

**GNSO  
Operations Steering Committee (OSC) GNSO Council Operations Work Team  
22 July 2009 at 16:00 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 22 July 2009 at 16:00 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-20090722.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#july>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

**Participants on the Call:**

Ray Fasset  
Wolf Ulrich Knobon  
Ron Andruff  
Ken Stubbs

**Staff:**

Julie Hedlund  
Gisella Gruber-White

**Apologies:**

Tony Holmes  
Rob Hoggarth

Coordinator: The call is now recorded. Please go ahead.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you (Louise). Good afternoon everyone. Good morning. On today's call we have Ray Fassett, Ron Andruff, Wolf-Ulrich Knobon and from staff we have Julie Hedlund and myself Gisella Gruber-White. And apologies we have Tony Holmes and Rob Hoggarth. Thank you.

Ray Fassett: Okay, this is Ray. I have a first order of business that I would like to throw out to those on the call right now which is we really are being expected to make some progress on this Rules of Procedure. And the -- part of it as I said earlier is it's a little bit of a moving target in that there's work being done on the bylaws level. There's a PDP work team that's also working on aspects of it.

And this becomes for us a process of elimination if you will of where we should be focusing each of our efforts. So it's sort of, I don't want to say musical chairs, but it's been difficult for us to get our hands around exactly where we should be focusing our efforts on this Rules of Procedure.

So but now I think there's clarity coming in that there is a, you know, (formal out) as Julie sent to the list a bylaws document up for public comment that really does cross-section much of the Rules of Procedure. So my request here is for sake of moving this forward because I think we can, would people on the call today be open to having weekly meetings each Wednesday at this time for the month of August?

Ron Andruff: Yes, this is Ron. I would -- I agree. However I have some vacation time that is planned and my wife just had an operation on her knee so it's a question of whether or not we'll actually be taking that vacation. But I just put the caveat in that I may miss a week here or there but I'm happy to take a call once a week.

Ray Fassett: Sure, yes, sure, of course for those that can attend. Thanks Ron.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, it's the same for me. So I will be out for the next two weeks. So the next two Wednesdays I wouldn't be here. But after that -- so that means from the -- I think it's on August the 8th so as of August I will be back here.

Ray Fassett: Okay. Would anybody object, and let's say there's a call next Wednesday and it's just Julie and I, would anybody object to us trying to just advance forward where we think that we're just for example citing the bylaws document or things of that nature?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No, it's okay.

Ron Andruff: No problem from my side.

Ray Fassett: Okay. All right. So if we can set that up then Gisella that our work team is going to go to a weekly meeting.

Gisella Gruber-White: No problem. I'll set it up and I'll send you the details.

Ray Fassett: Okay, very good. Okay, so with that said I'd like to propose our first order of business here to ask Julie's cooperation and now go back to the Rules of Procedure document and do the cross-referencing where it appears we're just going to be citing the bylaws.

Julie Hedlund: I agree. Right. That's perfectly fine for me. And as I said I -- and for those who -- I think Ron you weren't on the call when we were discussing this, but I had not yet done so because there was, you know, the bylaws changes and the proposed changes were only just recently voted on.

And I forwarded to all of you actually just now the formal notification of sort of the outcome of that vote that (Aubrey) had sent from the council to the board because (Will Florick) was asking, you know, what was the final determination of votes in there. In that communication it's detailed.

But there was really up until the last minute some discussion about some of the changes. And I think now that most of these are likely to go forward as is, and yet as this recorded call I will say that I don't know that and things can change.

So please all of you keep in mind that as I amend the procedures document, you know, recognizing the fact that until these bylaws changes are approved by the board, you know, anything can change. So I'll make that caveat. But yes that's a long way around of my saying of course I will go ahead and take that on. And I think I should be able to have that done say in time for next week's call.

Ray Fassett: Okay, yes. Perfectly well said Julie. The approach we're taking is yes this is not a fixed and final document, I'm referring to the bylaws, until the board approves. But what we're going to do as a work team is accept it as of now in its present form as a document we can rely upon. And as -- should there be changes later to the bylaws document, we'll double back.

Julie Hedlund: Right. And really keeping in mind too that -- well let me just put this out here for consideration -- there are different ways that we can reference the bylaws in the procedures document. Probably the most efficient way to do so is to simply link to the appropriate section in the bylaws so that we're not actually duplicating the text.

