GNSO
Operations Steering Committee (OSC) GNSO Council Operations Work Team 23 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 23 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:
Please find the MP3 recording of the GNSO Council Operations Work Team teleconference on Wednesday 1 April 2009 at 16:00 UTC at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-council-ops-20090423.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#april
Participants present:
Ray Fasset - Work Team leader Registry c.
Tony Holmes – ISP
Yoav Keren - Registrar c.
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben - ISPC
Ron Andruff - CBUC
Eric Brunner Williams
ICANN Staff
Julie Hedlund
Rob Hoggarth
Glen de Saint Géry
Absent apologies
Ken Stubbs - Registry c.

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Glen Desaintgery: Should I do the roll call for you Ray?

Ray Plzak: Yes. Thank you very much Glen. Let's start the meeting and if you can please

                  do the roll of who is on the call.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you. We have Eric Brunner-Williams: Ron Andrus, EC constituency;

                  Tony Holmes, ISP; Ray Plzak, (Richard's pre) constituency; Wolf-Ulrich

                  Knoben, ISP. And for staff we have (Julie), (Edmond) and myself Glen

                  Desaintgery.

Ray Plzak: Okay. Very good. I appreciate everybody's attendance today. This is Ray Plzak. We're just beginning our meeting. What - today's April 23.

I sent a brief email this morning to the team. Hopefully you've had a chance to read it. Sorry it came out a little late. But it was pretty straightforward and I'll summarize it for you.

I thought, and this is of course open to discussion, I thought we could spend time today reviewing the action items from last week's call which had to do with Ron's - what I - and the more I read, Ron's document, the more I'm impressed with it. His approach, I thought it was a very brave approach and I like it.

And then we asked (Julie) to prepare sort of a summary of that document for the purposes of sending out to the, you know, to broader constituency level on the one hand. But then I think Wolf made a very good point that, you know, let's be sure we follow our protocol to also bring the OSC into the loop for their thoughts.

So there's probably a brief question for us to say okay, should we go to the OSC first and ask their opinion before going out to the other constituencies. And then that assumes that we're comfortable with the document that has been summarized up to now.

And we should come up with a name for this document as well so we don't - sometimes semantics can cause confusion. So let's think about that as well.

So where would we like to start on this document? Does anybody have any thoughts?

Tony Holmes: Right. Can we start by discussing the (document)? I don't think we've had a

                detailed discussion or...

((Crosstalk))

Ray Plzak: Good.

Tony Holmes: ...if we have, I've missed it.

Ray Plzak: Good. No, I think that's a great suggestion. Please go ahead.

Tony Holmes: Okay. I did some questions to Ron in an email but it would probably be

                helpful if Ron clarified a couple of comments or a couple of questions. And

                for me they are when we look at (fitting) this role, are you proposing that

                these functions and you split it into two functions, as I understand it Ron. That

                they are undertaken by people on Council or undertaken by the working

                groups? Where do they actually fit?

Ron Andrus: Tony that - Ron Andrus speaking. That answer is in the draft that was put

                forward. Plus we will have - under the GNSO title we will have two bodies

                responsible for distinct activities.

                So the Council, Policy Council, two representatives from each constituency

                forming the total number that we all know. And then we would have a second

                group, which we'll call our administrative representatives. And the suggestion

                was that we would have two from each constituency as well bring together a

                body of maybe a dozen or so individuals.

                So it's two separate groups. Those two if you'd want to call them houses

                encapsulate the GNSO as a full body.

Tony Holmes: Okay. That's what I thought you were proposing and that's where this gets rather cloudy for me because if you look, even within our charter it mentions that the Council is moving from a legislative body to a strategic manager overseeing policy development.

But both of these functions to my mind are what was proposed by the BTC as a slimmed down Council. Both of those functions fit three and I don't think you're disputing that.

But what we're doing, we're moving from a situation where currently not only is Council the strategic manager in a way that is foreseen going ahead, but it also basically runs all of the working groups and undertakes most or a lot of the work in those groups as well currently.

It's all done within Council. And the thrust of the BTC, and certainly was so for the (consensus) team, was to work on the basis that we slim down Council. We got it down from three members per constituency to two because of that.

What you're actually proposing is slimming down the work, pushing it out to working groups and increasing the resource instead of reducing it. We go - instead of from three to two, we go from three to four. And for me it just doesn't stack up with the approach that was set out by the BTC.

Ron Andrus: Well in response to that it's not that we're - what we've done here is as you said reduced from three to two so we actually have reduced the Policy Council in terms of a role of managing the working groups. That's what Policy Council does.

I'm referring now the fleshing out the other side of the GNSO. The side that deals with new horizon issues that are coming up. Things that are out there in the horizon that we start to address now in terms of gathering information on, in terms of outreach making sure that we've got outreach to span the ranks of the ISPs, the BCs, the IP constituency within the commercial stakeholders group. So seeing from that point of view.

But also you're going to see an expanded ranks within the registry side of the house. You're going to see a lot of those activities going on. So we need to have outreach that's dealing with those kinds of things and expanding those things and thinking about those things.

We need to have other bodies that are responsible for other activities whether they be just the face to face meetings; how we make those more effective when we show up three times a year. And how we can really do more quality work with less time; so all those kinds of issues.

What we're talking about now is just building a group of people that can deal with those things. This has nothing to do policy. It has nothing to do with managing the working teams.

So in line with the BTC we are reducing the size of the Policy Council. What we're doing now is looking at the other side of it in terms of all these other elements I've just mentioned. We have to have human beings focused and devoted to those things and those things alone.

So I don't care how big that group is. But I would think that two makes it easier because if I can't make it, you're my colleague, you can show up on that day. It just - it just lightens the burden for one individual by sharing it over two.

So that's the - that's the rationale behind this is really to make sure we can start to do those other elements besides just looking at policy. We got a - there's a whole lot of things that have to be addressed within the GNSO that aren't being addressed today.

So it's not expanding the Council. It's shrinking the Council and developing another body focused solely on the (finished rate) of tasks.

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: ...of the policy. That would be perhaps GNSO or perhaps our recommendation. I'm not sure which. But that's how I see it.

Ray Plzak: Yeah. I think we've got a good discussion here. Let me go ahead and take a queue. This is Ray. Is there anybody else that would like to...

Tony Holmes: Yes. I'd like to respond on that please Ray.

Ray Plzak: Okay Wolf. Anybody else?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Wolf. Wolf speaking (unintelligible).

Ray Plzak: Oh, was that Tony? I'm sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: Yes, it is Tony.

Ray Plzak: Tony please, and then Wolf and then I'm also going to put myself in the
               queue. Okay Tony please.

Tony Holmes: Okay. I think some of this thing comes down to clarification because certainly
               some of the things that Ron mentioned I think do fall under the (remit) and do
               need to be looked at by this group in the manner that Ron set out.

               But the - I think the understanding is different. To me the paper as it is, it
               doesn't make clear which parts are being covered by Council and which parts
               aren't. So maybe that's just my reading of that. I thought it was some
               confusion there.

               But the other part that confuses me is that we talk about overseeing
               coordination and management. And clearly coordination and management of
               the working groups and their activities has to stay with Council. In fact if you
               take that away from Council, I would argue that they've got very little to do,
               almost nothing.

Ray Plzak: I'm sorry. Can you repeat that? If you take what away from Council?

Tony Holmes: If you take away the coordination and management of the process then I think
               under the new scheme and the way it was set out by the BTC was that was
               basically what their role was. They actually - if you look back at the BTC
               documents, they almost use those same words that's it's for coordination and
               management and little else. The work occurs in the working groups.

Ray Plzak: Okay.

Tony Holmes: Some of the things that Ron referred to I think fall outside of coordination and
               management. And certainly that puts a different flavor on this and for me

makes it a lot more sensible. But to put it - to put another group in place that is looking at coordination and management, which I think is what Council is for, primarily for in the new one, it's where the conflict for me comes in in the current approach.

So maybe it's a terminology thing as much as anything. I would suggest one of the - one of things that we should do before we broker much further on this is have bulleted list of what we think these different groups will actually do because there's a fair amount of confusion on that currently.

Ray Plzak: Very good. Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah. Thank you. Well I have also still my problem that to say (comes from) (unintelligible) text which confuses me as you answer. That may - where my problems come from - my misunderstanding also. Right now so I understand Ron right now. I assume you are referring to the GNSO as (unintelligible) and under the GNSO there should be a new structure.

