

**GNSO
Operations Steering Committee (OSC) GNSO Council Operations Work Team
10 July 2009 at 14:00 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 July 2009 at 14:00 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-council-ops-20090710.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
Tony Holmes

Staff:

Rob Hoggarth
Gisella Gruber-White
Glen de Saint Gery

Apologies:

Julie Hedlund – ICANN staff

Coordinator: This is the transcription recording of the ICANN conference call on Friday, July 10 at 2:00 pm. Universal Time. Gisella Gruber-White is the conference Leader. The call ID is 4856063.

This call is now being recorded.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much. Good afternoon everyone. I'll just do a quick roll call now that we're recording. Today we have Ray Fasset, Tony Holmes, Ron Andruff, Wolf Knobon, Gisella Gruber-White and Glen de Saint Gery and Rob Hoggarth will be joining us shortly.

Thank you.

Ray Fasset: Okay. This is (Ray Fasset). I did not have the opportunity to send out an agenda for this call. Thanks for participating.

We do have a follow-up from our meeting in Sydney to address. I did notice (Ron) sent out an updated version of what we've been calling the (Kite) Doc. He sent that out on 7/9, right?

Okay, we had a chance to review it. I have to admit, I have not had a real deep chance to review the document. Have other people?

(Tony Holmes): Yep. I'd had a look through it, (Ray).

Man: Okay, yes.

Ray Fasset: Okay, do we want to have some discussion on this document?

(Tony Holmes): Sure. Maybe could - if we could ask (Ron) to start with just exactly what his intent was with the amended version.

Ron Andruff: Certainly (Tony). My - after the meeting in - or at the meeting in Sydney, the action items present in the room and on the call, I guess, was to revive this document to try to bring more clarity to particularly the opening statements so people understood there were two bodies, not just one body being split into two.

And two - that was the first point. And the second point was to remove issues where we had words like constituencies and try to shift those to - moving them into the new terminology; into the different stakeholder groups.

So the two aspects that I undertook with this document, though - this iteration of this document, is exactly that; clarify the opening language in the important

notice for consideration of this document and to try to remove redundancy, vis-à-vis constituencies versus stakeholders.

(Tony Holmes): Okay. Thanks (Ron).

Ray Fasset: Okay. I'm looking - for some reason I'm not able to see the questions that we're asking.

(Tony Holmes): Well, whilst you look for that, (Ray). If I could make one clarifying remark, first of all, which (Ron) can probably cover off, on the section that's in title description, there's still a note in there, "need for a better example". It's where the text is highlighted in red.

Ron Andruff: Yes.

(Tony Holmes): And I wasn't quite sure how you were intending to do that; whether that a subject for this call or whether you were looking still to change that. I'm just unclear as to what the situation was with that thing in particular (Ron).

Ron Andruff: Is the former not the latter, (Tony); meaning that I - when I read that sentence, you know, it just seems to me - well, let me put it another way. I've seen this document so many times I'm not sure if - any more of certain aspect of it because I read right passed them, so the thought for me, another reason I had it in that text is to see if anybody in the group had a better idea for an example. So that's why I said better example needed.

But if everyone is happy with that example, I'm fine with it, too.

(Tony Holmes): Okay. I'm sort of between a rock and a hard place on that (Ron) because I don't have a better example, but I see why you're struggling and I thought it started to strain to new proposals there because it makes specific reference to ICANN's strategic plan and the operational project planning.

And my current view of that is that isn't done within the (DNS), so it's done in constituencies and that's where we'd free back from like at meetings, constituencies meet with the ICAAN staff who is responsible for that part of the process.

Normally engaged with them there and then we'll send them (comments), so isn't actually done at the GNSO level. It's done at the constituency level as it exists.

Now what form that takes in the new arrangement, I'm not sure, but I still thought it would be a pretty hard thing to achieve within the overall counsel because I think we'd probably have slightly different views on that.

So I'm also trying to find a better example if we can. I must confess, I don't have one - a couple in my head that I can put forward.

Ron Andruff: Well, (Tony), what you just said I agree with that. That's the point is that it's not - that's what this example tries to bring out is that, you know, that these discussions should be happening at the - we've said, you know, the constituency/stakeholder group level.

And that's the point is that - the idea of the - within the administration group's remit, they would actually say, okay, let's gather, you know, some people together that think and talk more about this task to get more - you know, to really try to be the catalyst of that conversation and to then draw out a better dialog, better discussion on that particular element.

Because right now, the way it is is we have policy officers focus on policy and predominantly that so the idea here is this part of the body would be trying to (fair) it out more information, get more sense of that.

So there's actually people tasked with that as opposed to it just - you know, people right now as it happens we'll get a message from our - in the (BC) in

any case we'll get a message from our policy council reps; here's something that's up for discussion, any thoughts.

And that may task completely without any dialog simply because there's so many other things on people's plates, or it may be, you know, there's not so much going on and we get into a robust dialog. But more often than not, if there's more stuff going on, things just float right by without any consideration.

And the idea here is to try to create an example that says this is what this body would do to these people - this is a matter, whatever the subject would be - this is a matter that crosses across all of the various constituents or stakeholder groups and it needs a body to try and draw our attention to it and give more thought to it.

(Tony Holmes): Well, if we can't find better examples, (Ron), amongst us to put forward and we're going to use that example, I think it would be worth within that text making the point that up until now, this has been done really within constituencies and it hasn't been progressed at the council or rather the GNSO level.

And that's one of the key changes that you're putting forward because now I understand that's what you're saying but I almost read into it - that was my take without the words being there.

So maybe you need to add something that makes the point that that wasn't done at that level before and it could be done in the future if we're going to stick with that example.

Ron Andruff: I would agree with that. So if you - I hate to bounce this ball so fast back into your court, but if you could bring some more - some thought and some language to that from your perspective, that would be helpful. Because as I said, I'm struggling with it at this point - or anybody else on the call - on the

team is welcome to bring some thought to that because at this point I'm just having trouble trying to refine that.

