GNSO
Operations Steering Committee (OSC) GNSO Council Operations Work Team 15 April 2009 at 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee (OSC) GNSO Council Operations Work Team teleconference on 15 April 2009 at 15:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ops-20090415.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#april

(All MP3's and transcriptions can be found on the calendar page).

Participants present:
Ray Fasset - Work Team leader Registry c.
Tony Holmes - ISPCP
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben - ISPCP
Ron Andruff - CBUC
Ken Stubbs - Registry c.

ICANN Staff
Julie Hedlund
Glen de Saint Géry

Coordinator: Excuse me, this is the operator. The call is now being recorded.

Woman: Thank you very much. Then Ray shall I go ahead and do the roll?

Ray Fasset: Yes, please.

Woman: Okay. Thank you. We have Ray Fasset, we have Ron Andruff, Tony Holmes, Wolf Ulrich Knoben and Julie Hedlund from staff. Is there anyone I've missed?

Ray Fasset: Okay. This is Ray Fasset, the chair of this GNSO work team. Oh and I think we do have a new member to the group and I wanted to make sure that I mentioned that. Eric Brunner Williams has joined our team.

He is not on the call today but my understanding is he has joined - officially joined our team.

Ron Andruff: Well, Ray in that regard, may I just - it's Ron. May I just as a question?

Ray Fasset: Sure.

Ron Andruff: We have on this team quite - a number of individuals who are listed.

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Ron Andruff: But I'm just wondering if in fact they realize that they are on this team? Vis-à-vis (Robin Gross). I have not heard her or seen her at any of our meetings. (Unintelligible) was on one call as I recall but we haven't heard from Yoav Keren for example.

Everyone is aware that they are on this team and that they've (a part of the) team I'm assuming. But I don't know if anyone's sending their regrets if they're not making the calls. So it would be helpful to know if in fact they are on - they're going to be participating with this group or not because we just - we seem to be getting a very small number of people on the call and we have very serious work ahead of us.

Ray Fasset: It's a point well said, Ron. There are members that are signed up and not even sending regrets if they can't make a call. I do find that personally disappointing.

Ron Andruff: Yes. As well and I'm wondering if we might just - you as a chair perhaps might through Julia or whatever send a message out to those who have not - (Robin) is an example. And I'm not picking on her just

to say - if someone from the MCUC can join the call and participate with this work, it would be very helpful. If she cannot, simple as that. Because we had a number of meetings and no response at all from these certain individuals and I think it's very important.

Ray Fasset: M-hmm.

Ron Andruff: I would hope that we get (Ken) as well on this call, for example, because of the - him and Tony are the only ones with a long history in terms of what the GNSO was an in terms of what we're trying to turn it into. So it would be helpful if we could have the benefit of those.

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Ron Andruff: And to just do an outreach to see if we can get more - get this to carve this into stone for the next call if possible.

Ray Fasset: I agree. I think it's a good housekeeping issue. Julie, would it be possible for you to send me the email addresses of everybody that is signed on?

Julie Hedlund: Absolutely. And I'll be happy to do that and also I should note that I do list (Jim Starr) on the work team that he had indicated that he was at least now not going to be able to be part of the team. I had not taken him off of the list because he hadn't specifically asked to be taken from the list but then again he certainly could be so at least we don't have the expectation of him joining.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, why don't you go ahead and send me his too. Everybody's on the list now. I'll reach out to (unintelligible) and see if I can get

confirmation on that. Obviously I'd like to have him stay in but if he doesn't want to then, well, you know.

Wolf Knoben: May I just comment on that? Because I was wondering sometimes too some of the minutes from other groups and I see it's not only the problem of this group. It's the problem of different groups and it may be that the list is not up to date, members. Not up to date.

So it means on the one hand I understand that in the past already people have been (announced that they are) to participate in this and it was just one but there are two on the list. And then later on some constituencies decided okay other people.

So let me just come back to it. We (as the head constituency as the ISP) (unintelligible) it would come up within some days and confirm our members to the different groups. But again so that you are really aware who is doing what and who is a member of which group. And maybe from ICANN it should be let me say asked for to the different constituencies again. Just to update.

Ron Andruff: Excellent Wolf. Ray I - I have a hard stop at 12 o'clock unfortunately today.

Ray Fasset: Yes. I think we should try to keep the call to an hour and the only other housekeeping issue I wanted to address is this particular call has conflicted with the registry constituency biweekly call which - (Ken) for example is going to have difficult time participating today. So my request is to change the hour to you know one hour back from what it is now.

Ron Andruff: One hour earlier?

Ray Fasset: One hour later. So right now it's 15:00 UTC, I would ask for it to be 16:00 UTC. Or we change the day.

Ron Andruff: Later than this time doesn't work for me unfortunately on Wednesdays.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Ron Andruff: Thursday would be fine.

Ray Fasset: I like Thursday.

Glen Desaintgery: Ray this is Glen.

Ray Fasset: Hello Glen.

Glen Desaintgery: Hi. Sorry, I was - there was another call going at the same time. Can I send out the (doodle) because there are a number of calls running during the week.