But in the text (as we all read) described for example. So the - the description the GNSO operations (work) and proposes that a new entity should be created within the GNSO Council.

So on the one hand - so at first we are referring to the GNSO to establish a new structure in the GNSO and then (within) GNSO Council. So it's not that clear to me. So what is - to which part you are really referring? Right now from your work right now I have understood that is distinct.

Okay. The GNSO Council should stay as it is but the - let me say the (administrative work) should be done from it - from the Council and should be

allocated to a separate group which may be - it matters not a Council group but it's a kind of working group or a sub group (unintelligible).

So that was not that really clear to me. And it's not that very clear in the text.

Ron Andrus: Chair. This is Ron. If I could respond. That's a typo. That's an error. That should be - that sentence should read the GNSO Operations Work Team proposes that a new entity should be created within the GNSO...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ron Andrus: ...to take responsibility for the separate and unrelated set of functions.

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: That's an error and I'm sorry. I didn't catch that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So right now that means - so the understanding I have right now is also that you will - you think okay the Council should stay as it is but function of the Council - shall be part of the function which is administratively or strategically or what else is related should be drawn from the Council and should be allocated to the other group which is a - maybe a working team under the Council or what's - what else. Okay. That's a separate step to talk about.

Tony Holmes: Can I (be in) queue on that point Ray?

Ray Plzak: Is this Tony?

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Ray Plzak: Yes. Please go ahead Tony.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Now if Wolf-Ulrich is correct that the proposal is we have a sub team
                  of Council, I think it becomes easier to understand. And the point I was
                  making that the coordination and management has to be done by council. If
                  the proposal is that it's a sub team of Council that does that rather than all of
                  Council then I understand it in a different way.

                  But that - I wasn't of the view that that's where this was going. I thought what
                  was being proposed was a separate group which would be comprised of
                  people in addition to Council because that's where you get the two plus two.
                  So for me that's the key point. Maybe Ron could clarify that.

Ron Andrus: That - you got it right Tony. That's how I see it. Again, it comes back to the
                  division of two separate groups. Administrators are great administrators.
                  They're not necessarily wonderful Policy Officers. And policy people are very
                  focused on drafting good policies and may not be good administrators.

                  So this is not a subset or a working group of Council. Councilors are busy.
                  They need to focus on policy and on policy management with the working
                  groups. We will have lots of working groups doing lots of things.

                  This is one of the concerns that I understand from people and I - and it's a
                  valid concern that there may not be enough bodies to man all the - all the
                  barricades.

                  But the reality is that we have to have a Policy Council that is very focused on
                  developing and managing and streamlining the policy development process
                  with working groups and then doing outreach within their constituencies to

build those working groups and getting the right people on those working groups and managing that.

It's a second group of people that mirrors the first group that's responsible for administration.

Tony Holmes: But - if I may come back on that. Just to come back. Even when you're explaining role of Council, you use the role, sorry, you use the words coordination and management. And that's exactly what Council should do. So I don't see...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: A policy Tony. Only policy, not - Council does - let me put it this way. How much time as a Councilor did you spend - and I shouldn't be so personal. How much time would a constituency spend on actual outreach versus policy?

I would venture to guess 2% of their time. Maybe 5% of their time was looking at anything other than policy because the amount of policy work that you're doing as a Policy Officer is inordinate.

Tony Holmes: Well we're back to terminology here Ron because coordination and management we spent one hell of a lot of time in Council on that. And the primary role of the Council now is on coordination and management.

As soon as you start talking about things like outreach then I agree with you. I think that that probably doesn't need to fall under Council and a separate group would be useful.

But every time you use this word coordination and management, that's exactly the role that Council has in the new structure. And it's this terminology that's causing me the problem, which is why I think it would be worth trying to produce a bulleted list of exactly what these two different entities would do. And then I think we - whatever we call them; at least we'll have a common understanding.

Ron Andrus: I agree. I agree with the principle and I think that's exactly the way we should go forward. But I want to be clear when we say coordination and management of what because it's always going to be coordination and management depending - in both regards whether it's administration or whether it's policy; coordination and management of policy development or coordination and management of administrative activities.

Now however the list gets divided up, who does what, that's less relevant to me. What's more relevant is keeping Policy Officers focused on policy development while Administrative Officers make sure we expand the ranks of our organization on the whole - as a whole. As one element of things that they undertake.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: Maybe if we look at what they did Ron in terms of a detailed list we would be able to seize on the right terminology from that.

Ray Plzak: Yeah. Let me - let me help out here. This is Ray. And much of what's being discussed are really a lot of - a lot of things I have in my head. And I think the beauty of what Ron has put forward is that it has us focused on the concept of separation of duties which then leads us to this concept of role definition

where, you know, we're now to the point of - which I agree of now actually coming up with what are the tasks.

You know, what are the tasks that fall under this concept of coordinating policy management versus the tasks of those? And then of course matching skill sets to those tasks of administrative duties. And I think that's a worthwhile exercise.

As I read Ron's original document, I'm reading about what - about how he envisioned the Policy Council and was describing this Policy Council and I was saying to myself as I was reading well that's what I envisioned the GNSO Council to be.

Okay. And then I got into all of these administrative things that was bring brought out in that document toward the idea of separation of duties. And I'm thinking yeah, boy, there's a lot of stuff here that could be interpreted or could be looked at as these are - these are things that just distract from the overall goal of keeping the focus of the GNSO Council on policy.

So my - where I'm going with this is I think we're all relatively in agreement that Ron's description of the Policy Council is good. I think we're there. It's the concept of the other - creation of the other subcommittees or work teams or whatever we want to call them within the Council that we're struggling with. Is that fair?

Ron Andrus: No Ray, and sorry to say that so strongly. This is where most people - and I myself was one of them. We understand when we hear GNSO that equates to Policy Council. But that's not the case.

The Generic Name Supporting Organization is supporting the ICANN process on all fronts. One front is policy development of which the Policy Council is responsible.

The other activities that fall under the GNSO banner that are getting short (schirffed) or not getting addressed at all is establishing a group that addresses that. They are not under Policy Council.

There's the Policy Council and then standing right beside the Policy Council is what we'll call the Administration Group.

Ray Plzak: Okay.

Ron Andrus: And then - and then on top of that and this maybe will help kind of shape this a little bit. On top of that is an Executive Committee. Who is the Chair of that Executive Committee? By vote of all GNSO members is the Chair of that committee. Then we have a Chair of the Policy Council.

Ray Plzak: Right.

Ron Andrus: Then we have - that sits underneath the Chair of the GNSO. Then we have the Chair of the Administration Group that sits right beside the Chair of the Policy Council.

Ray Plzak: Right. Right. I'm...

((Crosstalk))

Ray Plzak: ...understanding.

Ron Andrus: No. No. But this group then can work together to try to come forward with
                recommendations if necessary as to who does what. But when it starts - when
                we start to - you know, the - when the EXCOM sits down together and
                discussion where are we at, the Chair of the administration side will say well
                we've got all these things and oh by the way, it's been raised that there's this
                horizon issue out there. How are we going to deal with that?

                The Chair of policy might say well, you know, that's something that fallows
                the policy. We'll develop a committee internally within the Policy Officers;
                Policy Council to address this horizon issue, to gather information, to
                disseminate to the community, the larger community, so we can give thought
                to what this thing coming down the road looks like. So we can start to address
                it before it's on us like a bad rash and we can't get rid of it.

Ray Plzak: Right. I'm hearing your view and I'm good with it. I mean you're identifying
                that there is to be this Policy Council and then working alongside them are
                these other two groups. And they are to work in unison, work collegially all
                that. I understand that.

                What I'm saying here as a group amongst ourselves here in this work team, I
                think what I'm hearing is that we agree on how you're describing the existence
                and purpose of this Policy Council. But we're not - we're not there yet.

                We're not there yet on these other two groups without some further
                understanding of what these tasks or role definition would be if - and I think
                I'm hearing that from Tony and maybe even a little bit from Wolf. Is that - is
                that an accurate portrayal?

Tony Holmes: Ray, if I could just ask a question on that. When Ron explained that this time,
                I started to draw a sketch and it seems always difficult...

Ray Plzak: Yes.

