

**GNSO
Operations Steering Committee (OSC) GNSO Council Operations Work Team
10 June 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 10 June 2009 at 16:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is ncomplete 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-council-ops-20090610.mp3>

On page:

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

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

Participants present:

Ray Fasset - Work Team leader Registry c.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben - ISPC

Ron Andruff - CBUC

Ken Stubbs - Registry c.

ICANN Staff

Julie Hedlund

Glen de Saint Géry

Ray Fasset: Okay, so a quick roll call.

Operator: Okay, so the conference is now recording.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay, shall I do the roll call?

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay, we have on the call Ron Andruff, yourself, Ray Fasset and Wolf-Ulrich Knoben.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: And we have for staff Julie Hedlund and myself, Glen Desaintgery.

Ray Fasset: Okay. Thank you, Glen. Well, let's go ahead and get started. We - I sent out a brief agenda yesterday. I basically one through five items.

The first one being there has been some good activity on Lists between Ron and I and even others. I think Wolf and Tony both submitted comments last Thursday and Friday with regards to the smaller feedback we received on the (kite) proposal.

So, you know, I have as a first item here, we've got this threshold question here of should we send this document out in its present form? Of course, then I had turned around and made some edits to it.

Should we send this document out in its present form to constituencies for broader -- their membership to comment on in a very narrow way on these three or four questions, not offer their comment but answer these questions, so to speak.

You know, so we have a threshold question of do we want to take that step? Now in light of that we also have had some direction from the OSC of, you know, let's get our attention going on the rules of procedure document.

Not that this exercise that we've been doing has been, you know, not worthwhile. I personally believe it has been worthwhile because we've been able to vet out a lot of issues consistent to our charter and our mission.

But nonetheless, we are sitting here today and we have a threshold question that I'm looking to seek consensus on. Should we send this document out in its present form to constituencies for their member feedback? And I'll just start with that. Does anybody have any comment?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Wolf.

Ray Fasset: That's Wolf. I'll put Wolf in the queue. I'm sure Ron - I'll put you in the queue, right?

Ron Andruff: Thank you, yes.

Ray Fasset: All right.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well, I have read all your email traffic going on today and yesterday and first of all, well, I was asking why it's so difficult, well, to get the kite flying as they say this way? I think maybe there is a basic difference in what we would like - in understanding what we would like to achieve.

Let me say it that way. So Ron, you - several times you expressed the view that you might see that only as kite, you know, just asking people yes or no and therefore for an answer getting yes or no. Are you satisfied with that, shall we continue or not?

This is, you know, for me it's a little bit - it's harder to do it that way. I'm thinking a little bit different so that means for me I would like - if I would like to send something out to the outside world, I would like it, shall we say, to be as pure as possible that I get an answer yes.

That's what my feeling is, you know, and then my basic feeling, so that means that I would like to be in a position that I don't get only an answer no. So that's my starting point, you know, and that may be different.

And then from this point of view that is see the reason why I was every time, okay, asking for some basic input, you know, for that document. But anyway, so that's, you know, that is my feeling on it.

So coming to, let me say, to a conclusion what I get now from all this discussion is that, I was thinking well, we could find a kind of compromise in that. And I would have a proposal to that, so we have sent out already this document to people, to some people from the community which we were thinking they could give us some answer.

But that's not so relatively widespread, let me say, some board members, some council members, some members from the OSC and so on. So as we have a charter here in the OSC and also in our working team which alerted them clearly that so how to - how to work, and how to proceed in cases if we are not - if we could not agree in some cases. Why shouldn't we follow that?

And that means we did not yet officially ask the OSC as a whole, not only the OSC, OSC chair but the OSC as a whole, what to do with that business document.

My proposal would be, you know, why shouldn't we ask the OSC officially and in addition to the letter which we send to the OSC also include our wish that - our wish that it should be broadcast within the constituencies and but we leave it open to the members of the OSC to - how to inform their constituency members.

As I remember the most of the OSC members are people from the different constituencies and they are also leaders of constituencies in OSC. So that's my proposal to that and I would like to discuss that with you.

Ray Fasset: Let me see if I understand it, Wolf, take the document in its present form...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Whether we want to put my edits in there most recently or take those out, I can go either way on that. It doesn't matter. And as a step we send it to the OSC in an official capacity and we ask them a question of do you feel this document should be sent out to the constituencies for member input? Do you feel we should take that step? Is that the idea?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No, it's not a bad idea. It's not exactly that, but you know, in a way it's the same and we should send it out officially to the OSC, but not only asking should we send it out to the constituencies.

We should ask the OSC for their advice, official advice, and in addition ask the OSC also to discuss that within their - in their capacity as

constituencies, members or leaders, to discuss that within their constituencies. To get a feedback on an OSC meeting in Sydney which should be taking place in Sydney. That's my proposal.

Ray Fasset: Okay, I'm just trying to get my hands around exactly what we're asking the OSC. Are we asking for their input on to the substance of the report? Is that what we're asking for?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. We are asking the same questions, we should ask to same questions as we ask to the others, you know, which is the questions which we put together in the document.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Those questions, but also not only to the OSC members, but tell them in the accompanying letter, let me say, or introducing letter, please - it's up to you. It would be nice if you could get an input offer from your constituency.

Ray Fasset: I see.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So that's the way.

Ray Fasset: I see.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So, but the deadlines would be then for Sydney because I have seen in Sydney and Chuck also has written to me that there is no - there is not yet planned an OSC meeting, but he was open to holding an OSC meeting in case there is some substantive issue or item to discuss. And I think that is one.

Ray Fasset: So they're not planning an OSC meeting in Sydney?

Ron Andruff: That's outrageous. That's outrageous.

Ray Fasset: Interesting.

Ron Andruff: It's a face-to-face meeting. Everyone is there and the fact that they wouldn't sit down and have a review of the chair of all of these activities to get a sense of what's going on is mind-boggling. But maybe Chuck's just busy and hasn't...

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: That's sort of what I - when I had some email contact with Chuck and he wrote me again, not yet, it was one week ago. He didn't have in mind an official OSC meeting, but in case there is some substance about it. So I think there is something.

Ray Fasset: Okay, Ron, let's move to where you're at here. Let's - be candid. Where are you at?

Ron Andruff: Where I'm at, Chairman, is simply this. We're three people on the phone right now.

Ray Fasset: Yes, I know.

Ron Andruff: It's ludicrous. So my point has been from day one when I took the time to draft the document which we called a kite, which I fleshed out in some detail for all of our work team to review...

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Ron Andruff: Only for that purpose, just to review...

Ray Fasset: Yes. Let me have it. Go ahead.

Ron Andruff: ...to send out to the community, not to the reps. The reps are busy doing what they're doing. Let's send it to the community. Let them say yes, this is a brilliant idea or no, you guys are idiots. That's what it's for. Nothing more, nothing less and it's not about suggesting that we're looking for a yes.

We're a work team. Our job is to define the issue, bring clarity to the elements around the issue and invite the community to say yes or no to our thinking.

When they say yes, this is a brilliant way to go, our high level principle says we suggest to the GNSO policy council that they establish two bodies within the House of GNSO and here's a recommendation of a way forward. Take it or leave it in very simple terms. They can come back and look at our work product. It's all there on the Wiki.

Ray Fasset: Right, and that (unintelligible).

