing, and all the comments are something (Inaudible - 35:39.5).

Chuck: Julie, are you clear on that? So, you could re-do this, and-

Julie: Yes, absolutely. I'll re-do the document. I'll annex the minority reports, and include links to them as references.

Philip: Just links, not annexes. Yeah.

Julie: Just links. Yes.

Chuck: Okay. All right. I think we've covered that. I appreciate that. Hopefully you have a little bit of understanding of why this was our main item, and hopefully that will facilitate the working team's progress going forward.

Okay, let's then take a few moments- I don't want to take more time than we really need, but since we're on the constituency- by the way, let me raise another issue, this comes out of the minority reports, but the issue was made that the Board recommendations didn't say anything about stakeholder groups.

Very early in this process we concluded that, what applied to constituencies should apply to stakeholder groups on a new model. As you noticed, in one of the minority reports, at least, there was a statement made that there's nothing in our charter about stake holder groups.

Is there any disagreement with my conclusion that stakeholder groups- the principle of the Board recommendations really apply to stakeholder groups as much as constituencies, they just didn't exist when the Board first drafted the recommendations. Any disagreement with that?

Philip?

Philip: Not a disagreement, but I'm struggling a bit with this concept of eligible organizations, of which stakeholder groups and constituencies may be apart, as opposed to we're only talking about constituency groups, and constituencies and stakeholder groups. I think that clarity would help. Certainly if I was a budget officer in ICANN I would also like to know precisely what the scope was of an application like this, which has finance attached to it.

Chuck: One of the reasons for that was there may be cases where working groups could use some of these services or things like that, so I think that is why that was done. Now, do you think that it would be better just to restrict it to constituencies and stakeholder groups?

Philip: Personally, yeah, because the working groups are working groups of Council, and they're supported by the normal Council, procedural things. Yeah? I mean otherwise-

Chuck: Okay.

Philip: It just makes it confusing.

Chuck: Sure. Any objections to that?

Very good. Okay. Got that. Excellent. Okay.

Olga, let me give you an opportunity, and let's keep this brief, they don't need a detail-by-detail summary, but just in terms of a brief progress report of the other tasks.

Olga: Thank you, Chuck. Let me find the all the sub-tasks. I just have them here.

We have two main tasks. We divided our first task in sub-tasks. I know it's very confusing, but it's not very difficult. We divided it into four pieces.

The first task, the first one is, "Developing recommendations for a set of participation rules and operating procedures with all constituencies should abide by." This is held by a sub-working team, in the working team, led by an individual, He is SS from India. There is a draft document all ready for revision for the whole working team. We hope to have a revised version of all this- the draft document, perhaps in three weeks from now, by mid-November.

The second sub-task is led by Victoria, and the idea of the document is, "Develop recommendations for clear operating principles for each constituency to ensure that all constituencies function in a representative, open, transparent, and democratic manner."

This document still needs revision from the sub-working team, because there are people who commented, and those comments have not been already included in the draft version, so it will take some more time for the whole working team revision.

Sub-task three, luckily we have Krista here, but she is ready to send a finalized draft document for the whole working team revision. So, perhaps if I'm not mistaken I would say that in three weeks, two weeks from now, we could have all the three pieces that are as ongoing draft documents with complete revision by the working team.

Then we have two more, task two, that we couldn't already review, which is develop a global outreach program to broaden participation in current constituencies. So once we finish task one we will go through tasks. This is more or less the situation.

Chuck: Thank you, Olga.

Julie, could you put up the membership of that particular work team?

The reason that I'm suggesting that is we ended up- it took a while- but we ended up with pretty good representation from all the constituencies and stakeholder groups. You may want to identify somebody in your area that you could test some of this on and see how it's going for them. I'm not saying that you need to do that. I just thought it might be helpful if you know who your representatives were in that particular area. Okay?

Thank you.

Okay, let's go then to Ray, and of course they've already got a product that we're voting on Wednesday with regard to at least a sub-set of the operating procedures for the Council.

Ray: Great. Thanks, Chuck. Ray Fasset here. I wanted to just briefly discuss the Council Rules of Procedure document. A couple of respects, one, I just wanted to clear up some confusion that this requirement that the Chair needs to be a member of the Council. That is actually not the case, and I wanted to reaffirm that, because we just had a work team meeting, and I wanted to hear from the group if that was the case, or not, and in fact, no, it isn't. So, I wanted to make sure to communicate that to the OSC. That is consistent, of course, with the Rules of Procedures that we voted on, on Wednesday.