Tony Holmes: ...when you're not together. But I heard Ron mention an Executive

                Committee. And then if I understood it right the Policy Group and the Admin

                Group on two levels below that. Now at the moment all we have under

                recommendation is the election of a number of people to the Council. It's not

                even on a constituency basis particularly. It may be to start with but that could

                change depending on the number of new constituencies.

                But we will have a - we will have a Council that's erected. And if I understood

                Ron right there not sits about that an Executive Committee. And I didn't

                understand who would be on that or how it would relate to Council.

                And if I understood Ron right, we have a box at the top that says Executive

                Committee and we have two subcommittees below that. One dealing with

                policy development and I think that Ron equated that currently to the Council

                and then this other body sitting alongside it that is admin.

                So already all I've got is a box that says GNSO Council policy development

                with two people elected to under the current structure that's being set out.

                There's no executive committee and there's no admin. So as soon as you look

                to do that, you're actually increasing the overhead on the constituency because

                you need to get people in at the executive level and at the admin level.

                Now have I understood that right? Maybe you could come back on that Ron.

Ray Plzak: That's a good question. That actually came up on email too. We were battering

                that idea around. So maybe Ron you could address that one. You're back on

                the spot here.

Ron Andrus: Sure.

Ray Plzak: Is that the hierarchy that you're seeing?

Ron Andrus: Yeah I think - I think Tony - I'll just restate it again and so we're all clear. So yes we have a box at the top that says - and in that box it says GNSO. Okay. Now coming down below that you will see another box that will say Chairman, Chairperson GNSO.

                Below that box you'll see on the left hand side Chair Policy Council and then Policy Council also in that same box. And then on the right on the same level below the executive, the chief - the Chairman of the Executive Committee, you will see the Chairman of the Administration Group.

                So what you have here is - the only difference we have Tony is we've added one individual that will be coordinating - that will be voted by all of the GNSO to be the Chair of this body just as a coordination function. So we have someone that's basically - there's a last stop there that someone is dealing with all of these issues at some level at the pinnacle.

                And below that you'll have two - one Chair of the Policy Council and one Chair of the administration side. So all we've done now is added two people. A Chair of the GNSO, which we've never had before and a Chair of the Administration Group.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: You've added two people Ron but beneath those people has to be the Councilors to facilitate them. So you're not...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: Not Councilors, Officer. Councilors we're going to reserve for Policy Councilors.

Tony Holmes: Yeah.

Ron Andrus: And Officers, Administration Officers. Now they may be one person or two people. I'm recommending two just to lighten the load on one. But those individuals - let's say that, you know, it becomes a group of 12.

Those individuals are tasked with what was noted in the document that (Julie) circulated and it says include but not limited to outreach supporting a program planning function in support of ICANN face to face meetings, guidance on website enhancements for the GNSO web pages, general policies that are cross cutting across the SO. Policies and not policies as in Policy Council development policies, but just issues that will affect our SO on the whole.

New constituencies coming in. How do we deal with that? Someone needs to take that one and lead that discussion. It's not the Policy Officers because the Policy Officers got into work team, the working groups. So that's what this body does.

So it's this kind of idea. Travel reimbursement. That should not be the discussion of the Policy Council. They should vote on it how it goes down but the discussion should be within the larger body of the GNSO. Let the members determine how that money should be used, not the ones who actually are getting the money now to travel.

You see to have the very people voting, making a vote on how they're going to spend the travel reimbursements when that money goes to them doesn't make any sense at all. There's not transparency in that. Let the community decide.

If there's X amount of dollars, so much will go to our Policy Officers travel, so much will go to our Administration Officers to travel, so much will go to this one because of a working group or team he needs to meet face to face.

If these are things that aren't being covered by - or if they're being covered by ICANN particularly but if they're not being covered, these are things that need to be addressed within the community. And that's what this body does.

So yes there's a few more people and yes there's a new head of the GNSO but that's a titular head to coordinate functions.

Ray Plzak: Okay. I have a suggestion for the group. Would it enhance the document to add in this sort of flowchart, org chart to the document for people to visually see what's being textually described?

Man: Yes. Sure.

Ray Plzak: Okay. Let's - Ron you're the impetus here but I think you can work with (Julie) on that one.

Ron Andrus: Happy to.

Ray Plzak: Okay. And...

Tony Holmes: Just a comment Ray.

Ray Plzak: Yes. Please do.

Tony Holmes: I think we have that structure now almost but it's just in - at a different level
                  because for instance, Ron drew out the travel issue as something that could go
                  under this new group call it for now admin or whatever you want to. But it
                  wasn't the council that was working on travel issues, Ron. What council did,
                  we set up a working group. It was comprised of counselors, but it was
                  basically a subgroup of the DNSO and that's how we did the travel today.
                  And...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: But that - my point Tony, travel - the guys who are spending the money
                  should not be the guys making the decision on how the money's spent.

Tony Holmes: Yes. No, I understand now. But I think it's clearer to me now because what
                  you've done, you've elevated this group and I think this may be the
                  contentious thing for some people, you've elevated this admin group to the
                  same level as council. I'm not so sure that that is appropriate.

                  And the reason I say that is because you mentioned that on - and you gave
                  quite a good example with travel I think that the council shouldn't be doing
                  the work, and I think that's (unintelligible) comment, but they should vote on
                  it. Now if that's the case, this other group, you could actually say this admin
                  group takes the form of a working group below council but it actually does
                  exactly the same roles that you were setting out for it to do.

Ron Andrus: What purpose does that serve? Why are you concerned about these two bodies
                  standing on equal ground? Because neither one has...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: I'm saying that because...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: ...impact the other one for (unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: Well, the reason I say that is because I think for some parts of the community getting this acceptable to them, that would be far more acceptable than creating a new body. The reason is that the council itself is going to be quite a contentious issue as the number of constituencies grow. I think there are a lot of problems around that.

But the functions that you set out, I clearly agree with you. I think there is a need for them to work in the right way and the job needs to be done. Elevating that to the same level as council where you are actually going to have to have bylaws set in place to elect people to that group. Whereas if it was a working group, it could just be done under your specific council in the same way that there will be many, many other working groups. It's a lot easier to actually realize that concept.

Ron Andrus: Tony, with all due respect, this is not a working group. This is a fully functioning - you know, it's like we've got two halves of our brain, a left side and a right side. Right now we're operating with one half of our brain with the GNSO. I'm saying fully flesh out the other half so now we have a fully functioning brain that manages all aspects of GNSO.

It's not a working group. Under no conditions is this a working group. And policy counselors have no authority whatsoever except that vested in them from their constituents. So they're not kings or queens by any stretch of the imagination. They are worker bees that are sent off to do the task of the constituency at the request of the constituency to speak on behalf of the constituency but not to take decisions unilaterally without consulting the constituency.

So what's the difference between that and an administrative person that goes out and says, "We're going to set up this kind of idea. This - we're going to do this big outreach program. This is how it's going to function." They have to come back to the constituency and get approval for that. But there's exactly the same kind of individual, only one's focused on administration instead of policy. There's no reason whatsoever to make this a subgroup of policy council. Policy does not trump administration.

You need both halves to make this thing work. It's a fully functioning object, two sides of a ball. That way it can spin around, it can roll. But if you have one side of a ball, it moves nowhere. It just stays static. The comment that you made actually was very interesting.

You said that you feel that there's going to be a lot of issues around new constituencies coming up and who actually sits on council representing these - the full body. I agree. There's going to be a lot of contention in that area. But why should the contention in that area affect any of the outreach programs, face-to-face meetings, website development? Why should that affect that? It shouldn't. We should have a...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: No, no it shouldn't.

Ron Andrus: We should have a body focused individually and completely on that other stuff so the trains run on time while the contentious issues (unintelligible) have to get dealt with.

Tony Holmes: Okay, this is a really helpful conversation. I think I'm gradually getting that. But this admin body, how would you consider -- well, let me ask you two questions and you may not have the answers to these but you must have an idea. How big would this body be? How many people? And how would you see that being pulled together?

Ron Andrus: Well we could add them up from the point of view that within the CSG we have three constituencies. So we could say two from each one. Within the non-commercial group we have two constituencies as of today, so we could say two from each one. So that's - now we're at ten people. We can say the registries two, registrars two. That puts us at 14.