And there's actually a legal reason to do it that way, meaning that you don't want to incorporate duplicate language when -- you know, and it can be confusing if the language appears in the bylaws and the same language appears in the procedures. It's more efficient to simply have a reference to the source document.

Alternatively what one could do so that -- and this is maybe something we consider for what this looks like in its final state online and also the hard copy document is one could have an internal link within this document whereby the bylaws are an appendix to the procedures. And when you get to a section in the procedures that says, "See, you know, bylaws section blah, blah, blah," then that -- if you clicked on that, you know, that would take you to the appendix so you would have all the text there.

That's useful because if someone is looking at a hard copy of the procedures they would have all of the text there. And of course if someone is looking at an electronic version, they could simply click on the link and get to the appropriate text. And so what I'm saying is that when I do this I'm probably going to do these as embedded links rather than taking the text that's in the bylaws and embedding it in the procedures.

Ron Andruff: That makes sense to me because that makes it a more -- it's a living document at the change then with the -- the link should change then its -- our document is always up to date. But may I -- just for a point of clarification. I think I understand what you're saying but I just want to restate it because this was kind of the way I was coming at this today as well.

Having quickly glanced through the Rules of Procedure and also the revised bylaws that we're discussing it -- I think for our work going forward it would make a -- we'd make a giant leap (step) forward if in fact we have our Rules of Procedure reflecting the new bylaws. That way I think we will see that there's a lot of things we can just look at and probably check off the list that don't really need too much revision on our part but rather it's already there. Is that what you're talking about Julie?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, absolutely.

Ron Andruff: Perfect. That's exactly the way I was coming at it so I think that's a great idea.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: May I just add one point. It came to my mind (it to all) this last council voting about the bylaw amendments and the confusion afterwards. Since many, many people were upset with the council meeting and that was really a little bit confusing. So I think one point which is important is well the kind of the voting which we have already talking about, but the voting of absentees.

There's something in the bylaws at the time being about absentee voting but it's only related to some specific points like policy process issues or such things. So I would say for me if there's some essential really important things when -- in case if the council is going to vote on such structure and organizational matters like bylaw matters which is really basic, I think so, for the future. So there should be also a possibility to have -- for absentee voting. And so I will bring that up in the public comments period for the bylaws as well. But we should also from the (unintelligible) think about the absentee voting.

Ron Andruff: I agree with that Wolf. I'm very concerned actually when I look at there wasn't one member of the BC, there wasn't one member of the ISP as I see it who participated in that vote. Those are two key constituencies in the organization. So we do need to have something to reflect that. So I second that motion.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I actually -- just so you know, I'm scanning through just now the procedures because I believe there is a reference to how absentee voting is dealt with. I think it's at the end. But I believe that we -- obviously we -- you know, you as a work team can modify the language.

And I think in fact that there's been some discussion in the council of the strong need for more complete procedures relating to absentee voting and how absentee voting is dealt with in the procedures. So you're absolutely right, both of you. It's something that...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Julie it's a bylaw issue at the time being. In the bylaw it's really -- it's (unintelligible) to have this paragraph so...

Ray Fassett: Where are you at Wolf? Can you tell me what section are you at?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It's the bylaw Article 10, is it? And about council and then Number 7c.

Julie Hedlund: Right. It's in there as well as -- just so you know it's also in the procedures with respect to the taking of email votes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No it's just...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Number...

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...its absentee voting is vote on whether to initiate a PDP or to forward a policy recommendation to the board or fill a position over open for election. Then voting may be by absentee ballot -- balloting as well. But this is all. These three -- those three issues are only open for absentee balloting. So that means on the other hand so there's no exception. And this should be amended I think some. This is in the bylaws. It's a bylaw problem.

Ray Fassett: Yes, I think that comment goes through the public comment process.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. I definitely will bring it up in the public comment period as well. And we'll see.

Ron Andruff: I think I agree with Wolf for the purposes of our work with this work team I think that we should just address it. You know, yes, the public comment period we should be speaking to that because that's part and parcel to our activities. But I think what Wolf just identified is something we should address in the Rules of Procedure.

Julie Hedlund: Well and I think there is an opportunity to address it in Section 16 of the Rules of Procedure.

Ray Fassett: Let's go to Section 16 then.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, if you'd like to take a look at it now. It has to do with email votes. But of course an email vote, you know, is for those who were not there for a voice vote. We begin with Section 16 which is on page 20, GNSO Council email votes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, but it doesn't reflect the items which are...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: Right. But it could. I mean...

