

## **GNSO OSC GNSO OPERATIONS WORK TEAM**

### **Minutes of the Kick-Off Meeting**

01 March 2009

The initial meeting of the GNSO OSC Communications Work Team was held in Mexico City, Mexico in-person with remote teleconference capabilities on 01 March 2009 @ 2000 UTC. Interim Chair Ray Fassett called the meeting to order.

In addition to Interim Chair Ray Fassett (gTLD Registries) the following Work Team members participated in all or part of the meeting: Ron Andruff (Commercial and Business Users Constituency), Chuck Gomes (gTLD Registries Constituency) (OSC Chair), Tony Holmes (Internet Service and Connectivity Providers Constituency), Yoav Keren (Registrar Constituency), Wolf-Ulrich Knoben (Internet Service Providers Constituency), Steve Metalitz (Intellectual Property Interests Constituency), Antonio Tavares (Internet Service and Connectivity Providers Constituency), and Joop Teernstra (Individual)(by telephone).

Also, the following ICANN Staff participated in the meeting: Rob Hoggarth, Senior Policy Director; Ken Bour, Consultant; Julie Hedlund, Consultant.

The main reference document for the meeting was the slide presentation entitled “GNSO OSC-GCOT Work Team Kickoff (FINAL),” which was provided to all Work Team members prior to the meeting.

#### **Agenda**

Ray Fassett requested participants to introduce themselves and reviewed the meeting agenda as follows (slide 3):

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Review agenda
3. Review and discussion of GNSO Operations (GCOT) Work Team Charter (delineation of current problems, desired outcomes, deliverables, and timelines)
4. Timeline for interim GNSO Operations Work Team chair and procedures for selecting permanent chair; vice-chair
5. Procedures for finalizing GNSO Operations Work Team charter, including proposed timeline
6. Agree to regular teleconference meeting times
7. All other business

## **Board Recommendations**

### GNSO Council as a Strategic Manager of the Policy Process

After reviewing the agenda, Ray initiated an open discussion on the goal of establishing the role of the GNSO Council as a strategic manager of the policy process. Ron Andruff asked for clarification on the Board recommendation/mandate to review how the GNSO Council operates in the future, and in particular, how does this recommendation intersect with the activities of the other OSC and PPSC Work Teams. Rob Hoggarth responded that the Board's recommendations – although broad – are broken into policy and operations. He noted that one approach is for the GCOT Work Team to wait until the PPSC Working Group (WG) Work Team defines the working group model and the PPSC Policy Development Process (PDP) Work Team defines the PDP process. However, he added that the GCOT Work Team probably couldn't wait until the PPSC Work Teams complete their work since it is likely to take several months. So, he suggested another approach could be to determine where the GCOT Work Team can provide guidance to the PPSC Work Teams. For example, Rob emphasized that it may be difficult for the PPSC Work Teams to develop their proposals without guidance on how the Working Groups should operate.

### GNSO Council Function

Ron noted that currently the GNSO Council has a specific function and asked how it will function in the future. Chuck Gomes responded that none of the proposals from the GCOT Work Team would change the mission of the GNSO Council. It will continue to be a policy-making body for gTLDs. However, he added that this particular recommendation – establishing the role of the Council as a strategic manager of the policy development process – means that the Council will become less like a policy developer and more like a policy management body. So, as Chuck explained, under the new Working Group model the GNSO Council will become the overseer of the policy development process. In particular, he said that the Working Groups will come back to the Council with policy recommendations and then, after the Council approves these recommendations, it will forward them to the Board for approved. Chuck noted that under this new model the GNSO Council would no longer be making policy – that will become the task of the Working Groups.

Ron asked for clarification concerning whether the GNSO Council was moving from a decision-making body to something else. Chuck responded that, on the contrary, the GNSO still would make decisions, such as whether the output of a Working Group is forwarded to the Board for approval. Tony Holmes noted that, in terms of the approach of the GCOT Work Team, he had assumed that the team would look at how the GNSO Council is operating and see what the Working Groups will be doing in future and – based on the new Working Group model – the GCOT Work Team will determine what is left for the Council to do. He added that he assumed the Council could still decide whether to send Working Group proposals to the Board or to send them back to the Working Group to be reworked. He also noted that he assumed that some aspects of the GCOT Work Teams activities would have dependencies. For example, he added, in an ideal world the GNSO Council would decide to send a PDP proposal to the Board. However, one of the new aspects of the Council' role will come into play when a Working

Group doesn't agree. Nonetheless, Tony said he was unsure how the GCOT Working Team could conclude its work in this area until the PPSC Work Teams complete their work on the Working Group Model and the new PDP.

Ron asked, for clarification, whether this was how the new GNSO Council would work: 1) the Working Group agrees on a policy proposal and brings it to the Council; 2) the Council either passes it on to the Board or 3) sends it back to the Working Group for changes. Tony responded that the greatest difficulty will occur when there are issues of contention. In particular, he noted the GCOT Work Team would have to determine how to handle these contentious discussions in a more precise way. Chuck agreed that there are similarities in the role of the new GNSO Council with the role of the Board. However, he noted that while the Board can approve, the Council can only recommend and act as a policy coordinator.

