**GNSO Improvements Planning Team
teleconference
11 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 11 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-plan-20080911.mp3

Present:

Chuck Gomes - group leader registry c.
Avri Doria - NCA
Olga Cavalli - NCA
Philip Sheppard - CBUC
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben - ISPCPC
Milton Mueller – NCUC
Jon Nevett – Registrar
Susan Crawford – Board liaison

ICANN Staff:
Robert Hoggarth
Denise Michel
Glen de Saint Géry

Coordinator: Yes. I'd like to inform all parties that the call is being recorded, if there are any objections, to disconnect. Thank you. You may begin.

(Chuck):   Thank you very much. Okay welcome everyone. The - it looks like we

                have a - a - a - Jutta's not on, but - and then (Denise) wasn't going to

                join us because of the board retreat. (Liz)...

(Denise):   Actually they're starting late, so this is (Denise). I'm on.

(Chuck): Oh hi, (Denise). I didn't even see you on the list here. How come I - you didn't show up there? Let's see.

(Denise): I was not planning...

(Chuck): Oh you're up earlier and I looked past it. No you've been on there for a while actually, so that was my mistake. Okay thanks (Denise). And let's see. Lis Gassteron? No.

(Denise): No, she in Seoul

(Chuck): Okay. All right. And is (Penelope) on? I didn't think I - and then Glen, you're on. So we actually have every constituency represented except for the intellectual property constituency and a good representing for staff. So thanks everyone for this.

I think I kind of just did a roll call. If I missed anybody, please speak up. The - I sent out a more detailed agenda yesterday. Any concerns about the agenda? Any...

(Phillip): I had just one comment. Congratulations on creating one of the longest agendas I've ever seen in ICANN's history.

(Chuck): Thank you very much. I appreciate that compliment (Phillip). The - any suggestions today to the agenda?

(Chuck): Okay. Not sure what that was.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): Who is this?

Man: Yes, yes. Okay (unintelligible).

(Chuck): I think you're on a wrong call.

Man: He's in a private conversation.

(Chuck): Yes, okay. All right. All right, so the first agenda action - item on the agenda then is the next steps regarding...

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): Hello?

(Milton): You don't mind if I talk to my pet rabbit (Harvey) while we're doing this do you?

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck): Operator, can you see if we can get these - we've got some interference here. Glen, would you check with the operator and see if we can get that - get rid of that interference? Are you there, Glen?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes I am. Thank you, (Chuck), and I'm checking.

(Chuck): Thank you very much. Okay. All right. Well I'll try again. So the first big decision I think we need to make is next steps regarding the previously submitted GNSO improvements implementation plan. And...

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck):   ...I noted on the - as a - for a sub-item there, that we should change the name from top level plan to implementation plan. And I think most people know the reason for that, but let me state that.

The problem with using top level plan, many people in the comment period were associating this plan with the top level domains that were going to be introduced next year. So just to avoid that confusion, a simple change I think is in order unless anybody objects to that.

So we won't use top level plan going forward just so that we avoid that confusion. If you look at the public comments you'll notice that most of the comments were about top level domains as a result of that confusion.

Now it's clear that some non-substantial edits need to be made to that plan. I took a crack at that. And at some point, as soon as we have time we'll go through those and see if there are any others or see if the ones I suggested were appropriate.

But if we put that aside for a moment, just the simple edits that need to be made that don't really change the content, the first question I think we need to answer is whether we are willing to recommend the plan as it is to the council. And if not, then determine what areas we want to discuss further, and then of course develop action items and a timeline for a completion of the plan.

The - I noted there just a - and (Phillip) pointed out I included an awful lot of detail in the agenda. I did that to kind of keep things moving

quickly today, but it would - ideally -- and that's ideally in my mind-- it would be really good if we could submit a plan, you know, with some lead time before the September 25 council meeting so that the council could act on that.

That then would allow us to get some things moving pretty well in the Cairo meeting. So anyway that's an ideal. We may or may not accomplish that, but that's a thing. So let me open it up now for discussion on the current plan as it stands now. What are people's thoughts on that? Who would like to be in the queue?