Ron Andruff: Yes, that's the point. That's the point...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...and you might want to consider incorporating.

Ron Andruff: Exactly. So that's the spot.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...because you know how do we conduct the votes for various types of things. Now keeping in mind however that there is a whole voting process that is going to be addressed in the PDP section that is going to be -- is being worked on by the PDP work team.

Ron Andruff: Is there any language or any documentation even it's preliminary coming out of that work team that we might be able to look at in light of what we're discussing right now, Julie? Could you look into that?

Julie Hedlund: I'm not sure if they've gotten that far but while we're talking here let me just do a quick look on their Wiki and see. I -- yes, I'm not sure. But anyway -- but I mean as far as what -- I mean you know, certainly this team has leeway to incorporate how absentee -- absent -- you know, voting of absent members is dealt with for non-policy process, you know...

Ron Andruff: Right.

Julie Hedlund: ...types of activities.

Ron Andruff: Right.

Julie Hedlund: I mean decisions shall I say.

Ron Andruff: So chair I would -- if I may make a recommendation that perhaps we could have support staff Julie, Rob, or whomever on that side prepare a little bit of language that would go into this Section 16 that we're discussing rather than us try to fumble our way through it. Ray?

Ray Fassett: Yes. I'm sorry I was pausing as I was thinking. Yes, I think that's a place to start. If Julie would like to take a stab at capturing our thoughts here and incorporating into Section 16 which I'm...

Julie Hedlund: Sure. I'll be happy to do that and...

((Crosstalk))

Ray Fassett: ...still trying to find.

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: ...and I'll spend -- that would give me some time too to coordinate with my colleagues who are supporting the PPSC PDP work team. Because if I don't find specific language on the site, there may be other, you know, documentation that they have that would be speaking to this particular issue that I might be able to reference.

Ron Andruff: Yes. That's where I was coming from. That would be ideal because at least it gets -- you know, you and the staff are the red thread through this whole thing, through all of the work teams. So I think that that is a better place to start rather than us starting in a vacuum.

Julie Hedlund: Right. And I'll be happy to do that. I, you know, I neglected to mention at the beginning of this call but I thought maybe this is a good time when you're

talking about my coordination with other policy staff. I -- as you know I have been consulting with ICANN since about January of this year and ICANN has now as of today officially hired me on as a full-time staff member.

Ron Andruff: Congratulations.

Julie Hedlund: So I'm now officially an ICANN staff person. And I also will be in addition to my activities of supporting the GNSO policy process and the council and these work teams, which I will continue to do and happily, I also now will be splitting my time as director of (essex) support. So I will be supporting Steve Crocker and his team and the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. So that will be my other role. So I'll...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: Well Steve is very fortunate. Congratulations Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you very much.

Ron Andruff: Welcome aboard.

((Crosstalk))

Ray Fassett: And welcome aboard.

Julie Hedlund: Thank you.

Ron Andruff: Excellent news.

Julie Hedlund: So anyway just to go back, I'll be happy to go ahead and pull together some language for Section 16.

Ken Stubbs: Ken Stubbs agreeing with everything that you guys have said in the last few minutes and congratulating you Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Thanks Ken.

Ray Fassett: Well welcome to the call Ken. Thanks for joining.

Ken Stubbs: Well I've been on the call. It's just listening to some of the dialog. That's all.

Ray Fassett: Okay. Next steps on Rules of Procedure, anybody have any thoughts?

Ron Andruff: I -- in light of what we've just discussed about Julie going and looking at the other groups and pulling language and giving us a better -- a document we can start to get our head around, Number 6 on the procedures I note it says also may be effected by PDP work team recommendations, as well as Number 7 and Number 8. Could we also -- I see as well as Number 9 and Number 10, Number 11 and 12 and 13 and 14. Gosh, I can keep going, 15 -- all of those 6 to 15.

As you're going to go back to your colleagues in any case Julie on this issue perhaps you can touch base with the PDP work team on those other elements to see if there's anything there as well if that's possible.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I'll be happy to see if there's anything that they've...

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: If there's any work that's been done.

Julie Hedlund: ...that we might be able to incorporate. I think that -- well I can't say for sure. I think that they're, you know, they're working away to complete their work as quickly as possible but I'm not sure how far along they've gotten in these

areas. But anything that they are able to, you know -- that I am able to pull in, I will pull in.