### GNSO Council Rules of Procedure

At this point, Chuck suggested that one of the first areas the GCOT Work Team could consider are the existing [GNSO Council Rules of Procedure](#) because these will need to be revised to be consistent with the new Council structure. He also noted that revising these rules is time sensitive because they need to be done before the new GNSO council is seated in June. Yoav Keren agreed that revising the rules seems to be a practical way to move forward and suggested that the Work Team should begin by looking at these documents. Jaime Wagner concurred, adding that in looking at these rules the Work Team should consider that the role of the Council needs to be stressed more, particularly as it serves as a filter of policy moving up to the Board. In particular, he said the Work Team should suggest ways to better define this role beyond a revision of the GNSO Council rules. Chuck agreed that most of the Work Team's recommendations will be at a higher level than the rules, but the team still must address and determine how to revise the rules. Ron Andruff agreed that it was an excellent point to look at the rules of procedure for the GNSO Council as a starting point while the PPSC Work Teams on the PDP and the Working Group model begin their work.

### Communication with Other Work Teams

Jaime asked what were the rules for the new Working Groups and Chuck said that the PPSC PDP Work Team would be devising these. Jaime responded that, in this case, it would be helpful for the GCOT Work Team to be apprised of the progress of the PPSC Work Teams. Ron responded that among the tools available for the OSC and PPSC Work Teams to communicate and review each other's work are the Socialtext Wikis for each team. He suggested that it might be helpful to establish a common area that combined the work of the teams. Tony raised a concern that if you look at the scope of activity for all the Work Teams there is an enormous amount of work to be done in a short amount of time and there are dependencies between all of the Work Teams. In this respect, he said it would be helpful for ICANN Staff to develop a project-oriented approach to prioritize the work of the teams and to determine which team will handle each task within those projects. He added that he did not think that communication through the Wikis would be sufficient for teams to address project dependencies.

## **Draft GCOT Work Team Charter**

Chuck said it would be helpful if this team could identify the work that needs to be done before June 2009. In particular, as a first step the Work Team should finalize the draft charter, by filling in projects (Section VI) and estimated milestones (Section IV). Ray suggested using the “Draft GNSO-OSC OPS WT Board Recommendation Checklist” as a guide to help identify the tasks to be included in the charter. Jaime Wagner noted that there appear to be conflicting positions concerning the priorities for the GCOT Work Team. He explained that one is for the team to start with the tactical, near-term tasks. The other is for the team to engage in the discussion of the higher-level principles that may overlap with the activities of other Work Teams. Jaime suggested that an approach that might combine these two positions could be for the team to look at the level of strategic problems in GNSO operations that could be an immediate focus for cooperative activities across Work Teams.

### Work Team Priorities

Ray concurred that the GCOT Work Team would need to coordinate with the other Work Teams and asked the ICANN staff for guidance on the Work Team’s priorities. Rob suggested focusing first on the goals and projects listed in the charter – which are based on the Board recommendations – and additional tasks can be cleared with the OSC. To assist in this effort, he added that ICANN Staff could produce some straw-man documents to stimulate this discussion. Ron suggested that the team could use the draft charter as a working document. In addition, to improve communications he noted that a dashboard could be created to summarize the team’s efforts, as opposed to a combined Wiki page. Rob agreed that a dashboard would be a useful, and fairly simple, way to track the team’s activities. In the meantime, he suggested that the team could use a combination of the Wiki and the email distribution list to share comments.

### Coordinating with Other Work Teams’ Projects

Steve Metalitz asked if this Work Team would be establishing rules for new constituency and stakeholder groups. Rob responded that the GCOT Work Team would propose the rules for the establishment of new constituencies/stakeholder groups while the OSC Constituency Operations Work Team would establish the rules for the internal operations of constituencies. Chuck noted that some of these activities might be covered in multiple areas. Ron said there is no reason why the team couldn’t have regular meetings with the heads of the other Work Teams.

### Adding New Team Members

Rob noted that Work Teams can continue to add new members. Tony said he wasn’t sure that this was the best approach and Ron agreed that he was concerned that it would be difficult to bring in volunteers after work has begun. He suggested that it might be a good idea to set a window for new team members to join.

### Scheduling Meetings

Ray asked the Work Team to consider how frequently the team should meet. Ron suggested that the team should meet weekly, perhaps addressing one topic per call. Tony agreed that the team could start with a period of weekly calls. Ray suggested that weekly might be too frequent, and perhaps the team could have less frequent calls and use the Wiki and email list for discussion.

### Selecting Team Leaders

On the issue of selecting team leaders, Ray indicated he was interested in being the permanent chair and asked if anyone else was interested in the position of chair or vice-chair. Ron suggested that Yoav should be the vice-chair and Yoav accepted the position. Jaime Wagner recommended Ray as chair and Ray accepted. Ron added that it might be helpful to have alternates for the Work Team members drawn from each team member's constituency.

### Next Meeting

Ray suggested scheduling the next meeting for two weeks – the week of March 16<sup>th</sup>. Chuck said that the ICANN Staff would send around a “Doodle” to determine the best time for a call.

### **Action Items**

Prior to adjourning the meeting, Ray detailed the following action items:

1. ICANN Staff should draft the meeting minutes, circulate them to Work Team members, and post them on the Wiki.
2. ICANN Staff should revise the draft Work Team Charter on the Wiki to incorporate the Board Recommendations and any other items of discussion from this meeting.
3. ICANN Staff should review the schedule of upcoming GNSO meetings and establish a “Doodle” scheduling tool to determine the best time in the week of March 16<sup>th</sup> to target for regular Work Team meetings.
4. Work Team members should review the revised charter – particularly Sections IV and VI -- and related documents on the Wiki and submit comments to the Wiki or to the email distribution list in preparation for the next meeting.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2130 UTC.