So, there's that issue that I wanted to just clarify, and then secondly, there were some minor edits that were done at the last minute to the rules of procedure that just didn't get into the final version of the rules of procedure. They were important edits, not substantive changes, just clarifying the language.

For example, we went through with a microscope to make sure that when it pertained to voting that it was for each house, for example. We went through very hard to make sure that was the case all the way through the document.

Well, for whatever reason in the one that got published there are still a couple of instances in there where it says, "Both houses," and it doesn't change the spirit of it, or even the interruption of it. But there are some edits that we have to go back in and just fix. So, as a plan of action, and as we discussed in our work team, just prior to this, we're going to make those edits.

We intend that this Rules Procedure will be approved by the Council, and then we're going to come back, post those real quick, and offer up these few edits, get them into the document, and then get them back in front of the OSC for their review, and then approval. So I just want to provide that update. That's it.

Chuck: Ray, question. Obviously, the document management process, there was some failure there. Has the source of that been identified, so to lessen the chance in the future?

Ray: Yeah. Julie can actually answer that better than me. Go ahead.

Julie: I did a little bit of research. We had been circulating a document up until, through I'd say the 22nd of September, when the document was going to go to the Council that had a number of very detailed changes that the work team had worked through that were also in coordination with ICANN legal staff.

Unfortunately we determined, now, today, that there was an earlier version of the document that was under a parallel review, and that earlier version of the document got substituted for the later version. When it came back out of that review process, and at the last moment that was the document that was put forth to the OSC, that was a staff error that we've identified.

Chuck: Thank you. Okay. Anything else on that? Now, is there anyone here, besides Mason, from the Communications work team? He's not got a voice, so- okay. All right, Julie if you could do that for him. I think he'd appreciate it. We probably will too.

Julie: Yes, actually Mason and I agreed that I could give the report on his behalf. If I say anything untoward you can nod vigorously at me, and I will put a stop The

Communications work team met earlier today, and made great progress on a final set of recommendations.

It was actually the four recommendations of the Communications work team with relation to the tasks in the charter that came from the BGC report, and the determination in today's meeting that there were some minor changes to the Recommendations document, which we discussed today. Work team members will be reviewing the document one final time through this Wednesday, and then I'll be making the final changes on Thursday, and the document will be ready to submit to the OSC on Friday, the 30th.

Chuck: Krista, if I can put you on the spot. I probably will whether you think I can or not, but you're communicate- some of the sub-tasks, three, from your work team relates a little bit to the website requirements. You're going to coordinate with that work team in that regard, right?

Krista: Yes.

Chuck: Okay.

Krista: I've actually already started doing that.

Chuck: Excellent. Thanks. Okay. Thank you. And, thanks, Mason, for the good work you're doing in leading that group. I appreciate that very much.

Any questions or comments on any three of the OSC work teams? All right, and then does anybody have any other business?

Yes, Tony?

Tony: Just thinking about going forward, it appears that in some of the working groups they've got more work to do than others. I'm just wondering about the future schedule and the way that the OSC would work, because it would be useful to understand what the timelines are now for finishing some of this work. If it's proven that the problems are pretty insurmountable, we may need to think about setting a deadline where the issues that people are struggling with are referred back to the OSC, where perhaps we could give some guidance on how to proceed.

For instance, if there are specific issues which are proven problematic, it may be useful to have a report put forward with the work that has been agreed up to that time, and maybe a separate report detailing what the issues are that they can't resolve, so that we can deal with that. I wondered if we could think about doing that, maybe having some form of a hard-line date when we can do such a review.

Chuck: Would it help- thank you. I think that's good. Would it help to have each of the Chairs of the three work teams maybe give us what they're projected timeline is right now- I don't mean today- I mean in the next couple of weeks, and then see, because some of them may be close to finish, and may not have- that's why I'm thinking that may be helpful to have, and come back and revisit what you're talking about as maybe an approach in cases where it's needed? Would that be helpful?

Tony: That would be ideal, I think, Chuck.

Chuck: Okay.

Philip?

Philip: I support fully that suggestion, both of them, and indeed if there is certain work to be completed, or even if this is a group that feels that it has done all it can do at that level, because certain decisions may simply need to be elevated to Council to take, if they become that type of decision, to have that clearly indicated to us, and for the Chairs to indicate their own estimate of expiry of the group, I think, as we see that we can shut down these groups that will be the way to indication of process, of progress.

Chuck: Thank you. Anything else? Okay, thank you very much. Meeting adjourned.