Ron Andruff: The point of view from my side is simply that any way we can get information from these other teams that's going to shape this document, as much or as little as we can get, will help us as well because I appreciate Ray's concern about checking things off the list and where we have all of these open questions marks any day, anymore it's been some weeks past, maybe there's more data that we could actually include there. And if so, then we can start to close this off.

As we've said before, there may be absolutely nothing that we need to change in Number 6 or 7 or 8 whatever they might. The language might be just fine but in fact if there's work being done on it by other groups then maybe a little bit of language change or a lot of language change, the sooner we know that the better.

Julie Hedlund: Right. And I should note that I mean there is -- let me just echo what you just said. There is nothing that this group has to do with the items identified as being effected by the PDP work team. I mean they will be making the changes that will then change those sections of the document. We will not need to be doing that.

Ron Andruff: Okay. That's the...

((Crosstalk))

Julie Hedlund: But there's not going to be a duplication of work. So when I say that those sections are identified as, you know, part of the PDP work team, you know, that process, then very definitely we don't have to do anything there. But I agree with you in -- you know, to the extent that there is anything that has been done so far by those groups that can be incorporated, I'll be happy to incorporate it.

Ken Stubbs: Ray.

Ray Fassett: Yes, please Ken.

Ken Stubbs: I don't know where to (plunk) this thing in but I think I mentioned to you that I had some current concerns about multiple memberships and constituencies and dealing with votes. What I'd like to do is I'd like to send my comments to the committee and have someone take a look at that. What I'm talking about Ron is this basically, I'll read what I said here basically.

I'm somewhat concerned that there is not a provision for formal declaration of what constituency a multiple member elects to vote in. We need to ensure that selected entities don't fence jump on a selective basis. The declaration should be an annual binding declaration unless the entity withdraws formally from other constituencies.

And I think what I'm really trying to say is that there are situations already that exist and I will use as an example only because it's easy if I use a specific example, (Rob Hall). All right, (Rob Hall) owns a company that happens to be a member of the business constituency. (Rob Hall) also owns an interest in a company that happens to be a member of the registrar constituency and (Rob Hall) is talking about becoming a registry as well.

And I think in order to ensure that we have adequate protection against multiple votes as well as fence jumping, we need to have a process in place that ensures that a vote is taken in only one constituency in that case. Now I had a discussion with a couple of members about the board governance committee and they both agreed and it's a matter of where does this get hard-coded or put in? I won't bother you all with anymore of the specifics now but I need to find out does this fall within the purview of our working group? Is -- you know.

Ray Fassett: Good question Ken. Now I'm looking at the bylaws document under Article 10, generic name supporting organization, Section 3, GNSO Council and then the structure. Now there it identifies there will be three representatives selected from the registry, three from the registrar stakeholder group, six from the commercial, six from the non-commercial. Now your point is one company could have a representative on each of those.

Ken Stubbs: Well what I'm saying no...

Ron Andruff: No, no, no.

Ken Stubbs: ...you can't -- I'm not talking about the memberships in the policy -- the councils because that's already a situation where it's covered. What I'm saying is if a company -- it's possible for a company to in effect have three weighted votes in developing policies that affect the DNS. And I think that that's something that we need to protect against. In other words...

Ray Fassett: You mean at the working group level?

Ken Stubbs: ...you could see what I'm talking about...

((Crosstalk))

Man: No...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Stubbs: ...if somebody has a vote to impact a decision that -- let's say the business constituency is making on a vote on a PDP, they also have a vote in the registrar constituencies final decision on a vote on a PDP and they also have a vote in the registry. They're triple dipping in terms of their impact and I think we need to make sure that we don't get into a situation.

I'm not talking about a situation where -- let me use as an example. Let's assume (Rob Hall)'s a member of the business constituency. He's a dues-paying member. He should have the right to vote in the general constituency operations. He should have a right to vote on the amount of the dues, who gets elected chairman and stuff like that. But (Rob) should not have a vote on a business constituency position on a PDP and then turn around and have the same vote again on registrar constituency position on the same PDP and then again in the registry constituency.

That's what I'm talking about. And it is a potential problem that's going to pop up in the future and I just don't know where it needs to be addressed. That's all.

Ray Fassett: Yes, I see your point. Okay.

Ron Andruff: And I agree with everything you've said Ken. Then this -- I 100% support this issue that you're raising. I think the really -- what we're talking about, you can use the word "vote" but you can also use the word "lobby." And if you have an entity that is using multiple storefronts, if you will, to basically promote a position, one within the BC, one within the registrars, one within the registries and just using, you know, different faces but basically the same position and that voting is going on, that becomes very problematic.

