

Transcript

21 June 2009 Face-to-Fact Meeting in Sydney, Australia at 1515-1645 (0515-0645 UTC, Saturday, 20 June at 2215 PDT, Sunday, 21 June 0115 EDT, 0215 Buenos Aires, 0615 London, 0715 Brussels, 1100 Karachi, 1030 New Delhi, 1400 Tokyo)

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you for joining us on a Sunday. Is someone else on the phone?

>>SS KSHATRIYA: I think Mark, I heard. I did hear his name.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: I cannot hear you very well. Did you say Mark? Mike? Okay.

>>SS KSHATRIYA: Maybe Mike. Yeah.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Someone else on the phone? Okay, if someone else is joining on the phone, please, just let us know. interrupt us once you get connected.

And thank you everyone in the room and those on the phone for joining us on a Sunday. I appreciate that very much. Luckily, I have my computer because that Wiki there is so far away. I cannot see what it says. But okay. So we're -- for you, SS, we're not here. But our screen is quite long for my eyes, which are not very good. So I'm lucky I have the Wiki open on my computer.

Thank you very much for joining us this Sunday. We just had a few minutes delay because there was another meeting here in this room. So I apologize for that. But we were already in this room before starting. And sorry for letting you waiting there, SS, on the phone.

>>SS KSHATRIYA: Doesn't matter, Olga. It's only 10 minutes. It's Father's Day here and some celebrations. Just to wish all the fathers who are there and would-be fathers to this Father's Day.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Oh, it's Father's Day. You're right. We're so much immersed in this meeting that I forgot. So for those fathers here in the room, have a good day. Chuck?

>>CHUCK GOMES: Yes, I want you to know, SS, that I received a call from my youngest granddaughter and my daughter wishing me a happy Father's Day just a few minutes ago.

>>SS KSHATRIYA: Whole morning I've been talking to my children and grandchildren. I have quite a few of them.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, SS for reminding me that.

Okay. So we -- we have our group here. SS once you have to leave, just do that. And appreciated your joining us even that it's Father's Day and you're far away and on a Sunday. Okay. Thank you.

>>SS KSHATRIYA: (Inaudible) Even after I leave it.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: I cannot understand what he says. Okay, we start. Thank you for joining. I sent the agenda a few days ago. I hope that

you have received it. Anyway, Julie uploaded it into our Wiki page. I would like to make presentation or what you think? They present? Okay. Who is joining with us today and in the room? Perhaps we can start with Tony.

>>TONY HARRIS: I don't have too much detail to report today other than the fact that we have a meeting scheduled with Julie Hedlund and Krista Papac. You're in front of me.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Tony, you present yourself so we know who's in the room. And then we'll ask what you have to do and what you have achieved.

>>TONY HARRIS: I thought you wanted my report. Okay. I'll backtrack then and rewind.

And my name is Tony Harris. I'm from Argentina, Argentine Internet Association.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Chuck Gomes from the U.S. and here as a member of the team.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Olga Cavalli from Argentina. NomCom appointee.

>>JULIE HEDLUND: Julie Hedlund, ICANN staff.

>>RON ANDRUFF: Ron Andruff, business consistency and member of the GNSO operations work team.

>>CHRIS CHAPLOW: Chris Chaplow from the business constituency and communications work team.

>>CLAUDIO DiGANGI: Claudio DiGangi, member of the IPC. >>MICHAEL YOUNG: Michael Young, member of the registry constituency.

>>KRISTA PAPAC: Krista Papac member of the registrars constituency.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much. Okay.

We'll start with the agenda that I sent. If someone wants to add something to the agenda, please let me know.

The first point that I wanted to review with you, it's a result of a Doodle poll that Julie sent in relation to which procedure we want to follow about staff informing us about board activities. And, Julie, could you please make the update about this Doodle poll?

>>JULIE HEDLUND: Right. So we had eight responses to the Doodle. And there were three options. It was whether or not to add the -- add a report on relevant activities as a standing agenda item, whether to make the report as there are new developments available or whether or not to make the report prior to each meeting. The poll, there were five votes in favor of making the report prior to each meeting and there were three votes in favor of making the report as new information is available.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: So the idea would be -- so we have five for provide reports prior to each meeting. So, if there are new things coming from the board, you -- you staff would make an update to the group? That's the idea?

