GNSO Improvements Planning Team teleconference
24 September, 2008 at 16:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Improvements Planning Team on 24 September 2008. 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-improvements-planning-20080924.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#sep

Participants present:

Chuck Gomes - Registry c. - Team leader
Philip Sheppard - CBUC
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben - ISPCPC
Jon Nevett - Registrar c.

Staff:
Robert Hoggarth
Liz Gasster
Ken Bour
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent apologies:
Denise Michel
Susan Crawford - ICANN Board Liaison
Olga Cavalli - NomCom appointee
Avri Doria - NomCom appointee
Milton Mueller - NCUC

Man: Well...

(Chuck):   You want the one that I sent on Monday.

(Liz):   On Monday. You sent - okay. That makes sense.

(Chuck):   Yes. That was - (Rob) and I has some logistical problems. And he was

                having trouble with the table - with the org chart and the table of

                contents. I fixed those and sent out a version on Monday.

(Liz): I've got it now. I'm sorry. I was looking for Rob's and that threw me off. Okay.

(Chuck): And if you have - so I have it in print preview so I can talk about line numbers.

(Liz): So do I.

(Chuck): Notice that in the summary on Page 1 that there is a - we added their Reported to the ICANN Board as we agreed in our last meeting, rather than Approved by the ICANN Board.

(Rob): And (Chuck), if I can interject just for the serious members, you know, when I looked back through, the Board did not require in its resolution on the 26th of June that we seek approval for this implementation plan.

The resolution that went out on the 28 August meeting did ask for an implementation plan on the council restructuring that the Board wanted do. But the 26 June resolution didn't require approval. I figured you guys obviously would still like to report, though.

(Chuck): Right. And that's essentially what we talked about last week in our meeting. And (Susan) can affirm that. By the way, we can change the date of this to today's date, (Liz).

(Liz): Okay.

(Chuck): Okay. All right. Going on then to Page 3, I skipped past the table of contents. And the one thing I wanted to call attention to on Page 3 is

Line 9, where we're talking about getting the - Line 8 and 9 - where it's talking about initiating the actual work of the committees in Cairo in November.

Didn't put a date in there, but kind of left that open. But that's goal. Any concerns about that? I think we talked about that last meeting. Anything else on Page 3 that anybody wants to - most of that is just - I think that's really the only issue I wanted to bring up. The rest of them are all links.

Okay. Going to Page 4, we added Mike Rodenbaugh with (Phillip). (Phillip), have you rejoined us?

(Phillip):   I have, yes.

(Chuck):   Thanks. I'm not sure what was going on there. But I appreciate you dialing back in.

(Phillip):   (Unintelligible), yes.

(Chuck):   Yes. And so we added Mike's name since he filled in for (Phillip) last week in our meeting, and also added Kristina because she filled in for Ute last week. And then of course we added Ken who was on our call last week as well.

Going to Page 5, in yellow highlights there on Line 8 and 9, I added - I think it was me that added this. What we agreed to in our previous meetings that this structure, this plan will be used to implement all GNSO improvement recommendations adopted by the Board, except

for the seating of counselors and the new bicameral voting structure which is being handled separately from this plan.

Any concerns about the way I worded that? Okay. And that's going to be basically between the Board and the stakeholder groups the way that's going to proceed. Then in Item 2 there on Line 10 we changed - instead of monthly we changed it to periodic. Any comments on Page 5?

Okay. Going to Page 6, we made some changes there that I think we agreed to. You can see if you look at Line 24, all such work plans and committee composition decision - including termination of steering committees - will be done by a motion within Federate.

And then we also did the expiration at the ICANN annual meeting of the steering committees. And of course the council could do that sooner. But that's what - it was decided that six months might be a little bit short. Any comments on that?

And we added the footnote there on Page 6 talking about the - if there's a individual member that's causing a problem or something that - to be addressed directly by the steering committee leadership, and if not resolved then it can be brought to the council. Okay? Any comments on Page 6?

Wolf: Yes. It's Wolf.

(Chuck):   Go ahead, Wolf.

Wolf: I'm trying this Line Number 22.

(Chuck):   Okay.

Wolf: ...which I brought out. The council also must approve the membership, and so if you check that. So I was thinking if you would like to have the meeting - the steering committee's meeting - convening at the Cairo meeting. So then we have two let me say two things the council has to do.

                One is they have to approve the plan at first. Then the members have to be appointed. And then council again has to approve membership before the committees can convene, or before the committees can be sure that their members are real members - approved members. That was my point.

