

8/12/09	Marilyn Cade	CBUC	X
---------	--------------	------	---

8/19/09	Carolyn Hoover	Registries C.	x
---------	----------------	---------------	---

8/21/09	Terry Davis	NomCom	x
---------	-------------	--------	---

8/21/09	Clarke Walton	Registrar C.	X
---------	---------------	--------------	---

8/26/09	Tony Holmes	ISPCP	x
---------	-------------	-------	---

n GNSO Restructure Document

Response Details (If Any)

N/A

I think the draft is great. The only suggestion is the following --Current draft: Constituencies would establish their own selection process for these Administration Representatives, i.e., they may designate their elected Constituency chair or choose to elect a different representative for this function. Proposed draft: Constituencies would establish their own selection process for these Administration Representatives. optional; However they may not designate their elected Constituency chair. I really think it's a bad idea to allow the role-confusion that's likely to arise from allowing Constituency Chairs to also serve in this administrative role. So, at a minimum I'd leave that suggestion out of the language, but better yet I'd prohibit that choice.

Acting in my personal capacity only, I vote "NO" to the question: "Do you think that the establishment of a new, additional body to address specific responsibilities – as described herein – would better serve the stakeholder groups that make up the GNSO, or not?" I see no reason to separate these functions.

I believe this a really terrible idea. It will create an unnecessary complexity in a function that is already in danger of being a bureaucracy. it will also lead to endless debate about what constitutes administration vs what constitutes policy. It will detract from the intended function of the new GNSO Council as the manager of work groups and will risk a return to the "legislative" function that caused so many problems in the first place.

In answer to the question, I am concerned that the establishment of the new body will add unnecessary bureaucracy and complexity to the GNSO, and over-burden volunteers who are already stretched too thin from the existing organizational bureaucracies.

At first glance, my answer would be a resounding NO, it would not help. It would appear to be a way to add layers of bureaucracy to the system. The motive behind it would presumably be to allow more people to travel to ICANN meetings for free as part of their "duties". For example, the BC would be reduced from 3 reps to 2 reps under the current reform proposals. I could see how some people who won't be getting their free travel vouchers under this reform might be in favour of creating a new layer of bureaucracy, one that they can take advantage of for their own personal gain. Council members who are subject to term limits would also be able to abuse this system, to entrench themselves in other "official" positions so that they can personally benefit. If any new bodies are established, they should be limited entirely to work that can be conducted remotely, i.e. through telephone and internet meetings. Enough people are milking ICANN in order to get free travel (and then pursue their own business affairs when at ICANN meetings). We don't need one or two additional layers of bureaucrats feeding at the public trough.

I think that establishing an additional body to address specific responsibilities will add more bureaucracy to the whole GNSO process which will be (i guess) more complex in the new bicameral structure, with stakeholder groups and constituencies.

My appreciation to the GCOT for the opportunity to comment on the establishment of a separate Administrative team. My response is that it is very much an improvement to the GNSO to separate the Policy Council and its work from the Administrative functions, as proposed. I will make a couple of proposed changes, however, in the team's proposal. Since this was distributed via the constituencies, I have cc'd the BC list as FYI. I think that there are very good ideas in this proposal by the GCOT. Let me try to describe the area where I would propose a change. On page 4, under Executive Committee, I propose a change to the role of the Executive Committee. First, think of this administrative management group as a 'team'. So that group will have a chair, which they elect. Then, it is appropriate to have the Policy Chair, [or Vice Chair]and one more rep sit on the Coordinating Team to ensure that there is reflection of the Policy Council's priorities, but there is not a need to have such a formalized structure that creates a second layer on top of the Administrative Coordinating Team. Thus, I could see that we could strike the new Executive Committee of 5 people. This will be perceived by many as creating too much layering. Keep this simple. Divide the work as proposed. Have a separate Administrative team, put the Policy chair/and one more policy rep on it. The two chairs then have separate functions. There may be instances when both chairs should participate in certain events, or meetings, when both administrative management and policy development/management are being discussed. I am sure that can happen in a cohesive and collegial So, "yes" to the new Administrative Group, but cut out the 'supra chair' and cut out the executive committee idea of 5 people. The constituencies/groups should all be largely self governing, and will hopefully have independent management structures of their own that are separate from their elected policy councilors. Otherwise, I want to applaud the work of the group in the write up of this document. It is well thought out, and succinct in how it describes what is a significant change, but one that can improve the neutral administrative functioning of the GNSO, while also enabling the dedication of time and focus on the important policy development activities

I believe the addition of another body would create confusion and difficulties in deciding which groups would have "jurisdiction" over a particular issue. In any case, many issues cross the lines between the two proposed groups and this split would serve to further paralyze action by the GNSO - which is already slow enough.

Somewhat unclear what the proposal is and how it relates to the Board's goals for the GNSO Council. Concerns with functions on the administrative side. In particular, some admin functions could be provided solely by staff and some via a combination of staff and Council. Comments provided separately.

In the RC's view, establishing a new administrative body at this time would not benefit the GNSO Stakeholder Groups. Further comments provided separately.

The consensus view of the ISPCP Constituency is that the creation of a new Administrative body would not be in the best interest of the GNSO. Further comments provided separately.