(Jon):   This is (Jon), (Chuck). This is...

(Chuck):   Okay, Jon. Anybody else want to be in the queue?

(Wolfe):   Yes, (Wolfe).

(Chuck):   Okay (Wolfe).

(Wolfe):   Yes.

(Chuck):   So I've got Jon and (Wolfe). Anybody else? Ok...

(Milton):   This is (Milton). I just want to know, were we discussing your - we're approving your agenda approach or are we actually substantively discussing?

(Chuck):   We're discussing the question whether or not we would be willing to submit the plan with whatever minor edits need to be made -- as is.

(Milton):   Oh okay. All right. So...

(Chuck):   And if not...

(Milton):   I'll get in the queue then.

(Chuck):   Okay, good (Milton). I have you in the queue. And if not, then we'll talk about what things need to be discussed further. Okay? Anybody else? Okay Jonstart us off please.

Jon: I'm in agreement it will take a long time. I think we need to go through it with fresh eyes, and I think we need to not approve the plan as it is. There might be more than minor edits, there might be some more substantive edits. We don't know yet until we go through it.

(Chuck):   Okay. Thank you. (Wolfe)?

(Wolfe):   Yes. Let me say it's all primarily (unintelligible) the (unintelligible) constituency and in principle we agree to existing to the present plan. That we have some amendments - some comments to what you also highlighted to discuss, but in principle we would agree to take this plan.

(Chuck):   Thank you very much (Wolfe). (Milton)?

(Milton):   Yes, I think we need to discuss the plan and go through it and I will be trying to argue for some simplification of the proposal.

(Chuck):   Very good. Thank you. Anyone else want to jump in on this before we actually start talking about how to proceed and what areas should specifically be - might warrant some consideration of amendment?

(Phillip): (Chuck), (Phillip) here. I do this through to support the comments from Jonand (Milton). I think we do need to review the plan in light of where we know the board are, and where we know the uncertainties coming from the board also are.

(Chuck): Okay. Thanks (Phillip). Now that's fine. And I actually thought that's what we would need to do. And so let's talk bout how to proceed in that regard. We can obviously go through the plan bit by bit. Is it possible rather than going through all of the plan to identify specific areas that we should discuss further? What are the - what is the inclination of people on the team?

(Milton): (Milton) here.

(Chuck): Go ahead.

(Milton): I would just suggest that we start with some general comments that we know what people are targeting for change?

(Chuck): Is anybody uncomfortable with that? Then let's do that. So let me get a queue to - and let's start off just with identifying the areas where - for the consideration is needed, and then we'll go from there. Who would like to be in the queue? I assume Jonand (Milton) do. Is that correct?

(Milton): That's right.

Jon: Sure.

(Chuck): Anybody else?

(Phillip):   (Phillip).

(Chuck):   (Phillip), good. Okay Jon you want to start us off?

Jon: No, can I...

(Chuck):   Do you want to defer? That's fine. I'll put you at the bottom of the queue. Okay? (Milton)?

(Milton):   Yes I want to come after Jon. No I'm kidding. I think - and like I said, I would be looking for simplification of the structure. I'm a little bit concerned that the standing committees are going to be standing for so long.

I'm wondering if a lot of the issues can't just come to the council, and if the council needs to appoint an advocacy hoc committee at any given time for any given task, that it could do so, but that most of the time, you know, everybody would be represented and they would be going through the approval process as a council. That's one of my suggestions.

I'm a little bit vague about the relationship of this structure to the creation of these new stakeholder groups. And I would just like for that to be clarified and discussed, and I'd like to hear people's ideas about that.

(Chuck):   Yes, and in that regard, the - we might find it useful before we talk too much detail about the plan of jumping ahead to agenda item 5, because that's really what I tried to deal with there so that we could

kind of get our heads around whether that process is part of this plan or totally separate. And that's one of the things that I wanted to talk about.