>>JULIE HEDLUND: That certainly would be fine. And I would just

note that in some cases we might have to say that there was nothing new to report. But we could certainly do that prior to each meeting.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. Any comments about these changes we are doing, improvements that we're doing to our meetings? Okay, Julie. Thank you very much for the Doodle.

Rafik is sending me an e-mail that he's on the phone.

Rafik, are you on the phone?

>>RAFIK DAMMIK: Yes.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Great. Thanks for joining us on Sunday.

In a call that I couldn't attend because I was traveling and that Michael was so kind to chair, you -- and I heard the MP3 recording -- you decided to change some ideas about best practices in relation with the functioning of constituencies. As far as I know, I haven't, as a chair, received any feedback from you. I would like to know if there was a some misunderstanding of this task that was agreed in a call, if there is something that will be sent soon, if -- I would like to know the comments of the group about this. Because we extended -- we even extended the time frame for the due date in our last call. But I don't recall receiving any feedback from any of you. So I would like to bring this point. Because I'm a little concerned about the feedback we're receiving from constituencies and U.S. representatives. So I open the floor if you want to comment about this. Chuck, you want to go first?

>>CHUCK GOMES: Sure. I wouldn't be alarmed. It's just been a couple weeks since we sent it out to the constituencies. And I know in the case of the registry constituency we're going to talk about it in our meeting on Tuesday. And --

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Sorry, Chuck. We're talking about a different issue.

>>CHUCK GOMES: I'm sorry.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: There was a call on the 5th of -- I was traveling. I was in Europe. And Michael chaired the call. It was at the beginning of May. I think it was the 8th of May. And you agreed to exchange in between one or two weeks some best practices.

>>CHUCK GOMES: You're on best practices. My apologies.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: We had first one deadline for exchange of ideas. And we extended it two weeks more. But, as far as I know, I haven't received your comments. This is what I was wondering if we could exchange some comments about. No comments. Okay.

>>CHUCK GOMES: I'm not the lead of our team. So I'm confused what you're waiting for.

>>JULIE HEDLUND: This is Julie. With respect to task four, we had confirmed with Olga that the best and worst practices didn't apply because there isn't currently a toolkit procedure or toolkit available to constituencies. This is really a new concept. So the best and bad practices applied to whether or not we could pull out some ideas from reviewing the constituency and stakeholder group charters to see what might be recommendations we might want to make as far as things to do

or not to do related to our work plan. That was my understanding.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Michael, perhaps you can share with us what was the genesis of this idea. Because I didn't participate in this call. And maybe hearing the MP3 and the minutes of this meeting, I'm missing something.

>>MICHAEL YOUNG: I'm trying to recall exactly how we ended up on the subject. But the idea came out of some general conversation. I think we were at the time talking about or one of our favorite subjects, and that was the staff reviews of the charters at the time. And because we were talking about these proposed charters that were coming in and comments were coming back, we evolved into a thought that maybe there would be some gains to looking at these new proposed charters and this work that was submitted to see if there were any elements that we thought were good that we could extract and use them as potential recommendations across the board for all groups. So, if one particular constituency or stakeholder group had come up with a really good idea that we thought was usable across the community, then, you know, why not use it rather than try and invent it absolutely from scratch?

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Yeah. I understand that. But we are not receiving a lot of feedback. So I propose the following: Let's keep this idea of exchanging best practices principles and let's review our work plans and the things to produce as outcomes and see if we can merge these two things and forget about the deadline we had for this exchange of ideas about good and bad practices.

Any comments about this? No? Okay. I would like to review with you now our work plans. We have some dates there. We have some -- could we put this in the Wiki? I have it open in my computer. Please remember that we agreed about task one and the different subtasks which are one, two, three, and four. We divided ourselves in subteams, and we agreed in doing and developed different things. We had subtask one. We had a team led by SS with Victoria, Rafik, and Claudio. We have subtask 2. We had Victoria. Victoria is not on the call, right? I haven't heard about her. Julie, she's not on the call? Okay. No problem. We have subtask 3. Krista and Tony. And then we have Julie and Chuck in subtask 4.