Ron Andruff: They can determine whether any of these ideas that we are suggesting as examples of work are right or wrong.

Ray Fasset: I know, but...

Ron Andruff: But at the end of the day...

Ray Fasset: Yes, but you said something and I think that's - I want to catch it while you said it because, I'm not trying to cut you off, but there's definitely a disconnect here. You're saying a high level principle is to create two groups within the GNSO.

Ron Andruff: Why not?

Ray Fasset: I think...

Ron Andruff: And we don't know that.

Ray Fasset: I think...

Ron Andruff: And we're not looking for a yes.

Ray Fasset: I think...

Ron Andruff: And we're not looking for a no. What we're looking for...

Ray Fasset: Yes but Ron, it's different.

Ron Andruff: ...is where, you know, we don't have a vested interest here. Our job is to identify.

Ray Fasset: Right. That's different than what I understood the high level principle to be which was about separation of duties. Those are not into the same thing.

Ron Andruff: Ray, my goodness.

Ray Fasset: So, I'm sorry, but I find that to be a finer point.

Ron Andruff: I'm sorry. I'm getting very frustrated with you guys and I think maybe I should just bow out for a while and let you guys sort out what you think it is and determine it because it's getting extremely frustrating.

Ray Fasset: Well now wait...

Ron Andruff: The point is simply this and if you can - if I can finish my statement, I'll finish it and then I will not say another word on this topic because...

Ray Fasset: I don't want you to do that.

Ron Andruff: ...I can't be a party to this. I can't be - listen, all I'm suggesting is we are too few people. We have not enough voices here to make any of these determinations whatsoever. But for some reason my colleagues on this work team are reluctant to ask the community if this idea makes sense to them.

I don't care if - believe me, if you guys want to go and select a panel of 500 ICANN community representatives and send it to them with a check box yes or no. I don't care how we do it.

But we cannot at all begin to address operating principles of a generic name supporting organization unless we get guidance here because there's three of us talking every call about the same things.

It's ludicrous boys. I'm an entrepreneur. I'm a Chief Executive Officer and my job is to drive business forward every day. My job is not to go

back and forth over the same things and split hairs. The only reason there's so much detail in this document is for people to understand...

Ray Fasset: I know.

Ron Andruff: ...what we're talking about. What does it mean when you separate responsibilities? Well, this group would do that and this group would do this. Policy people are Policy Counselors. That's why we named them that.

And we named the other group Administration Representatives. They're not policy people, they don't sit on council. They have nothing to do with council. We've talked about this on every call since the document was written.

So Chair, my point is this, going to the GNOS - or going to the operating - the OSC and submitting it to them with a request they may or may not want to submit it to a larger group is fruitless. The OSC - our job, let's just put everything in perspective - our job was to work on a list of issues and bring them into some rules of procedure.

And this is what we've been attacking. We've been attacking two big parts. This part we're attacking here is structure and we have to get some sense from community if they agree or disagree instead of you disagreeing with me and me disagreeing with you. It's fruitless what we're doing right now.

Ray Fasset: I'm not doing that. I'm really...

Ron Andruff: I'm going to finish Chair, please.

Ray Fasset: Ron...

Ron Andruff: I'm going to finish if I may. So when we take this now and start giving it to OSC for an OSC meeting we're giving it who - to exactly the same people that are currently on the GNSO council who may or may not believe this is right or wrong. And they have a vested interest, perhaps.

I'm saying take the kite to the community, get a sense from community do they like this direction? If they like the direction then we'll write a high level principle saying it's going to be two bodies, one administrative, one policy. If they don't like we're going to submit a recommendation that says we're going to go with one policy council and this is what they're going to do.

That's the point, boys. It has nothing to do with us. Our job is to create an idea and put it forward to the community. And if you do not want to that's fine.

But I'm telling you from my part, I cannot continue to be on these one hour calls from, you know, different parts of the world where I am in to go through the same thing again and again. If you read the document - the five page document - it's very clear.

Ray Fasset: Yes. Okay, Ron, is that it?

Ron Andruff: Yes, yes, I think so. I think so.

Ray Fasset: I hear you that you say it's very clear. And my point is not to revisit, you know, things that you feel has been accomplished or all ready discussed. But there are other comments coming in. And my role...

Ron Andruff: Ray. Listen, you're the Chairman of two people...

Ray Fasset: ...as Chair is to hear these comments.

Ron Andruff: ...about three of us. Do you...

Ray Fasset: No, no, there's...

Ron Andruff: ...think any of the three of us have a voice...

Ray Fasset: Yes, but, Ron...

Ron Andruff: ...that can make sense here?

Ray Fasset: ...is it my turn? Is it my turn?

Ron Andruff: I beg your pardon.

Ray Fasset: Okay. Just last Thursday comments came in from Tony. We did - first of all I accept as - let me just explain my role here. First of all I accepted your document in as a substantive document, you know, as the Chair of this group.

From there we talked about the document. We made improvements to the document, not just your efforts but other people's efforts. And we included, you know, we've included an organizational chart because

we weren't clear. We didn't understand the structure of what the text was explaining.

From there we did another request of the work team. We sent it out to a small group of people to get their feedback. Their feedback came back and...

Ron Andruff: At best it was vague. And we never saw anything in writing so I'm not sure what it was. I mean, I saw...

Ray Fasset: Wait a minute, I'm not done.

Ron Andruff: ...your summary but I'm saying...

Ray Fasset: I'm not done.

Ron Andruff: ...this is the thing we lack.

Ray Fasset: Okay, I hear you. I'm not done. I'm just talking about the steps while you may...

Ron Andruff: Oh, Ray, come on, we know the steps.

Ray Fasset: Ron, our...

Ron Andruff: That's fine. I agree. I grant you that we've been making progress.

Ray Fasset: Okay, Ron, right. It's not that we're just wasting time here to rehash the same old issues. We are actually progressing through people being

able to offer their input and discussion and we're, you know, that's what we're supposed to be doing, okay?

So I think we have done that in a progressive way understanding people have, you know, other things on their plate and, you know, are getting to it as they can. But we've done...

Ron Andruff: Chair, if I may just speak to that point?

Ray Fasset: Let me - yes, okay, go ahead.

Ron Andruff: That point is this, people get to it when they can. They forget the substance of what we're doing and the particular position within which we are.

Ray Fasset: Well, that's my job.

Ron Andruff: Our job as a work team is to provide some documentation of work product to the OSC.

Ray Fasset: Right.

Ron Andruff: The OSC is going to chew it all over in regards to all of the other stuff that's coming in and then they're going to bring it forward for public comments.

Ray Fasset: Okay, now let me finish, okay? So this is - these are the steps we've gone through, and I know you're getting frustrated because it appears to you that we're just rehashing what is all ready clear.

Ron Andruff: No, not at all. I'm just...

Ray Fasset: Let me finish. Let me finish. Let me finish.

Ron Andruff: ...saying that we're splitting hairs on stuff that has no relevance in terms of the picture we're trying to achieve.

Ray Fasset: Right, there's where I'm going.

Okay, you're saying what's clear and irrelevant, is to me as a Chair not clear and irrelevant.

Let me give you an example. Just a few minutes ago an email popped - I asked you a question today, can an administrative volunteer per the document be a member of the (EXCOM).