So the - let me - I'm going to put that down, but we'll come back to that. And then I'll - once we get a list of parts of the plan that we want to talk about further, we'll decide whether we jump ahead to agenda item 5 and then come back to the plan. Okay? Anything else (Milton)?

(Milton):   No. Not right now.

(Chuck):   Thanks. (Phillip)?

(Phillip):   Thanks. I - my main concern is that when we first wrote this plan, all of us had a certain slightly more relaxed timeframe in mind to implement issues in a certain structured way, to consider them thoroughly, to have the right time for into group consultation, et cetera. And that is in direct contrast to the time table that the board has now presented to us.

(Chuck):   I don't think that's true. Why do you think that's true?

(Phillip):   Because the plan that we had setting up various structure to do things had in its inherent quite generous structure of committees, subcommittees, and teams, a structure that is geared to a longer timeframe than doing it all by January, which is where the board seems to be want us to be.

And I think our overriding concern in the (BC) is that you can't just have, you know, people in seats by January without everyone else also

being in place, because they've got to do something (once they're in those) seats. If we're not empowered to do any votes because we haven't worked out how voting happens on thresholds and all these other questions, you have an impotent body.

So these two things need to be seamlessly integrated, and we see a timescale challenge in that integration.

(Chuck): So what you're saying is that - because I don't think the board was asking us to get all of the changes done by January. They were just asking that the seating of the bicameral structure approach happened. But what I hear you saying is, is that you don't think that it makes any sense to do that unless everything else is in place. Is that what you're saying?

(Phillip): Well yes. I mean otherwise I think (they'll all) sitting in an empty room and nothing to do, because they won't have any procedures to act upon.

(Chuck): Well why couldn't the - I mean we - until the other things are in place, I was assuming that we would go ahead even though we would have the bicameral voting structure. But other than that we would function pretty much as we have, and then make changes as they're implemented as far as the broader recommendations are concerned. But I get your point. So...

(Susan): (Chuck) can I join the queue? It's (Susan).

(Chuck): Sure. Do you want to talk specifically about this, (Susan)?

(Susan): Yes, specifically on this topic, as long as we're on it.

(Chuck): Go ahead.

(Susan): I think it would make sense and is the outcome of the board's discussion to have the bicameral structure in place and people seated in January. I think the dependency there is making sure that the voting thresholds have been established for triggering particular events.

But other than that, our thought, as far as I'm aware, is that the stakeholder groups and other would be working in implementation of other elements of the restructuring following the seating of people as (Chuck) is suggesting.

So I hope that this group will energetically move towards creating the bicameral structure and seating people by January. That's what the board is expecting. But I don't think all of the dependencies need to be in place.

(Phillip): Well (Susan), will you and do you think the board will be happy with the concept that constituencies make a temporary appointment in order to make that seating happen by January rather than have proper elections in a way that an individual would happen once the integration of stakeholder groups have happened?

(Susan): We haven't discussed it in that detail (Phillip). I personally would be happy with temporary interim appointments just to have people in place to begin in - on - in January.

(Chuck): And then - and (Phillip) you can tell by I think one of the ideas that I threw out in - on the list was is that, you know, it may very well be that we need some sort of an interim type seating with a clear understanding that within three to six months or something there would be a more permanent thing.

So I really anticipate the possibility of what you're talking about, so (Susan) it would be helpful we - if you were able to get confirmation that that kind of approach, if we need it, would be okay.

(Susan): I should be able to have a discussion about that today if I get inserted into the agenda.

(Chuck): Right. Thank you very much. Appreciate that. But (Phillip) did you have anything else?

(Phillip): No, no, that's it for now.

(Chuck): Thanks a lot. Jonare you ready, or do you want to - me to open up the queue first?

(Jon): I guess my question is having not been involved in the process before in this, getting in a high level view of where we're going, you know, as far as the bicameral approach, the impact to the contracted party house is going to be a lot less than the impact to the non-contracted party house in that it appears that we will have three registrars and three registree reps in the new world order, and we currently have that as well. So it's pretty simply for us to transition over. It's going to be harder for the non-contracted party folks who - there's going to be a different mix.