(Chuck):   Right. And hopefully all of you saw Wolf's e-mail in that regard. Let's talk about that right now. So approving membership of the committee - and we talked about that a little bit last week, that we weren't talking about specific individuals so much as the representative that, you know, who would be represented on the committee. So what about that? Comments on Wolf's point? Discussion?

Jon: This is Jon. To be consistent, you probably want to change membership there like we did in the next sentence.

(Chuck):   Yes. That's probably true. So we would say - oh yes. Approve the committee composition - would that satisfy your concern there, Wolf?

Wolf: Yes. So I see I mean the composition is getting to be - to get approved with plan itself because the composition is in the plan.

(Chuck): Oh. So are you suggesting we could just delete that? Maybe we want to delete that sentence of the council must approve the membership?

Wolf: Yes, because the composition itself is in the plan. And as long as the council has approved the plan, then the composition is approved as well. So that's my understanding.

(Chuck): Anybody disagree with that?

Jon: Yes. I would. This is Jon. I wouldn't delete the whole sentence because you're talking about material changes there. But you could delete that first clause because Wolf's absolutely correct. So you could say the council also must approve any material changes that are made to work items, milestones or committee composition.

Wolf: That was my proposal. Exactly.

Jon: Yes.

(Chuck): And so are you combining that sentence with the next one then?

Jon: No.

(Chuck): No. I guess you can't. You can't, although we have some redundancy there that we might need to fix. But yet I'm okay with that. Anybody opposed to that?

Wolf: No. (Unintelligible) fine.

(Chuck):   (Liz)?

(Liz):   I got it.

(Chuck):   You got it?

(Liz):   Yes.

(Chuck):   Okay. And you can smooth out the two sentences there because we may have some redundancy on committee composition in the next one. But the other part of that second - that next sentence on Line 24 also needs to be in there.

(Liz):   Right. Right.

(Chuck):   Okay. Any additional comments? Thank you very much, Wolf and Jon both. Anything else on Page 6? Okay. Good catch. Going to Page 7, I don't think there were any - there's nothing highlighted on Page 7. But if anybody has a comment on that, you're welcome to communicate it.

Okay. Going to Page 8 - excuse me. Note that I highlighted the paragraph there start date for steering committees. Let me just read that paragraph real quickly.

The initial steering committee should begin forming as soon as possible after council approval of this implementation plan. Interim chair duties can be assumed by the GNSO council chair or vice-chair, followed by appointments of constituency representatives and assignment of staff support. The first steering committee meeting should be scheduled as soon as practicable after council approval.

And I changed - in what (Rob) did I changed the, you know, there on Line 10 I changed an and to an or - the chair or vice-chair I think is what I did there if I remember correctly. But any comments on that? Is that okay?

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Chuck):   Okay. All right. Going on to Page 9 - and then we added a section down there on Line 23 - decision making for the PPSC. And that is unless otherwise determined by the PPSC members, committee decisions will be made using a full consensus process. Is that okay? We had quite a bit of discussion on that last week. I'll pause there because that was a little more substantive addition there.

Okay. Everything's okay with that? All right. Going to Page 10 - and I guess that's just - there's actually nothing new there. So we can go on to Page 11 - the GNSO operation steering committee. A couple I think minor edits, but let's make sure you agree with that.

On Line 9 Item 2 there, we added stakeholder group and constituency operation. So what we're dealing with here is a transition where we're now still under a constituency model. But at some point during the implementation phase stakeholder groups will also be involved. So is that change okay? Any problems with that? And going down the...

(Phillip):   (Unintelligible)

(Chuck):   Yes. Go ahead.

(Phillip): (Chuck), that change was okay. This was the part where I (unintelligible) to edit to the rest of the text.

(Chuck): Oh. Thanks for bringing that up. And go ahead and talk to your edit rather than me flipping over to your e-mail.

(Phillip): Okay. (Unintelligible) one in which I reverse the two things, putting outreach effort up front and then the constituency in (unintelligible) and bits afterwards. I just thought that was probably a better way to do it.

And I wanted to put into the outreach effort bit and current broader participation was - inject something to suggest that we have a sale job to do rather than just pre-supposing that ICANN's fab and they really want to join, and it's just ignorant so they haven't. So I changed that to outreach effort to encourage broader participation in stakeholder groups, while explaining the added value of ICANN participation to such groups.

(Chuck): Anybody disagree with those suggested changes? Everybody's...

