Registrar Constituency Position on GNSO Council Operations Work Team Proposed GNSO Structure

BACKGROUND

The GNSO Council Operations Work Team (GCOT) recently circulated a proposal ("Proposal") to restructure the GNSO by creating a new GNSO "Administrative" body to deal with GNSO administrative matters. The GCOT requested feedback from the Registrar Constituency ("RC") on the Proposal. Accordingly, this Position Paper captures the overall sentiment expressed by the RC Members who provided feedback about the Proposal. Due to time constraints, however, no formal vote regarding this Position Paper was taken.

RC POSITION

The central question asked in the Proposal is whether establishing a new Administrative body to address specific GNSO administrative responsibilities would better serve the stakeholder groups that make up the GNSO. In the RC's view, establishing a new Administrative body at this time would not benefit the GNSO stakeholder groups.

A new GNSO structure was recently adopted and the RC believes it is too early to consider restructuring the GNSO again. The ICANN community needs at least one year to evaluate the effectiveness of the current structure before a new structure is contemplated.

Additionally, the RC is concerned that establishing a new Administrative body may further encourage policy activity where none is warranted. As such, the RC suggests that the GCOT consider recommending that the Council create committees to accomplish the desired goals outlined in the Proposal.

Finally, the RC is concerned that considering further GNSO restructuring at this time consumes ICANN resources that should be directed toward other initiatives. The RC believes that the ICANN community is already strained with its current workload, and the RC is reluctant to support initiatives that would allow ICANN to take on even more work at this time. In short, the RC believes that ICANN needs to prioritize and focus its resources on other more critical matters.

CONCLUSION

The opinions expressed by the RC in this Position Paper should not be interpreted to reflect the individual opinion of any particular RC Member.