It's capture and the example is well taken. So that's -- we really should give some thought to that and so I wonder if you might - you've written something Ken, maybe you might circulate that or frame that a little better and send it out to the committee - out to the work team I should say.

And we should all give some thought to that and where that belongs and how we should try to frame that. But it would certainly fall into terms of reference as far as I see.

Ken Stubbs: Well I appreciate that and I want to do two things. Number one I want to apologize for using Rob Hall. It is not Rob specifically but he's an example that's easy to make because we're all familiar with him and we all are aware of those things.

It also might behoove us to have this thing run up the flagpole inside ICANN to find out where they think it really needs to go.

Because it may very well be an issue that needs to be hard coded into the GNSO bylaws you know. I really don't know and I'm not in a position to make that decision.

But I'm certain that somebody up the road would - you know I could - that's what I'm looking at.

Ron Andruff: Absolutely, it could be viewed - and we all agree this is not targeting Rob, Rob was a good example but I think we can all agree it's really about avoiding capture and avoiding you know one entity having undue influence over the whole organization.

Ken Stubbs: Okay, I'll send something out to you guys but it will be a broad concept because how it gets framed is it has to be done in a very practical way.

I'm not trying by any means to diminish somebody's ability to have some sort of an operating - operations influence in the constituency that they really do have a strong interest in, you know.

So it's more policy, general policy than it is constituency operations, that's all.

Ron Andruff: Understood. And the reason I'm asking for that document is just if we can see some black on white I think we can all put this together to try to shape that into something that would be - that the whole group could get behind.

Ken Stubbs: Sure. Yes. Okay, thank you very much.

Ray Fassett: It's a good point Ken, thanks for clarifying that, I get it now. That will be helpful. But you know Julie was making a point previous to that too which was in our current rules of procedure document if it says may be affected by you know the PDP work team for example, then we - our work team is to remain hands off to that particular topic?

Ron Andruff: So that would be specifically points 6 to 15 if you look at just that particular page, Page 2. But I think what Julie's comment was is they are working on developing that, we don't - we should have a look at those things.

But we don't have to do anything necessarily on those things. And what I was suggesting is that any work that has been done that Julie can bring to the table on those elements so we can see where that's going may help us to flesh out other elements of this particular document we're working on.

Ray Fassett: Right, because in communication with the OSC, they're basically telling me straight out that this rules of procedure document has to be in place in order to see the council by Seoul.

So if we're dependent on other work teams then, I think we have to communicate that back to the OSC. Areas 6 through 15, are they crucial to seating the council?

Ron Andruff: Well now Ray I think right, sorry to interrupt but I think let's make sure - let's do our work. You know I think the whole document needs to have some review by us, but what we're saying is that if there's been some material change.

Ray Fassett: I agree, I agree with that, I get that point. I'm wondering though Julie, do you know is PDP work team even looking at the rules of procedure? Are they looking to draft language under - it's an unfair question perhaps.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And the answer is because I'm also sometimes participating in the PDP team, but they don't deal with procedure. They are just working on let me say on the structure of the PDP process and the pros and cons for different rules let me say and different items to be incorporated in the structure.

But at the time being they are not that far really to work on the work list procedure.

Ron Andruff: So Wolf just to put a sharper point on it, if I take it by example task number seven, task forces and you know it's noted here may be affected by the PDP work team.

So I would assume that the PDP work team is actually defining or perhaps shaping what those task forces might look like, or not?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well they are a separate group. You know the PPSC, the steering committee has two sub groups, the one is the PDP work team and the other group is a working group team, work team.

It's a real separate group and I assume that they are working on those items.

Ray Fassett: Well and that's the point, that's what I'm asking Julie to come back with is really to clarify exactly that, if there's work being done by one sub group or another sub group, you know what are they bringing to the party?

And what - is there something new within this that we need to address. Otherwise I'm going to assume that these elements, you know we have responsibility to review them but recognizing there are other bodies working on that unless there's something screaming at us that needs changes, we'll defer to those groups.

Julie Hedlund: Right, this is Julie. So you, Wolf-Ulrich you're absolutely right. While the PDP work team and the work group, working group work teams, so those are the two are not looking specifically at the rules of procedure.

In a sense what they are doing is my understanding is that they are in coming up with the structure for these processes they are essentially creating the, you know, the language that would then be incorporated into the rules and procedures.