Jon: This is Jon. Just one question, (Phillip). When you talk about the usual need for appropriate privacy and confidentiality, how do you square that with transparency? What falls into one? What falls into the other?

(Phillip): Well I thought we're doing this in two sections actually. But I just wanted to do that first.

Jon: Oh. I'm sorry.

(Phillip): (Unintelligible) first.

(Chuck):   So let's make sure that (Liz) has the - is clear on what you're suggesting there, (Phillip).

(Liz):   Yes. Can you just restate, (Phillip), what you think that should say in Number 2?

(Phillip):   Okay. Well it's a new (unintelligible) for listeners if you haven't got it now. But it's the outreach effort to encourage broader participation in stakeholder groups.

(Liz):   So not the current constituency?

(Chuck):   Now are you still there?

(Liz):   I am.

(Chuck):   Okay. So...

Jon: The language is an e-mail, (Liz).

(Liz):   Okay. Thanks.

(Chuck):   Yes. It is. It says...

Man: (Unintelligible)

(Chuck):   Okay. We once again have...

Man: ((FOREIGN LANGUAGE SPOKEN))

(Chuck):   (Phillip), is that your line again?

Man: ((FOREIGN LANGUAGE SPOKEN))

(Phillip):   That's somebody else.

(Chuck):   Somebody else...

Man: ((FOREIGN LANGUAGE SPOKEN))

(Chuck):   Operator?

Man: ((FOREIGN LANGUAGE SPOKEN))

(Chuck):   Operator?

Coordinator: Yes, sir.

((Crosstalk))

Man: ((FOREIGN LANGUAGE SPOKEN))

(Chuck):   Okay. Did we lose...

Coordinator: You just came back in now again.

(Chuck):   Okay. All right. Thank you. All right.

(Phillip): Okay. So as I said in the e-mail, in the meantime - so I read out what I had again.

(Liz): I got it. I got it. Thank you.

(Phillip): Okay. Fine.

(Chuck): So you found it? Okay.

(Phillip): On the second part of that, it was really just again trying to clarify what we're doing by constituency enhancements, which to my mind was all to do with the processes within constituencies rather than the content.

And in answer to Jon's question about this balance of transparency and privacy and confidentiality, I just thought it was - we needed to put something in there to show that what we wanted was transparency of process. But, you know, the idea of constituency as having members meetings, members calls, etc. was entirely appropriate. It was just that I thought was important to include.

(Chuck): So what's the specific change that's recommended in that regard? I mean…

((Crosstalk))

(Phillip): The change is and enhancing constituencies by offering advice on making processes outcome oriented, with these outputs being transparent and acceptable in the way they have been developed within the bounds of usual need of a process, privacy and confidentiality.

(Chuck):   All right. Discussion on that?

(Liz):   So this is (Liz). I thought that part of the enhancing constituencies concept also involved making the like membership transparent, and the operating principle to the degree that they're not - or membership criteria, that there was more than just the - in the GNSO improvements recommendations, that it was more than just the policy development part that should be transparent.

(Chuck):   And I think what we're getting into here is really what did the - what do the Board recommendations say there. And I guess to some extent I think we ought to leave that to the implementation part.

                Because the implementation of the objectives with regard to constituencies and stakeholder groups really is going to be - they're going to have to figure out what the Board intended and to do that. And I think part of what we're talking about right now really - we're trying to interpret what the Board meant. And I'm not sure that we need to do that in this plan.

(Phillip):   Yes. I might just as a clarification - neither the original text nor my edit addressed the client (unintelligible).

(Chuck):   Okay. Any other comments on this?

Jon: So there are suggested changes to address that point?

(Chuck):   I think there are. You want to clarify those again, (Phillip)?

(Phillip):   Well there's two issues. There's the text now proposed, which was based on the original text we talked about processes. So the first question is are we happy with that? And then we ought to go on to the second question that (Liz) raised. But that's a separate issue.

Jon: I'm just...

(Phillip):   (Unintelligible).

Jon: ...flipping through e-mails. Okay. So...

(Phillip):   So I (unintelligible) nobody gets. Are you happy with the change I made there? But (Liz)'s was that should the original text and therefore the edit say more than constituencies processes.

(Liz):   Well no. The original text talked about all the processes being - I mean I don't want to quibble about something small. And I'm happy to move on. But the reason I highlighted it was that the original text talk about all processes being transparent. And this is just talking about the outputs being transparent.