            That's just a recommendation. That's not hard and fast. It's just a recommendation. Maybe we come back and say, "You know what, one is enough from each one with an alternate that we can pull on from time to time." So that brings it to a body of seven. My point is that a body of seven probably doesn't function as well as a body of 14 in terms of bringing group mind to dealing with issues such as outreach, such as, you know, website development, et cetera, et cetera.

            All of these issues - the more people you kind of have on a conversation, the more valuable that conversation is going to be. I complained on last week's call that the number of us who get on this call to have a conversation about

what the future operating aspects of the GNSO were going to be was dismally low.

And that those who had to committed, we need to get them on or find others - if they're not going to get on the call, find others to represent them because we need more people to have this conversation with so at least we're not talking to ourselves in a vacuum.

Ray Plzak: Hey Ron, let me ask a question if you don't mind. This is Ray. The idea of having representation from each constituency into this administrative part of it is for balance so that there's, you know, equal representation if you will. Is that the idea of it?

Ron Andrus: One side. One side is equal representation. The other side of that thinking is just to say that we - if you've got a few more people involved. So if I'm, you know, if I go on vacation for the next ten days, all the sudden, you know, the representation of the BC is no longer there for some major impor - major discussion, I'd like to have, you know, someone else from my constituency support - you know, involved in that conversation.

Ray Plzak: Let me - can I ask, is it a reasonable notion to say that because it's really mostly administrative that a single person could do - could go to the constituencies as needed, on an as-needed basis, for an adminis - for this - for the handle administrative issue that comes up?

Ron Andrus: You know, I'm not going to debate that one way or the other Ray. I mean it could be two, it could be one, it could be three. It's really a question of what the - we're supposed to come up with some high-level operating principles. So our high-level operating principle is split the board - split the GNSO into two appropriate bodies and staff those appropriately...

((Crosstalk))

Ray Plzak: Well, no, no, not quite.

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: No, stick with me. Stick with me.

Ray Plzak: Wait Ron, it's not so much splitting...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: Well no, I'm...

Ray Plzak: ...splitting the duties at...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: Yes, exactly. But all I'm trying to say in very simple terms is that our job is to sort of come up and say, "We suggest you should split the duties." Now in terms of voting and making a decision how many those should be, I'm not sure that's our decision.

                But what I am suggesting is that two would be better than one just because it would share the load. If I have someone else who can pick of this call this week and I'll pick up the call next week, makes it easier.

Ray Plzak: Well I'm talking about one person in total.

Ron Andrus: I understand, but there's not - it's impossible. One person in total, that's nuts.

((Crosstalk))

Ray Plzak: No, no, no, but on an as-needed basis. Follow me. On an as-needed basis this one person would then go to the constituencies to...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: You're saying one individual responsible for all these activities, Ray?

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: Or one from each constituency?

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: ...it's along those lines Ron and that is (unintelligible) currently (unintelligible) one of the constituencies. One of the problems that we have is working groups are going to be increasingly important. And I think that's right.

That's where the focus of the effort has to be. So what you need to do is to ensure that you have people representing your constituency who've got the right skills, who are really going to engage in those important debates in the working groups to represent your part of the community.

What - if we go down the path you're advocating, already now we have to put two people maybe up for council, two people forward for the administrative

group. We're already up to four. We haven't even looked at any of the groups who are doing any of the work.

And I know what's going to happen. People will be saying, "Well, I'll do it. I actually want to participate in ICANN and I'll take an active role, but I have day job and I'm already on the acting council so I can't engage in working group."

And the way I think that the focus of the Board Governance Committee were going was to say, "Let's slim down the council and we can have less councilors involved. They can look at the policy work.

They can also undertake the administrative role for managing policy. But the rest of you can engage in important stuff that's being done at the working group level." We're now at the stage where we're doubling that resource and I find that a real concern.

Ron Andrus: Let's not (unintelligible) excuses Tony. There's no - you know, it's - let's - we have no idea...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: ...it isn't excuses at all.

Ron Andrus: No, but nobody has any idea what the future of GNSOs going to look like vis-à-vis the workload. We all assume that with new gTLDs coming on, there's going to be more work groups, more work groups having to be manned and so forth.

My recommendation was that the policy officers are - the policy councilors are not only overseeing those work groups in terms of scoping the really getting sharp point - sharply-worded and clearly-focused scoping on those things, but it would be out - doing outreach to man those working groups and so forth. It will be looking for the right partners.

Every working group is not going to use the same people. It's going to use different people with different expertise and those people will bring their minds and hearts to these discussions. And hopefully, you know, bring this to resolution. So I may well be an officer of a constituency responsible for administration aspects. But there is two of us as I mentioned before, so therefore, I can spend some time focused on one of the work groups I'm on.

You know, I think we're getting a little bit too tied up here with the number of people. If we cannot, as I can, on the GNSO feel 12 people to work on administrative things and these things that we've been discussing than we're - that's a sad state of affairs.

((Crosstalk))

Ray Plzak: I think we need - I think a bullet list of what these administrative affairs would be might help.

Ron Andrus: But we have a list right now. It's just all we're going to do is bring that list into a bullet and flesh it out. And I think that's a good idea. But if you look under what (Julius) presented vis-à-vis policy councilors and constituency representatives, it gives four or five different things that these individuals...

Ray Plzak: Okay.

Ron Andrus: ...will do. And I think we can continue to expand the list. But - and that will perhaps help people understand. But this - both policy and administration are going to grow. There's no question. If we're 21 gTLDs today and we become 200 gTLDs within a few years, I can tell you we will have more workloads. There's no question about it. Therefore, how do we do it? How do we devise something that makes sense and not get crazy about 12 people here or 10 people there?

((Crosstalk))

Ray Plzak: I agree with you Ron. No disagreeing. You're making very good points. I think though just understanding what I'm hearing is - or procedurally - I'm trying to grasp an intangible because this is all new - trying to grasp something that's intangible and then kind of tangible procedures of this. It seems to me that the issue that you've I think identified well is that something comes up and then it becomes, okay, is this a policy council duty? Or is this an administrative duty?

Ron Andrus: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Ray Plzak: Yeah, there needs to be a threshold decision made and then it gets put into the right bucket.

Ron Andrus: Right.

Ray Plzak: And then it flows through the process.

Ron Andrus: Exactly and the ExCom's job is that. That's what the ExCom does because you've got the leadership there. You've got the head of policy, the head of administration, somebody to run that meeting. You've got the treasurer there that says, "Yeah we can afford it. No we can't. Are we going to go get money from ICANN?"

Ray Plzak: Right. But I think what you're hearing and what I'm hearing anyway is, do we really need to set up this other group - subgroup - not the executive committees you're calling. Forget that for a minute. But this administrative group, do we really need to man that with 12 people? Or can we take - when an issue comes over into the administrative side, there is a person highly skilled at this sort of thing that then follows a process...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: Who is that person? Who is that person? Where'd they come from?

((Crosstalk))

Ray Plzak: Well, I have ideas on that.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Ray.

Ray Plzak: Yeah, please go ahead. I'll be quiet. Please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I'm sorry. It's Wolf (unintelligible). You know, I told you I have a (unintelligible).

Ray Plzak: Yes, you did Tony. You mentioned it - or Wolf, you mentioned it, yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It's just (unintelligible) some ideas. I would really appreciate if you get

any of this on chart. That's the one thing, you know, to...

((Crosstalk))

Ray Plzak: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: The other thing is, so looking to the bylaws of GNSO - not only is GNSO

council, GSNO is supposed to be a body which is related to policy - to policy

development. That is the body. That is the description of the GNSO.

Ray Plzak: Right.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So that should be the main thing in the future as well. And I fear if we

balance, you know, on the same level (unintelligible) administrative things

and the policy development things that - they'll generate misunderstanding.

That's my fear.

I understand the GNSO shall do (unintelligible) policy development mainly.

All other administrative things which are necessary to do this kind of - in my

point of view, kind of services to the GNSO which are necessary to be done

but they are not, let me say, major or things of the same priority as policy

development is.

And under this understanding, so I would look to the paper and look to the

future organization. I'm sorry to say that in that way, but maybe I have strong

misunderstanding with the paper. So I have to leave right now. I will also put

my ideas in (unintelligible) writing and send it to you and then talk - we have assorted discussion about that, yeah.