Yours said yes. Ken Stubbs interprets this conversation and says no. Now this is just, again, one example of the confusion that is going on as it pertains to the structure.

Ron Andruff: Well it would be nice if Ken Stubbs sent the same statement to us all so we all were privy to it...

Ray Fasset: Oh, isn't it in there.

Ron Andruff: ...then we'd have only one conversation.

Ray Fasset: Isn't it in there? I mean, I don't know if he's...

Ron Andruff: I don't have it. I never saw it.

Ray Fasset: All right, well he must have cc'd me, I mean, must have sent reply to me. I mean, you know, I'll forward this right now. I mean I'm sure he (unintelligible)...

Ron Andruff: My point is Ray, we got a handful of people talking about something important. So you make a decision as the Chair what you want to do because from my point of view I just I don't see this - I can bring any more value to this group and all I am is a distraction on it. So I'll pull back, no problem for that.

Ray Fasset: No, no, no, no. No, I'm not asking you to pull back and I'm surely not asking you to not contribute.

What I am asking you to understand or at least take some level of appreciation of is there's more confusion than what you are stating is the case. And I really don't...

Ron Andruff: Ray, hey Ray, there's going to be a thousand questions. Believe me, 1001, but through all that noise all we're looking for is the kind of a general sense of this cacophony of noise is louder than that cacophony of noise. To which we will say thank you. I will submit a work product to the OSC.

Ray Fasset: Okay. All right, well we have a fundamental difference of opinion as I'm not comfortable - now I'm speaking as a member of the work team not the Chair. I'm not comfortable sending out a document that is unclear. Now you're...

Ron Andruff: Well, that's fine. Then...

Ray Fasset: Your fundamental difference - yes, but I'm talking as a work team member, Ron. I'm not talking as the Chair, okay? Now you as a work team member are stating that is not the case. Okay, so now I'm going to go back to what Wolf said earlier. Wolf said when we don't have a consensus position...

Ron Andruff: And that's what the document says right at the very top, if you read the opening statement.

Ray Fasset: But when we don't have...

Ron Andruff: It says we don't have consensus. We're asking opinion...

Ray Fasset: No, no, no, no, no.

Ron Andruff: ...because we're too small a group.

Ray Fasset: Ron, we don't have to consensus the division of sending it out. Not of what the contents are of the document. This is where we don't have a consensus position of sending this...

Ron Andruff: All right seeing as how there's three of us on the phone then I would move that we adjourn this discussion until we have a larger group. Next subject please.

Ray Fasset: But what I am suggesting is going to the charter and the rules of procedure of our charter that Wolf has cited as I think a logical approach when we don't have consensus we go to the OSC and seek

their advice. Is that what you - basically what you stated, Wolf, as a way forward?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Yes, that's why I'm - well, but my additional (unintelligible) would be what do you think is the community that you would like to ask the community because from my knowledge from ICANN it's every time you're talking about community, but again and again these are the same people?

Ron Andruff: The community of ISPs, the community of the BC, the community of the registries or the community of the registrars. They put it on the list and the discussion happens and then we get feedback from maybe their administrator or their representative saying our general feeling was 60% said no, 40% said yes. Thank you. Thank you. That's what we needed.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Well that could be done through the OSC, why not?

Ron Andruff: No, the OSC is too small a body, too, and what they are are the elected reps from the Policy Council and me. I happen to be an alternate in that group.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Well, we have already asked. We have already sent our request to the chairperson of the existing constituencies as I remember very well, (Steve Magall) got it.

Ron Andruff: Right.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: (Unintelligible) three. I don't know who is the chair of that, but leading people have got it, you know?

Ron Andruff: They're the same group that you want to send it to, Wolf, and the point here is that if we ask them to read the documents and give us their response and it describes - it asks two questions and they didn't give us a response.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: No, no, no. We ask him in addition, you know, to read out the opinion that it could be of the opinion of it is to be discussed within the constituencies, but we won't like to bypass them.

Ron Andruff: We're not bypassing them. It's all members of the same community.

Ray Fasset: No, no, no.

Ron Andruff: That's the point. How can we bypass any of them? But listen, I tell you what, if you want to do it that way that's fine. Let's move on to the next agenda item. I mean, you know, I would first state - the only thing I would say on this regard, though, is that Ray's recent edits I think should be removed. I think they cloud the whole document and if that's the case, if you want to send this document with the recent edits then I disagree.

Ray Fasset: Okay. I don't disagree with that. I don't have a problem with that. Wolf, how about yourself?

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: I do not - I don't have a problem, no.

Ray Fasset: Okay, that's fine by me. Now I just want to understand exactly what we're asking the OSC. We're, first of all we're going to articulate to the OSC one, that this is a formal request. Two, there is not a consensus

position within our work team to send this document for broader constituency membership input.

Ron Andruff: Would you point out that the constituents - there's no consensus amongst the three of us on the call?

Ray Fasset: Oh, yes, yes, yes.

Ron Andruff: This is a ridiculous part of this discussion, gentlemen.

Ray Fasset: There's one...

Ron Andruff: There's such a small number of us having this conversation...

Ray Fasset: Yes, I...

Ron Andruff: ...so we don't have consensus when two of us don't agree. That's the size of the group.

Ray Fasset: Ron, let me just say, I mean using terms like ridiculous and things like that, I mean...

Ron Andruff: I'm sorry, Ray.

((Crosstalk))

Ray Fasset: This is not ridiculous.

Ron Andruff: This is not, you know, I beg your pardon for being so forthright. You asked me to be candid. I'm saying to you the three of our voices on this

phone do not represent the global Internet community and the operation of the body most responsible for making sure policy is developed going forward.

Ray Fasset: Okay, fair enough. So I'm going to point out to the OSC formally that we're asking their - that we don't have a consensus position of sending the document out to the constituency for a broader membership feedback.

I would like to ask their advice on that question as to whether we should take that step or two, should we ask is the OSC comfortable sending it out in their capacity to the constituencies for broader membership.

And then three, please answer the three questions that are contained in the document for us.

Ray Andruff: Why don't you just ask them question number two? Dear OSC members, would you please discuss this and based on your discussions send it on to the broader community? If you believe it to be of value?

Ray Fasset: Okay. All right. Wolf, what's your feeling on that?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, and please also put into the letter that they should have a discussion about that and if possible a discussion of a - of this, how do you say that, a discussion in Sydney where we expect also to get responses that the OSC members should bring as far as possible responses from their community, from their constituencies.

You know what I mean, so...

Ray Fasset: Well, if they answer in the affirmative, yes, we think this is a document worthwhile to send out in our capacity, if they answer that in the affirmative where our expectation then is to try to obtain to the best of their ability feedback by the time of Sydney?

Ron Andruff: If I recall, Tony Holmes was objecting to that and I would agree with him. What we should be saying is, "OSC, please review this document at the - at your - review now or review it in Sydney this document and if you agree please distribute it to the broader community for their input.

Or allow us to distribute it to the body, and then, you know, bring the document to the heads of all the current constituencies that says here is a document. Please poll your community to determine whether or not they want to go with this way or that way and advise us in the coming 10 days.

Ken Stubbs: And I agree with Ron. This is Ken. I've been on...

Ray Fasset: Hey, Ken.

Ken Stubbs: I'm sorry I was quiet, but...

Ray Fasset: That's okay.

Ken Stubbs: ...I think that's the best approach to take. Get it out.