Jon: Yes. I have some concerns about the language. And, you know, it's probably not (Phillip)'s intent. But it could be used in a way that probably we're not intending. And we're kind of prejudging what this group should do on that point. But to the extent we could, you know, maybe remove it or make it a little more at a higher level and let the committee decide what they want to recommend. I think that would be more appropriate.

(Chuck):   And that's kind of what I was trying to say. And I didn't say it very well. The stakeholder group...

(Phillip):   (Unintelligible)

(Chuck):   Go ahead, (Phillip).

(Phillip):   And that's what I was - I think that's what I was driving at effectively. I think that's what I felt that the original text was indeed to prescriptive.

(Chuck):   So where are we at now? Now your recommendation was stakeholder group and constituency operation. And you said outreach efforts to encourage broader participation in the stakeholder groups, by explaining the added value of ICANN participation in such groups, and enhancing constituencies by offering advice on making processes outcome oriented, with these outputs being transparent and accessible in the way they have been developed within the bounds of the usual need for appropriate privacy and confidentiality.

So where are we at now in terms of are you still advocating that the language be changed as I just read? Or have you modified that some?

(Phillip):   I'm happy for that text if everybody else is. Or I'm happy to go along with Jon's suggestion in making something that altogether a higher level, and shorter than either the original or my edits.

(Chuck):   Okay.

Jon: Once suggestion might be where (Phillip) says enhancing constituencies, and then goes off on the by offering advice on making,

you know, processes more outcome oriented transparent with the usual bounds of privacy and confidentially. We could say enhancing constituencies per the BCGWG report.

(Chuck): Does that work, (Phillip)?

(Phillip): Yes. I guess so.

(Chuck): Okay. And that - obviously the issues that you're raising, (Phillip), I think are going to have to be dealt with by the working teams that actually zero in on this. And there will be I assume in that regard heavy constituency participation in that particular area, because that's going to be very critical in that regard. (Liz), are you okay with that? You got...

(Liz): Yes I am. And I captured it.

(Chuck): Okay. Excellent. Anything else on that page? Okay. Well Line 28 notice that - and this was a change I made. The OSC if we had would be comprised of three separate teams. I said the OSC could be comprised of three separate teams.

I think on Ken - on the original development of this plan was is that we would let the steering committees decide the best way to go forward. We'd put forward what we think are some good idea and so forth. But they - I don't think we need to preclude them making some variations in the plan, whether they use three teams or four teams or whatever. Is that okay?

Man: Yes, that's okay.

(Chuck):   Okay. Going on then to Page 12, (Rob) highlighted the whole section there on the OSC work activities. I'm going to assume that all of you had an opportunity to review that, that that's where we had more significant discussion last week. And any concerns about anything there?

I noticed we had moved the last bullet under the first main bullet there - the review and recommend amendments as appropriate regarding methods of introducing new constituencies - into a different area than it was before. It was in GNSO ops team instead of the constituency ops team. Excuse me.

Okay. So those are okay? Going on to Page 13, we had a similar change on Line 20 there. And also there's a new bullet or a changed bullet on Line 10. Any comments on those?

(Rob):   This is (Rob). Just to clarify that "new bullet" in 10 or 11 as I have it was - had been deleted. And you guys just said let's not delete that and put it back in.

(Chuck):   Oh that's right. Thanks for clarifying that. Okay. On Page 13...

(Liz):   Do you need somebody to just go through - do some of the talking for you?

(Chuck):   Well it's hard as Chair. I may have to do that tomorrow in the council meeting the way I'm going.

(Liz): Yes. No, but you're just going through the document. So if you want someone else to...

(Chuck): Yes.

(Liz): ...go through that...

(Chuck): Okay.

(Liz): ...if you're - I feel for you. You're doing a lot of coughing.

(Chuck): We're just about done.

(Liz): Okay.

(Chuck): So let me stick another...

(Liz): (Unintelligible)

(Chuck): ...cough drop...

(Phillip): Yes.

(Chuck): ...in my mouth and...

(Liz): Yes. Have a sip of water.

(Chuck): And I have some tea here. I do. I have some. Now let's think about the...

(Phillip):   (Unintelligible) (Phillip). Just before you moved on, can you explain what that meant that last - what it is now back in?

(Chuck):   Oh, the one representative from any constituency formally approved in the process of formation?

(Phillip):   What is a constituency formally - oh that's right, formally. It's not like a format. We're not (unintelligible).

(Chuck):   We don't know. That was one of the - that's going to be something that takes some work. And in fact I think that's part of what (Denise)'s request for feedback and so forth - one of her reasons why...

(Phillip):   Excuse me, a new constituency appears?