(Tony Holmes): If we go down that path, I think it's a difficult one, as well, because up until now if you look across the views that have gone back from the old constituencies, on things like the operational subject, I think we've all come at that from our own perspective and with (unintelligible) have all been useful, but haven't necessarily been the same.

And what we're going to get into quite quickly is the desire to make sure that what comes out, comes out as an overall GNSO view. I think that could be pretty hard to get at times.

Ron Andruff: Yes, maybe. I mean, until we cross the bridge we won't know it, but I would agree that this - we're never going to always have 100% agreement.

Rob Hoggarth: Rob Hoggarth joining.

(Tony Holmes): Back to you (Ray).

(Ray Fasset): Well, (Rob), thank you for joining.

Rob Hoggarth: I apologize for my lateness.

(Ray Fasset): That's okay. We're just doing a review of the most recent revision of the (Kite) Document that (Ron) was kind enough to prepare for us and I have to admit, I have not had a chance to deeply review the edits or the changes.

We've had a discussion on just - completed a discussion on one of the examples of how to demonstrate administration functions.

So that's about all where we're at. So you're pretty much caught up now.

Ron Andruff: You know, (Ray), if I can just pick up on that, if you go through or one just goes through the deleted things that I've taken out, often you'll see things like subgroup, you know, group, constituencies, it's really - so a lot of the edits have just trying to get one set of phrases - phraseology all the way through the document.

So if it's administrative group, it's administrative group all the way through the document. If it's policy council, it's policy council all the way through the document.

So what I'm trying - what I was trying to achieve with this round of edits was just to bring more clarity. There's been nothing materially changed in this. I just want to make sure we bring that out. The document itself remains the same.

(Ray Fasset): Great, okay. So not a lot of substance has changed.

Ron Andruff: No, no substance has changed.

(Ray Fasset): Got it.

Ron Andruff: Except for the fact I was suggesting that we move the chart from the middle of the document to the end of the document, because I think once you read through this and then you look at the chart it's more clear, as opposed to reading - looking at the chart half way through the clarification of what the chart means.

(Ray Fasset): Okay. I think that's a good suggestion.

(Tony Holmes): Yeah, I'm okay with that. I wonder if I can just go back (Ron) to that paragraph we were discussing just now.

Ron Andruff: Please.

(Tony Holmes): The red paragraph. And the points that I was making, I think I've got words - only a few words but they'd probably clarify, if you read through that and get to the end of the sentence that this is a cross cutting topic that is not limited to policy development...

Ron Andruff: Yes.

(Tony Holmes): The first line of the text in red...

Ron Andruff: Yes.

(Tony Holmes): At the end of that, add some text so it will say, it's not limited to policy development and until now this has never been handled at GNSO level. I think that makes the point.

Ron Andruff: Perfect. That's perfect. And that picks up with the next sentence of a well developed budget includes...

(Tony Holmes): Yes.

Ron Andruff: Perfect.

(Tony Holmes): Okay.

Ron Andruff: That's very helpful.

(Ray Fasset): So let me - again, so I'm reading the sentence, for example, "While all constituency, stake holder groups would review and participate in ICANN's strategic and operational budget planning, this is a cross cutting document that is not limited to policy development." Period...

(Tony Holmes): And the additional test (Ray) is, "And until now this has never been handled at the GNSO level."

(Ray Fasset): That up to now has not been handled at the GNSO council level?

(Tony Holmes): Well I think it's the overall GNSO level rather than just council which is the point I think (Ron)'s trying to make.

(Ray Fasset): Okay.

Ron Andruff: Agreed.

(Ray Fasset): Okay. I think that's a fine amendment. (Rolf), do you have any issues with that, making that amendment? Excuse me.

Wolf Knoben: No. I'm fine with that. Thank you. Really okay.

(Ray Fasset): Okay. If there's no other discussion on the changes, which are again not substantive changes, per (Ron)'s comment, I'd like to focus in on the questions. I'm having a hard time bringing up the question...

Ron Andruff: I'll come back to you - if I may on the question, (Ray). Just one other point I had made in here in the red block you may have noticed further on, it's on the bottom of the charts. I recommend that we make the footnotes 11 point font and bold to ensure they're read.

For some reason, on the most recent document I think they fell out, the footnotes, or I may have deleted them out of my recent document for some reason.

But in any case, I put them back in in this edit just for clarification that people, you know, understand that when we say constituency for whatever reason,

even though it's a past term, it reflects what we're trying to say in the new light.

So that's the Point one. And the second point is in the drawing itself I added that small green box on the right just to clarify what those green circles mean in relation to the blue boxes that make up the Executive Committee.

(Tony Holmes): (Ron), a couple of questions on that. The footnotes, when you said that the diagram is going to go to the end, I assume the footnotes go to the end after that, is that right?

Ron Andruff: Sure, exactly, and I think that would kind of, you know, summarize everything for everyone - anybody reading saying, okay, I understand. You've used the word constituency in here, but clearly you understand stakeholder group.

(Tony Holmes): Okay.

Ron Andruff: But with regard to those green boxes - that green box, does that clarify what those green circles now mean? Does that make it clearer for you as you read it, gentlemen?

Wolf Knoben: Now, the one I couldn't read that. What do you mean, those green boxes?

Ron Andruff: You can't read the - it didn't show up the text, you mean or...

Wolf Knoben: Something - in my document, you know, it shows the format in the upper layer, so these boxes are covered by format comments. You know what I mean?

Ron: The one I looked at is clean. It just, you know, GNSO chair, policy council administration, policy council elected rep. Those boxes there you're saying have some other --

Wolf Knoben: I don't see that in the (unintelligible) --

Tony Holmes : I had some trouble when I look at it on the screen, but when I printed it out, it came out okay.