Ray Fasset: Very good, very good. We'll get it out to the OSC and ask if they - for them to if...

Ron Andruff: Give approval to the Chair to send it to the constituencies.

Ray Fasset: Very good. If they feel they want to do that, right?

Ron Andruff: Yes.

Ray Fasset: All right. Fair enough. Let's move on to the next one. Thank you, Ron and everybody for that. Next agenda item is, excuse me for a minute.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Procedure.

Ray Fasset: Yes, let's go to the rules of procedure. Basically the section 3.5 and 3.6 quorum and votes respectively, and under this I basically just have general discussion and if possible identify action items.

Now with this said there has been some question within our work team members as to the work we're performing and the rules of procedure and how that relates to other, you know, work teams and potential overlap or of work being done on bylaws and how does that overlap our work?

I'm wondering if Julie, you want to give any kind of background? I don't want to put you on the spot, but is there anything you want to contribute on that point?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, this is Julie. Ray, I'd be happy to do so. What happened was I had gotten together with Rob Hoggarth and Ken Bower and given them suggestions after spending quite some time looking at the rules and

procedures and looking at what was happening with the bylaws as well.

And suggested, you know, asked for their input and suggestions as to how, you know, this team could begin and what would be the crucial sections to address. And Ken in particular is very much involved in the by-law process, working with the GNSO Council's restructuring team.

And also has spent a good deal of time looking through the rules of procedures and he suggested that we start with the quorum and the vote, sections 3.5 and 3.6 and Rob concurred, in section three of the current rules of procedure.

And there's two reasons for this.

First of all, these two sections are not impacted by changes in the bylaws, nor are they impacted by the work of any other work team, but they would be crucial for the new council to be able to begin their work because, you know, it's quite possible that there would be decision that they would need to make that would come down to a vote in that first meeting.

And so that would need to be addressed. And then I've identified other areas within the rules of procedures that we can address as well. I had gone through the whole table of contents and made some suggestions as far as where the bylaws intersect and the works of other teams and I had sent that to Rob.

He hasn't had a chance to get back to me, but I think I can go ahead and send that to the team. It's just - it just takes the table of contents

from the rules of procedures and indicates which are under consideration in the bylaws and the only other teams that impact this work, the work of the team that impacts this work is the PDP work group.

There are a number of sections in the rules of procedure that deal directly with the policy development process and all of those are on hold until they're addressed by the policy development process work team. So we don't need to address it at this time.

Ray Fasset: Okay, so thank you, Julie.

So if I understand it, you know, we've got clear and concise direction from the OSC to be focusing our attention on the rules of procedure, but it is not entirely clear, as some of our work team members have pointed out, where in the rules of procedure we should be focusing on.

I know it's difficult for us in a vacuum to identify exactly where those places are, so we have to push it back now to, when we ask you in your support role, to talk to others within ICANN staff and et cetera, to identify where those areas are for us. And this is the process that we're taking to attack this document. Is that a fair enough analysis?

Ron Andruff: Well, I would like to add to that, Chairman

Ray Fasset: Yes, please, Ron go ahead.

Ron Andruff: Julie, I think you mentioned that you'd created a draft that - what I'll call a chart that delineates who is working on what and where the overlaps are. That's correct?

Julie Hedlund: Right. Actually it's just a table of contents from the rules of procedure and after each I've indicated whether or not it looks like it's an area that's going to be addressed in the bylaws.

And I have to tell you that that's a moving target right now. There are still a few issues there. So it would be to my best current guess, which is why I was running it by Rob first, to get...

Ron Andruff: Very good. So what I'm getting at is simply that that document will give us sort of some direction wherein which we may want to, as a committee and us make a recommendation to the chairman, that we may, as a work team, want to perhaps get on a joint call or even in Sydney sit down and jointly discuss certain items.

If in fact those items are on two tables at one time so at least we can be working in tandem, not working in singularity and operating in two different directions, potentially. So that's point one.

Julie Hedlund: So let me address that real quickly, Ron. I agree with that and in fact I know that the restructuring team is having a meeting which I'm sure anybody can attend and I think that's on Saturday, to go over additional, you know, questions about the bylaws changes.

I think it's very important for the team to be aware of what's happening there. I agree there. I will check with Ken, who is the staff support for the PDP work group. I'm not sure what, you know, I'll check...

Ron Andruff: No, no, that's understood, that part's understood. That's a gray area. No, I wasn't going there. I was just going to the place where we know

what is happening and, if things are gray, then we just mark them gray and say we don't know about that.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I agree with that.

Ron Andruff: Okay. So that was the first point. So that would give us, at least, some direction, Chair, as to where we stand so we're no longer in a vacuum.

And then the second recommendation I would make is that we might want to take these ones, as much as they've been presented as things we consider right now, look at the rest of the work items that we might have on our list, which I have not done, because these two elements, quorum and - let me bring that screen up - quorum and votes, what I was thinking there is that, quorum, I have no idea what that means.

It kind of means if anybody shows up, maybe we can get some clarity from Julie on what quorum means, in this language.

And then on voting, if she could - perhaps staff could rewrite those paragraphs using the new terms that will be used, so constituency - so we're no longer constituencies, but we now become the Commercial Stakeholder Group, et cetera.

So the Stakeholder Group - if we had that language rewritten with the language that we will be using, that would at least give us a head start on that, but quorum, I'm not quite sure what that is.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Wolf. May I talk?

Ray Fasset: Please, Wolf. Go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Also, I would agree to Ron's, because quorum was not very clear to me, but what does it mean in this context here, what is behind that. The other one with regards to other items, including voting, there has been done a lot of work already in preparing the council new structure.

So that's what Julie was mentioning and that still the restructuring group is working on the bylaw amendments and changing some - so there are some documents available.

And regarding the rule change, so I was asking just what it means to work already with, let me say, with the council restructuring work? There was a document maybe already one year ago, when the proposal was put on the table for the two houses approach.

And this proposal including, also, the voting of the two houses, the voting scheme, voting threshold, and is that still relevant - I think it's relevant because the board approved that.

Ron Andruff: That's certainly worth a good long look, absolutely.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And this is all the - it is written something of specific point about the PDP process, the voting threshold regarding that, and it is written all other GNSO business - business simply a majority of both working houses needed, so that's all. That is all included in that document. Is there anything else? That's my question as regards to voting?

Julie Hedlund: Ray, may I address that question?

Ray Fasset: No. No, I'm just kidding, Julie. Go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: And Wolf, over here, you're absolutely right. There was previous work done with respect to voting thresholds. Voting thresholds and particularly relating to policy is dealt with in another section of the procedures and also there is some discussion within the restructuring team as to which voting threshold will be in the bylaws and which will not.

And as far as I saw, from the most recent traffic, I think that's still a moving target. And so this voting, the section here is sort of to be non-policy voting process and sort of a simpler process. And it's a little bit difficult because voting is dealt with in a couple of different places within the procedures.

And I just want to also address the question about the quorum. The question about quorum is just really for, you know, what is considered a quorum, you know, in the context of voting, when the council votes?

And I have some language that was proposed in an early report on the GNSO improvement process that we can use as a start for that, to perhaps give us a little bit more direction.

And I agree with Ron that I think I would be more than happy to adjust the language so it reflects the Stakeholder Group, you know, structure as opposed to the term constituency.