As far as the voting thresholds that we agreed to as a package, assuming the board signs off on that, that's not going to change much with regard to seating new folks in January. So the long pole (in the tent) is really the non-contracted party house and whether they have enough time to move to this new structure or not.

You know, once we get there, the question is, are these committees then taking over in helping with the implementation of the other recommendations, or these standing committees as in they'll be standing from, you know, time and memorial forward essentially with the new structure? And I'm not sure what role these new committees are having. Is it just an implementation or is it going forward?

(Chuck):   The teams at the bottom of the chart there really are the - it's - where the main work would happen with regard to developing implementation plans that the standing committee then would pass on to the council for approval. And I assume ultimately board approval. But the...

(Jon):   So is it a standing committee, or is it a temporary committee?

(Chuck):   What you have in the middle. And this is one of the topics that (Milton) brought up there. Our standing committees, that are fairly small -- we suggested they were only - no more than 12 -- have a coordination role, because there's several tasks under each of those standing committees that really need coordination and so forth.

And as far as the long term nature of them, the concept was to have them serve the standing committees, not the teams at the bottom. The standing committees serve kind of an ongoing oversight role of

continuous improvement, you know, taking a look at what's going on. And it becomes a mechanism for ongoing review and suggested changes as we go forward.

So that's the idea of the long term part. The initial part really is to implement the - to oversee the implementation of the - of all of the recommended changes from the board and to be an intermediary between the council so that everybody in the council doesn't have to be as intensely involved in the overall coordination effort. (Avri), did you want to add anything to that?

(Avri):   Can you hear me?

(Chuck):   Yes.

(Avri):   Oh okay. No that was essentially it. And I think the other thing that we had was like standing committees like anything else. And if it's not in there explicitly, we need to put our reviews on an annual basis to see if it still serves a purpose. If it needs to be rechartered, if its purpose needs to be rechartered, if its purpose needs to be changed. So yes I think it's what you said. Hello?

(Chuck):   Yes you - we're hearing you. There's...

(Avri):   Oh, oh, okay. So yes it's what you said. I think the only extra element is that there's periodic reviews. Is it something we want to keep? And I think we put that notion in on just about everything. And if we don't have it explicitly there on the standing committees -- I don't have my computer in front of me now so I don't remember -- if we don't have it

explicitly, that's capital expenditures a worthwhile amendment that, you know, the role of the standing committee is review yearly.

(Chuck):   Right.

(Avri):   And if the...

(Chuck):   I'm pretty sure that's in there. I'm not...

(Avri):   I'm pretty sure it's in there, right too. Because that was a step we went through on just about everything at the last time. But none of these things that we create are permanent. They're all recurring, but they're - all need to be reviewed every year, and does this still make sense. Is the structure of the standing committee fulfilling a useful function in terms of looking for continued improvement as opposed to waiting for the next evaluation, you know, and such? So yes.

(Chuck):   Okay, thanks (Avri).

Jon: I guess - if I still have the floor (Chuck)...

(Chuck):   Go ahead.

Jon: Yes, good. I guess we might want to analyze this differently. We might want to analyze this in two phases. One is in implementation of the recommendation phase, and then two is the long term role of the standing committees and things like that.

                If we're trying to get this done in short timeframe, we might want to just focus on the implementation first and then focus on long term -- what

would a standing committee do and evaluation of the standing committee.

You know, there are things in here that need to be updated based on the bicameral approach that - there's references to super-majority votes of the council, there's references to composition based on constituency. Should it be the houses? So the long term role of the standing committees we probably could move to Phase 2 and move the implementation of the recommendations to Phase 1.

(Chuck): Okay, thank you. All right, I'm going to make a suggestion now. Please disagree with me if you don't like the suggestion, but because a couple different people in their comment have talked about the implementation of the bicameral voting structure, I - before we continue discussion of the plan itself, I think it would be helpful if we jump ahead to agenda item 5 and then come back and talk more about the plan after we see where we're at on the implementation of the bicameral voting structure, which has a goal of January to be in place.