I would like to exchange comments with the different leaders of the subtask, if you have improved, if you have difficulties in doing your job, if you have achieved something. And it is another point in our agenda how are we going to make outcomes of our work and our analysis. Please remember we have very useful information in two documents produced by Julie.

By the way, I would like to again thank Julie. I have said this to her yesterday. But I would like to point my thanks to her because she has been extremely helpful in all this work that we have done in our working group. We have those documents produced by her that already have comments from some members of the working team. And, SS, are you on the line? Okay, SS is not here.

Claudio, have you worked with SS maybe? Maybe you can give us some update about subtask 1. How are we? Do we need help? Do you -- could you review the documents that Julie prepared? Could you give us some feedback about it? Because we have a deadline of June -- 20 June that it's already past. Thank you.

>>CLAUDIO DiGANGI: We -- as far as I know, I have not -- I am not

sure what work SS has put forward on this one or task 2. I mean, I saw that the work that Julie circulated. And I think those are great starting points.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. SS sent already some interesting analysis about your document. Not exactly sentences or recommendations but some analysis that he already did. So maybe we could exchange with him some ideas that we have thought for how to move forward. We have another team led by Victoria. Unfortunately, she's not on the call. She already did a very detailed analysis about the documents that Julie produced.

(Speaker off microphone.)

Sorry? Krista and Tony.

Now, Tony, you have the chance. Sorry it was confusing how I started the meeting.

Can you tell us what you have done? I know that you have arranged some meetings during this Sydney meeting to -- in order to review your subtask 3 about the database for constituency members.

>>TONY HARRIS: Well, actually, I think I should defer to Krista. I'm the alternate here. But would you like to say something? Or -- okay. Fine. So, basically, we thought, you know, rather than try to do this by e-mail or phone calls since we were all going to be here in Sydney, we have scheduled a meeting for tomorrow with Julie and with Krista to look at this -- at this subject of the database.

>>JULIE HEDLUND: Actually, the meeting will also include Ken Bour on the ICANN staff who is quite knowledgeable on the -- on information services within ICANN and will be able to speak to the issue of the membership database. And Rob Hoggarth will join us as well. That will be at 10:00 tomorrow morning. And I have secured a reserved room for us, and I'll send that around to you.

>>TONY HARRIS: Yes. I think I did express on one of the phone calls a little concern I have over this -- the whole idea because I remember the days of the general assembly in ICANN in the initial two or three years. And the idea of really ample and sort of open participation in mailing lists and discussing everything, developed into a bit of a nightmare of submissions particularly from some people who had nothing else to do with their lives, I think. I'm not sure if that will produce a lot of productive outputs for what's intended. And then, of course, the matter of privacy was also raised when you're talking about a database. But, anyhow, we'll have a chance to discuss that and report back when we've had our meeting tomorrow.

>>KRISTA PAPAC: The other thing I would just add is we -- I'm also scheduled to talk with the chair of the registrar constituency. And, you know, we need to also think about talking to the other constituencies about how they currently manage their member list, which is sort of one of the other tasks on here to again gather their practices and see what challenges they've had. I know privacy comes up in a number of areas in the ICANN space. And I'm, you know, guessing it's going to come up here. But at least we can gather that information and then decide how helpful it is in addressing this subtask.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Yes, Chuck. Go ahead.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Just a comment. And I know both of you know this very well. But just remember that members are defined very differently in different stakeholder groups. And so you're probably not only talking about a member list but maybe membership delegates. For example, in the case of the registries, it's registry operators that are members of the registry constituency, not individual people. And probably what we're talking about here is delegates from those members in the case of us. And it may be the same for ISPs. I don't know. So, just a caution, to remember to make that distinction when you're looking at this issue.