Ray Fasset: Right. Yeah, even if we just - you know my conflict with the registry constituency is just that it happens to fall at the same time of the biweekly. If this was you know one week off, you know it could stay Wednesday at the same time but then you know we have to get it staggered so it's you know...

Glen Desaintgery: Okay, would you like to call in biweekly or would you like to keep it every week?

Ray Fasset: No, I think biweekly is...

Glen Desaintgery: Biweekly? Okay then we stagger it so that it doesn't fall on, for example, the 29th is that correct?

Ray Fasset: That's correct. So it does not fall on the 29th. So our choice is either is do one again on the 22nd and then two weeks after that or to go three weeks, which I don't think it's a good idea. So...

Glen Desaintgery: Okay, so if it could stagger it it would work for you.

Ray Fasset: It would.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay, I'll do that. I'll try and do that.

Ray Fasset: Does anybody else have any objections to that idea? So in other words we're planning already to have a call next Wednesday the 22nd.

Ron Andruff: I think it's a good idea.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Woman: I should mention unfortunately Ray I will be on a plane at that time next Wednesday.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Woman: And I believe (Rob) is as well. We'll be coming back from California. So that would be a bit of problem unless we did switch it to Thursday.

Ray Fasset: Thursday the 23rd does work for me (me and Ron Andruff's calendar).

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, but before we say that can we just see what else is on that Thursday because I've got (doodle) that for times on that Thursday.

Woman: I thought perhaps, Glen, the way we could do a (doodle) and try for next Thursday and see what people think?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Okay, I think that's a good strategy.

Tony Holmes: Yes, just on this issue of trying to keep track of everything, we just had a nice PCP call and trying to keep track of what was going on across the (space). Is there any chance on the ICANN site we could actually have maybe a weekly posting of what groups are holding calls when? Because it gets hard to make other arrangements without knowing the full picture.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay, Tony, but do you know the GNLS calendar?

Tony Holmes: Yes, is it on there?

Glen Desaintgery: Everything's on there.

Tony Holmes: In one place?

Glen Desaintgery: In one place, yes.

Tony Holmes: Okay, I've missed that. Then okay, thanks.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, everything is on there. I'll send you the link.

Tony Holmes: I'm okay. I've got the link. I hadn't picked up that all the information was available there. So I've got that. Thanks Glen.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay.

Ray Fasset: Okay, do we want to move into the agenda? We've got 45 minutes here.

Ron Andruff: Let's go.

Ray Fasset: Okay. The you know the first item here is what I proposed out there to be high level GNSO council operating principals. I think the good news to that is Ron Andruff has put together a really well thought out document. So I'm going to ask has everybody had a chance to read that document as yet?

Man: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Okay, with that said, I would like that Ron if you don't mind, give an - understanding that everybody has read it, to give a brief overview of what you're thinking with this.

Ron Andruff: Certainly Ray. Thank you very much. I - first of all I'd like to say I've mis-titled this, and I think that may have brought some confusion to the community at large by calling it GOT Recommendations dash final doc. It was my final draft, not the final draft of course. So I do want to go on

record noting that this - these are just recommendations put forward to the group.

I did a little canvass - little quick canvass internally with a number of colleagues from the community to get some feedback from them and their thoughts. And one of the things that was screaming out was the fact that the amount of work that has to be done and the few individual with which - that are saddled with that burden, really it makes it very difficult for others in the constituency to kind of keep up with what's going on.

Because those who have been given all that work both from the policy side and administrative side you know plus their day jobs aren't able to get out the information to the community as best they could.

And that also then serves to create a not only a more poorly functioning organization, but actually an organization that's weaker in the eyes of the board and so forth. So the idea of this - putting forward these ideas and they're simply ideas, was to try to break the groups into - break it into two groups with very specific activities.

In the past -- and Tony correct me if I'm wrong -- but I would think that most constituencies sent their best bulldogs into fight to win the day for their constituency vis-à-vis whatever that policy issue was. As opposed to coming in together in a collegial environment and saying okay, we all have to find common ground here, let's look for the highest consensus we can find here you know as opposed to fighting for my own turf.

So what we're - what I'm describing here is policy officers or counselors as more working in an environment of management and coordination. And then the other side of that is you know operating - you know look into - now we move to the other group with what I call the constituency representatives who are basically dealing with the day to day management of the operations outreach meetings and so forth.

Right now what we've got are people who are dedicated to the tasks. The ones who are doing management or administration type of people. The ones who are doing policy are the policy wonks that we all know and do the job really well. So this was really the thinking.

The third group in there, what I've called the (Ex-Com) is really a gathering of a handful of people from both sides, the counselors, the (smart task) constituency reps, the chair, the vice chair just so that there is some coordination happening at the top of the GNSO. Vis-à-vis all of the different work groups and things that have been going on.

So this was the thinking, and so really the body of what I'm trying to say is in that first point number one. Qualities (accomplishes) tries to explain a little bit more about what the nature of the individuals are in terms of doing the different activities and that we would you know hope that the (GNSO) would try to get this message out to the stakeholder groups and so forth.