Ron Andruff: Excellent, that's very good news.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well, Julie, though, it was again just to ask the question, did I understand correctly though that you mean, okay, the policy related

voting, well it's a different issue that's what we have to talk about and to discuss right now, but what are then - what would that be, the differences?

So for example, in the other proposal that I mentioned, it's within - it's already covered because it's just all other business, GNSO business. It's done through a simple majority of both voting houses. So, to my - my question is really, well, I would like to understand so what should be behind of that paragraph?

Julie Hedlund: Right. I don't have that language that you referred to in front of me, so I'll have to compare it with what is in this paragraph.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well, one copy is referring to, to some extent, to the PDP it does and then there is a paragraph on all other GNSO business, and there is a different part of for board elections. So this is also covered regarding the kind of majorities within the different houses.

But if you refer to the PDP and all other things, so I wonder what is different besides the PDP? Okay, there are other things to be dealt with, but is it covered by all other GNSO business or is there something else or - so I don't have something arranging in mind, arranging more.

Julie Hedlund: I see, yes, so the - I think I understand. So the PDP voting procedure and thresholds is in the PDP section of the GNSO Council. The all other business voting procedure, I think, is what is referenced in this section here, that is this - by this I mean the 3.6 section titled Vote.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: And I think that - my understanding is that we need to, you know, for all other business, you know, right now we're talking about the number of votes that council members may cast equalized so aggregate number of votes of representatives and then we have to change that Stakeholder Groups, it's not constituencies...

Wolf-Ulrich Knohen: Sure.

Julie Hedlund: You know, right. So that is - that's the voting process for all other business, so any - a resolution, you know, that sort of thing, you know, making sure that there is appropriate representation, when a vote is taken, et cetera.

Man: Mm-hmm.

Julie Hedlund: And then it may be - and I should mention this - when we look at these sections, it may be that in some cases and, perhaps, in many cases, for some of the simplest things like, you know, dealing with mailing lists and other things, we may just have to change the language to reflect the new structure, the new bicameral structure.

Taking out the words constituency, replacing them with Stakeholder Groups and we may find, otherwise, that this is a perfectly acceptable procedure. We shouldn't feel, as a work team, that we have to change something, if it seems like it's a process that's been working, unless we think it can be improved.

Ron Andruff: Julie, you just identified exactly what I said. That's why I would like you to do that document change or that term change, nomenclature change within the document. This is Ron. Thank you very much.

Ray Fasset: Okay. I think that, also, is very useful and I completely agree with Ron on that. We need a starting point and it seems to me the starting point is to fix the terminology to at least reflect - I mean this is I something we can do.

Or if I'm understanding, we feel it would be beneficial, if we re-updated the document to reflect the proper terminology we may then read that particular part and see there's nothing further for us to do with that particular section; is that what I'm hearing?

Ken Stubbs: That's correct.

Ron Andruff: I'm sure we'll have to do some adjustment on quorum though because as it reads right now, it doesn't read anything. But that's exactly my point. Julie articulated it very well.

Ray Fasset: Yes, so we need - I think as a work team, we need that as a starting point. Now, are we talking the entire rules of procedure document or are we talking those sections that Rob and Julie and who else are going to identify for us are within our purview?

Ron Andruff: More the latter than the former, in my view, but it probably would hurt to do this total document.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Ron Andruff: It's only - I think it's eight - I'm not sure, but the length of it is something like eight pages? I may be wrong. I don't have it in front of me, but anyway, I think that for our purposes, certainly things we need, but it wouldn't hurt to do a whole document just so, as we read it, it would be more clear.

Ray Fasset: Okay. Now, how - a suggestion of getting us to that point as a work team, having that document in front of us, I would suggest that we're going to have to draw on staff resources to accomplish this part. Does anybody disagree?

Ron Andruff: No.

Julie Hedlund: Ray, may I get in queue?

Ray Fasset: Yes, Julie, there you go, since you're directly affected.

Julie Hedlund: Staff resources is my cue, I think. What I would propose, if it's acceptable to the team, is that I can go ahead and update terminology in these two sections and - well and in fact I can update it for - I'll do it for the entire section three and also indicate, in section three, those items that are dependent on the bylaws, as the discussion currently stands in the restructuring team.

And also I will insert the recommended language that was in a previous GNSO improvement report with respect to quorum and that could be a starting point.

And I certainly can go through and update the language throughout the rules of procedure in general and send them to - I think I might break

them up into sections since it's fairly lengthy and I think we'll probably deal with them in chunks that way, as well.

And also indicate which sections are dependent on the bylaws and which are dependent on the PDP work group. There are a very large number of sections that are dependent on the PDP work group that we will not be able to deal with at all for quite some time.

So that - you know, I can send you those sections, I can do that before - I'll get them out in time, so that you can have them to review before Sydney, if you like, and we could use that as a starting point.

Ray Fasset: Okay, that is exactly where I was heading. I absolutely believe we will need those for the face-to-face meeting in Sydney. And I would suggest, as an agenda item in Sydney, a real takeaway is to identify those sections, where possible, that really we don't need to spend a lot of work on.

In other words, the language has been updated and it's sort of a process of elimination approach, too, where these sections we don't need to spend time on, but here are the sections where we do, and I think that's kind of what I'm hearing from work team members is we really - it's great that we were able to identify today 3.5 and 3.6, but geez, where does it all fit in the whole bigger scheme of things.

So as an action plan, yes, if we could get the entire document, all sections or at least those that are considered by Rob or others within the purview of our work team, you know, we've been asked direct. We've been instructed by the OSC to work on the rules of procedure as a direct mandate.

Okay, we're willing to do that. Now what are those sections that we need to spend our time on? First, so we need a starting point; provide to us those sections, updated, if possible, we'll ask for staff resources, update with the proper terminology.

And when we have our fact-to-face meeting in Sydney, let's be able to hit the ground running and discuss which of these sections we don't need to spend a lot of time on, if any, because the terminology's been updated, and then, okay, now which ones do we have to spend a lot of time on. So there's my approach. Does anybody have any comment or discussion on that.

Ken Stubbs: No.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

Ron Andruff: Agreed.

Ray Fasset: Okay, now, Julie, within your world, where you live, is the timeline that we have feasible for you to get that to us - you know, actually, we'll need - I don't know, do we want to do it as handouts at the Sydney meeting and then just, you know, dive right in?

Ron Andruff: I would suggest that if Julie could get it done in the next week or so and we all have it, we can give it some consideration prior to our arrival at the meeting on Saturday.

Ray Fasset: Okay, so prior to arrival. Now, I throw back to Julie, is that feasible within your workload?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, it is, Ray, and in fact, I will try to get this done as soon as possible. Just so you know I will also run it by Rob and Ken Bower...

Ray Fasset: Yes, sure.

Julie Hedlund: ...just to make sure that I'm, you know, and so that they can kind of check my work because Ken, in particular, has been so involved in the bylaws process, I want to make sure I - and also the PDP process, so I want to make sure I reflect that correctly.

But I am - I can get it done before Sydney and, in fact, I leave next Wednesday afternoon and so I would definitely want to send this before I leave because I don't arrive until Friday and that would be a little bit late, I think.

Ray Fasset: Okay, well I think that's a good course of action for us to take here towards the mandate that we've been given, to work on this document.