Ron: Oh, really?

Tony: Yeah.

Ron: Some formatting problem on that. Because on mine, it's clean. Okay, but when you printed it out, Tony, did you see then there's a box on the right hand side in green.

Tony Holmes Yeah, but if that box, if you put it on the screen, that box for some reason or another it positions itself lower down in the text.

Ron: Oh, okay, so it's just a formatting problem. Okay.

Tony: Yeah.

Ron: Okay. Yeah.

Tony: Yeah.

Ron: I don't know what that is. Well, what that box says, this is the point, basically it's a bracket that is in green, the same color as those two round circles, the two round circles being two councilors per constituency --

Tony: Okay.

Ron: -- and an arrow going up and the next one is one to two representatives per constituency and an arrow going up. And those arrows and the green are bracketed with a green line and it says, in the box, "Three or four

representatives per constituency would serve in the new G&SO,” and then in parentheses “(Split between the policy council and administration).” So, it’s basically just a box with clarification. But obviously that didn’t come through very well. So --

Ray: Well, if I view the document in print form --

Ron: Oh, so, when you go up and say look at -- click on view.

Ray: Yeah, click on view and then print layout.

Ron: Okay. And then you get it properly in that case.

Ray: Yes, I do.

Ron: Okay.

Ray: I have to then lower the size down to 100% or less. And it comes up fine.

Ron: Okay. Well, Wolf, did you catch that?

Wolf: Well, just I can read it it’s right now, yes, okay.

Ron: If you follow Ray’s lead on that, he’s saying at the top of your window screen, under View, if you click View --

Wolf: Yeah, yeah?

Ron: -- and then Print View --

Wolf: Yeah?

Ron: It will give you -- it'll read -- give you the page again. And he's saying if you reduce it to 100%. Maybe it jumps to 150 on your screen, but if you reduce it to 100%, you'll actually see all of the diagram.

Tony: Yeah, we've got a little bit of formatting to do on this before it can go out.

Ron: Obviously. In fact, you know what I will --

Wolf: Ah, yeah. It -- that's okay, great.

Ron: Oh, okay, good.

Wolf: Thanks.

Ron: So, what -- so maybe we can have staff just clean that document up so the formatting comes through cleanly when it gets moved to the back page.

Tony: There's another problem on the front page as well or it certainly was on my set up. When I looked at the same page and the text that's in the book on the block, it doesn't show all of that when you just put the document on the screen. You have to print it yet again. So, there's some issues around that as well, I think.

Ron: Oh, okay. So, you're saying that box actually shrinks?

Tony: Yeah --

Ron: So, all of the text isn't --

Tony: -- the one that said, "Important Notice."

Ron: Right.

Tony: I couldn't only see part of that and I couldn't make it any bigger. It was only if I printed it I saw what was underneath.

Ron: Oh, okay. Very good.

Ray: Yeah, I would suggest we take that out of the text box form. I was having the same problem.

Ron: Yeah. I think that was -- Julie was the one, if I'm not mistaken, who put it into that box. So, she may actually have the original of that. But we can certainly go just rewrite that page.

Ray: Uh-huh. I'll follow up with her on that.

Ron: Yeah.

Ray: She's on vacation now, but --

Ron: Right. That would --

Ray: -- I'll have some communication --

Ron: -- and actually, Ray, that comes to your question. Where is the questions?

Ray: Yeah, I got them now.

Ron: It's only the one question, basically. It's just, you know, that's again, we reduced it.

Ron: It's on the very first page.

Ray: Okay, yeah, I see that now.

Ron: Yeah, yeah.

Tony: Are we really going to do that, Ron, because my take on that was that whatever anyone said, we needed the answer to that question. But it wasn't going to limit the response back to (Erlene) to saying yes or no. We want some additional feedback as well, okay?

Ron: Some rationale. I, you know, I can go either way on this one. You know, my take coming out of the Sydney meeting was to dumb this document down as much as possible. So, that was the rationale there. We're asking you one question, "Do you believe or don't you?" And I kind of assumed rightly or wrongly that people feeling strongly one way or the other will actually tell us why they feel that way. But, I can go either way on this one, from my point of view.

Tony: Did you say then that they will tell us which way?

Ron: I have a sense that people will say, "I think this is a stupid idea and here's why," you know? Or "I think this is a brilliant idea," you know, and maybe they'll tell us why. But if they think it's just a brilliant idea, well, at least we know that they like the direction. But, as I shared with I think you and (Wolf) and (Sydney), it doesn't matter to me which answer we get from the community coming back to us. So --

Tony Holmes: I just wonder whether we really are going to limit it to yes or no, because the reason I raise that is I think in a lot of cases, people are running pretty hard at the moment. I think 17 working groups is quite a lot for GNSO. And you may well just get back a yes or no, but make sure that is enough, if that's the question you're going to ask.

Ron Andruff: You know, my view on this actually was to -- I kind of envisioned it this way, so, you know, please give me your thoughts, guys, I kind of assumed that we would send this out to each of the current constituencies and ask them to

share this with their members and provide us some feedback, you know, within a specific period of time, say two weeks after we send it to them, to allow their community members to, you know, provide feedback.

I then thought they would just post the document to the list of each constituency saying, you know, "We've been asked to give some feedback to this. Please respond." Maybe we should be saying, "Respond to" a particular E-mail address and so -- and put that in the document. "Please respond to this E-mail address." And then all the responses would just -- anybody who cared to respond would just click on that link and say, "Good idea," "Bad idea," "This is what I think."

Tony Holmes: We discussed this in our constituency meeting in Sydney, (Ron), and we took a decision rightly or wrongly that we would respond back as a constituency.

Ron: As a group?

Tony: As a group, yeah.