Ray Plzak: Very sound contributions Wolf. Thank you for coming out today.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you (unintelligible). Bye-bye.

Ron Andrus: If I may just follow up on Wolf's comment. His concern that it would - that a new administrative body sitting beside the policy council would create issues, I don't know who it creates issues for. This was the reason I wanted to bring this suggested originally this should be kited, kited, sent up as a kite to our constituencies not as a recommendation, just put this up and say, "Who likes it? Who doesn't like it?"

                See which way the wind blows that kite. And then we follow that direction. This whole document was a document to start this dialog, not to finalize the dialog, but to start a dialog. To get this out to the constituents that they come back to us and say, "We really hate this idea. Stupid. We don't want it. Get back to what you should be doing." Fine, thank you. At least we've got direction. And now we'll take that direction and we'll follow that.

                So this was a critical aspect. He - Wolf just said how can we develop - that we're supposed - policy council is supposed to develop policy. That's true. But you cannot develop policy unless you've got an administrative base that is, one, expanding your ranks, bringing in new blood as older blood passes out and moves on to other things and moves (unintelligible).

                Two, that we've got a policy council that is fully functioning on policy only; and three, that we've got the administrative aspects that are the nagging

nabobs that keep pulling people away from the focus on council - or policy development, getting those developed with somebody else.

You cannot have a body that's responsible for administration reporting to council. For what purpose is that?

Ray Plzak: Here's where we're at though. I think we agree that - we agree completely I think as a team here on your notion of a policy council and what it's for and what its purpose is. We also agree that there is a separation here between what is policy and what is more administrative that takes away from policy.

What we're pushing back a little bit on or a little afraid to go outward, if you will, to others because I think what I'm sensing is it's going to - it's going to really not go over well, is the concept of manning this administrative area with a bunch of people which may appear like a new layer, a new bureaucracy, or even perhaps moving - may even be interpreted as moving away from what the BGC intended the GNSO council to be doing.

It could be interpreted that way as well as an expansion from just staying home with policy and now here you guys are suggesting this whole new group, "Oh, my God, what are guys - what are you doing?" You know. So I think that's what...

Ron Andrus: Well, Ray, Ray, first of all, the BGC is not God. It's a body that was to add - that was paid to come back with recommendations.

Ray Plzak: I'm just coming up with...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: I understand.

Ray Plzak: ...examples of bullets that could be fired at us.

Ron Andrus: I understand. I understand. But they are not God, number one. They came back through - they were hired to come with recommendations and we as the body are now working with those recommendations to build a better GNSO, number one.

((Crosstalk))

Ray Plzak: Right. I think...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: Number two, number two...

Ray Plzak: Please, go ahead.

Ron Andrus: It's only to say that I - my blood boils when I hear things like, "We don't want to put something out that's not going to be well received." We don't know if this is going to be received good, bad, or indifferent. This is a kite. This is not a recommendation to anyone.

                  This is, "Ladies and gentlemen of our constituencies, we are debating amongst four our five of us for several weeks now about this issue. We've kind of got to a place where we think that we're not sure if this is good or bad but why don't you tell us."

This is the point. Let's get feedback. Why we debate about it amongst our selves? It's important we do. But for us to go on another call in two weeks and debate more about this is ludicrous. Let's get it out. I don't care which way you guys want to write it.

Get it to constituency members. Let them give us some sense of it. Get a copy to the OSC for courtesy. You know, they're part of the community. We're just sending this out to get some guidance. So, "FYI, here it comes." This is not a document sent up to OSC for their review, approval. It's got nothing to do with that. This is simple...

((Crosstalk))

Ray Plzak: Well maybe we just move it up one level Ron and...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: No, no, no, no, no, no.

Ray Plzak: No, no, no, follow me Ron. Ron, follow me. Instead of trying to identify how many people are going to be on whatever committee or group, we just identify what the issue is, that there is a threshold issue of - first a decision needs to be made of whether whatever the issue might be. Is it a policy issue or is it an administrative issue?

If it's a policy issue, it should flow through this part of the process. We can create a flowchart. If it's an administrative issue, it should flow through this part of the process. We can create questions. For example, how many people should be on - you know, we could ask the questions. You know, I'm just

thinking we might be offering more than what we really need to be offering to get to where you want to be.

(Julie):   Can I step in for a moment here?

Ray Plzak: Yeah, please, please.

(Julie):   I wanted to just make a point with respect to something Ron said. Ron you had said that the BGC recommendations are recommendations, you know, for, you know, the community and ICANN to consider. I should point out however that the BGC recommendations that we are dealing with as a work team are actually the recommendations that were adopted, voted on, and approved and adopted by the board.

So there is another element there that I think we need to consider. I'm not suggesting at all that we should not be, you know, going down the path that we are and, you know, I don't mean to take away from this discussion at all. I just wanted to make that point.

Ray Plzak: Well, let's agree (unintelligible) today that...

((Crosstalk))

Ray Plzak: Oh, is this Tony?

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Ray Plzak: Oh, yes, please Tony, I want you to go ahead right now.

Tony Holmes: Okay. In terms of the sort of functions we've been talking about, I think we all agree that those functions need to be carried off and the debate really is about how that happens. Some of those functions actually have worked, Ron, in the past but in a different way.

For instance in the OSCs, we've been pretty fortunate at our meetings that we hold in conjunction with ICANN meetings have normally been pretty well attended.

And the reason for that is that as a constituency, we do outreach to the regional ISP organizations wherever I can meet. And over recent times we've had a lot of support and help from ICANN's staff to make sure we bring those people in. So that outreach is happening. It needs to happen in a different way and I think this is where you're heading because if you move to working groups you need - you certainly need more outreach and you need to try and broaden those functions.

So we're all I think geared up to say that these tasks need to happen. The only difference of opinion needs to - that needs to be addressed is how they happen and whether you do it through another body that's on the same sort of level as council. And that's where I have some concern.

But (unintelligible) forward I think if we could actually add to this document - I think there needs to be some - maybe where it's missing of the document to make it clear the areas that certainly Wolf, (Rick), and I had questions on and the other people may have questions, so perhaps we could make a few points clearer.

We could add to it the chart that was proposed and then we could add a list of functions for each of the bodies, the three bodies that are going to be shown

on the chart, just list the functions. And then if you wanted to just say one of the ways of dealing with this would be to do it as per this model, user welcome, without saying, "This group thinks it's the way to go, or not the way to go."

But I think it's in the words you used "just fly a kite." Then we could probably go ahead on that basis and maybe we can agree (unintelligible) at the next meeting that we can float into constituencies and see that feedback. That way we're going to get a good idea of whether this is a go or whether it isn't. And probably that's what we need at this time.

Ray Plzak: I - (Julie) did you catch all that? Because I couldn't have articulated that any better.

(Julie):   Yeah I did get all of that and...

Ray Plzak: I thought it was good. And I know the downside - probably Ron's thinking to himself, he's going, "Oh great, another two weeks." You know, but I...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: No, no, no, no, I'm - no, no, no...

Ray Plzak: ...think it's okay.

Ron Andrus: I don't have a problem with that Ray. All I'm - my issue is only let's get some forward motion here and let's not try to refine it so tight, you know, that we're - I mean, let's leave room for people to bring their ideas.

Ray Plzak: I agree. And I think Tony had - the way Tony just said it was perfect. And I think he just captured what you just said Ron. I think he did anyway.

Ron Andrus: I'm in agreement.

Ray Plzak: Well that's wonderful. I think so next action steps, if we can capture kind of what Tony just suggested and of course Wolf's suggestion of including the flow chart if you will into the document as sort of a visual description. And here's what I would do and I'll ask if you guys agree is when we get there within the next week because I know (Julie), you know, doesn't sit around doing nothing all day. If we get there with some kind of next document I want to go ahead and send it on over to the OSC and have them look at it too. Is that fair enough?

Tony Holmes: Ray, is that before it goes to constituencies or at the same time?

Ray Plzak: Yeah, before, before.

Ron Andrus: But Ray, we're not going that - again the - all that does is add another layer where people feel compelled to have to comment because there's something before them.

Ray Plzak: Yeah, okay.

Ron Andrus: I'm saying this (unintelligible) member of the constituency like anyone else. All we're saying to the constituency is, "Guys, do you like this? Don't you like it? Don't like it. Good, fine, thanks, we're going to go in the other directions. We're going to go in the direction you like."