And that particular aspect of implementation didn't exist when we created the plan, as all of you know. The - now I inserted - and this is one of the reasons why my agenda's long. Just to keep things moving quickly, I inserted some of my own opinions in that regard.

So let me ask - and I'll go over those in a minute if you are okay with that. But let me ask, is anybody opposed to me jumping ahead to this agenda item so that we kind of see how the - this short term (path) that we - that's in front of the GNSO, see how we're going to deal with that before we go back to the plan. Does anybody object to that?

Man: No, I support it.

(Chuck):   Thanks. Okay now I'm throwing - I threw these opinions out, and one
            of the reasons I put them in the agenda it was a quick way for
            everybody to see them in advance and think about them. The - but
            please disagree with the opinions. They are just that. They're just my
            opinions, and the chair's opinions are no more important that anybody
            else's.

            But let me go through them quickly and then let's talk about those and
            see where everybody's head is. And that was my goal in putting them
            on the table. I think that deciding how to seat representatives on the
            new council should, you know, should primarily be the responsibility of
            the new stakeholder group.

            I don't really think there's a need for a full council involvement in that
            task. If we agree with those two points, and also recognize the short
            time constraints we have, it might be better in my opinion, to separate
            this task from the GNSO improvements implementation plan, except
            for insuring consistency of the two efforts. And obviously there are
            interrelated things there.

            And then fourth, to achieve a January goal of implementing a
            bicameral structure, the task that - that task - to make that happen in
            such short order, really needs to start, you know, as close to
            immediately as possible.

            And then last of all, this team -- this planning team -- could serve a
            facilitation role of just getting all that started and wouldn't have to have
            any role beyond that. But because we are a planning team, we could

maybe kick that off instead of waiting for a council meeting, which is still a little ways off, to - I think two weeks off -- to get that task moving.

Now those are my opinions. Let me - would you rather take one at a time or just a broad discussion? Any preferences there?

(Wolfe):   Well I have - it's (Wolfe). I have a question.

(Chuck):   Go ahead.

(Wolfe):   If I'm right - so I think if you look to the present council, with the Cairo meeting, there - the membership of - I counted nine members shall expire. This Cairo meeting - and they shall be reelected or some constituencies have to select somebody for - who is - for the Council as members.

So that this coincides with, which is planned. You know, if you look to the Cairo meeting, which takes place beginning of November, then we constituencies shall start or shall have somebody elected -- a new council members -- and then in January they will come up with a new voting structure and which means that we shall have - the council shall have less members and other members maybe. So I wonder how we - how this fits together.

(Chuck):   It's an excellent question (Wolfe). And I think that that scenario where this team could put some suggestions forward. For example, I've heard somebody say that, you know, maybe we, you know, maybe we extend the terms of existing councilors for a little bit so that this all fits together with it.

But let's not - and so I think that there's a possibility. If we decide as a team to kind of kick this thing off -- and that may be our only role as a planning team just to kind of spur it on -- we could come forward with some suggestions to deal with issues like that.

And the issue (raised) is a very important one. So very good point. Does anybody have a preference? Should we take my opinions one at a time or just want to just talk bout them in total?

(Phillip):   You can probably...

(Chuck):   (Unintelligible).

(Phillip):   ...linked together (Chuck).

(Chuck):   Okay, so just talk about them as a group. Very good (Phillip). If nobody objects to that, that's what we'll do. So let me start a queue for a discussion of my opinions, and I'd like to hear your opinions. So who would like to be in the queue first?

(Milton):   (Milton).

(Chuck):   Okay (Milton). Next?

(Phillip):   (Phillip).

(Chuck):   Okay. Anybody else?

(Wolfe):   Yes, (Wolfe).

(Chuck):   Okay. Anybody else at this time? And you can jump in later of course.
                Okay let's start off with (Milton).