Ron: Yeah. Well, but see we're trying to get this out to sort of the broader community to let each individual kind of weigh back in as opposed to a constituency's standpoint. This is a kite. You know, that's the whole point. The kite is just to get the direction of the wind, not affirm our group stands this way or that way. Because I think if we do that, we're going to -- we're not -- we're basically we're trying to put a kite up in the air to see which way the wind blows, but now we're not going to let the wind blow on it. So, I wouldn't want to see anything get in the way of each individual responding.

Tony: Okay. Maybe it's that condition as well.

Man: That's fine too.

((Crosstalk))

Tony: -- so open it up to individuals as well.

Ron Andruff: Yeah, but more importantly, this is the whole point, that's why this document opens up by saying that we feel it's important -- what is it, we've been (unintelligible) this and that, "We feel that it's appropriate to seek broader input from the ICANN community on that approach that would fundamentally change." That's what -- we're asking the community to weigh in. So, hopefully individuals will weigh in and constituencies certainly can. But, what I was trying to draw out in this is just the practical matter of how do we get this out and how do we get a response. Do you agree that it might be a better idea to have an E-mail address that would feed back -- that anyone, that all the feedback goes to one place, unfiltered as it were?

Tony Holmes: Well, we can do that anyway. But, I think there's a risk whichever way you do this, (Ron), because currently people are under a lot of other pressures in different working groups and doing different things. And what I wouldn't want to see was this get left (a) because people haven't got time and (b) because they'll think somebody is doing it. But at least if it goes to constituencies and your request a response, then you should get at least get something back from those constituencies. If other people can also put their views in, then that's in addition. So, maybe we need to cover it up both ways.

Ray Fassett: Yeah. That's a good point. So, when we send this out -- I'm not sure who's sending it out. I could send it out. Say that I am sending it out, this is (Ray), what am I asking the chair to do? Am I asking them to give us -- am I explicitly saying, "Don't give us a constituency statement, give us -- please have your members provide an opinion to this E-mail address"?

Tony Holmes: You know, I think you're asking for both, (Ron), and the message that's currently in the box in the text would need to be revised. I think we should put, as (Ron) suggested possibly, a two-week deadline. We should ask for a response from each constituency, but in addition to that, we should make it

quite clear that there is the ability for individuals contribute and that we'd also welcome that as well.

So, they can contribute under their own right, particularly if they -- what we're looking for maybe from the constituents is a clear response to (Ron)'s major question, which was a yes or no. But we could also seek some additional input back on how people view this and why they view it that way and welcome them to post that as individuals. Because that way we're going to get two (unintelligible), one at the constituency level and one from the individual.

Ray Fassett: But to your point, Tony, your constituency would not -- your members would not respond at all that way.

Tony: Well --

Ray Fassett: They would just respond through --

Tony Holmes: -- I would ask them to do that. I mean, we (unintelligible) a decision that we were going to respond as a constituency and we will certainly do that as a constituency. That shouldn't prohibit anyone from posting their own views either.

Ray: Okay, okay.

Tony Holmes: And I'm quite happy to encourage them to do that. I'm just wary that if we just say, "Let's leave it to individuals," all you're going to get back is a few people who feel pretty strongly about it either way and the middle ground, which is probably what we're seeking, we're not gonna hear from.

Ron Andruff: Yeah, so I think that sounds about right. So, (Ray), you know, my take on that it's just -- it's an E-mail from you that goes to the constituency heads and you can almost lift the language right from this first page, this box that we're

talking about, "Important Notice for Consideration," because all the language is there. It just explains, you know -- you can explain to them that, you know, "We're tasked with this specific mandate and that we have an idea and we'd like to get some feedback from community whether or not it makes sense or not. If they could be so kind, if the constituency representatives could be so kind as to disseminate this to their members, their respective members, with a deadline to respond back within two weeks and we would be grateful if we could have a constituency position, but equally importantly we want to have individuals give their take on this idea." Again, you can explain, our job is to try to define a high-level principle.

(Ray Fasset): Right.

Ron Andruff: And this is all we're trying to do with this, but we need the feedback from community.

(Ray Fasset): Right. Now, if I was reading this document for the first time, I would probably have questions before I could answer yes or no - clarifying questions.

Ron Andruff: There's no clarifying answers. Because, I'll tell you why, we could waste so much time and as Tony just pointed out, everybody's bandwidth is so narrow. I think this document spells out, you know, there are -- very clearly, there's two bodies. One is policy. One is administration. This is what we're looking at. We can't find consensus within our working team. So, we're looking out to you guys. Where do you fall on this thing?

(Ray Fasset): Right.

Ron Andruff: Because we all take decisions pretty quickly given limited amount of information within ICANN.

(Ray Fasset): Wait, but I'm just saying we're not allowing -- if anybody has a question, we're not going to allow an opportunity to say, "I have a question on this before" --

Ron Andruff: No. My point is I would push it, push back on that, because you'll get one question here, another question there, we'll find we'll go on for another two, three, four, five weeks before we actually just get the basic answer to a broad question.

(Ray Fasset): Yeah, I agree with that.

((Crosstalk))

Ron Andruff: ...we're not...

(Ray Fasset): Yeah, I don't disagree with that at all, but is that going to harm our ability to get responses, because people are going to go like, I can't answer the question, because like there's other questions I have before I can give a yes or no.

Tony Holmes: There is one another way around this potentially, (Ray), and that is that we could ask people to indicate whether they have questions and if they do we could set up maybe an hour's call where we could just take them on the hoof.

Ron Andruff: That's a possibility. I would agree that's a possibility. But, guys, I think we're over thinking this thing.

(Tony Holmes): Okay.

Ron Andruff: I've been saying this for months.

(Tony Holmes): Okay.