Ray Plzak: Okay. Good point.

Ron Andrus: Because why take it to the OSC? Why waste our time?

Ray Plzak: All right. All right. Reasonable point, reasonable point.

Ron Andrus: I mean yes, get it to the chair courtesy, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Ray Plzak: That's what I was referring to.

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: ...all those things...

((Crosstalk))

Ray Plzak: I think that's what I was thinking Ron, as a courtesy.

Ron Andrus: Absolutely.

Ray Plzak: Get it over to the chair, "FYI, here's what we're going to be sending out to the constituency and..."

Ron Andrus: Yeah, and just explaining exactly that. And to the community, we just want to say this is to get your input. We want to find out if we're going in the right direction with you guys because we believe that these things have some merit in terms of splitting these offices. Do you think so too?

Ray Plzak: Okay, procedurally then. (Julie) is it reasonable that we could probably have a next iteration of this? I know Ron - you'll be working with Ron probably in the next week?

Ron Andrus: From Ron's side, I'll have the work chart done in an hour after we get off this call.

Ray Plzak: Okay, so reasonable to say -- we might have lost (Julie). Reasonable to say that probably in a week we'll have the next iteration capturing Tony's comments plus adding in the chart, et cetera. We, you know, and at that point we might be able to just do this on list and say, "Yeah, let's move forward with this as our kite." And I think that's a great description of what this is.

(Julie):   Yeah - I'm sorry Ray, I thought I was going off of mute and I went on to mute. I was going to say that I'm happy to start work right away on a revised document. Ron, did I hear you say that you were happy to take a first stab at a chart, at our org chart?

Ron Andrus: Yes, exactly. And as I said, I'll have it done within the hour. My time just for FYI chair, I'm going to be out from the 1st of May to the 10th of May. So if we could get a meeting next Thursday for the - on the 29th, that would be ideal from my point of view if you wanted to just sort of have a look at the final version of this.

Ray Plzak: I'm not against the idea. On - you know, next - is next Thursday the 29th?

Glen Desaintgery: Next Thursday is the 30th.

Ray Plzak: That's what I thought.

Ron Andrus: Oh, I beg your pardon. I beg your pardon. That's right, 30th - 29th or 30th
                doesn't matter. Either day is fine. But my point was...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andrus: ...if we have a call next week.

Ray Plzak: 30th is out...

((Crosstalk))

Ray Plzak: Yeah, 30th is out for me.

Glen Desaintgery: Oh.

Ron Andrus: 29th?

Ray Plzak: I could do the 29th but it would have to be no earlier than 1600 UTC, which
                would be noon eastern time.

((Crosstalk))

Glen Desaintgery: ...1600 UTC, okay.

Ray Plzak: Okay, let's - now in this case because we are doing the schedule, I'm going to
                take (Julie)'s suggestion this time around. Let's do a Doodle. Is that okay,
                Glen?

Glen Desaintgery: It's okay. But it would be much better if we could somehow find permanent
                times for these things.

Ray Plzak: I know, I know.

(Julie):   You know, Ray, this is (Julie). I might suggest, because we have had the meetings on Wednesdays at 1300 - I know sort of now you're talking about 1600 - but I'm wondering if we could just go ahead and set this -I could send out action items today, suggest this time and ask people if anybody has a conflict. The problem with a doodle is it can take a good deal of time.

Ray Plzak: I know. That's why they wanted to do it last time.

(Julie):   We're meeting in just a week; we might not have responses to the doodle until a day before.

Glen Desaintgery: As the doodles are turned in, it becomes extremely confusing to people.

Ray Plzak: I agree. That's why did didn't want to do it last time, everything you guys are saying.

(Julie):   (Unintelligible).

Man: Look at 1600 UCT.

Glen Desaintgery: 1600 UCT on which day? Wednesday or Thursday?

(Julie):   Wednesday the 29th? Because you can't do it Thursday, is that right, Ray?

Ray Plzak: I cannot do it Thursday. Yeah, so the 1600 on Wednesday should work for me.

(Johabe):   Sorry, everyone. This is (Johabe) here. I was there almost the entire con call. First of all, I want to apologize. Last week I had vacation with my family that was not planned before, so I lost the call. And actually I had a very busy week and there's so many durations of the emails, I wasn't able to read everything yet. So I didn't get into the con call and just start doing my opinion.

                I was listening. I think what you decided to do now is okay. And just wanted to say that Wednesday for me also works fine. I prefer Wednesday in general than Thursdays, so...

Ray Plzak: Is 1600 UTC okay for you?

(Johabe):   Okay for me, no problem. I think I'm the latest, so it's okay and it's not problem.

Ray Plzak: Okay. I can do any Wednesday, as long as it's no earlier than 1600 UTC because...

(Johabe):   On, that's no problem.

Ray Plzak: Every other Wednesday there's the registry constituency one that has to fall before the 1600 time. It's causing a problem for (Ken Stupps) as well.

                Anyway, that sounds good. Are we all in agreement on 1600 UTC on April 29.

(Julie):   Right. And I'll go ahead and send action items out shortly, include that, and if anybody has a problem they can let us know. But let's try to go with that.

I'm getting back to this action item, if I could just clarify. So Ron, if you could do the org chart then I could turn around and incorporate that into a new document along with bulleted lists, and then send it out to everyone?

Ron Andrus: You'll have it within the hour, (Julie).

(Julie): Okay, great. Then I can get it out today.

Ron Andrus: Excellent.

Ray Plzak: All right. That's a fair approach. Now, let's try and make some headway on list as well. If we have comments that can work on email, let's do that.

Okay. I want to move on to something else, and we're starting to run short of time. And I think what's going to be the sacrificial lamb today is the (SLIDLI) documents.

(Julie): Actually, Ray, if I could maybe just make one comment about that.

Ray Plzak: Yes, please.

(Julie): Very quickly, and that is it's probably best if we can delay it until next week because my understanding is that in the Board Governance Committee, which is now tasked with coming up with a revised conflicts of interest policy, may be making some progress in that area and may be coming out with something shortly. And so if that is going to be out say in the next week or so, then that's something that would be available for us to look at. Because otherwise what we would be looking at is the 1999 document on conflicts of interest which is, at you might guess, somewhat out of date.

So I just wanted to mention that, and then we could schedule this for next week, if that's okay with you.

Ray Plzak: Very nice. I second that one. Does everybody agree?

Ron Andrus: Agree.

Ray Plzak: Okay. Because we have another one here that has to do with your charter. I had a request come from the OSC. Apparently they would like to see us approve our charter as it is written now. It's called a draft charter, so I didn't really see what we need to approve it. But apparently there's some thinking that they would like to see us as a work team say, yep, we like this draft charter.

Ron Andrus: All right. I'll get in the queue on that one, (Julie).

Ray Plzak: Yeah. In fact, I don't think I really need to say much more. But I'll tell you what I will say is Ron, something you said earlier was we don't necessarily have to follow everything that the BBC told us what to do. And then of course we had (Julie)'s comment on that, which I agreed with her, too. But that drives this document. If there's something in here that we think has been identified for our work teams that we think should be in here, or things that should be in there that aren't in there, this would be the time to say it.

We don't necessarily have to - I'm not saying that we have to decide today that we can go back to the OSC and say, yes, we approve our charter. But I'm saying that the OSC has asked us to get to that point. Whether it's today or next week, we have to make it a little bit higher priority item, I guess.

So with that, Ron, please go ahead.

Ron Andrus: Point of clarification. I wasn't saying that we didn't have to follow their...

Ray Plzak: Am I putting words in your mouth again? Sorry.

Ron Andrus: It's not this almighty power above us and we have to march in lock step towards everything they say. What I'm saying is they've given us instruction for us to go out and explore these things.

Ray Plzak: Right.

Ron Andrus: And so that's really what we're doing. So it may not - it by itself is explanatory.

               Looking at the team charter goals, I'm wondering if we can just get some points of clarification, and I'm looking to staff for this. The first point, determine what steps are needed to establish a rule of conscious procedure - management process. That's what we've been debating all morning.

               The second point, define and develop scope of responsibilities in any other standing committees as recommended - committee to analyze trends, committee to benchmark policy. So that's again what we just debated this morning in some ways. It's to deal with our administrative group.

Ray Plzak: I agree. It's your documents.