The third the policy (counselors) manager mandate was really again this idea of transitioning from voting on policy to managing policy development. And then the final element the idea of the suitable well supported issues process kind of deals with the other document that we received from the ICANN board of recommendation and that has to

do with the idea of developing - defining and developing the scope of responsibilities of other standing committees as recommended by the (BTC) working group.

And this says - underneath that rubric it says analyze trending and changes in GTLD arena and as a consequence provide advice on the use of ICANN resources affecting the GTLD name space, begin a constructive dialogue with a broader range of Internet stakeholders in order to fully understand the DNS related technologies, trends and markets. And then finally establish committees of 4-5 members to guide work in certain areas where focus, attention and followup are required such as benchmarking and trends analysis.

So that fourth point really speaks to both kinds of things that we need to start thinking that (GNSO) needs to start thinking about how do we set up groups to address issues that need addressing that are on the horizon. These are not things that are on us right now but things that - where groups would be given consideration to these things that are on the horizon before they're right in our face and we have to deal with them as an organization.

So again, just some ideas to try to get the ball rolling and to give some place for dialogue. There's no - what would you say? There's no owner or authorship here. This is really trying to just get the ball rolling.

Ray Fasset: Thank you Ron. I - again, I think it is a well thought out comprehensive document, while brief you know, while fairly brief. I think lots of what's in here crossover into many aspects of our charter. Whereas high level principles I think are you know just that real high level things. I think

we've gone a step further to our benefit to delve into some more areas that encompass our charter.

There - is there anybody who has any comments on that document.

Wolf Knoben: Yes.

Ray Fasset: And please state your name first.

Wolf Knoben: Yes, Wolf Ulrich speaking.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Wolf Knoben: So, one - well I really appreciate such a comprehensive paper you know because it's so clear on the one hand about your idea and what you are focusing on. And so I'm sorry that I had only time and a little time really to go into details and to offer these (cuts) with other people. And so it may be that many questions come up at the time being which it may be clear to you. So, but anyway.

On the one hand it's very comprehensive and I appreciate that. And it's - the first question would be from me, what is the status of this paper? Is that your personal opinion at the time being? Or is it an opinion from the (BC) which you are pretending here? Or what is it about? That's the first question I have.

And then I - by reading that paper I was asking myself how this potential structure that is related I understand that it was the to content to the task of the (unintelligible) council. How that fits - could fit into what has been (followed) by the let me say started to be - to get

established, but (divided between two houses) and so on you know? So I'm thinking about how this could fit together or is there any fitting together? Or is it a new idea or what was behind that?

Then the --

Ron Andruff: Let me respond to those first two things if I may, Wolf.

Wolf Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: So, the first - as for the first question was this a document that has been reviewed by the BC or other bodies, the answer is no. What I did was after our first meeting I submitted a kind of a report on our call to our community and then asked for any input and for anybody who wanted to join. I think this will surprise all of you, I received no feedback and no arms in the air to join. And then so I started to do some homework on my own.

So the result - the resulting document was that. Again, it's - but it's now as I understand it - as I posted it yesterday to the BC to see if I could get some reaction from the members and to see if there were any comments.

What I have received in the mail this morning, and again it's still pretty young and a lot of people haven't had a chance perhaps to read what I've written, but there's some questions coming back from within our own constituency from Philip Sheppard has posted a number of questions about this and there's been some dialogue I understand happening. Philip forwarded the document to other members of the

Commercial Stakeholders group, the leadership to (Steve) and to Tony and a few others.

So there is dialogue on it now.

Ray Fasset: I think that's great Ron. I was going to cut you off there.

Ron Andruff: Yeah.

Ray Fasset: You know that's what we need and if you got something going here I just want to compliment you on that. So go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Thank you. So all - this - I just wanted to finish that statement by saying that this was the purpose of it, to be a catalyst. So unfortunately it's been - a misnomer, I didn't think about it at the time but I think that may have a few peoples' knickers in a twist. But that's not meant to be so and I'll try - I'll be clarifying that both on the BC list and I sent a message out to (Steve), Tony and others responding to that today.

So the point here is that if we can get more people talking about it and discussing it and that it can lead to the kind of structure we might have within our commercial stakeholder's group, that the two might parallel each other I think might be very beneficial.

But the whole point here is that we need to get more fresh blood into the leadership position.

Ray Fasset: Yeah.

Ron Andruff: And the only way we can do that is to create these kinds of mechanisms. And so while there's no - kind of difficult to pull that - you know, let me rephrase that. We can pull high level principles out of what I've written there I'm sure if we all put our minds to it and think about it.

Ray Fasset: Sure.

Ron Andruff: But ultimately it's to really give us a basis of thinking both within the commercial stakeholder's group as well as at the GNSO level that these things are kind of working together. Now we all know we're working in these siloed environments. There's all these different work teams and steering committees and so forth, doing a lot of things that are overlapping each other. So that's why it's - in some ways it's comprehensive and in other ways it's a little more vague because we need that input from the various groups.

Wolf Knoben: So I understand. You're - just the (main message) of that paper is what we should focus on in the future is that counselors should be, let me say, the main brain of the counselor should be - its major task is policy development.

Ron Andruff: Yes. Scoping issues really, really sharply. Yeah.