>>KRISTA PAPAC: So meaning -- clearly, I understand what you're saying as far as the member is in the registry case of VeriSign or dot mobi or NeuStar. But I think also you're going to have a primary contact that's associated with that. And you're saying just to be clear that you have the member and then the primary contact as --

>>CHUCK GOMES: And it doesn't just necessarily have to be primary contacts either, depending what you decide to do or recommend or something. The point is, whereas, I might be a contact and Michael is a contact for Afiliias, that's probably more what you're looking for here than Afiliias and VeriSign as who are literally the members. The companies are the members.

>>KRISTA PAPAC: I think we want both though, right?

>>CHUCK GOMES: Probably and possibly. That's something that's going to have to be decided. Keep in mind this is an idea that was put out there. Tony has already communicated some reservations there. And we could -- you know, you guys could decide to come back and recommend to this full working team that, you know, we don't think this is a good idea, or we think it should be controlled this way, or here's how we should handle privacy or something. So don't think this is -- and, Julie, correct me if I'm wrong. But I don't think this is one of the absolute board recommendations. This is an idea -- one idea that was put forward as a possible fulfillment of a board recommendation.

>>JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah. Chuck, that's correct. I mean, it's developing recommendations for creating and maintaining a database. Those recommendations might be very minimal. Or perhaps, you know, it could be a different way to address that particular recommendation that I think has just more to do with knowing -- being able to access constituent members and being able to access constituency members. Stakeholder group members too as well.

>>CHRIS CHAPLOW: Chris Chaplow, if I could just drop in. From reading the LSE documents and so on, there was one thing that did stand out. I know it was only a recommendation, but I think it was quite an important one. Thanks.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: I personally find it -- sorry, Krista, I just have one comment -- I personally find it useful. But I know that there are some concerns about databases. And people that really experienced as Tony already has pointed this out, so perhaps we reach to the idea that it must be limited or not necessary. Krista, I'm sorry I interrupted you.

>>KRISTA PAPAC: No worries. Coming back even around to what you're saying, Chuck, I mean, there's a number of reasons I think you are making that distinction, but is it less challenging from a privacy perspective if it's a company that we're naming off rather than a person, meaning it's VeriSign rather than Chuck Gomes or --

>>CHUCK GOMES: I think it is.

>>KRISTA PAPAC: Okay.

>>CHUCK GOMES: I think it is less challenging.

>>KRISTA PAPAC: I'm just closing the circle of thought in my own head.

>>CHUCK GOMES: The intent of my statement, though, was -- be careful how we word it. You're talking about more than a membership roster. You're talking about a membership roster and member delegate roster, probably, I don't know what the best term is to call it, but that's all I was saying, okay?

I noticed even in -- in one of the things that this group has done is to review the -- staff reviewed our charters, proposed charters and so forth, and one of the things that they said was, is that the registry constituency charter, or that the registries did not publish a list of their members. Well, that was an inaccurate statement. We do. But they were looking for people names, they weren't looking for company names who are our members so...

>>KRISTA PAPAC: Okay, thank you.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Okay, thank you very much. And then we have seas (inaudible) -- Julie, I understand that this letter about the ICANN staff support was already sent to the constituencies. We're still waiting for some feedback. Could you give us some comments about that.

>>JULIE HEDLUND: Yeah, we did send it out to the constituencies and I think that Chuck was addressing this earlier and I can refer to him on this but there have been a lot of activities going on recently and so it's perhaps not that surprising that we haven't gotten responses from the constituencies to our request concerning the tool kit. And I guess I would wonder whether or not it's worth to wait until sometime after Sydney and send a reminder or just assume that maybe people will get back to this after Sydney. Chuck, do you have any suggestions?

>>CHUCK GOMES: Well, first of all, keep in mind I think we gave a deadline at the end of July.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Yes.

>>CHUCK GOMES: So there's no need for alarm right now. Like I told you with regard to the registries and maybe other constituency representatives here today can give us a quick update in terms of their area, but it's on our agenda for our meeting Tuesday. And we -- I briefly mentioned it in our call a couple weeks ago for the registry. So -- and it may be, because keep in mind, staff did a good survey on this and it may be that people don't have many additions to it, that's a possible outcome. But I think maybe after you give people a little time to settle down after these meetings that it would be very good to send a reminder.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Great idea. So we can send a reminder after the meeting. Any other comment about subtask four, Julie, that you could give us.