(Chuck):   Right. At what stage that is far enough along - one of the concerns on this committee early on before way back in the spring was that, you know, you can't just let everybody and his brother because they say they want a constituency get involved in the process.

                At the same time, you want some new constituency that's reached some reasonable level of progress to be able to participate in the process. What the details of that are this plan doesn't outline. And it seems to me that'd be okay for the steering committee and the council as a whole - the GNSO as a whole to fill in the details there.

(Phillip):   Yes. Okay.

(Chuck):   We tried to strike a balance, (Phillip), between - okay you don't want Jeff Williams joining here and saying, "I'm going to form a new

constituency." At the same time, you know, at some point maybe even before they're completely formed it may be useful to allow some of these new groups to participate.

(Phillip):   Yes. I mean - okay. Okay. (Unintelligible)

(Chuck):   It's terribly vague.

(Phillip):   It is. I have a wider issue because on one point we've got a - on the commercial side we've got three commercial constituencies who were pushing together under an umbrella. And we're simultaneously talking about formation of new constituencies which, if you look at it from the commercial side may be splinter groups from this new umbrella group.

(Chuck):   Right.

(Phillip):   So I think there's a slight tension in terms of...

(Chuck):   Sure.

(Phillip):   ...objective here. But (unintelligible) why...

(Chuck):   One of the things I - in the case of the registries, one of the things that - and our situation is a lot different. I understand that. But one of things I communicated the registry constituency - in developing our plan for seating counselors under the new model, that we need to do it in such a way that it allows for integration of new constituencies should there be some.

And that's not going to be real easy. But I think that's the intent is for us to be able to - okay. Let's say that the GL - GTLDs want to form their own constituency, you know. How would we accommodate that in the new model in terms of seating representatives and so forth?

So it's a little bit hard to fill in the blanks on that in advance. At the same time, one of the key recommendations of the Board Governance Committee is that their - that it'd be easy to add new constituencies and so forth. Are you okay with that as it's worded? Or do you have some suggestion?

(Phillip):   I don't. I thought it was a bit bizarre having a hypothetical appointee to a group that we want to get up and running, when we know that place isn't going to be filled.

(Chuck):   And I think that that's one of the things that the policy group - in particular some of the info that (Denise) sent out last week with these templates and so forth - possible ways for constituencies to, you know, show that they're making some progress and getting - actually they haven't been sent out.

The staff is working on them - some ways to - so that we can kind of zero in on this whole issue. And at some point in the GNSO we're going to have to make a decision. At one point, have they made enough progress? And I don't know what that answer is right now. I don't think anybody does.

Jon: This is Jon. This is exactly why I deleted it in the first round because we say initially the membership will be comprised of the following. And to the extent another group forms, it's got to go up to the GNSO

anyway. And that point, the GNSO council could add a new seat. I don't carry the way. But at least you, you know, that was the thinking of deleting it.

(Phillip): I would support deleting it for clarity.

(Chuck): Other thoughts?

Jon: I noticed we didn't edit in the other one though. You edited it back for the OSC. But you didn't edit back for the PPSC.

(Chuck): Good point.

(Phillip): Okay. Fine.

(Chuck): Anybody opposed to deleting it? And keep in mind that the council can change the charter. So at such point we get to a point where those groups should be - we think that it's appropriate to add them into the steering committees, we could do that. I'm not here...

(Liz): We could always put some text in there that says that, you know, in the development of this, the planning team recognizes the possibility that new constituencies in formation would be appropriate at some mature, you know, or selected point in that stage to allow them to participate in the process and that, you know, the future steering committee'll consider that, you know, at the appropriate time or some placeholder for footnotes if that's a, you know, a real possibility that would have to be factored in. I mean that's another - just another way forward.

Jon: This is Jon. You could add all that language or you could assume that complied by the word initially.

Woman: Yes. That's good, too.

(Chuck):   And we've got initially there.

(Phillip): Why not go the deletion and keep initially.

(Chuck):   That all right? Anybody opposed to that? Okay. And keep in mind obviously the council is going to consider this plan. So it could be revisited if it was a really big issue for someone. For right now, let's go ahead and delete it. Okay?

(Liz):   Done.

(Chuck):   Okay. Anything else on Page 13? Okay. Now going into Page 14 where we moved the chart - the org chart. I left in the special teams...

Jon: Yes. This is Jon. I suggested deleting that for two reasons. Either we should delete it or add it to both, because it's a - both the policy process standing committee and the operations standing committee have the ability to add a special team as needed. So I was just (unintelligible)...