Wolf Knoben: And this is because in the past the load of additional work - administrative work which is done - which has been done by the (council) has been increased more and more and we should find a solution how to separate those or how to withdraw that load from the (council) itself.

Ron Andruff: That's exactly right. Put the administration on staff and work really
                 hand in hand until the policy council is scoping it and defining what's
                 the work that needs to be done by dividing the work teams, letting staff
                 manage the load.

Wolf Knoben: Okay, then my question is really what could be the right solution to do
                 so. So is it the right a complete solution a good solution to let me say
                 to separate it by organization - to establish new bodies for example?
                 Because that is what is in the paper to establish new bodies.

                 To do that work for example or could it be managed in different way for
                 example to (restore) that load from the council. I don't have a final idea
                 about that but I'm only asking is it the right way to establish new
                 organizations, new bodies as we have still lack of people within our
                 contingencies for example and in others as well doing this work.

                 You know so this is a great question for me for the future. How shall
                 we fill up positions?

Ron Andruff: Well if I may the - it's a valid point. A very valid point. And I think
                 anyone who is doing the work that we're doing or working in the
                 counselor's position recognizes that we are a few. But the view is with
                 this reform is that we're reshaping ourselves.

                 If we had a committee of a - within the CSG the Commercial
                 Stakeholders Group, that is made up of two representatives from each
                 of the each constituencies, six people, who are solely focused on
                 outreach. Solely focused on outreach, both in Sydney and in Seoul.
                 And you know wherever the next meetings take place, where instead
                 of just having you know 12 or 15 people new faces in the room from

the local community we actually have 200-300 come out to a major event that we host to talk about what is ICANN, the importance of it and so forth.

You could start to see there's a possibility for that if you had a committee of six people working on this for the next six months.

Wolf Knoben: ;Yes.

Ron Andruff: Point being is right now we don't have anybody doing that. We're doing this ad-hoc, you know we did a little bit here, a little bit there and we get a few new members from here or there from time to time who might get excited about the prospect of what ICANN means, but there's no concerted effort.

And in like manner as well as there's no concerted effort in outreach, there's no concerted effort at looking out on this horizon issues and saying let's put together a team, a task force. You know, bring together a technical person, a legal person, an intellectual property person. Whatever those different types of skill sets are to go and chew on this for a while and kind of bring something back to the community that we can start to understand and address appropriately.

So this is it. So yes, in the short term we will be short handed. In the longer term if we're doing this right we should be seeing a lot more fresh faces in the group and more thinking.

Wolf Knoben: Well, just for (today's occasion) are we just talking about the CST part of the council or...

Ron Andruff: No, I'm talking about the whole thing. But I'm saying that the two
                   should reflect. I'm hopeful that the two would reflect you know that the
                   GNSO would be reflected in the CSG. That we would end up with a
                   chair and some vice chairs and so forth. And those individuals may
                   well be officers in policy or they may be administration people,
                   constituency reps.

                   So people might wear two or three hats. But you know in my view I
                   think this a kind of a program that could be applied to both the
                   Commercial Stakeholders Group as well as to the larger GMSO.

Wolf Knoben: M-hmm.

Ray Fasset: Hey Ron, this is Ray. Let me focus in on one sentence that I do you
                   know, that I keep looking at which is division of GNSO responsibilities.
                   And then it completes with ensures that appropriate individuals are
                   selected on the basis of particular skill sets to serve independent
                   bodies in representation of the respective constituency.

                   I think that's a really a well said sentence there. I think it is consistent
                   with you know the ideals put forth in terms of this whole reform
                   process. But let me ask - let me just ask this. Division of GNSO
                   responsibilities is a little different than who does what.

Ron Andruff: Well -

Ray Fasset: I like the concept of - first let's define what the responsibilities are of
                   the GNSO and then let's divide them up.

Ron Andruff: Agreed.

Ray Fasset: Now, whether we need different people doing those responsibilities, is I think is what Wolf might be asking. And then of course where do we get those people. But I think first though is this concept that you've raised, which I think is a good one, of divide up the responsibilities so that it's more - it runs more efficiently. Is that correct.

Ron Andruff: Absolutely. I mean if I look at my own operations here, and you gentlemen are familiar with my colleague (Cherion Matie). (Cherion) is financed based, he's operational based, he's legal based. I - none of those are my skills. You know operational to a certain extent, but none of those others are my skills. I don't want to know about it and I don't do it.

And so you know Mr. (Matie) handles all of those things for our company because his skill set is completely suited to that whereas my skill set is completely suited to something else.

So this is the point and it's the very most basic, simple point. Don't send me to do policy because I am not a policy guy. I don't understand policy. Marketing, development, business, that sort of thing I understand well. But policy I don't understand the nuances. You know certain words that a policy individual will know in a heartbeat that there's a vast difference between those two words.

So it's really about making sure that the skill set that everyone has are appropriately applied to appropriate tasks.

Ray Fasset: Right.

Ron Andruff: That's why at a higher level aspect of this, the separation part and who does what, that's what we're suggesting that the GNSO could sort out.

Ray Fasset: Oh.

Tony Holmes: Ray it's Tony. Sorry to interrupt. I've just had a text message. My wife's been involved in an accident and I need to get along to the hospital. So I'm going to drop off the call, if you...