(Milton):   I was reliever to see agenda item 5. I pretty much agree with your
                opinions (Chuck) about leaving this out of the full planning process
                bureaucracy and letting most of the work be done by the
                constituencies. I think when you say the task at making that happen
                needs to start ASAP, though, I'd like to know more what you mean by
                that.

                And also I guess when - I need to clarify my understanding of what is
                left if the seating of the representatives and the formation of the new
                stakeholder groups is not part of this GNSO planning process. My
                understanding is that what's left is the procedural stuff about working
                groups and how to form them and so on and so forth. Is that correct?

(Chuck):   Right. And the revision of the (PDP). That would be the two big tasks
                under the first standing committee. And then the operational standing
                committee would deal with things like communications between the
                different (SOs) and constituency operations, because there's lot of
                recommendations in the boards recommendations that have to do with
                that.

                And then there's the operational thing of how the council functions like
                our procedural rules and stuff like that. That's another area that has to
                be worked. And it seems like I'm leaving something out, but anyway
                that's the work that all - this plan was originally designed to provide a
                structure for. Did that make sense?

Now you said something at the beginning - let's see, what was the first question you asked?

(Milton): What does it mean to make...

(Chuck): (Unintelligible).

(Milton): As soon as possible.

(Chuck): Well, as soon as - just what it says. I mean...

(Milton): You mean the...

(Chuck): I think it would be - if we could for example today -- and I don't know that we'll get this done today -- but if we could as a committee come up with a rough way to get this thing started, maybe even just go back to our own constituencies and in our - for our next call decide how we can get going. And I think each of the stakeholder holder groups is going to need somebody to kind of take the lead in that regard.

So I'm suggesting that then we may be able to spur this on by some recommendations we make within our own stakeholder groups. And so in other words...

(Milton): Oh definitely. I mean we have basically started preparing for the transition at the (Paris) meeting. And now that the uncertainty's been cleared up about where the responsibility lies and the board has accepted the basic bicameral plan, we have a much better idea of what to do.

So we're ready to go. There's some ambiguities unique to the non-commercial stakeholders group that we might have time to talk about, but fundamentally, you know, I'm - then I'm totally on board then with that part of your agenda - or your opinion, I should say.

(Chuck): Thanks. Okay (Phillip)?

(Phillip): Yes (were thinking of) (unintelligible) (representatives) to the non-commercial group, which would simultaneously solve (both of) our immediate representation problems. But besides that, I think if we're serious about moving forward with the January deadline, (unintelligible), you know, there are certain enabling things which the board needs to be aware of.

(Unintelligible) (one of those) in terms of, you know, we need a board resolution in terms of extending the life of certain councilors beyond current. Otherwise there's be impotent (unintelligible). We need a decision about interim membership, if that is to happen by January. And then to my mind we still need three other things in place if we're not to have a completely impotent body, and that is a voting threshold.

And even if we've got those in place, somebody comes along with hey, an actual policy issue (unintelligible) stuff, "Okay guys, you're all sitting in a room. You're in your chambers. You've got your interim (unintelligible) in place. (You know you're voting) threshold. This is a major problem of the internet. Let's vote to start a (PDP). Hey we can't do that because (standing) committee on the (PDP) hasn't worked it out yet, and hey we can't do that, because we don't know how our working groups look yet."

So we have this problem that incurs a misfit still that we are concerned about in terms of building in impotency simply because of an unseemly desire to be seen, to be creating activity, where the result of that activity will be impotent. And I think those are the questions that we as this planning group should be asking of the board, because it is only in their (gift) to change this particular set of problems in a good way.

(Chuck): Not let me respond first of all, but then in case - maybe (Susan) or (Denise) might want to respond as well. With regard to voting thresholds, (Phillip) I totally agree with you. Those have to be in place. And my assumption is that the board would approve voting thresholds in their meeting later this month.

(Susan): Yes, that's right (Chuck). That's the plan. And I haven't heard a lot of unhappiness with the voting thresholds. So I have - my assumption is that they will be approved as suggested.