>>JULIE HEDLUND: Okay I don't have, I have anything more add but we can wait after Sydney for a reminder after we've given people time to settle back into their offices.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much Julie. And any comments, any comments from people on the phone, Rafik, something to comment?

>>RAFIK DAMMIK: No.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. So I would like to share some ideas that we've been talking about with Julie and with Michael about how to move forward and I would like to refer -- this is point five of our agenda -- I would like to refer to the charter that we that we approved and we agreed to do is that we should develop proposals for council consideration, recommendations for improving inclusiveness, effectiveness and efficiency of the GNSO constituency and stakeholder group, operations and their interactions with other GNSO structures. Outreach efforts, broader participation, you remember our charter. What we did some -- a while ago, please remember, we started in Mexico at the end of -- February? We have been working for three months. And we should start to build these sentences, to find these recommendations, to build our outcome. So we have exchanged some ideas and Julie did a great job. We -- I sent it to the list maybe two hours ago. Some examples of how we could go through the document that she prepared and try to extract some sentences that are relevant for trying to set up these recommendations that we should do. Let me try to find this e-mail I sent to you, for example, in subtask one which is develop recommendations for a set of participation rules and operating procedures, so it's really related with participation and constituencies and stakeholder groups, stakeholder groups develop recommended framework for participation, what Julie did, she went through the document and she extracted some -- some sentences that are relevant to all the charters that are reviewed in the document. Which, for example, the constituency stakeholder groups should provide guideline rules, participation in the constituency and stakeholder group including participation, qualification, recognition, structure, rights and responsibilities such as participating in policy development and elections, publicly available information about membership, eligibility requirements, application procedures, application decisions, clear avenue appeal for application rejection including reviewing by a neutral party, a consensus-building mechanism for policy development including procedures for recording minority -- mi- -- oh, minority positions -- sorry for my English -- did you receive this document I sent two hours ago? This is an example of what I think that we could start doing, sincerely talking to you, I think this division in smaller work teams and this work plan is not moving forward. I don't see outcomes. So I would propose that we restart our work having this idea in mind, trying to find, going through the document that Julie prepared, trying to find sentences for building our draft document about recommendations. Perhaps we could again review who is in charge of which part of the document, who is in charge of which subtask and try to find the sentences in reviewing the documents that she prepared. Is this a good idea, do you think this is feasible, do you think it's a way to move forward? Tony, go ahead.

>>TONY HARRIS: Well, first of all, I'm not quite sure which document this is.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: It's an e-mail I sent to the list two hours ago.

>>TONY HARRIS: I got your e-mail but when you're referring to the Julie because I have several from Julie.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Julie prepared two documents, I have hard copies here, if you want I can share them with you. Maybe we can give copies

to the --

>>TONY HARRIS: That will be very useful because I'm not too sure what it is.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: I think they are very useful documents. They are two big tables. She went through all the charters of the different constituencies and so she prepared a table with -- with the task and subtask that we should write about and make our recommendations, and then each of the columns refers to a different constituency. But she went further than referring only the charters. She also did something which I think it's very useful in referring the subtasks that she's talking about, she says that if it fits the criteria or if it doesn't fit the criteria. So she made a first yes or no analysis, of course, from her perspective and we are here to discuss if we want to enhance or change this, it's just a food for thought, this document is just the beginning of our discussion. So I would recommend that we should go through this document and try to find the sentences for perhaps each of these boxes, each of these rows in this table and try to identify these different principles that we should find.

What I would like to stress is the value -- thank you, thank you so much, Julie. The value of you that work in different constituencies because you have the experience, you have the -- you know which is the dynamic of your working groups, of your constituencies, so this feedback is relevant. If I review the charters that I don't work specifically in any constituency and I've been involved in the GNSO for maybe one year and a half, I may not find just using my common sense useful information as an outcome. So I would rather work with you but not leading this work because it could not make a real outcome. So how do you suggest to proceed. Any comments? Any ideas? How could we divide this task that we have to face?