(Chuck):   Well I understand your point there. But it is a little bit different. Okay? The special focus teams were not just - either one of the steering committees can add teams. That's not the purpose of that particular box.

We specifically in the plan talked about the need for some teams that involve just a special technical, or management expertise-like for example development of the Web site. You might (unintelligible) some Web site experts and things like that. That's what those teams were. Now I'm not hard nosed on this if it - if people what to delete it.

Jon: Where are you referring to?

(Chuck):   Well like in the plan itself. Hold on. I'll have to go back up.

(Phillip):   (Chuck), what you might want to do - and I mean my only thought is it depends how much we want to scare constituencies really. At the moment this - we're thinking about different people per team and per standing committee and council. I'm not talking about eight or nine different people here.

(Chuck):   Yes.

(Phillip):   I would have thought, you know, on a (granagram) showing a smaller set of known certain plots will be better. And we've got, you know, the flexibility to change the way the - in the text anyway. So I would...

(Chuck):   Well my view on that, (Phillip), is that all of us in our existing groups are going to have to - unless the volunteerism of quite a few new people to make this thing happen. So yes, it is a challenge and it can be somewhat scary to see how many are needed.

                Back to Jon's question - if you go to Page 11, Jon, in that last paragraph the - you've got the successful implementation on Line 33 there, may benefit from special expertise and experience.

Jon: Right. If you read it, that's referring to the establishment of the...

(Chuck):   Yes. You're right. You're right. You know, maybe...

Jon: But what I'm looking at is Page 9, Line 9. And that's the extent of - talking about the PPSC may establish special teams. And then Page 13, Line 3 with the exact same language about the OSC.

(Chuck):   Okay. And so we must have taken out language that originally we had in there on the special focus team. So I must be regressing back to an old time. In that regard, it probably does make sense to delete that right now because the document itself doesn't refer to that. Okay?

Jon: Okay.

(Chuck):   (Liz), I don't know if you're going to need me to send you a new copy of the table to...

(Liz):   Yes, probably.

(Chuck):   Is that so? I'll try and get that done before my next meeting.

(Rob):   The only other quick thing on that, (Chuck), is that I just noticed that they're still referred to standing committees in the diagram.

(Chuck):   Oh, they are. So I need to fix that, too. All right.

(Rob):   My apologies. I'm your (unintelligible).

(Chuck): I'll try and get that done if not before my next meeting during my next meeting when I'm not actively involved, which I hope there will be some of that time. And I'll get that out to you, (Liz).

(Liz): Okay. Thanks.

(Chuck): Okay. Good...

(Liz): That's a good catch.

(Chuck): Good catch. I messed that one when I fixed the table. We had changed the Board Liaison with the table. I'll delete the special focus teams. And I'll change standing to steering. Okay?

Ken Bauer: (Chuck), this is Ken Bauer. I am able to make those changes in my version. And so I - let me just make sure I have the changes correct. But my version of Word is letting me delete that box.

(Chuck): Oh good.

Ken Bauer: So I think I can help you out there. All I'm going to do is delete the special teams box. And we'll then just leave three sub-boxes under operations.

(Chuck): Correct.

Ken Bauer: And then I changed the two titles of the two intermediate boxes, to policy process steering committee and operations steering committee.

(Chuck): Excellent.

Ken Bauer: Anything else on the diagram?

(Chuck):   I don't think so. Anybody have anything else? Thanks, Ken. That saves me something to do which will be very helpful.

Ken Bauer: Okay. Super.

(Chuck):   The next thing we go to is the glossary. And Jon, after you had to leave the call last week most of the team thought that we should leave drafting team in there. I did make a edit or two in the wording of it. Do you want to talk about that?

Jon: Yes. And that was fine. I didn't see a reference to it earlier. So if there is one, that's great.

(Chuck):   I think (Rob), didn't you point out there was...

(Rob):   I think Wolf pointed it out.

(Chuck):   Oh. Wolf pointed it out. Okay. Now Wolf also suggested adding some things to the glossary, and I think it was stakeholder group, constituency and stakeholders as - to the glossary. And (Rob), just this morning - and did that get around? Did people see that? I haven't been watching my e-mail.

              So let me see if I've got it. Yes. It looks like (Rob) sent around three definitions for those three terms to be added to the glossary, and if you could look at that real quickly and see if you're comfortable with those.

I can read them or have somebody else - I'll have (Rob) read them if you need - want them read.