(Chuck): Yes, and each of us as constituencies and other groups within ICANN community have been asked to provide comments. (Denise) asked that.

And then secondly with regard to policy -- and I think I kind of hinted at this before -- my assumption is, is that we would have to use our existing procedures and processes for developing policy until such time that we approve new ones.

So we would be functioning the same other than the voting at the council level, as we have been all along in terms of the way we've been doing things. And we would be going by the existing (PDP) in that regard until such time as that has changed.

So - and that seems reasonable to me. (Susan) or (Denise) do you want to add anything there?

(Susan): Yes, (Chuck) I'd like to. It's (Susan). I agree with you that the current (PDP) process should continue until it's changed. My one addition there would be that it would be appropriate to set a deadline by which you hope the (PDP) restructuring group will have done its work, just even as a checkpoint, just to make sure that this - the reworking, which is not going to be easy, doesn't drift too far.

(Chuck): And the plan that's in place right now really kind of left it to the steering committees and ultimately the teams themselves to set a schedule. But - it's suggested that they set a schedule, and especially if you get into some of the detail work that has been provided that the teams could use and the steering committees could use when they - or standing committees -- excuse me -- could use as ideas to start with.

So the expectation is, is that there would be timelines and that could be made firmer if it needs to be. (Wolfe)?

(Wolfe): Sorry. Sorry (Chuck). I (unintelligible) at this point. I do not have a comment (on) that. I was (unintelligible) another point. So...

(Chuck): That's okay. On your - well I said I was going to give (Denise) a chance to talk on (Phillip)'s question. (Denise), did you have anything to add?

(Denise): No. No I agree with (Susan).

(Chuck): Okay. Go ahead (Wolfe) on your point.

(Wolfe): No, (unintelligible) I was thinking you were with the service implementation plan. So we are at another agenda item, so I refrain (unintelligible).

(Chuck): Okay. All right anybody else want to talk about my opinions? Any other comments in that regard? Is there - is anybody in disagreement with any of the assumptions I made there or the opinions I expressed? Okay

All right, so - then, you know, there's the issue of okay to get this thing started. And I'm just - I'm not talking about the implementation plan of the broader recommendations, I'm just talking about implementing the bicameral voting structure -- something that we wouldn't continue to be involved in as a planning committee if there's support for the position that it wouldn't be our role, nor would it be the council's role.

But here's some possible tasks for the stakeholder groups. And (Milton) you may have some good ideas on this since you guys have started thinking, and I'm sure others have as well.

It seems to me that the key role of the stakeholder groups is to develop proposals for seating representatives on the council in January, and then to submit those proposals to the board for approval at least a week prior to the board meeting on December 11, which would be December 4, if it's a week ahead.

Are there other tasks that people see that the stakeholder groups need to do in the - with regard to the goal - the January goal of seating reps in the bicameral structure? Okay.

Now - so then there's the idea, okay then there's the challenges associated with the proposal development of the stakeholder groups. And I listed some things. I - like I said in my email message, with the revised agenda was, is that I tried to do some of my own advanced personal thinking.

And I think we'll all agree that the proposals that the stakeholder groups put forward need to be consisted with the total package of GNSO improvement recommendations. They need to incorporate in that process - and this is a tough one -- how do you incorporate new members that maybe not part of existing constituencies or interest groups, because none of those will be formed in time for this seating in January.

Third, the mechanisms that are designed for seating representatives need to deal with the future when there will be new constituencies and interest groups that may become involved. And the proposals have to accommodate that. And then of course we all have the challenge of meeting the short time constraints.

And Jon's point is very good that - I mean I think it's accurate -- that in some ways the registries and registrars have it a little bit easier, because we're not changing seats either up or down. But we also will have the challenge of making sure we design proposals that are - appropriately deal with possible new constituencies or interest groups being a part of our stakeholder groups in the future as well.

Now can anybody think of other challenges that the stakeholder groups will have with regard to this short term task?

(Milton): Just to go down - you said how to incorporate new members and what was the other challenge?