Ron Andrus: The third point, (Julie) has given us a head's up that we're going to get some fresh text on that - this is the statement of interest and declaration of interest, so that's fine.

The fourth one, Develop Curriculum for Training Council Members, Constituents, Facilitators and Others. I understood that (Michelle) was working on something along those lines. (Liz Gaskon) was looking - and so this is my question for staff. This curriculum for training, wasn't there a tool kit or something along those lines being developed by staff?

(Julie): Actually if you'd like I can speak to that, Ron.

Ron Andrus: Please.

(Julie): There has been information collected from the community concerning what a curriculum might look like. And part of that was this constituency survey that went out last fall that several community members participated in.

But the work of developing the curriculum has not happened. It does fall under this group. However, I think you're leading us to a good point, and that as we look at these goals, some of them may be led and initiated by the work team members; however, the Chair and the team members may decide that something like this item could - the initiative for this item could be taken by ICANN staff, at your direction, of course. Because I think as you are noting, this is more of an administrative-type of task, and there is some information out there that staff might be better able to pull together to get this one going.

Ron Andrus: Right on queue, (Julie), right on queue. Exactly what I was coming from.

Ray Plzak: As I understand that correctly, the threshold thing first is okay, the focus should just be in our charter - do we approve this in our draft charter, first of all, and then secondly becomes how does it get executed or performed or devised or whatever word -- that's the second question.

So I think on a top level, are we okay that this particular line item is in our charter?

Ron Andrus: My part - it's Ron - yes, along the terms of what (Julie)'s just described, because I think that there has been some work done. The staff is intimately involved in it, and we would expect the staff would come back. So as part of our charter we would say, yes, we approve this as part of our charter and we see this as being led by this group called staff.

Ray Plzak: All right. And then the work team would review what staff comes up with and offer our input at that time, right?

Ron Andrus: Correct. That's from my point of view, yes.

Ray Plzak: Okay.

Tony Holmes: Ray, could I ask a question on the charter?

Ray Plzak: Yes, please, Tony.

Tony Holmes: It's to do with the next point, just a comment maybe from staff. The issue on the charter about looking at your constituencies and to what we would need to do on that - how does that stack up against the current requests that are actually there for ICANN Board to consider? Is it the intent that they would work wait until this work is complete before they make any decisions there, because they could actually pre-empt some of the things we needed to do.

Ray Plzak: That's an excellent question. I think what you're asking, is there already a process in motion that if we come up with a different process, how does that affect what's already going on?

Ron Andrus: Well, and I understood that that process was quite well under way. In other words, these people that are submitting these drafts to us right now at the various constituencies for our review, they are responding to a document of some sort. So I'm of like mind with Tony I think on this one. I think that there's already - this document is already out there. I'm not sure what we are doing in this regard. That was my question as well.

Ray Plzak: Yeah. I wonder if we could just narrow it down a little more. Instead of prepare clear rules for establishing new constituencies, which I think there already are clear rules for establishing constituencies.

                 But instead, I think what might be lost is how does anybody know? Is there a place, a location that people can see who has filed to be a new constituency? I'm getting emails from various sources saying, these guys have filed for a new constituency and these guys have. Maybe we can just hone ours in as here's our recommendation of a centralized way for the announcement of new constituencies. Any thoughts on that?

Tony Holmes: Well, my question is I think we need to do that anyway

Ray Plzak: Right.

Tony Holmes: But do we need also to review what's currently down there as a set of rules? Is that where this was intended, that there was something put there (unintelligible) to act as a focal point for those who wanted to get in their applications fairly quickly, and so they had cause to do that. Are we supposed to review those rules and come back?

Ron Andrus: Well, Tony, this is actually the best of six charters, sixth and last charter, review of recommended amendments to the appropriate reporting methods and encouraging promoting introducing new constituencies while recognizing the differences, blah, blah, blah.

So by the sixth, that's the quest no. Staff can really - (Julie), can you shed some light on what that document is or where that document came from vis-à-vis applicants for TTL's new constituencies?

(Julie):   Yeah. I should point out - I think this might be helpful here - is that the Board was very anxious to encourage new constituencies. And so at the Board direction the staff moved forward with developing a sense for new constituencies to use charter templates. And that was moved forward before this work team was established. And then that's what the new constituencies are using.

This question actually has come up - and I will send around a link - pardon me. Ray was asking where are these things, how do new constituencies know what to do, and should we be looking at that. There is a link off the (Gina 7 Improvements) page that has all the information as far as new constituencies and charter templates and so on. I'll send that to you.

So to answer Tony's question, yours and Ron's, yes, there's a process. I think that this group is tasked with looking at this process for establishing new constituencies and making recommendations. It may be that this group looks at what this charter template is and the process and says, looks fine, our recommendation is no change.

Would changes to the charter template then involve changes to constituencies and so on? I don't think that that's we're tasked with doing. There is another

work team, the Constituency Operations team that is actually looking at rules for participating in constituencies and state quota groups. The question went out from that group, should we be doing this if these new constituencies and stakeholder groups already have their charters out there, if we make recommendations do they have to change their charters.

(Chuck Golems) has said his understanding is yes, if recommendations come out of a work team that changes what's already out there, then these groups may have to make changes accordingly. That is assuming that the Council and the Board approve what the work teams do.

So in short, I think that this group needs to take a look at what are the current rules and procedures, decide if we want to change them, and also is that sufficient for meeting the recommendation of encouraging and promoting and introducing new constituencies, or should there be other practices in place?

Ron Andrus: Well, Chair, I would suggest that -- the fact that three's always this template out there -- I would suggest we follow (Julie)'s suggestion that we, let's have a long, good look at that. There's a document there; why start with a clean piece of paper? There's people already responding to eight documents. Why don't we review that document, and if every one on the team is agreeing with that, then I guess we're also agreeing that points 5 and 6 fall under our responsibility.

Ray Plzak: Yeah. I'm okay with that. I might wordsmith a little bit under the fifth one; that is prepares if we're starting from scratch. Both 5 and 6 are the words review instead of prepare.

Tony Holmes: I agree with Ron's approach. I think that would be a good way to handle it.

Ray Plzak: Okay.

(Julie):   I can make that change in the charter if we all agree to it.

Ray Plzak: By the way, a procedural question. Do we have a quorum? Do we need a quorum to be voting on things?

Ron Andrus: I don't think we're really voting; we're just all agreeing or disagreeing. I think that's all.

(Johabe):   We're reaching a consensus.

Ray Plzak: Yeah, we're reaching a consensus. Do we have enough people to say - I'm talking about, that are supposedly on our work team, that are on our work team - do we have enough to say, okay, yeah, we're...

                 The best thing we want to do, to decide today on this call -- and this is my procedural question -- we accept the charter, the draft charter as it is.

(Julie):   Ray, can I...

Ray Plzak: Yeah. Could you speak to that?

(Julie):   Yeah, just briefly. This has already come up in another one of my work teams.

Ray Plzak: Sure.

(Julie):   First of all, in the work team, the charter, the work team rules, there isn't a requirement for a quorum, for how to vote, that sort of thing. It is sort of a consensus-type of procedure.

However, in another of my work teams, the constituency group, what we did was, in the meeting the recommendation was made to adopt, approve the charter, and this was sent out with a link to the full work team with the request that everyone should approve or disapprove by a certain time - so you know, for us it could be say, next Monday - close of business next Monday, for instance. And if there were no significant dissenting opinions, then the charter would be deemed to be approved at that point.

Ron Andrus: Okay. So I think that's a good approach, and of course I'm drifting down to number 3, work team rules of our own charter, which says decision making, how to go about that. That all sounds consistent, so that's good.

I would suggest that as far as this goes, what we're saying today on the phone is we should change a word or here on number 5 that those of us on the call agree. We'll send an email to the list.

Whatever changes we may see in here today, or if we don't finish it today, next week, we'll just finish it up on list. If we agree on the call if there's some people not able to make the call, whether it's (Eric) or (Robin) or whoever, then we'll just say, here's what the people on the call reached consensus on; if anybody has opposition please respond by email. Otherwise we'll consider your not replying as in agreement.

Is that a fair approach, everybody?

Ron Andrus: Agreed.

Ray Plzak: Okay.