I want to stress, too, that by the time of Sydney, and I think you're going to need Ken and Rob's, you know, cooperation, we have to know which of those areas of the rules of procedure that are the bylaws or the moving targets, et cetera.

We really have to have those identified, so if you can stress that to Rob and Ken. We're more than happy to work on the areas that we can and that are efficient and will not result in overlap from other work teams. We're more than happy to do that, but we have to be told which ones those are. Does that make sense?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ron Andruff: Yes.

Julie Hedlund: Yes and, Ray, I might add that those things that are under discussion right now, as possibly being in the bylaws, we should have a resolution on that probably, I would hope, by Sydney and possibly even sooner, although - no, actually, I take that back because there's no restructuring team call next Monday so I think the next discussion will be in Sydney.

And I will send you the - I'll send you the information on that meeting because I will certainly be attending it and others of you are, you know, there on Saturday. You know, other work team members are welcome to attend as well.

Ray Fasset: Okay, can you again - I'm sorry - identify what that meeting is?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, it's the GNSO restructuring team meeting. This is the group of GNSO council members that are working on the - looking at the bylaws and the changes that need to be made in the bylaws to reflect the GNSO improvements process in the bicameral structure.

That's been going on for several weeks now and I would say that they are nearly complete. There are a few remaining questions that they're trying to finalize and I think they're going to try to see if they can do that in Sydney, although I won't be - you know, I can't be held to that. That's just an impression of mine, I can't...

Ray Fasset: Well, we won't hold you to it.

Julie Hedlund: Okay.

Ray Fasset: Okay. Is there any other comment or discussion on this topic? All right I think we have a plan of action and the reason I wanted to stress that was because really on our very first call we started to talk about the rules of procedure.

And I believe Rob was on that call and this entire issue that we're talking about now about moving targets was why we you know were actually - suggested not to necessarily dive into this document right away.

So I just want to stress now, okay, we've been given a mandate and I want to make sure that we can also be provided clear - we want our work to be productive. It might be only three of us or four of us but you know we want to make sure that we're productive in these meetings.

And I definitely want to be productive as part of the Sydney meeting. I'm sure we all do. So and I even though we're a small team I think, you know, we have a lot of talent here that is extremely worthwhile. So anyway, with that said, I want to move on to the next item.

Ron Andruff: SOIDY.

Ray Fasset: Thank you. SOIDY. Any comments on that?

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: I guess this means we've got to kick this around a little bit. Wolf provided some comments and I responded to those comments because there was some questions that I felt we - I could respond to.

I submitted my comments and Wolf submitted his and I think that document looks pretty close to being ready to circulate. I think there was some good catches in there and I appreciate that, that close read, particularly where we note we actually use the wrong term.

We talk about a declaration of interest which we have not and it's obviously we've changed this to disclosure of interest now so I think from my view with those most recent changes this is ready to go.

Ken Stubbs: I think we should send it.

Ray Fasset: Now send it. When we talk about send it, who are we sending it to?

Ken Stubbs: Well, no. I don't think - I don't think he means send it to anybody. This is just a work product that we've got done and it's ready...

Ray Fasset: Okay. Good.

Ron Andruff: ...to be submitted to the appropriate time.

Ray Fasset: Okay. Great. I agree. Now that was why I (unintelligible).

Ken Stubbs: That's what I meant.

Ron Andruff: Okay. It's Okay. I am with you, Ken.

Ken Stubbs: It's a product. That's all.

Ray Fasset: Okay, making sure we're on the same page.

Ken Stubbs: I have been on calls for four hours so I am getting a little dingy. You'll have to excuse me. I apologize.

Ray Fasset: Yes, wasn't there an IRT call now, Ken?

Ken Stubbs: Yes, there is an IRT call going on, too.

Ray Fasset: There's an IRT, okay. So you chose this one over that one. Thank you.

Ken Stubbs: No, I have this phone in my left ear and the IRT call in my right.

Ray Fasset: All right, all right, very good.

Ken Stubbs: But I have to leave on the hour so...

Ray Fasset: Okay. We've got a few minutes here. Now when I hear send it maybe I'm thinking maybe how do we send it in to the rules of procedures? I think in the rules of procedures there's not any - there's not any mention at all of declaration of interest or statements of interest or conflicts of interest, nothing.

Do we feel that this is something that should be added to the rules of procedures?

Ron Andruff: In my view yes, Chair, and I would suggest that we just park it in terms of where it belongs until we actually work through all of the other

elements and then we can reconstruct the document for submission to the OSC.

Ken Stubbs: And if we want to we can always ask somebody like Dan Halloran to take a look at it to make sure he's comfortable with the way it's worded now. So if there is any crafting that needs to be done let's get it out of the way so we have a completed document.

Ron Andruff: Good point, Ken.

Julie Hedlund: Ray, this is Julie. Can I ask a question?

Ray Fasset: Yes. Yes, please, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: If this is a recommendation for the statement of interest, declaration of interest policy, I think by our charter doesn't this need to go to the OSC as a recommendation from this team?

Ray Fasset: Well let me throw this question back at you then. When we complete the rules of procedure does that - if we collapse this into the rules of procedure isn't that the document we're sending to the OSC?

Julie Hedlund: That's correct, but what I think is I don't know that we have to wait with this until we've completed all the changes to the rules of procedure. I'm suggesting that we could send this now to the OSC as a deliverable.

And because they could consider it you know recognizing that our recommendation would be in sending it to them that it would be you know part of the rules of procedure.

But if they have changes they want us to make then you know we can you know work on those along with the other things that we are doing.

The only reason I am mentioning that is because you know since the OSC is looking for, you know items that the work teams have completed, this is something that should say hey we have agreed on a recommendation and we're sending it to you, recognizing that it will be folded into the rules or procedures.

Ron Andruff: I support that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Okay. How about do we want to get input from Dan Halloran before we send it off to the OSC as what we consider a finished product?

Ron Andruff: Well I think as a matter of course that would - it would be a wise move. And I think that Julie and Rob have done, you know, good work with us on this thing but he's the, you know, second in line or whatever in house, so give it to him. Let him scan it. I'm happy. Then we send it on. I think that's a very good approach.

Ray Fasset: Okay. Then let's do that. Julie, if you could I'll need a final version. Can you do that accepting all changes or however. Can you do that?

Julie Hedlund: Yes, in fact I'll do that right after this call.

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: And I - yes, so and then if you want to then just go ahead and send it on to Dan Halloran letting him know that this is something we've worked on it. I think that would - that's a great idea.

Ray Fasset: Yes, procedurally I am going to make one little adjustment, too, to a point I sort of interpreted from Ron which I thought was a very good point. When I send it off to Dan I'm going to see cc our list so that way you guys know you know what I am saying or - Okay?

Ron Andruff: It's helpful. It's helpful, Ray

Ray Fasset: Yes, and then when we...

Ron Andruff: And it's in the context.

Ray Fasset: Yes and then when Dan replies we'll all be in there and then it's - if we send it off to the OSC and I'm sure that email is Cc'd to the list. So I thought that was a very helpful comment you made, Ron. I just wanted to appreciate that, Okay?

Ron Andruff: Thank you.

Ray Fasset: All right so there's our plan of action. Very good job, everybody, I appreciate it. So you know the next item on the agenda I have, and I know Ken's got to go, is Sydney's face-to-face meeting. You know, I want to explain too, my understanding is OSC people are not going to attend our meetings.