Ray Fasset: I'm sorry Tony. Good luck.

Ron Andruff: Good luck.

Tony Holmes: Thank you.

(Ken): I hope everything's all right, Tony.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes. Whew.

Ron Andruff: Well, that's a shocker.

Ray Fasset: Welcome (Ken). I think I heard your voice.

(Ken): Yes. I've been on for a few minutes Ray.

Ray Fasset: Good. Oh, we all wish Tony the best on that one.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Okay. I think part of what you're describing would actually fall under if we look at our charter, if we go back to the charter, kind of falls under team membership. It - part of your document Ron is it really does sprinkle across the charter. So yes, I agree with that that some of it, you got to - you know we can fit into where they belong and I think this does fall into team membership.

I like this idea that you've introduced of division of GNSO responsibilities and focusing in on. I mean I think it's worthwhile. I wonder though and I'm going to point this question out, do we first have to define what those responsibilities are and then look to divide them?

Ron Andruff: Well, that's - if you want to talk about a higher level principle, we would say in our view it's - this is how it should go. And we throw that ball to the GNSO to sort out. That's one way of doing it.

Ray Fasset: Yeah.

Ron Andruff: Another way is we can take it down. We can become more granular and say that the work product of this team was such and such. And then it gives very specific direction to the GNSO and send that back to the constituencies and get their approval on that rather than you know throwing the monkey out to the GNSO's back where they get their first day they have to struggle with determined who our membership is.

Maybe it starts with our GNSO - or I'm sorry - starts with our SG Stakeholder Groups coming back and giving us their input on this and saying this is how we want to see it. Then we turn it back and say okay

this is our recommendation to the you know GNSO board or whoever, to whomever we're actually responding with this information.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Ron Andruff: Maybe you should go that way and then to the GNSO is what I'm trying to say.

Ray Fasset: M-hmm. I think that makes sense. (Ken) what's your thinking on this concept of division - I'm probably catching you midstream I know you just joined, but the concept we're talking about is division of responsibilities. Instead of a counselor serving one stop having to be involved in the actual policy work and also trying to get outreach and basically be - having to be everything there is that has to do with the GNSO. We divide - we put together sort of a principle that says divide up the responsibilities for greater efficiencies.

(Ken):   Yeah, well I think from a practical standpoint we've had that engrained in our procedures in the past. The problem is that a lot of people just are reluctant to give up that responsibility because if they view it as a sign of weakness or they can't find anybody to delegate it to. But we've always had the ability when we've formed working groups and so forth to delegate that to another representative.

                  I think one of the most important things is doing like Ron indicated and that is acknowledging the need for that. I think that politically the best thing to do would be to let the council deal with that issue in a way that they're comfortable with politically. Yeah, we can tell them what we think needs to be done, but I think you're going to get a lot of push back there.

So from a practical standpoint, you know...

Ray Fasset: To identify it but then have the council address it, if you will.

(Ken): Yeah. Yeah, I think it's very easy to task the processes that the council's been doing over let's say the last two years which would bring it to the how would I put it, the modern era. And take a look at which maybe stratify them in terms of skill sets, like Ron was talking about. You know there's specific skill sets that are really needed and you know it always amazes me.

I'll give you a classic example. The council has been dealing with these travel subsidy deals. Okay, in the last two months there have been more emails back and forth between council members on travel subsidies than there were in equal two month period at the height at the new gTLD PDP.

Now you begin to look at something like this, and you start to question whether or not this organization is operating efficiently. If every single person has to get involved in a discussion like this, whether or not it is impossible to task that operationally to somebody who can make a concrete proposal and bring it back up and let the council deal with it politically.

Things like that are perfect examples. It's you know 240 emails on travel subsidies over a two month period.

Wolf Knoben: (Ken), Wolf speaking. You're fully right, I saw that as well, but I'm asking myself whether you could - you could avoid that in the future by

establishing a new body who deals with let me say some formal things about traveling. Because traveling funding is something which you - which touches you personally and everybody is looking for that and has some feeling about that.

So that is an open question for me. I don't have a solution.

(Ken): Yeah, and I understand what you're saying Wolf again. But the only problem is that I think from a practical standpoint that the council could be operating at a much higher level. You know it would be like the I will use in the U.S. as an example, Congress - congressional committees being preoccupied with the type of fixtures that are being used in the men's room.

You know it just to me they have to have enough competence to be able to delegate various functions out to a body who can mange those without you know if you're not happy with the way it's going you can always change the people who are responsible for managing that function.

But the idea that every single council member should get involved in every single decision that's made in every single area you know I mean that's - Ron's point was well taken. You know I mean his relationship with people like (Jillian) give Ron the comfort of knowing that he can concentrate primarily on two things. One being what he does well and number two as the manager and person responsible for the operation of the company. He has an obligation to his operation to make sure he demands accountability and it makes it much easier for him.

And we need to have those kind of efficiencies in the future in the way that the council operates. Otherwise they're going to get dragged off in directions that frankly are not at all efficient and it's a waste of resources and more importantly the council members are constantly reminding everybody how much time they spent. Well my argument is if this is an example of the time that you're spending, you're wasting a significant amount of your own resources on areas that frankly could be used - you could be using your resources more efficiently your time.