(Julie):   Tony, I can go ahead and make that one change. I think it was the change prepare clear rules to review clear rules. And if that's the only change, then perhaps I could send it around and ask for comments from people. And would you like me to pick a date for when people need to approve, or just...

Ray Plzak: Well, let's - we've got another about 13 minutes here, then I'm going to cut the call off, I think. We've done enough for the day.

                  Let's go on through the charter.

Tony Holmes: (Julie) - I'm sorry, just one question. It's not really review clear rules - review rules.

(Julie):   Okay. Thank you.

Ray Plzak: So let's go on. Is there anybody in the queue that has any other comments on the charter? We finished section 1, which is Team Charter Goals, and it seems like we have rough consensus on that so far. Team Membership, anybody have any comments on that?

Tony Holmes: I think that we have a few questions around that, Ray. Surely we need to engage more people within the group.

Ray Plzak: Yes, right. But I don't think that changes our charter.

Tony Holmes: No. Well, hopefully we can meet everything that's down here. The issue of the liaison back to counsel - I assume that is with today's counsel which we're talking about now. If it is, then I qualify one of those. But there's no one else on the call currently that does enable us to get to two counselors.

Ron Andrus: And also if I were to say -- add to that -- you're the only counselor.

Tony Holmes: At the moment, yeah.

Ron Andrus: There is to be a minimum of one counselor or two - in terms of service liaison, two in team Council. I'm not sure if that's meant that we're supposed to - I should be doing outreach to one of my counselors to be the liaison, but I'm the liaison back to my constituency to B.C. in this case.

                 And then with my liaising with the B.C., my officers then, my counselors take it to Council if necessary. But at this stage of the game I don't know what say GNSO Council is really doing with regard to what we're doing, other than just observing.

Tony Holmes: No, that's right. And I just wonder, is this the standard in all of the charters, or is it something that is amendable? I mean, could we put it down to one, or does it have to start?

Ron Andrus: Well, I just wonder if we need - with points number 1 and 2 in this regard.

(Julie):   All the work teams were given a sort of standard initial template with a charter that developed by the steering committees. And so this is boilerplate language that you as a work team can alter, as long as you agree to it. So however you see fit.

Ray Plzak: Well, I have a suggestion. I think number 1, tier should be changed to be a minimum of one GNSO counselor, and then get rid of preferably two. And then on number 2 I would suggest that the number of counselors be limited to two, to maintain separate -- no more than two -- to maintain separation. Does that make sense?

Tony Holmes: Would that just be applicable for our group and not others?

Ray Plzak: Right.

Tony Holmes: It may cause problems in others. I think it's going to cause a problem here.

(Julie):   It would be applicable only to your group, any changes to your charter.

Ray Plzak: Well, we don't have to change number 2.

Ron Andrus: Well, my view, Ray, is that number 1 and number 2 aren't really necessary in terms of our membership. What we do need is number 3, one representative from each constituency. We need each advisory committee and SO to be given the opportunity -- number 4. Number 5, there are to be members who are not associated -- that's fine. We have if I'm not mistaken; U.P. team is an example of that.

                  Number 6, participation by team members and other teams should be minimalized. I'm on the OSC and I think Tony might be on one or two, but that's it. And official interim term chair of the team should be someone from the steering committee.

Tony Holmes: You shouldn't remove 1, Ron, because I think you need someone to be the liaison to report back. I know on counselor's clause there's not really a call if anyone wants to say anything.

Ron Andrus: Oh, I'm sorry. That's fine, Tony. It's not one from every - I misread that. So it's just one counselor to report back, and you or...

Tony Holmes: Or whoever.

Ron Andrus: Or whoever. That's fine, absolutely - one, I'm fine with that. Beg your pardon. But that 2, number of counselors should be limited at most to three to maintain separation with teams work on the counselor's oversight rule. How many counselors do we have on our team?

(Julie):   One.

Ray Plzak: One.

Ron Andrus: (Unintelligible) is not, and neither. And what about...

(Julie):   We just have one.

Ron Andrus: Okay, very good. Well, that's fine then.

(Julie):   We don't 'really have a problem with two.

Ron Andrus: Okay, then that's fine then.

(Julie):   And number 7, keep in mind, doesn't really matter anymore because we're past the initial interim chair stage.

Tony Holmes: So that could go as well.

(Julie):   We can take it out. I mean, it's...

Ray Plzak: Or it could stay. It's no harm.

(Julie): Or it can stay. It was there to make sure that there was, that the liaison was the steering committee.

Ron Andrus: That's fine. It was a charter document, so that's fine. So it can stay.

Ray Plzak: Actually, I really don't see any need for us to change anything in number 2. I mean, there's no urgency to me. It can all stay as is, and we can say, yeah, we accepted that charter, that draft charter.

And I think we would still have the opportunity to change our charter later. We're just accepting from what I understand the draft charter.

(Julie): Right. Even if the charter is approved, just to clarify - the steering committee has said that once it's approved and it's no longer a draft charter - no, that does not mean you cannot make changes. You can make changes. It's just that you will need to let the steering committee know that these are the changes you'd like to make so they can approve them.

Ray Plzak: Okay. Okay. I still like the change from up above. I like to do that one, changing the...

(Julie): What about number 1 and team membership. You said there should be...

Ray Plzak: I don't know. I don't think we need to change that.

Ron Andrus: From Ron's point of view, that's - everything under rubric 2, Team Membership is fine from my point of view.

Ray Plzak: I agree with that. Tony?

Tony Holmes: Yes, I'm okay with that.

Ray Plzak: All right. Let's go on to Work Team Rules - if there's nobody else that has a comment on that. Is it just us three on the call now, by the way? (Johabe), you there?

Glen Desaintgery: Another, is he still there?

Ray Plzak: Okay. Let's go on to Work Team Rules. Any comments on this?

Tony Holmes: I've read through these, Ray, and I'm fine with this.

Ray Plzak: I have as well, and I agree.

Ron Andrus: Nothing had screamed at me when I reviewed them in the past, so I'm willing to go forward with it as well.

Ray Plzak: Doing good. I guess that's all.

(Eric):   Are you there for who?

Ray Plzak: I'm sorry - who's there?

(Eric):   This is (Eric). I heard and are you there just as I was going out of the room for a second.

Ray Plzak: Oh, thank you, (Eric). You are breaking up. It's on me.

(Eric):   (Unintelligible).

Ray Plzak: Okay. (Eric), you're breaking up on the call, so I just want to encourage you if you have any comments on what we're all agreeing to here, feel free to drop them on the list.

               For Calendar Timetables, any issues here? So we're moving through this, okay. All right. Staff Support.

Ron Andrus: That's been excellent.

Ray Plzak: Well, I really don't feel uncomfortable reporting back to the OSC or to whoever that we are -- other than the one change from up above that we discussed -- that we're comfortable with approving the draft charter.

Ron Andrus: Agreed from my side.

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Ray Plzak: Okay. And then from a procedural point of view, I think I'll send a note to the email list saying that this is what we came to a rough consensus on the call, and if anybody has any other opinion, to please speak up on list. And then we need to put a deadline to that. Anybody have any suggestions on that? What kind of deadline should we put on that? Should we put next Wednesday?

Ron Andrus: I was going to say, one day before the call.

Ray Plzak: One day - so next Tuesday. Okay. I will do that today. I will send that out today. I'll name next Tuesday as the deadline. Speak up or forever hold your peace, and we'll communicate to the steering committee that we - our work team has approved this draft charter. Good? Very good.

Okay. Any other business? I was going to get into this issue that -- I think it's an important one -- that (Eric) raised with regards to this reaffirmation that the comment I made that the BGC has reaffirmed its position toward ICANN's approach to a constituency model.

We really don't have time to get into that today, but I want to keep that on our radar screen because I read what (Julie) brought back, and when I read it, I'm not so sure - I think reaffirm, the word I use, might be a little strong. But I do want to hear other peoples' comments on that. I think it's an important point.

Ron Andrus: I don't have any comment on that at this stage of the game.

Ray Plzak: Right. And I think it's appropriate.

Tony Holmes: It's my understanding we're the same majority on that, Ray, that I'm not so sure everyone agrees.

Ray Plzak: Right. So let's keep that on our radar screen. I understand we have other matters here that we're looking at.

So with that, I think I'm going to go ahead and ask that we adjourn the call and stop the recording.

Glen Desaintgery: Thanks, Ray.

END