Ron Andruff: I think we're over thinking it from the point of view all we want to do is get a sense from a larger group of people that they want it to left or go right. Once they give us that, we're going to finalize this high-level principle in a day. And

then we're going to move on to the other work we have. As I said to (Tony) and (Sydney), you know, we should take this, all of us in this group, which is a very small group and just look at the elements that we have to do and just tackle it like a project and get it nailed down within the next four weeks.

Whatever is left let's just, you know, one call every week and just do it in our business as we do that. When we let this stuff drag on and on and on and on we get - it gets fruitless in the sense that there's no progression anywhere and I think that's frustrating and I think it's delaying a lot of the other stuff that's going on.

If we, in our work group just move forward on this stuff and, you know, nail some stuff down and say, "Okay, we've done our work." We hand it back to the (GNSO), "You guys decide, we just came up with the high level principals. You take it from here. It's a new council and the new bodies will take it from there."

Our job is really to try to refine some thinking, not to refine the whole thing. Just get people moving in a certain direction, that's all we're trying to do. Once that's happening then the refinements are going to come by other bodies than ours.

Ray Fassett: Okay, so if we put an email address in here that anybody can respond to and they give us a yes or no, and then they decide to put forth all these other comments, their thoughts, are we going to even consider any of those other thoughts or are we just going to stop at whatever they say yes or no?

Ron Andruff: No, we consider them. Obviously we'll consider them, for sure. We want that feedback, we value the feedback.

Ray Fassett: All right, so that's a little different than when we did those smaller version, when we sent it out to just a small group and we got lots of comments back, what I heard was, "Well, they're not answering the question. They're going off

on things and all we wanted them to do was answer those three questions, and we want to disregard all the other comments.” I’m just wondering how we’re going to handle that.

Ron Andruff: Well, you just...

Ray Fassett: Now I’m hearing that we want all that feedback, beyond just yes or no, we want all that feedback.

Ron Andruff: The key for us is to get directions, that’s a yes or no. And then the nuances of that direction are going to come with comments or not. There may or may not be comments, but we need direction first.

Ray Fassett: All right, so are we going to ask for - are we going to put in there that we are accepting additional comments in addition to the yes or no?

Wolf Knoben Yes. Well, its Wolf speaking. I would say it’s (valid). But it is a little bit strange about just only for - speaking for a yes or a no because people are looking for about - they would like to be encouraged to say yes or no, and to be encouraged means to have the chance or the comment on these things.

So I would say we should leave it open. We should be encouraged to say yes or no, but in addition also to put some comments on, so as they like. So it could get comment, okay, just now if you only give them a chance to say yes or no they would like to say no and tell you, “Okay, I didn’t have any other chance to comment on it, but don’t ask me why I say no.” Absolutely that is (not enough I think).

But leave it open, encourage people not to say yes or no, but please also let them also put some comments on there.

Ron Andruff: Here's a proposal. The line goes like this, "We would be very grateful for an answer that you agree or disagree with this way forward. All comments welcomed."

Wolf: Sure.

Tony Holmes: Good proposal, (Ron).

(Ray Fasset): Yeah, I think that's a good proposal as well. Now, if we get back lots of yes or - just yes or no's without a ton of comments are we going to interpret that - as our work team are we going to interpret that result, whichever way it is, as an endorsement or a non-endorsement of the structure, the chart that we have in there? Are we going to say, "Well, 90% of them said yes, so therefore they are in agreement with the structure"? Are we going to make that conclusion?

Ron Andruff: I think it's not that way, (Ray). I think the answer is that when the community comes back and gives us the direction then we will look at all of the comments vis-à-vis that direction. And if we have a lot of people saying, you know, "Good idea, but bad structure." We'll just take the structure right out of there.

But if there's no comments about the structure one way or the other we can just say, "Here's a high level principal, how we view the (GNSO) going forward," and put our notes on the side, leave our notes in an envelope, if you will, and then let the new (GNSO) come and address this issue.

And I would think they would then come back and say, "Could we look at the work teams notes on this to understand where they're coming from?" And then we'll see the chart.

I mean, we've got to cross that bridge when we get to it. The first step here is really to find out what the community says, and once the community gives us

some feedback then we can have this conversation. But in lieu of information we're just talking about hypotheticals.

Ray Fassett: Okay, okay, so a lot of our reaction is going to be dependent upon what we get back and we're going to ask for all comments welcomed and go from there. Is that right?

Ron Andruff: That's how I see it, yeah.

Ray Fassett: Okay, and if we get comments back from people with questions that we're not going to take a position of, "Well, they didn't understand the documents or they didn't read it carefully or they didn't read it," you know, we're not going to take that position, right?

Ron Andruff: Correct.

Ray Fassett: And I just want to make sure how we interpret it, because the last time we did this and we got back a few comments from people we took a position somewhat of, "Well, they didn't understand it."

Now that's going to happen, you know, with this, and this time around as well. So I just want to make sure that we're open to all - everything that we get back that we're not - we're going to dismiss anything that we get back. I just want to make that plain.

Ron Andruff: So I would agree in some things you said, but I disagree in others in the sense that when we sent it out to that first group just to get a feel for how they were feeling about it, what that did help us to understand we need to sharpen the language and clarify some issues and dumb the document down.

So that was fruitful. I don't view it as being negative. But the issue that I had with it was that we were sending it to guys who have been in the (GNSO) now for a hundred years, and so their view of the (GNSO) is not necessarily

an open, unvarnished view. They have a very clear view of what (GNSO) does and may or may not want to see it change for whatever reason.

So that was where I was critical about that. But in this case whatever comes back we're going to look at all the information just like we're doing right now with the (dag), you know? The (dag) comes out, the community responds, the, you know, staff synthesizes all those responses and tries then to come back with another version of the (dag).

So in the same way we're going to function here. We send this out, we get some feedback, gives us some better understanding of what the community feels and with that we'll then take our next steps as a work team.

Ray Fassett: Okay. Any additional discussion on this document? What are...