Ron Andruff: Well if I could respond to your open questions Ron. Your issue - your comment you're saying you're not sure who should be dealing with it and I agree with that, exactly that point is that our policy (officers) should be working on framing policy discussions. They should be working on scoping the work. They should be looking to make sure that they've got the right committee together technically, politically, financially, whatever those elements might be that are all at that table. That's what we're doing.

They should not be in that dialogue about travel policy. That's exactly what the administration element does. They say there's x amount of dollars, we've got these many people to move around. This one on this committee, that one on that council, etcetera, etcetera. And that's determined by the constituency level, not at a policy level and not by the policy counselors. This has nothing to do with them. This is the whole point. Their job is to go ahead and work on policies, it's not to determine whether or not they get paid to travel somewhere.

The constituency has to deal with that. And they deal with that through their - through the what I've referred to as a constituency representative. So here's - I think the key here is that if I may, we seem

to have everyone moving in this direction of yes we should have separation. But in the interest of time and so forth why don't we take this back to our constituencies and get their input for our call next week and then come back with you know yes, I've got (Brian) on my side. Or no, nobody on our side likes this idea at all. But at least it will tell us where we're at.

I think right now to debate amongst us whether or not this is valid - this is a valid point one way or the other has value, but I don't think it brings in the whole constituency.

Wolf Knoben: Okay. Ron, I have a question with it. You know this idea is fascinating and why would - I'm not - I'm thinking about relationship, a potential future relationship between those bodies and the board. The board level. So what does - what is the board going to see if that much (torture) is going to be imposed? Is the board going to see a council entirely? Or if you're looking at different council groups or if you're looking toward an executive committee which is (dealing) with policy board? Or what is going on in the future?

And the other question is because those things, the policy issues as well as the more or less administrative organization it should have to be also reflected on both levels I think so because the board with regard to financial (attempts) the board has to decide to some extent, yes?

Ron Andruff: Right. So the answer is they see one GNSO just as they do today. When there are policy issues they will hear from the vice chairman - let's say the vice chairman of the executive committee who is

responsible for policy and who will be discussing policy issues and standing up as a representative in that regard.

Wolf Knoben: All right.

Ron Andruff: And then on issues such as travel policy you might hear from the vice chairman of the administration side of it talking to that. But they see one GNSO, they have one policy council which determines policy votes, yes we think this is good and sends it up to the board, so those are all policy issues. And anything else other than that where there are budgetary issues and so forth that would be addressed from the other side.

But clearly it remains the same as it is today but instead of looking to the policy council to say okay, what's the budget for travel for the next year, they're going to get that from the constituency members. The idea here is to create a stronger SO, so that the voice of the SO really has some you know merits some trust and some faith and some understanding from the board.

So today, you know the GNSO is kind of confused. Everybody thinks GNSO is a policy council. It's not. It's a much bigger body but the rest of the body has been somewhat stunted and retarded because it hasn't been given that opportunity to grow and develop. There was never any mechanism for it.

What we're trying to do now is get the other side of our you know our house in order and get people working on administrative issues, get people working on outreach issues, get people working on horizon

issues that we need to be aware of to gather facts and have those kinds of committees established.

So it's the same body, but now we're just fleshing it out in real terms.

Ray Fasset: Okay, this is Ray. Let me ask a question. Julie are you catching all this?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I am. Writing it down.

Ray Fasset: There's been a suggestion made I think by Ron that we could go back to our constituencies and throw the idea out at them. Assuming we want to do that it's best that we're all asking the same thing. So my question to you is can you prepare a brief synopsis of what it is we would ask each of our constituencies about this topic?

Ron Andruff: Who are you asking Ray?

Ray Fasset: I'm asking Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Well I can certainly take, you know I had thought of - you know when this was mentioned I was thinking that what Ron was suggesting was to take the document that he had prepared, retitled as he suggested and as a starting off point to go back to the constituencies. But I'm happy to do a sort of a briefer summary of that and of the discussion here as well.

Ray Fasset: I think what I'm suggesting here is yes, something not quite as granular as Ron's document. But maybe just taking one big bite of it which has to do with the division of responsibilities. And I think if I'm

understanding correctly from Ron it's policy related and administrative related.

Ron Andruff: And Julie I'm happy if you want to cut a draft you know send it over to just you know to make sure that kind of the base thinking is reflected in that. I'm happy to review it and work with you on it if you'd like.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, that would be excellent Ron. I'd really appreciate that. I will then try to roll up that you know pull out I should say that concept of the division of responsibilities from your document. I'll send that off to you so that I make sure that I haven't lost anything in that before we send it around to the team to circulate. And Ray of course I'll have you look at it as well.

Ray Fasset: All right. So we would need a description I think. A brief description, a purpose of what it's for. And -

Ron Andruff: And asking for specific input from the community. Really stated, you know put the question out there. We want your specific input, what you like, what you don't like. Whatever.

Ray Fasset: Should we go a step further too and ask what - who we're asking to or what would fall under a policy and what would fall under administrative?