For example, on voting for - voting threshold for you know on a PDP, if they say you know if this percentage, you know right now in the procedures it says 33% of you know the GNSO council.

That is you know now under discussion, is likely to change because of the bicameral structure of you know of the GNSO and so you know as those two work teams say, well we think the voting threshold should be this, you know.

Or we think that this is how task forces should be developed and constructed, then that - those recommendations will then be incorporated into the rules of procedure.

And that's probably going to be a fairly administrative process. I mean this team will look at that, but once those two teams make their recommendations, those recommendations go up through the PPSC.

And if the PPSC says yes we agree those look good, then you know they would probably simply be incorporated in more of an administrative fashion into the rules of procedure.

In which case this particular work team would not be having to do that.

Ron Andruff: Well let's - I think we need to make clear in this rules of procedure document that we have now, a little bit more hard coded. It's not may be affected, it...

Julie Hedlund: Yes, and I said may be because - the reason I said maybe is because conceivably the two PPSC work teams could say no, the way it's written right - you know the way it's working right now is fine and we're not going to change it.

And if there's no change then conceivably a section, you know that some of the languages within this section may not change, may not you know and therefore will stay the same.

Ray Fassett: All right, we'll say pending output from PDP work team.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, they're on the - you know the same track as we are to get their work done as quickly as possible. Recognizing the fact that they may have a little bit more leeway because of the fact that there may not be votes on you know policy you know when the new council is seated.

I guess another way to put this is that some things may be able to - some aspects of the current rules and procedures may be able to be applicable when the new council is seated.

Meaning that they may not have to change, you know they may not be affected by the bicameral structure or some other things.

And so the council could be seated and they would proceed in some cases under rewritten aspects of the new rules and procedures. And they may proceed in other cases under existing, you know the way that real procedures are currently existing.

This is a way Rob Hoggarth had explained it to me that perhaps what might happen or could happen at the time that the new council is seated is that the things that absolutely have to change, that either are affected by the bylaws

or they change because of the structure of the council, you know those things have to be done.

And then there may be things that don't need to change and those things wouldn't necessarily have to be done in time, meaning that there wouldn't necessarily have to be a brand new completely rewritten rules of procedures document ready for when the council (unintelligible).

They may be able to operate under sort of you know transitional document. And some things just may not change at all, for instance as your group looks through this, it's something as simple as you know minutes and how minutes are taken.

You know if you made it - you know if you said well we didn't get around to the section on how minutes are taken, you know and if the council proceeds according to the way that language is right now in the procedures, that may be perfectly fine.

Ron Andruff: Well and that's how I see it and I think Ray to alleviate some of the concern that you have about how much work has to be done. It appears to me having heard what Julie just said that we're really addressing you know points number three through five.

And again in many cases we're just reviewing them and saying you know that still makes sense. Or you know this is outdated, we need to update that language. So I think we're not so far away from completing our specific task on this.

But we really won't be able to check this off the list until the other work groups have done their - finished their aspects of it. So I think in response to the OSC you can go back and note that there are three work teams all working on this document.

We are doing our part, we'll have our part done shortly and then we will just wait to have the others complete once they've done we will do a review.

But I don't think there's too much for us to review because it will already have been reviewed a number of times by different people, different groups up the chain of command.

So I think we're not - and the essence of my comment is we're not that far away from getting this document completed for our work team.

Ray Fassett: Right, that's a really good point Ron. Yes, my communication I think back to OSC who are asking me for time frames of deliverables will be - it is our position as a work team agreed upon that sections 6 through 15 we are dependent upon output from the other work teams.

Ron Andruff: That's it.

Julie Hedlund: Right, and I should add here and you know as all of you have said, we have some sense of which way the bylaws are going because there's been a vote in the council.

They're out for public comment, we can put them in this document and that's going to make it a lot more clear, the few things and I think they are few that this team is absolutely must address in order for the new council to be seated.

So those things that you can do, they're not (unintelligible) clause, they're not dependent on other work teams and those are the distillation of this you know what we're trying to get to.

Ron Andruff: Absolutely so in section three through five what we're going to have soon is which of those sections are basically completed by the bylaws as of this point.

Ray Fassett: Exactly. And from council terms for example, council's terms, that's in the bylaws. That's what I'm saying is that much of the work has already been done, we just need to be a little patient over the next few weeks to let it continue to flesh out and see what Julie comes up with in terms of revisions that we need to address.