Wolf: Well it's Wolf here. The reason why I brought it up is with some (unintelligible) or might (unintelligible) a little bit. It's those terms used at the time being because on the one hand if you look to the existing bylaws, there I've given some definitions about constituencies and stakeholder groups. And then in the last board resolution there is very well six - the stakeholder group means - okay.

We shall have four stakeholder groups as it is all time here in the document of Jon as well. But the terms are used in a - well it seems to me that depending on who is using them before - I give you an example. So to my understanding the stakeholders, it tells they are - must be the basics. The basic let me say element all of this. And then (unintelligible). In the bylaws it defined that the constituencies are representing the stakeholder.

And now in the board resolution it means for stakeholder groups representing - and before stakeholder groups for example in the case of the commercial part, why one stakeholder group in the commercial part is representing in future at least three constituencies.

So I wonder myself I wonder to how it fits together. And this should be - that'll be fine. That's my issue on that. And if I read right now works for this (unintelligible) by Jon for a number. The definition of stakeholders - he used in his last sentence or in last phrase he's referring stakeholders are the fundamental units, comprising constituency groups. So Jon, you bring up a new term.

(Chuck): By the way, that was (Rob)'s - those are (Rob)'s definitions, not Jon's.

Wolf: Sorry. Sorry. (Rob)'s I mean.

(Chuck): Couldn't that be changed on that - that's a good point. By the way, I'm supportive. I think it makes sense, Wolf, to add these definitions. Your point's well taken. But what if we are to say are the fundamental units comprising constituencies in that last definition? Does that work?

Wolf: Yes.

(Chuck): Yes. Is that all right? Anybody have a problem...

(Phillip): (Phillip) here. I think yes, it's a very good idea to try to define them whether or not these are perfect definitions, we don't need to do it now and if other people will comment. But I think it's a very good start indeed. So that I support including it.

(Chuck): Anybody opposed to including these three definitions? Any other edits to the definitions?

(Liz): So I want to be sure I captured that edit though. That's under stakeholders, not under stakeholder group?

(Chuck): That's correct. At the end of that just delete - change constituency groups to constituency.

(Liz): Thanks.

(Phillip): Okay. (Liz), you've also got the typo on this - online on represent rather than represent...

(Liz): Oh. Thank you.

(Phillip): ...three lines up on constituency.

(Liz): Okay.

Wolf: Anyway, if you read to them - okay. Stakeholders are the fundamental unit of comprising constituency on the one hand. So if you go to the constituency definition, there it means constituencies representing groups of stakeholders let me say, particular groups of stakeholders.

So isn't that the same thing vice versa? That means what - constituencies representing stakeholders, and on the other hand stakeholders comprising constituency groups. So that is not clear to me.

(Chuck): I guess I...

(Phillip): (Unintelligible)

(Chuck): Go ahead.

(Phillip): I'm just trying to make a hierarchy here in which stakeholder group is the biggest, under which is constituency and under which is stakeholder.

Wolf: That's what I would see as well.

(Chuck):   Part of the problem is the term stakeholder group has - is a new term, a new definition, a new organizational structure element under the board recommended improvement. Okay? Stakeholders is an old term that really encompasses anybody who has an interest.

So we have to kind of separate those. And I think that's part of the confusion that you're running into there, Wolf. An individual user can be a - is a stakeholder. And then you also have stakeholder groups in caps, which is a specific term under the new organizational structure recommended by the Board.

So you have one a lowercase S for stakeholders, and you have a stakeholder group which I'd put in capitals -- capital S, capital G -- because it's an organizational unit under the new structure.

Wolf: Hey, (Chuck)? May I just comment on that?

(Chuck):   Sure.

Wolf: I was reading the bylaws. And I think it's justified further. In the bylaws, there is no definition given for stakeholders rather than for stakeholder groups. Because let's (unintelligible) for example, it's the constituencies are recognized as representative of a specific and significant group of stakeholders. So that's in the bylaws already.

(Chuck):   Right. And that's the lowercase S. Right?

Wolf: Lowercase means?

(Chuck):   In other words the third definition.

Wolf: Yes. Yes.

(Chuck):   All right.

(Rob):   This is (Rob).

(Chuck):   Go ahead, (Rob).

(Rob):   And I really appreciate Wolf bringing this up because I've had, you
                know, staff concerns about this. I think it's just amazing that in the ten
                years of ICANN, none of this has ever been fully defined. And in doing
                my research I too, Wolf, went to the bylaws.