Ron Andruff: Well, that'd maybe get a little - well there's some examples that are in the document there. But it may get a little tricky if we try to get too granular. I think just basic examples of what you know which falls in each box gives people at least some direction in their thinking. But...

Ray Fasset: Great. Could you put a few examples of those in the summary that you're preparing?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I'll do that.

Ray Fasset: You know just example purposes only.

Julie Hedlund: Right, so that they understand.

Wolf Knoben: It's Wolf speaking. I would appreciate it if it is possible Ron if you know you could add something about you know the hard to say but what I was asking how it fits - it fits to the already existing ideas about the (conference) structuring.

                If it's a (said) that way, does it touch the organizational structure - the new organizational structure of the company which (is at the time being) from the organizational point of view? Or is it - can we take it as they say and say okay, it could be a (council) and that's (not too hard) a structure for a (council) and it's just about the (past responsibilities) within that structure that you are talking about.

                Because otherwise I fear that many questions will come up and they'll fire back - people will fire back and say okay, you've got this new idea. Why should we go that way, we are just talking about this potential new structure and why should we rethink again in this way? So this is I think it's important Ron to have such a kind of indication.

Ray Fasset: Fair enough. Fair enough, and I think when Julie and Ron prepare that first draft you know we'll send it out to the entire group to make sure

we all like what it says. And of course please online, on email, offer comments and edits I think as Ron said, there's no ownership here.

Ron Andruff: Right.

Ray Fasset: And once we're - we all feel comfortable or no one's objecting, I mean I'm going to put it there as the lowest common denominator. You know does anyone object and if nobody responds then we should assume there's no objections because we're not getting a ton of responses, I'm just being honest on things so - on the list.

So and then assuming no objections then I think we follow through with this and take it back to get you know feedback you know. Not that any decisions have been made but we're just looking for feedback.

Ron Andruff: Agreed.

Ray Fasset: And I think if we start here as a starting point and I'm calling it that, I think it does start to flow into the other items within the charter as Ron has even highlighted. Some of the more difficult challenges out there that have been put on our plate that have to do with you know forming (standing) committees and developing trends. And you know how does that stuff get done? You know.

So I think this concept of division responsibilities and then applying skill sets to identifying skill sets and then people to fill those skill sets I think is really right in line with what we need to do if everybody else is in agreement.

Ron Andruff: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Okay. Now how you get there on execution which I think is what Wolf
                was referring to, yeah, that gets tricky. But you know...

Ron Andruff: One step at a time.

Ray Fasset: One step at a time. Let's start here and go from there. Now we're down
                to nine minutes I think until Ron's hard deadline. I think this is an
                appropriate place to start on this. We had another subject matter on
                our agenda today which had to do with the fine work Julie has
                submitted to us. It had to do with the statement of interest and the
                disclosure of interest documents.

                Now given the timeframe that we have I assume we've all reviewed
                them.

Ron Andruff: If I can get into the QA, Ron?

Ray Fasset: Yes, please go ahead Ron.

Ron Andruff: Really good work Julie and Ron. Much appreciated. The only two - I'm
                not sure - you gave a couple of different alternate languages there in
                both the SOI and the DOI which I'm sure have certain - there are
                different - real large differences in there and that's why you've put them
                in there.

                I will - from my point of view, I can go either way with either of those.
                The only issues for me that are interesting are one is that the chair of
                any council working team, committee, whatever, once roll call happens
                that they actually ask for any updated declarations of interest -

disclosures of interest I should say, or statements of interest, just to make sure that it's put on the table right from the get go.

I think that's important. That way people will state their interests because things change and they change rapidly and I can't remember did I send something in or didn't I send something in? So I've asked and something's changed in my life and I need to step forward.

So that's one point. And the second point was that we do need to beef up some language to have stronger enforcement. People need to know this is a serious issue. You cannot be you know consulting a client and you know they're in the background on a major issue if we're going to have any credibility as an organization vis-à-vis transparency. So we do need that - those two parts to be done.

And then the final thing is the statement of interest it says that the GNSO (conference) shall provide a statement of interest. The question is to whom? We shall note in there to whom those statements of interest need to be presented so that in fact there's a clear mechanism for that.

Wolf Knoben: Okay, may I - say something?

Ray Fasset: Please.

Wolf Knoben: Yeah, it's Wolf. Okay, so (I've also) been thinking about that so the consequences let me say according to the level of interest which a person has who is providing an SOI and DOI. So it means - what does it mean? Well I was missing something in that paper regarding the consequences only outlined at the end. You know, that if the - in case

there is a wrong indication is given or the input data are wrong. So that the chair of the (group) should ask repeatedly you know to update (GNSO) and these things, are there any other consequences with regards to the content or to the level of interest that the person has let me say which is applying for membership within a group.

So I wonder if (unintelligible). Some people may have stakes in to - up to a certain level to in any (register) or (registry) company maybe. And ours has lower - less at stake. So the question is what does it mean? To which level - at which level consequence do I? It's unclear to me.