Wolf Knoben: We got in the timeframe, one you mentioned you would like to have it back in two weeks after it has been sent out. So the question is any (choice send out) and then taking into consideration that we have now summer vacation, it ranges from July to August.

So that means really you could expect real answers end of August I would like to say.

Ron Andruff: My goodness, guys, that's, you know...

Wolf Knoben: No, it's not that...

Ron Andruff: I understand, (Wolf), I understand. Again, gentlemen, all we're trying to do is to get some feedback back. We don't have to have the whole community's feedback. As (Tony) just pointed out, there are some 17 work teams going on right now, summer vacation or no summer vacation.

I think it's really important that we all have a good look at this document as it is right now. Today is the 10th, it's Friday, next Friday everybody submits their final modifications to this document, whatever that is, okay?

If there's any further input this first page needs to be cleaned up and so forth. So we'll need staff to do that, and submit a, you know, suggest an email address and whatever.

So once that first page is done and everyone is happy with the document, I'd say we get it out and that will - and put two weeks on it. Because anyone who will respond will respond. And anyone, you know, I don't think they're going to say, "Oh, gee, damn, I was on vacation I didn't get a chance to put my voice to this that I like it or I hate it." It's a kite. It's only to give us directions.

Tony Holmes: Okay, (I think Kevin) we're already said that we should look to extend it beyond two weeks (unintelligible) plan in all of these things really asking they're all full up. I don't know whether to go to the end of August but certainly longer than two weeks.

Ray Fassett: Okay, so (Ron)'s suggestion was on the 17th we send the document out. Is that correct?

Ron Andruff: That's right, yes.

Ray Fassett: Okay, I think that's reasonable. I think (Julie) might be back in the box. I'll have to listen to this recording again to hear the action steps that we have decided upon, some additional language, or I'll need (Julie)'s assistance to get it formatted so we don't have any issues in that regard, functionality issues.

There should be obtainable doing those things by the 17th, right? Okay, so then it becomes how much time do we give? (Ron) is suggesting two weeks

which would be the 31st of July, and I'm hearing that that might be a little aggressive if we really want to try and get a lot of feedback.

I hear (Ron)'s point. If you're going to want to comment you're going to do that, you're not going to wait. The longer you give people sometimes they will wait until the last minute. Should we say three weeks then? They'll wait until the end.

And here's another point. If we extend it out beyond two weeks then we will have to send a reminder out as well, which we should do anyway. But if we were to extend it out at all, I suppose we - our options are August 7, August 14, August 21, or August 28. I'm hearing that the 28th would probably be (used as) too much time. So now we're left with the 7th, the 14th, and the 21st of August.

I'm sort of siding with (Ron) here. I think if we did the August 7 which is 3 weeks that would be in our best interest.

Wolf Knoben: Are you really expecting answers from the constituencies as well? Not only from (single) members.

(Ray Fasset): Well, practically speaking my thoughts on that are constituencies will not comment. I don't think the registry constituency is going to make a statement on this. I don't think, now, I could be wrong.

Tony Holmes: I had the other thing, (Ray), because I thought that that was the only way we could actually guarantee getting a response back other than from people who maybe have a particular axe to grind.

Ray Fasset: Yeah, that's where I was struggling a little while ago. It's like what am I explicitly asking for? If I explicitly asked for a constituency statement...

Tony Holmes: You should get something back from the constituencies. Then we take the view, "Well, it's fine, they don't care either way."

Ray Fassett: But if I say that you can respond as - which one am I stressing? That's what I'm trying to get at, which one?

Ron Andruff: If I just say, "I need a constituency - we are asking for a constituency statement," I think the constituency will then, you know, try to meet that request. But if I say, "Well, we're looking - it's up to the members. If you want to have a constituency statement you can, or your individual members can comment. It doesn't matter to us either way." Or actually (Ron) is, I think encouraging that we stress the other way, not to have a constituency statement, then I don't think we're going to have a - get one.

Ray Fassett: I think, you know, we're - it could go either way on this thing. But at the end of the day it's that first page, it says right here, "We feel it's appropriate to seek broader input from the community, therefore we would be grateful to receive a constituency response, but most importantly we need a response from the various community members individually. And we encourage everyone to respond to this address."

And then I would say one week before the close of the deadline send another message to the constituency representatives saying, "Could you please respond back to us by this time with a constituency position or not. Please let us know."

That way the constituency reps could come back and say, "Okay, this deadline closes in a week, we're going to publish this statement. Does everybody have an agreement or disagreement, whatever." And they can move that forward, and if it comes back everyone says we're deadlocked within a constituency they come back and say, "You know, our group is split down the middle. Some say yes, some say no."

(Tony Holmes): Maybe we can ask the staff on the (call). For instance, dare I suggest (Rob), what's your experience of requested that's gone out asking for input back from the general community?

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks, (Tony). I think they depend on the issue. If it's something that's very hot, as you know, folks will respond very quickly. If there's something like this coming in cold, you might expect that you'd probably need a little bit more time.

The only thing that sort of strikes me in terms of the conversation you're having is that certainly from a constituency standpoint the feedback you guys constantly provide is that you want more time and I think that's the balance you guys are discussing right now.

Because let's say this gets (unintelligible) on Day 1, the constituency - the response of constituency leader will send it out to his or her stakeholders, constituency members, and, "Give me a response in a week."

And then it seems as if it takes another week to develop a draft and then another week to fight over the draft. So you're talking at least two weeks - probably three (unintelligible) there to be a formal constituency response.

I think the ore you emphasize individual responses then that will certainly help you in terms of your feedback.

The only other recent experience we've had on this is of course the Constituency Toolkit Survey that we did last year around the time of the Cairo meeting.

We made some significant efforts to publicize, get it out, send reminders to folks, and got a total after giving folks I think six weeks to respond, about 28 responses.

So I think it's a matter of managing your expectations about how many responses you're going to get and, you know, trying to balance that with that timeframe.