You know, that might seem strange, why wouldn't the OSC attend our meetings especially in a face-to-face? Well they're being very strict to a

code of approach or ethic maybe that they don't want to be seen as influencing our work, as we're going through our work.

In other words there's always been this issue within the GNSO Council that you know the council members are the ones doing the work, they're the ones on the work routes or, you know it's the same people all over the place.

So they're - and I'm - and this is a little bit my own interpretation but I think I'm gaining an appreciation that the members of the OSC do not want to be reaching down and actively being in our groups.

So right now I don't think there's a plan for formal attendance by the OSC into our work team meeting in Sydney, so I wanted to let the team know that.

Ron Andruff: Well I'm sorry to put the kibosh on that, Ray.

Ray Fasset: No, no, no. I hear you.

Ron Andruff: I actually am an OSC member but as an alternate for the BC.

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Ron Andruff: Okay. So but in any case I think the point you've made is well taken. It - rather than having five or six members sort of sitting in kind of watching what we're doing and feeling like big Brother is looking over your shoulder I think it's - the approach is exactly right.

And I think that you know I appreciate and understand that. I am participating in both this work team and the OSC just be - sharing a load within the BC.

Ray Fasset: Very good. So I'm not going to reach out to the OSC and invite them to our meeting. Now obviously it's an open meeting, I believe so anybody can attend and they may but...

Man: Yes.

Ray Fasset: ...I wanted to ask the team if that was appropriate. I'm not going to reach out to them and say hey, you know, can you please attend our meeting and provide us input and advice. I'm not going to do that.

Ron Andruff: Yes, I agree with that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: May I just comment there? Okay, first of all I'm also a member for the OSC so there could be some participating in the meeting, but I'm afraid personally I cannot participate this time in Sydney.

Not personally in Sydney, but what I would like to do if possible is remotely participating if that is convenient to both parts with regards to the time difference.

So I was waiting - so you plan to have a meeting at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. That means at 6 o'clock in the morning here which is not bad because it's summertime, but so that would meet my requirements as well, so I could participate if you start really from 2 o'clock that time, so that's my point for that and so, okay.

Ray Fasset: Okay. Well let's jump right into that then. You know, Ron put forward a request to see if we can extend the time of the meeting from one hour to two hours. You know, the length of the meeting I should say. It appears our scheduled time now is 1400 UTC? Yes, so that's 2 o'clock local time.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh, is it local...

Ron Andruff: Local time, local time, 1400 local time.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Oh, 1400 local time. Yes, okay. Oh, okay. So that would be 2 o'clock local time?

Ron Andruff: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Right. Okay.

Ron Andruff: Two pm.

Ray Fasset: All right, so, we could move the meeting up to as early as 12:30 appears to me which may be cutting into lunch hours so if we wanted to say 1 o'clock, we could go 1:00 to 3:00, right? Yes.

Ron Andruff: And this is just a recommendation. In terms of if we really want to sink our teeth into getting some work done having everybody around the table we might be able to knock a large block off - or a chip off the block so to speak.

So that was my recommendation but if it doesn't fit others' calendars and you feel that an hour is enough then I am fine to agree with that ,too.

Ray Fasset: Well - I'm sorry, go ahead, who's that?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So that means if you - you plan to start it at 1 o'clock? Is that correct?

Ray Fasset: Well, that's what we're talking about, whether we want to start at 1:00 and go from 1:00 to 3:00 or start at 2:00 with a hard end at 3:00? Either way it's a hard end at 3:00.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Oh, okay, 1 o'clock maybe I will join later. It - depending on what - because it's a weekend so and then 5 o'clock in the morning?

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay. So I would like you to look how to help cover that but then okay I know 1:00 to 3:00. So if Glen could let me know the access code and those things so it would be nice.

Ray Fasset: Yes, I'll...

Glen Desaintgery: I'll do that Wolf, but I am busy doing this right this moment.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

Ron Andruff: Actually Glen as we have you on the phone, chair, with your permission could we ask could we be sending a message from the

work team that we would like the OSC to convene a meeting, particularly with regards to discussion item one on the agenda today.

And perhaps any other items they have and perhaps the various work teams could give a report at that meeting as to how much ground they've covered? They've covered you know these ten - these are the ten tasks and four of them have been covered.

The next three should be done in this time period and finally, then at least that would give the operating steering committee just some sense of how things are progressing as opposed to picking it up in the hallways and - a few people but the rest of the committee not knowing what's going on?

Ray Fasset: All right that's an interesting question, to reach out - for us to reach out to the OSC to hold a meeting in Sydney to give all work teams and update on their progress?

Ron Andruff: So that each chair or whatever, members of the other teams can sit in and get a sense of where the whole thing stands right now. It would be interesting to find out how it is progressing through their chore task list as well as how we're progressing with ours.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ray Fasset: Yes. Okay. Okay. I am hearing Wolf and I think he's saying yes. So I think that's sounds like a good idea to him.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That's good. I was asking Chuck by email about, and I know I was really surprise that he didn't say anything.

Ray Fasset: Yes, I could put that request forth to Chuck who's the chair and again, would that be the way to do it or should we ask Glen if that's...

Glen Desaintgery: I think that's the way you should do it. Ray?

Ray Fasset: Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: As I said the schedule is very full and you've probably seen the one that I sent to the group?

Ron Andruff: Yes. Indeed.

Ray Fasset: Yes.

Glen Desaintgery: And so it would be trying to fit in something there.

Ray Fasset: Yes. Okay.

Ron Andruff: Even if it was a one hour meeting - how many work teams are working in tandem right now? Does anyone have any sense? Glen, perhaps you do?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, on that Sunday we have got the...

Ron Andruff: No, no, I'm sorry Glen. My question is for how many work teams in total are working right now simultaneously?

Glen Desaintgery: Oh, of the GNSO

Ron Andruff: Yes.

Glen Desaintgery: There are about 13.

Ron Andruff: Thirteen?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

Ron Andruff: Thirteen different work teams working on different elements of the GNSO?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

Ron Andruff: Well I think that needs - that calls for a discussion face-to-face with the OSC at least to give a ten-minute or five-minute update as to what each one is doing.

Julie Hedlund: Ron?

Glen Desaintgery: Well not - these are not all calls that have to do with the restructuring.

Ron Andruff: Oh, no, that was what my question is.

Glen Desaintgery: Oh, sorry, no there's five restructuring teams.

Ron Andruff: Yes.

Glen Desaintgery: And two of them have got - three of them have got sub-teams.

Julie Hedlund: And this is Julie. Ron, there are three OSC teams...

Ron Andruff: Right.

Julie Hedlund: ...and there are two PPSC teams.

Ron Andruff: Okay.

Julie Hedlund: And I am the staff support for all three of the OSC teams.

Ron Andruff: Oh, okay so that's - there you go. So my point was within one hour if there was possible to get a calendar - to get one hour on the calendar when the OSC sat and got - heard reports from the three OSC teams that it's responsible for, that would be very helpful for all of us I think to clarify you know where do we stand?

You know, where are the other groups? How does this all fit and so forth? So perhaps, Chair, if you could make a request to Chuck to do that because we already have one item on their agenda to discuss and that's the kite and the second item we were going to send them is a work issue, a work-related thing, in terms of work product, which we believe is an SOIDY ready to go kind of thing.