Ron Andruff: Yes, right. We're going to go ahead and accept this document now even though it's not a final document, the bylaws document we're going to go ahead and accept that as a fixed document for now so that we can update these sections three through five.

Ray Fassett: Right.

Julie Hedlund: Right.

Ray Fassett: And then see what's left.

Julie Hedlund: And so as far as like what's left, for instance I'm just kind of looking ahead here, so number five, conduct of council meetings, right away that - you know identified that as a priority because they're immediately they're going to have a meeting in Seoul right?

They're going to sit down, they're going to be constituted and they're probably going to have a meeting.

Ron Andruff: Who's doing the dishes? I'm hearing a lot of noise and it's tough to...

Ken Stubbs: Well if they're going to do it they should cook for me as well.

Julie Hedlund: I'm good at multi-tasking but I'm not that good.

Ron Andruff: All right, I'm sorry go ahead Julie.

Julie Hedlund: No it's just that you know for instance if you look at just as an example number five, conduct of council meetings, now numbers of votes cast, voting is something that is you know is affected by the bylaws because it depends - you know the way votes are taken now, it has to do with bicameral structure and so on.

So that and encore brave, whatever that language is. But something simple like minutes, procedures, speaking at meetings, seatings, proxies, you know who can vote for whom, that sort of thing.

Who can be a proxy, you know are you eligible? We could look at those sections, you know they're not affected by the bylaws, they're not affected by the PDP process.

And you may just read through that and say you know that's pretty good or maybe it could be a little clearer. And then we'll add - you know we'll do something else with it.

But those would be I think pretty you know relatively straight forward things to deal with.

Ron Andruff: That's exactly my point Julie, exactly my point.

Ray Fassett: I think that's a very good point, I appreciate the discussion and bringing clarity for me as the chair. I sincerely appreciate it.

And with that said, let's - and given that next week people can't or are unable to participate let's for now let's keep with our two week, okay?

I'll go back to you on this Gisella, let's revisit then where we're at in two weeks on this. Julie obviously will be providing us documents for us to read through.

And let's double back in two weeks. Does that make sense?

Ron Andruff: Absolutely, that would be fine. So we should be able to check a lot of stuff off in two weeks because we will have had a chance to review the various fresh documentation that has been completed.

Ray Fassett: Then let's decide in two weeks if we need to go to weekly.

Ken Stubbs: Ray, I'll send that document out we talked to you guys as well.

Julie Hedlund: And I will send out the revised you know rules and procedures document with the language from the bylaws and if there's anything I can include from what's happening in the PDP and working group teams.

And then I will set out - set aside, you know sort of set out highlighted within there the sections that (unintelligible) by anybody else that you know are a priority item, we can (unintelligible).

Ray Fassett: Thank you. And I'm going to give feedback back to the OSC as I said that sections 6 through 15 were dependent upon other work teams. Now that might be a revelation for them, I don't know.

So...

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I think it probably isn't Ray. I mean and I would still you know in your communication I would say maybe that you know as near as we can tell, I mean I haven't done that analysis to exactly see what they're doing and what the language is.

But you know my sense is that yes, a lot of - anything that relates to PDP and working groups is - you know I guess this is why I use the term may or likely to be is really something that we can't deal with.

You know in your communication insights it appears to us that we're going to be dependent on what happens in those teams and I don't think that would be a revelation to them.

Ray Fassett: Great, fair enough. Okay, well I think we have our next steps. Now I do want to spend a couple minutes on the - just real quickly on the (kite) document that we want to send out here.

I apologize, I was not able to get the formatting down on that document in order it to have gone out already as we had planned.

So we're okay with - I think I made one minor change where it was need better example, I just kind of tried to wordsmith that a little bit, is everybody okay with how I wordsmithed it?

Ron Andruff: Yes, I'm fully in agreement with that document as it is Ray and as I noted in an email, I'm on a 16 hour flight tomorrow so I will have time to - I drafted that original figure, you know the drawing.

So it's - if I'll go back and clean it up and reattach it to the document that you and Rob worked on. So what I will send back to the group and to Julie is the what I'll call the final draft.

Which is all I'm doing is just cleaning up the formatting of that drawing and sending it on in one full document.

Ray Fassett: One with all the changes and basically have it in final form where - and do we have an email address yet set up?

I think that we discussed that there would be - the staff would set up an email address for everybody to be able to respond to.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, but Ron don't expect a comment from my side from next Monday on, I will be out for ten days without email.