Again, if you're looking at formal responses, maybe a little bit more time. If you're looking at the individual responses then, you know, the lesser time probably makes sense.

Ray Fassett: I'd agree with that -- this is (Ray) -- I'd agree with that.

Ron Andruff: And, what else - I'd add one other point to that is that we're traditionally, people that agree with things do not respond.

Ray: Yeah.

Ron Andruff: When you look at the public comments on a lot of things, what people usually say, well there's no comments there. And the answer is; people don't have a problem with it that's why it's okay.

Ray: Right.

Ron Andruff So we may only get a few responses is what I'm saying and they - as we may find it, there's a large group of people that have just kind of - it's fine with them.

Ray Fassett Yeah, so we have to be careful that we don't make that assumption...

Ray: Right.

Ray Fassett ...just because we don't get responses back. So we have to be - I think we have to be clear that we are - if you agree or if you like this or whatever, please tell us that you like this.

Ron Andruff: That's my point. That's why I'm suggesting you take your language for your email to the constituents and, you know, take it from our first page.

At least try to be - what that keeps consistent language with what we're trying to say and what we're looking for. We need it and we need a yes if you think it's a good idea; and we need a no if you think it's a bad idea, and all comments are welcome.

Ray Fassett: Yeah. And I would probably slant as we're looking for individual comments. If you like to provide a constituency statement that's up to you.

Ron: Most welcome.

Ray Fassett: Yeah, so that's up to you. But this is how I will explain it to the constituency heads - the chair people is if you want to provide (unintelligible) statement that's up to you, but we're looking for individual member comments and here's the email address.

Man: Mm-hmm.

Ron Andruff: Okay, why don't we take a three week - make it three weeks and split the difference on the timeframe; 7 August?

Man: Okay.

Ray Fassett: And the effect of that -- just so I'm thinking this through -- the effect of what we're asking for is individual response versus constituency response.

I don't think there will be necessarily a lot of discussion by the constituency groups. In other words if I send it to a Chair the Chair is going to say please read this document and provide any comments you have to this email address.

But they're not going to spend time deliberating the document or vetting it out within their own constituency. I don't see that happening...

Ron Andruff: I agree.

Ray Fassett: ...which I think is probably good considering everybody's workload right now.

Now some constituencies may decide that they want to; I just don't anticipate that.

Ron Andruff: And that's their call, whichever way they want to go so that's fine.

Ray Fassett: Yes. I'm okay with that. Anybody else?

Tony Homles: Yeah, I'm fine with that, (Ray).

Man: Okay.

Man: Okay.

Ray Fassett: Okay, so we've still got a little work to do here. We've got a week to get this ready. And like I said, action step wise, I'm going to have to listen to this recording again and get exactly what we need to do.

(Julie) is going to have to listen to it. I'm going to have to collaborate with her on this one; probably a phone conversation so that we're clear on what on we need to do.

And then - what a week from today do you want us to send this document out internally to our group here as a clean version that (Julie) and I came up with before...

Ron Andruff: I think that's a good idea. One last look is I think is always better, as they say, measure twice; cut once.

Ray Fassett: Yeah, okay. So if we set a deadline on that to be next Friday will everybody have an opportunity to take that one last look over the weekend and then we send it out on Monday - the following Monday?

Tony Holmes: That works for me.

Wolf Knoben: Sure, that's fine.

Ray Fassett: Okay. And then if we take that tact then the Monday would be the 10th and then -- I'm sorry, no I'm in the wrong month. Monday would be the 20th which would put the deadline three weeks after that of the 10th of August; is that correct?

Ron Andruff: That was correct.

Ray Fassett: Okay. Okay, I think that's fair.

Now next thing I wanted to ask you guys is can we do a call next week? Are you guys available - are we available?

Ron Andruff: I am. (Ron) will be - I'm going to be in Taiwan.

Ray Fassett: Okay.

Ron Andruff: So, it may be a little tricky for me there. But I could probably take a call in, depending on the time.

Ray Fassett: How about everybody else; next week at all?

Tony Holmes : Are you talking about Friday, right?

Ray Fassett: No, I want to get back on Wednesdays. This was really to accommodate me today because I was sort of out of pocket this past Wednesday.

Tony Holmes : Right. I - Wednesday is out for me because it clashes with the GTLE Workshop in London.

Ron Andruff: I'm actually flying on that day myself; I'll be flying for two days.

Ray Fassett: Oh, July 15 is the GTLE Workshop in London, huh?

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Ray Fassett: July - that would be what, July 22? Where am I at here? No, that would be the 15th. Okay, all right.

Ron: Well let's do this.

Man: Yeah.

Ron Andruff: You can get the document out. So there's a lot of work to be done this coming week.

(Ray Fassett): Okay - all right.

Ron: So, why don't we consider picking up the call on the following week?

Ray: The 22nd then - get back on our Wednesday 1600 UTC?

Ron: I may be - I for myself will still be in - yep, that's fine. I will still be in Taiwan but that's fine.

(Ray Fassett): You can do the 22nd 1600?

Wolf: The 22nd of July?

(Ray Fasset): I don't know what time that is in Taiwan, it's probably what 4:00 am for you?

Ron: Yeah, well it doesn't matter. I'll check that after the call.

(Ray Fasset): Okay, all right. Because like - you know, there are so many groups going on that, you know, we don't want to be moving around our time slot. We're kind of fixed in that every other Wednesday 1600 UTC, so I'd like to keep that.

Does that work for everybody else?

Man: Sure.

(Ray Fasset): Okay. Well we're approaching an hour on this call. I think we made some progress on the Kite document. I hope everybody is comfortable with that.

We didn't get too far today on the other Rules of Procedural Decorum issues and voting and those things. So let's pick that stuff up on the 22nd.

Ron Andruff: One question (Ray)...