                There are also pieces put together by the Internet Governance Project
                back in '05 and others. And no one seems to use a common definition
                of stakeholders, at least in the ICANN model. And I think you've
                touched on what's going to need to be a broader, you know,
                discussion.

                I think what we're trying to do is define as (Phillip) suggested what the
                hierarchy is for purposes of the planning structure. But you noted an
                area that's going to, you know, require some broader community
                discussion just to make sure that we do have some consistent
                terminology in the bylaws. Because there's no clear (unintelligible) this
                at all.

(Chuck):   I'm going to make a suggestion. In the definition for stakeholder group,
                I think we need to tie that specifically to the - not just to the Board of

Directors, but to the Board of Directors recommendations for GNSO improvements. So I would suggest that we say a GNSO organizational entity specifically defined by or in the ICANN Board of Directors recommendations for GNSO improvements.

(Liz):   Well we could turn that around a little bit...

(Chuck):   And that's fine. You can wordsmith it. I'm okay with that. Because really the stakeholder group is a new term that has a definition from the GNSO improvement recommendations from the Board.

(Rob):   That's right.

Wolf: Yes.

(Chuck):   Is that all right?

(Rob):   Okay.

(Chuck):   Hey I don't know if it totally solves the problem, Wolf. You have any other suggestions?

Wolf: Well my suggestion was, you know, okay I would agree to that definition for the stakeholder group. But there will come up a discussion about the future all of constituencies, stakeholders and so on.

And my suggestion was why couldn't we put that question to let me say to the task of the - what is that - oversee (unintelligible) the steering committee to come up with clear definitions. We could put the

three terms in the glossary. And we could also agree on the stakeholder group definition like you did right now. And the other terms I would put it as to be defined.

(Chuck): So you're suggesting for constituency and stakeholders, that further consideration of the definitions of these terms is recommended.

Wolf: Yes.

(Chuck): Anybody opposed to that?

(Phillip): No. I'm fine with that. I mean that sounds the text that we've got as amended and just put two footnotes by those two, and why not?

(Chuck): Fine with me. It's a good...

(Liz): So all three? Or just the two stakeholders?

(Chuck): No. Just the two - constituency and stakeholders I think. Is that correct, Wolf?

Wolf: Yes. Yes.

(Liz): For stakeholders and stakeholder group?

(Chuck): No.

(Liz): Okay.

(Chuck): Constituency and stakeholder groups.

(Liz): Got you.

(Chuck): Excuse me - constituency and stakeholders - the last two.

(Liz): Right. Although once you alphabetize them, they're not the last two anymore.

(Chuck): I understand that. I'm looking at what (Rob) set which is that they're not in the glossary yet.

(Liz): (Unintelligible)

(Chuck): I understand.

(Liz): So you're just going to simply add a footnote that says that this is subject to further review by or...

(Chuck): I don't know if it's subject to further review. I think that the point is is that...

(Phillip): Let's say this is a working definition.

(Liz): Okay.

(Chuck): That works.

Wolf: Okay.

(Chuck):   Okay? Now (Liz) and (Rob) and Ken - whoever does it - will send out a new version when they - to this group as well as to the council so that if you catch anything afterwards, please let your council reps know if they're not in this group so that we can - things can still be fixed before the council approves the final plan so if people have additional thoughts. So those three definitions will be added as modified. Does anybody have anything else on the total plan?

(Phillip):   Not from me.

(Chuck):   So we will then if staff can go ahead - and I used the general term staff. I don't care whether it's (Liz) or (Rob) or Ken or...

(Liz):   Now what we've got it, (Rob) - (Chuck), yes.

(Chuck):   Okay. So send the, you know, accept all the changes. Send a clean document with today's date from the planning committee to the council, because it's going to be talked about in the meeting tomorrow. So that needs to go out today. And then also send it to the planning list so that everyone can check it. And again, any additional edits will be via the council rather than through this planning team. Does that work?

(Liz):   Yes.

(Chuck):   Okay. Let me say thanks to all of you, including those who weren't not able to make this call today. If they have additional concerns, they also can communicate those via the council. And I think most of the people missing are actually council members. So that works - should work out very well. Any questions or comments? Very good. Thanks again.

Jon: (Chuck), thanks for all your hard work on this.

(Chuck):   Oh, you're welcome. Thanks to everybody else. It's been a great team
                effort. It really has. And I always - it's much more enjoyable to do those
                kind of things when you have such great team cooperation. So thanks
                everybody.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck):   All right. Bye.

(Phillip):   Bye-bye.

                                END