>>CHUCK GOMES: Olga, which task in particular are you talking about?

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Something that we have been discussing with Julie and also with Michael today and yesterday is that we should start to define some sentences, some text that is related with the outcome that we should produce which is these recommendations that we describe in our charter. Maybe I'm wrong. This is why I'm bringing this issue to you and exchange some ideas. Am I clear, Chuck, or did you receive the e-mail I -- that I sent two hours ago?

>>CHUCK GOMES: Yes.

>>MICHAEL YOUNG: Olga, maybe I should try and --

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Please go ahead.

>>MICHAEL YOUNG: Yeah. I will -- perhaps not diplomatically enough but I'll cut to the chase, really, with this. You know, we try to organize our work around these subtasks. And to provide leadership for each subtask. And in a couple of the subtasks we've had progress and people have made headway. And I think that that's really great to see. In a couple of the subtasks -- and I'm not sure we have any answer at this group right now why -- we've made little or no progress whatsoever. In fact, one of the leaders of the subtask groups isn't on the call right now. So that makes it very difficult to understand what's going on there.

At some point we're searching for an answer to how to move forward to move forward on those subtasks that we're not making progress on and I

think that's where our concern is. One idea, just to push the progress forward, is to ask -- and I don't know if this is the subtask leaders because we haven't necessarily had enough leadership from those subtask leaders in some cases, or progress, and I'm not questioning why they haven't progressed, they may have very good reasons why not that I'm not aware of, I'm just noting that we haven't progressed, we need to progress. We're not making distance here. We're going to end up slowly down this entire process unnecessarily and the suggestion is really that we start to get some recommendations down for the -- within the subtasks and even if they are frankly pulled out of other charters, out of proposed charters, out of people's raw ideas, that's fine, we need to get something down on paper in these -- within these subtasks so that we can, as a group, start reviewing them commenting on them and start building some real recommendations. Really what we're talking about is just draft recommendations. For each of these elements say, for example, take subtask one we would expect in each of these bullet points a minimum of three raw recommendations. And then that starts a discussion point. They can be taken from proposed charters, they can be taken from other people's best practices, it really doesn't matter where they come from as long as they're applicable and useful.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Thank you. And the reason I was somewhat confused is because this is coming across as a task for all of us and I was wondering which task you're talking about. It seems to me -- I mean, what you're saying is absolutely right. We need to track progress and make sure people are making progress. But wouldn't it be more effective to suggest what you're suggesting to the leads of the individual subtasks rather than talking to the whole group as a whole? You know, do we have subtask leaders that aren't going to be able to do it? We should find out whether they're going to be able to do it and at the same time give them some suggestions like you're doing. See, I was listening to it, okay, so Julie and I are working on a task and I'm trying to figure out, okay, now, how does this relate to me? Because you're at a high level. It probably helps to communicate the message that I now am understanding from both of you to the subtask leads and see, now, has their ability to do that changed? If so, we need to regroup. If not, here's some ideas that can help -- does that make sense?

>>MICHAEL YOUNG: I think that makes perfect sense, Chuck. And, you know, we've tried to reach out to everybody who has deliverables. And in some cases, you know, the answer is I'll have to shift the date. And I don't know at what point we can start saying as a group, well, we can't keep shifting dates so can we delegate or transfer that responsibility to somebody else? I don't know. But we need to do something.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Chuck, if I may, I'm so sorry, I didn't meant that your subgroup didn't do the job. By the way, it's all done and perfectly achieved. Just a general concern that we, Julie, Michael and myself have shared. And the idea of bringing it to the whole group is just to exchange ideas because maybe I'm making some mistakes in proposing some ideas and perhaps you think this is not right and there are other ways to face the issue, the task that we have to do. So -- but I agree with you that the leaders should say if they are going to commit to the task that they have agreed or not. Any other comments from the group?