(Ray Fasset): Yeah.

Ron Andruff: ...did we get any feedback from (Dan Halloran) on the SOI DOI yet?

(Ray Fasset): No, I haven't. I got a response acknowledging receipt of the document and that someone would be following up with us or with me from Staff.

Ron: Yeah.

(Ray Fasset): Maybe not (Dan)...

Ron: Yeah.

(Ray Fasset): ...but I have not heard anything since then so I'll ping him on that.

Ron Andruff: I would be good to know because I think that one for all intents and purposes kind of checked off our list. So it would be good to know that we got Staff approval on that so, that's all.

(Ray Fasset): Yeah, I thought we had a good discussion on that one in Sydney. I think I hear probably one person that was not crazy about the documents, but I think general everyone else thought they were pretty good.

Is that what everybody else is in...

Ron Andruff: That was my take that - but again, it was a little bit of confusion in there that they felt this was going to be very cumbersome. And the point, when it was draw out, that this is just a statement made by the chairperson at the beginning of the meeting, that clarified a lot of issues.

(Ray Fasset): Okay. Okay, so I'll contact (Dan) too for any update and let you guys know what I hear.

Rob Hoggarth: (Ray) this is (Rob) if I can get in the queue here.

(Ray Fasset): Yeah, yeah - please go ahead (Rob).

Rob Hoggarth: In terms of the issues with (Dan), (Dan) has been on vacation post Sydney.

(Ray Fasset): Yeah.

Rob Hoggarth: I think he'll be returning early next week. He did assign it to another member of the Legal team because I talked with him about it briefly in Sydney.

(Ray Fasset): Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: So I would imagine when he returns he'll have some report or, you know, once he clears out from a pile of papers he'll be able to respond. But it wouldn't hurt, as you suggest, to just drop him a ping so that's higher on his priority list when he returns.

(Ray Fasset): Sure, sure - will do.

Rob Hoggarth: The other thing is on any communications to (Julie) if you could also include me and Gisella on there.

I can't recall at this moment the exact that (Julie) returns...

(Ray Fasset): Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: ...and I - so I don't want her absent to otherwise stall the document process. So if it turns out she's not going to be available then you and I can work on it or we'll identify some additional support so we can keep that moving along.

The last thing in terms of the quorum discussions that we discussed it briefly on the GNSO Council call yesterday.

And the reason the issue came up is that in the Bylaw Amendments comments forum -- a comment forum that is currently open and open through the end of July --- (Phillip Sheppard) did submit some comments noting that there some issues in the current draft of the bylaws that still had some quorum language.

And the discussion among the Council was to generally sort of take the position that staff should alert the Board that there were efforts underway to

address the quorum issue. And that in general the council wanted a lot of those operational rules to be in Operations Rules; not in the Bylaws.

So I just wanted you all to know that that discussion is taking place in a wide sense. And if any of you individually thought that it was useful, you could submit comments in the forum that addressed (Phillip)'s concerns.

So I just wanted to highlight that for you all.

(Ray Fasset): How does that affect us - I'm not clear.

Ron Andruff: Well actually if I may just for clarification Chair, I thought that when we were in Sydney that we actually kind of clarified language for the future GNSO vis-à-vis - quorum?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes you do and, you know, I had to leave that meeting a little bit early, but you guys had going through that discussion.

To the extent that that word is not out to the broader community, I raised it to you, you know, if there's an interest in one of you or having you (Ray) sort of look at what (Phillip) said, and say oops, don't worry, this work team is addressing that. And just having that in the comments forum would be useful.

Otherwise at Staff we'll be advising the Structural improvements committee that these discussions are underway. And I'll possibly try to communicate with (Julie) in terms of any specific work product that you guys have developed in that regard.

(Ray Fasset): Yeah (Rob) if you could send me a link to that forum I would...

Rob Hoggarth: Sure, will do.

(Ray Fasset): Okay, here's what the language (Julie) came up with as a result of our discussion in Sydney.

"In order for the GNSO Council to initiate a meeting, a quorum must be present. A quorum is a majority of voting members which includes at least one member of each stakeholder group. At the time of a vote there must be a quorum."

That was it.

Ron Andruff: Yeah, that's it. So I think that we're probably pretty good there but it would behoove us now to go and check those comments that (Phyllis) made. Again, what we're talking about - the language you just described (Ray) is what we're recommending in the revised bylaws.

So, what the council is now dealing with sounds to be a little bit overlapping. And so we should - and I think that's interim what they're talking about is in the interim phase or maybe it's in the bylaws as (Rob) just described.

But, there should be some - you should have a look in to that and let us know whether we should be taking this up again.

(Ray Fasset): So if it's in the bylaws are we saying that it doesn't need to be in the Council Rules of Procedure?

Ron Andruff: Yeah, well actually I think that's the point and I thank you for clarifying the language because I think that's the point there. If I understood what (Rob) just said is that's just to get - to have that on the bylaws and in the Rules of Procedure that we have defined that in the Rules of procedure.

So the point being is when he sends you that link you might just forward...

(Ray Fasset): Mm-hmm.

Ron Andruff: ...a copy of what we've done and what we're considering for Rules of Procedure.

(Ray Fasset): Got you. Okay.

Ron Andruff And that way that might diffuse that problem on the other end or it might actually light a bomb on our end.

(Ray Fasset): Right, right.

Ron Andruff: And one way we'll know one way or the other.

(Ray Fasset): Right, understood. Okay I get it.

Man: Thank you.

(Ray Fasset): Okay, if there's not any other business, although we do have lots of other business, I will call for an adjourning of this call and we'll pick up again on the 22nd.

(Ray Fasset): Yes, you can please stop the recording.

(Ron) this is Glen.

(Ron Andruff): Yes Glen

The time in Taiwan will be midnight.

Coordinator: Thank you for calling the Digital Replay Service.

END