So I accept all what you are doing.

Ron Andruff: No, we'll forward, all I was saying is all I'm going to do is just I'm going to take what the document - as it is. I think that the purpose of what Ray just said is we all agree on the document as it is.

All I'm going to do is just clean up the formatting that keeps making the document look kind of crazy vis-à-vis the drawing itself.

The drawing doesn't appear properly on the - within in the four pages, three pages. I'm just going to - because I drafted the original one I might - what happens when you send these things back and forth from time to time the formatting goes wonky.

And it's impossible to get it back I'm saying because I have the original document in my computer, I'm just going to clean that up, attach it back to the document now that we just received that we all weighed in on recently.

So there's no material change at all, just a clean up of that drawing and reattaching it.

Julie Hedlund: And Ray you asked the question concerning whether or not there was an email address set up and in talking with Rob I think that he had suggested that I think in preliminary discussion with Glen that perhaps the notify address, that is this work team's address could be the address to which comments could be sent.

But Gisella would you mind checking with Glen on that because I'm not - neither Rob nor I were sure whether or not that would be the best approach?

Gisella Gruber-White: What she actually sent through was if you wanted to use the GNSO secretariat email address.

Julie Hedlund: Oh, to have the comments come in to the GNSO secretariat. Well if that's best for her, what do other members of the team think?

Ray Fassett: I don't know, I like the former idea better, just go ahead and send it to our work team email address.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I just don't know if that's problematic for collecting or not. I mean Gisella could you check with Glen and see if there's a problem with using the work team address?

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely I will check with her and get back to you as soon as she gets back to me.

Ray Fassett: I guess I don't feel strongly either way, I just...

Ron Andruff: Well I think you're right though Ray if it goes to the GNSO mailing list it might look a little too formal in the sense that - because we're saying we just need direction.

And I would concur with what you just said, if it went to our - and I mean I don't think if we get 25 emails I'd be kind of surprised. So it's not like we're going to get this avalanche of mail. And I think that would be helpful if it comes to our email address as stuff comes in, we'll all see it simultaneously.

Ray Fassett: Yes, I think that's best for us as a work team.

Ron Andruff: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: I just had one other question Ray. Rob and I - Rob when we spoke this morning about this, was there to be a - some kind of a you know text for an

email that would go along with this to have a little explanation as far as what this is and was somebody working on that?

Ron Andruff: Well I can add that to that first, the opening statement because we say we have one question we ask you and we think - and then that's where Ray has added all comments are welcome and I can put the email address right in there.

Ray Fassett: What about in the body of the email like when I send it out to the...

Ron Andruff: And again I would double up with that, yes. But I mean in terms of the document we send we have in there and then we also put it in the body copy of your excellent explanatory email. That way they've got it twice.

Ray Fassett: So do you want what was the former original box, you want that whole thing in the email?

Ron Andruff: Yes, there's no reason why it shouldn't. You know I always take the position that people don't really read so if you give it to them twice, you know they might actually see what we're asking.

Ray Fassett: Read one of them. Okay.

Ron Andruff: Yes, they'll either read the email or they'll read it when they open the attachment.

Ray Fassett: Right. Okay, that's easy enough.

Ron Andruff: So if that's checked off the list then I have one question on the SOIDOI document, I wonder if we've gotten any feedback from staff on that.

Ray Fassett: No I haven't and I have to ping them, I will. I'll ping them. I know that (Dan) was on vacation but he has not gotten back.

Ron Andruff: Yes, I had understood he handed it off to some other staff members.

Ray Fassett: I'll ping him today. I haven't gotten anything back.

Ron Andruff: I had to check that one off the list as well.

Ray Fassett: Yes, and those documents are also in the hands of OSC.

Ron Andruff: Yes. And OSC I think was fine with that as I understand it.

Ray Fassett: Okay, so I think that's all I have for today, any other business? Okay then we can likely stop the recording and adjourn.

Ron Andruff: Enjoy your vacation Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knob: Thank you, enjoy your time in Taiwan.

Ray Fassett: Julie congratulations and Ron thank you very much for joining us at such an odd hour there.

Ron Andruff: No problem at all, with pleasure. Good night everyone.

Julie Hedlund: Sorry, thank you, good night.

Ray Fassett: Bye.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you (Louise).

Coordinator: Bye Gisella, thank you, I'll get the recording listed now.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much have a good day, bye bye.

Coordinator: You too, thanks, bye.

END