>>CHUCK GOMES: Just this -- and I think that you and Michael as chair and cochair, vice chair, you know, it's okay for you to make a decision that if you're getting unresponsiveness from some work team members, to, you know, just be a little bit aggressive in terms of,

okay, if you can't do it, just let us know and if they're still not responsive then I think it needs to be brought back to this group to see, okay, can we get some other volunteers for this or something. So if you have to get, you know, do more on your part, I think it's okay for you to do that if it becomes -- if it looks like we're just not making any progress in some area 'cause I understand the awkwardness of your situation. That's the problem with volunteer-type groups, right? But feel -- I would encourage you, to the extent that you judge necessary, to go ahead and, you know, suggest some changes if you're not getting anything back.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Chuck. I'm thinking about two different issues. One, if -- is -- just let me tell you that Michael and myself already sent e-mails, personal e-mails, to all the leaders, so we have gone through that process somehow. Maybe we should insist more.

So one thing would be if the leaders have the time and maybe they want, really, to commit to this task that they have to do, and other thing is sharing -- and this, I would like your feedback -- if you think that this -- the revision of this document that Julie prepared, having in mind, trying to find this general principles and sentences that are relevant for each of the constituencies, you think it's -- it's a way to start preparing our -- some outcome from our working team, this is something I would like your feedback and sharing with you this idea, maybe you have another idea or some other way to do it, this is something I would like to -- your comments.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Well, first of all, it depends on the particular subtask. But I think you have to be careful. Our task, as a working team, is not to recommend elements of charters. So first of all, we need to understand that it's not our role to evaluate charters. Now, that said, we should still -- I mean, there are elements in these that are good practices, that's why we were doing the best practice things and things that we may want to recommend aspirins, as best practices or whatever, but specifically related to the board recommendations. So we should always be working from the specific board recommendations in terms of what we pull out of there. It's not just enough -- it's really easy to get confused with a document like this that, okay, let's evaluate whose charter's right and whose charter's wrong, that's not our role. But there are things in here that are good, that might be good principles for the whole -- you know, to recommend. Now, we always have to understand that each stakeholder group, each constituency's going to have its own variations and that's healthy, that's not bad. But there are areas of common interest and to the extent that we can find those as they relate to a specific board recommendation, which we organized our tasks by, right, is -- is good. I don't know if that's helpful or not.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: It is, at least for me, very much helpful. Yeah, the idea of reviewing the different charters was not to repeat things that are in the charters but to try to find this information that comes from the context of the working dynamic of each constituency. That's the idea, I think, that we should work on.

Well, how could we achieve this? Should we still keep this task, subtask structure, should we change it? Should we go to each leader and subleader of the different subtasks and see and get some feedback from them if they're going to achieve something or -- this is something I would like to share with you. Michael, perhaps you have some idea to share with us?

>>MICHAEL YOUNG: Well, listening to what Chuck has said, and thank

you, Chuck, for the support, I really -- we really appreciate that. And considering that, you know, I'm looking at this subtask structure and in terms of dividing up work, it's logical, it's rational. I think that's why we did it in the first place. I think the problem is that we haven't had the responsiveness we wanted to see on all four subtasks. We've got two lagging behind, frankly, and rather than change the whole work structure or the plan that we've done we should address the real problems Chuck said and we'll go to the individual subtask leaders and if they can not make the dates that the group feels is reasonable for the work then we'll ask for other volunteers. I think that's a reasonable approach. And, you know, I -- it's nothing to be said for, as I said, the subtask leaders that maybe have not proposed what we had hoped to, everybody has day jobs, everybody is well intentioned here. And there may be actually work surrounding this we're not aware of that has slowed them down so that's something for us to clarify one last time.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Michael. So we have four different work plans. And what we're referring specifically is subtask one and two so we could contact Victoria and SS and check with them, we could do that, Michael and Julie, with private e-mails, not going through the list, and see if they can catch up with the -- with what they committed to. Chris and Tony, is that okay, if you keep working with your subtask three, is that find for you.