The other question is as a non-US. person, what is the California law about talking so I'm missing an indication of the content of that. And then I have additional question are we talking only about SOIs with regards to the current (unintelligible) as we are - as I'm aware that for example (unintelligible) nominating people for members to the council. They are also asking for SOIs and these are more comprehensive SOIs if I understand. But what is it about? That, those are my three questions.

Ray Fasset: Actually, Wolf, I had a few of those same questions. Especially that last one for Julie. Is the intention here that this statement of interest and declaration of interest are targeted just for the purpose of the GNSO? Not necessarily a standardized document that others outside of the GNSO would also be using?

Julie Hedlund: That's my understanding since this is the GNSO operations team, the SOI, DOI recommendations are just for the GNSO.

Ray Fasset: M-hmm.

Julie Hedlund: And whatever organizations may be formed under the GNSO the work teams and so on.

Ray Fasset: M-hmm. Did that answer that question Wolf?

Wolf Knoben: Yeah, Julie I (showed) that you're understanding so are you really sure?

Ron Andruff: Well and I would say if it's wrong here I would say it's critical that we have it for all - any work teams, any work groups, any committees. It's not just for the policy counselors. It's for all individuals that are working on anything that reflects on ICANN policy.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, anything in the GNSO vertical if you would.

Ron Andruff: Right.

Ray Fasset: Now...

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, and if you -

Glen Desaintgery: Sorry, it's Glen. Just to say that as our statements of interest are indeed for the GNSO and they are quite different and have got really nothing to do with the statements of interest for the nominating committee.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Just in case you wanted to know.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, so I have a high level question here in that. You know, can you use the same ones that are used in the nominating committee? I'm just picking on them because that's the one that we're using. I'm sure the board has their own version. You know every constituency may have their own version, I don't know.

                Like is there one we can pattern that instead of making up our own? That's a high level - that's a first procedural question I'm just tossing out for discussion real quick.

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair and then the group, I beg your pardon, I'm going to have to leave now. But thank you very much for your time. I look forward to -

Ray Fasset: Okay, Ron before you go, what I wanted to say before you left was next week we have a call same time, right?

Ron Andruff: That's right for my side.

Ray Fasset: And we're going to focus the first half hour of that call on this subject.

Ron Andruff: Very good.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Ron Andruff: Okay, thank you gentlemen. Thank you Julie. Bye-bye now.

(Ken): Ray I'm going to have to jump off pretty quickly but I would like to make one comment if I could please. The board's spent a significant amount of time on the conflicts of interest and they had a specific committee that was constituted and did an awful lot of work on this same subject and then come up with some specific documents.

Our opinion is that we should ask staff to request the final report that was prepared for the board which was a public document number one.

And then number two, the related forms that the board members are obligated to complete, and what we could do is have them send them out to us. And I think it would give us some good homework until - and my feeling is there may be a little bit of minor crafting that goes - but there's no reason to reinvent the wheel. Because all of these conflicts of interests issues are and the final word product that was finished was designed to deal with the basic ICANN requirements for transparency public disclosure, everything. You know they covered all the applicable laws, everything. So that's how I...

Ray Fasset: (Ken) yeah, I'm kind of with you on that. I kind of would like to see you know it could be we look at those documents that have been prepared or vetted out or expertise put into it and we look at it and say well we don't need those for the GNSO.

But I think we need to at least look at those and see if they work for us towards the goal of a standardized process. I'm understanding we're within a vertical. I know we're within a vertical. We can't - you know we can't force our will on - outside of our vertical, but if we can borrow from other areas of ICANN towards the goal of standardization it might be helpful. Okay Julie, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, just very quickly (Ken) before you go, to speak to your question about the board and the board process, I'd be happy to get that information and then the report. I did pull in some language from the board conflict of interest that some of that conflict of interest language. However, my understanding is that traditionally the GNSO up until this time had not had a statement of interest or disclosure of interest requirement that was focused on conflicts of interest. It was a less formal type of language.

So I think that I would ask as a team that you consider whether or not you want something that is more formal, along the lines of the board process and I'm - as I say, I'll be happy to get that information for the team to look at. But I'd originally not gone in that direction because I didn't know if that's where we wanted to go.

Ray Fasset: Sure, exactly. And that's - and I don't know either. But that's a good point Julie. So if you could yeah, let's as a group let's look at it so at least we can say later if we chose not to go that direction we could say why.

Julie Hedlund: Yeah, exactly. And I'll do that.

Ray Fasset: Okay, so let's spend - let's look to end this call now, because I know people have to leave and there's only so many of us people anyway. And then plan on the call again, one week from today, the same start time, and we're - let's look to focus the first half hour on this particular subject matter to see if we can get this thing really moving along.

I think Ron did a nice job getting us moving along on other areas of the charter does that make sense?

Julie Hedlund: Sounds good to me.

Ray Fasset: Anybody still on?

Man: Yes. Let's Glen if you can stop the recording I think we'll adjourn the call.

Glen Desaintgery: Do you want the recording stopped?

Ray Fasset: Yes, I think so. I think we're ready to adjourn?

Glen Desaintgery: Operator?

Coordinator: This is the operator.

Glen Desaintgery: Please stop the recording thank you.

Coordinator: Okay, thank you.

Ray Fasset: Okay, thank you everybody and...

END