So they've got reason to sit. Now, the question is can we get the reports from the various committees to give us a clear bearing where we are?

Ray Fasset: Okay. Yes, I will send that request to Chuck and cc the list, that we think it would be helpful for the OSC to provide the work team members an update of all the progress has been made.

Ron Andruff: The progress to date and open issues or key open issues that at least gives a sense of what else is hanging out there that is being addressed? And there may be no impact but there may be some significant impact to how well we're progressing.

Ray Fasset: Okay. All right now back - so we really haven't made a final decision then, whether we want to start our meeting at 1 o'clock local time or 2 o'clock local time.

I guess maybe I'm thinking we go ahead and have our one hour meeting and then try and shoot for maybe the OSC to take the one hour slot at 1 o'clock.

Ron Andruff: Well, let's let Glen do that. I mean, I wouldn't want to surrender an extra hour of work time from our side.

Ray Fasset Okay. Now, with that said, which I agree with, Ron, why don't we shift our meeting to 1 o'clock? That way if we run over, there's no issues because no one needs to run?

Ron Andruff: That would be much better in my view.

Ray Fasset: Okay. So, Glen...

Ron Andruff: Sorry, Wolf. Sorry, Wolf. I owe you a beer.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ray Fasset: Okay. So, Glen is that an accommodation we can go ahead and confirm?

Glen Desaintgery: Sorry, what was that? I was only listening (unintelligible).

Ray Fasset: No, that's okay. We want to move our meeting in Sydney from - move it up from 2 o'clock to 1 o'clock local time.

Glen Desaintgery: That is the one that is already at - isn't that the one that I've had correspondence with some of you on?

Ray Fasset: Yes. Yes.

Glen Desaintgery: Yeah, that's perfect. That's perfect.

Ray Fasset: And then with the understanding, we may, if not likely, we run over a one-hour time period going into the 2 o'clock to 3 o'clock hour for this....

Glen Desaintgery: Okay. So you want to go up to the 1300, 1 o'clock?

Ron Andruff: Up to 1500 up to 15, 13 to 15.

Glen Desaintgery: Thirteen to 15, okay. I'll send out to a new schedule.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Is it Sunday or Saturday? Which day?

Glen Desaintgery: It's Sunday.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: And for you that would be in the middle of the night, Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Five o'clock in the morning.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay, nice.

Ray Fasset: Okay, another comment here. I think I've mentioned this, but I will also not physically be in Sydney. And now I'm hearing Wolf will not physically be in Sydney.

I think, you know, because we - well, I think the New Zealand meeting, if I recall, we had excellent voice conference call ability for that meeting. But I think for just in case of that not working I would - I definitely am going to be attending the meeting remotely to the best of my ability.

Now well, with that said, I figure it would be prudent to have somebody who is going to be physically there be chair this meeting, as an interim chair and I will throw that out to discussion number one and two I would also like to suggest Ron for that.

Ron Andruff: Well, Ray if I may, (Johan) is vice chair. Is he also not going to be attending?

Ray Fasset: Yes, that's a good point. I don't know. He hasn't been participating so right, that would fall there but - so, I'm not going to count on that for this call right now.

Ron Andruff: But maybe that's worth looking into...

Ray Fasset: Obviously if I can attend the call - if I'm on the call there's no problem chairing it, so...

Ron Andruff: Right, well it's tough to see whose hands are in the room, that's the problem.

Ray Fasset: Yes, true

Ron Andruff: So, that's where I was coming from. So, I mean if (Johan) can be there and kind of work and coordinate with you that would be my first preference.

Ray Fasset: Okay

Ron Andruff: I'm concerned that, you know me. I might try to dominate the microphone a little too much.

Ray Fasset: Okay. Fair enough and maybe Tony, I don't know if Tony plans on being physically in Sydney or not, but...

Ron Andruff: Maybe you want - perhaps you could send a message around to the work team and get a - and find out who's going to be there and particularly if (Johan)'s there to actually chair the meeting.

Chairing the meeting, as you well don't do and do a good job is listening and summarizing and creating a list of speakers. So if he's not

comfortable with doing that, I will put my hat into the ring as a reluctant second.

Ray Fasset: Ok. So, what I will do is I'll send out to the - I will ask the members of our email list, who is - please confirm who is going to be physically in Sydney. Let's do that first and then we'll go from there.

Ron Andruff: Okay. And then also of course I will rely on you to continue to formulate the agenda in terms of the - you've been doing - keeping a very good keeping track of how we're covering the various elements that are out there. So we rely on you for that to activity.

Ray Fasset: No problem.

Glen Desaintgery: And I'll get you the remote participation details after and we ought to have good remote participation because the company that's doing it in the last couple of meetings has done an excellent job.

Ray Fasset: Okay, thank you Glen. The last item on our list is any other business? Anything else? Yes?

Ron Andruff: The only thing that I have Chair is that regarding that the first item which was the kite.

Ray Fasset: I'm not talking about that any more.

Ron Andruff: There was clarity - that we needed some clarity in the opening. We have a box there in red letters and capitals that says, "Important notice for consideration of this document."

Ray Fasset: Right.

Ron Andruff: And my recommendation would be that we would take the second paragraph and have that in bold and in red capitals and that paragraph reads, "At this stage of the discussion this proposal should not be viewed as a firm recommendation for the work team, neither should it be assumed there is consensus to this approach.

But we do feel that it is appropriate seek broader input on an approach that would fundamentally change the basic structure and working arrangement of the GNSO to the separation of its score functions, policy development and administrations of the GNSO.

So make it very clear we are just looking for input and then we go from the next statement says, "To be clear, we're asking two questions." And just hopefully this will be understood with bold and red because, you know, people don't read. But that is a fact, an unfortunate one but true. Bold and red might catch their eye.

Ray Fasset: Okay, so what I plan on doing and now I'm going to ask you for something is - now (Robin) has not been an active participant in this. I understand. She has been active in ICANN and I do feel she is credible. Now, she has made - I have made one edit in there that had to do with wanting (unintelligible)...

Ron Andruff: That's fine. That is fine.

Ray Fasset: You don't have a problem with that edit? I changed the domain name (pasting).

Ron Andruff: Absolutely, that's fine.

Ray Fasset: I didn't hear from that. I don't want that coming at me.

Ron Andruff: Not at all, that's fine. That's fine.

Ray Fasset: Now with that said, I'll download the document again from the Wiki site. I will make that one edit and then I will bold out the second paragraph in red like you're suggesting. And then....

Ron Andruff: Bold out and capitalize, I mean literally both.

Ray Fasset: Bold out and capitalize, okay. And send that off to the OSC with the instructions you guys have given me. In fact, maybe what I'm going to do is I'm going to send what I thinking - what I plan on saying to the OSC off to the list first and you guys can tell me if you like what I'm saying...

Ron Andruff: Agreed.

Ray Fasset: ...as to what we're asking for, okay?

Ron Andruff: Agreed.

Ray Fasset: All right. I don't want to fall into that trap. All right, with that said I will call for a meeting adjournment unless there's any objection?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No.

Ray Fasset: And to stop the recording.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Man: Okay, I will stop the recording now.

Ray Fasset: Thank you. Thank you very much. Alright everybody thanks for your help.

END