>>KRISTA PAPAC: I'll speak for Krista, I'll let Tony speak for Tony, but I will be sort of forthright where I'm one of the people that has lagged and I had some -- took on a little more than I can handle but I will also say that I feel like between the meeting we have set up tomorrow and some of the other things I have going on this week that I think we're going to go from zero to, you know, 75 much -- in a very short period of time and we might have started slow but I think we're going to get caught up and -- at least that's my intention and looking forward to Tony's help and if he agrees with that.

>>TONY HARRIS: Yeah, I think that's exactly what I feel. We'll catch up tomorrow. How's that sound? Is that too far in the future?

[Laughter]

>>CHUCK GOMES: Yeah, could you speed it up?

>>MICHAEL YOUNG: That works for us, yeah. Krista, I thank you for that. The point is you're commuting that and I think a few weeks when you were trying to wind up some items I think in your schooling you were quite straightforward about it and the group understood and I think you communicated when you're able to apply for time to it. That's a meaningful thing, we can work with that, it's when we don't know what's going on that creates the problem.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Tony and Krista. Let's do the following. We will contact Victoria, SS and the rest of the volunteers for the subtask one and two and see if we -- if they are going to commit their work or if we perhaps talk with the group if we need to find some other volunteers or perhaps constituencies good, perhaps point some other people working in the work team to do these tasks, which is not easy, Tony looks at me like what are you asking for, Olga, this is kind of difficult. But, okay, let's do that. And after Sydney, after we return to our homes, or maybe during this week, what do you think, Julie, could we do this, talking -- sending e-mails to SS and to Victoria or do you think it's after, after Sydney?

>>JULIE HEDLUND: I think, I mean, I think it's most appropriate, of course, to have the e-mail message come from you and from Michael. I'm certainly happy to assist with that. And this week, if you would like.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. I don't know, we are all very busy this week. And we'll see. We can check. If we are able to do this week, the e-mail is fine. If not, we can do it once we return to our regular jobs.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Olga?

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Yes?

>>CHUCK GOMES: Just a question, maybe a comment. Have you been getting responses to e-mails? And then I lead into the comment. If not, you may at some point want to make a phone call. Now, I know that's hard with the different time zones. But we deal with that all the time in this world. So if you're not getting responses back on the e-mail, it might be good to just do one of you, probably don't have to be both of you, if you want it to be both of you and can do conference calls that's fine but at some point it might take -- if you're not getting e-mail responsiveness -- now, there can be some special circumstances going on, too, so all you want to know is communicate with us, let us know if that's the case. So I just would suggest, e-mail's great, some of us really use it really well and effectively, some people don't. So...

>>MICHAEL YOUNG: That's a very good point. Thank you, Chuck.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Chuck. And we'll do that. First an e-mail and then maybe a phone call. And I agree with Michael that Krista was very clear that she had some commitments and thanks to urgent and very important in her life and that's fine but she communicated and she has started working so that's the kind of feedback that we need so we know how to plan our work. So we will do that e-mail and if not a phone call. I can draft that with Michael and perhaps we need some -- we'll request some help from you Julie or not, we will see.

Any comments about this? Any other ideas of -- this revision of the document prepared by Julie is my idea, really. Maybe you have some other ones. How to exchange experience about your dynamics of the constituencies, how some other ideas that you have to start writing some of our outcome text. No problem. If you think that you have any idea you can share it with us in our list. But please feel free to criticize me, if you don't like the way that I think maybe you didn't like it and it's fine, tell me, "Olga, you're wrong, and we think it should be done another way."

What I would like to do is just to bring ideas to move forward.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. Any other comments? Any other business? Great. I think we're done.

>>TONY HARRIS: I'd just like to thank Olga and Michael for being so patient and being so perseverant, and I think you'll see some better results now. And I think your suggestions here were good, by the way.

>>OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Tony. Thank you for being here on Saturday -- Sunday and on Father's Day. And we keep in touch through the list. Remember to check the Wiki and remember that we are able to change the Wiki. We have edit rights, right? So if someone is so courageous to change the Wiki, just do it, change dates or put some

information. I use Wikis a lot with my students. I find them really very useful, but not everyone likes to work with Wikis. So thank you very much and we'll see you around.