(Chuck): The one is involving potential new member - or community members that aren't part of constituencies now that maybe in your stakeholder group in the future.

(Milton): Oh okay.

(Chuck): The second one, which is a little bit different, designing a proposal that will be submitted to the board that will accommodate the inclusion of new constituencies and interest groups in the stakeholder group in the future.

Man: Oh (unintelligible).

(Milton): Yes.

(Chuck): Make sense?

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Milton): Definitely. That's basically what we've...

(Chuck): Yes.

(Milton): ...identified as the two main (tasks)...

(Chuck):   Yes, I figured your way ahead of me on that, but I just wanted to kind
                of get the things in front of us very quickly.

(Milton):   What I wanted to ask -- is there a template that we're supposed to
                follow? I mean we would be developing a proposal based on the
                former charter of the (NCUC). I mean basically modifying it in ways
                designed to conform to the new situation. But is there some other
                structure that we're supposed to follow?

(Chuck):   I don't believe there is. Now (Rob) sent something around today. It's
                not a template, but I think (Rob) -- and I'll let you talk about that -- that
                what you tried to do was to pull out of the board recommendations
                some critical principles with regard - that the stakeholder groups need
                to keep in mind as they're developing a proposal to submit to the
                board. (Rob) would you like to talk to that?

(Rob):   Yes thanks (Chuck). That's correct. I mean as we were looking at
                some of this stuff from a staff perspective and looking at the timetable
                that were facing all of you, that the real challenge became, okay what
                sort of hooks are there (unintelligible) guidance is there. And the
                (similar) documents to that is the board governance committee working
                (group report) that was produced on February 3.

                So what I did is I went back through that document trying to call those
                general principles or specific recommendations that the (BGCWG)
                made, and try to just present the format that, you know, and this group
                can change or play around with it, but essentially to create a format
                that gives that guidance -- you know, that really provides some
                measure of a framework or just a checklist that, as you discussed

(Milton), it's not a specific template but something that as you go through it to say, "Oh, did we do this? Did we do that?"

(Milton): Well this is fantastic. I didn't even know this had been sent out, so I see it here in my mailbox. I have it open now, and it's - I haven't read it all yet, but it's the kind of guidance I can send to other people and that's great...

(Phillip): (Unintelligible) (Milton).

(Milton): What's that?

(Phillip): (Unintelligible).

(Chuck): Would it be helpful, because this hasn't been out very long, to have (Rob) quickly go through the nine principles that he included? And they're all from the report -- the board of governance committee working group report. Is - would anybody like that? No? Okay then we won't take the time. If somebody would benefit by it, I would be more than willing to spend the time on that. But each of us of course can read it ourselves.

And they're right out of the board of governance committee working group report that was approved by the board. So - and he gives page references so you can go back and see the detail. And you could find some of these in multiple places as well of the report, but I think it's - there's not too much duplication in the nine that are listed there.

(Phillip): (Unintelligible) just with a comment (on them). I think - I mean the whole concept of the new constituency is a very vast (set of) issues.

I'm just looking at it within the commercial group. I mean we see that happening in one of two ways.

And maybe you get a bunch of people who are new, who have never managed a (unintelligible) before, or you get a (unintelligible) group of existing constituencies. And I think (unintelligible) the big question for us is what would be the (nook and the shoot) of stakeholder groups and some of the (unintelligible) constituencies and relationship between those and (the diverting) structure.

You know, do you build in questions of diversity, geographic, or of interest group within that? Would you be happy with six American (ISPs) as our representatives or six French (unintelligible) lawyers or should we have some better means of diversity in the structure? So it's questions like that that we will be looking at and clearly take a longer than the January deadline to (pull it out).

(Rob):   (Chuck), this is (Rob). If I can comment on (Phillip)'s (unintelligible).

(Chuck):   Go ahead. Go ahead.

(Rob):   I think it's a combination of things, (Phillip), from, you know, going back and having read this and committed to read this document many more times than I'd ever like to admit to.

I mean I think it's fair to say that the (BGC) report was not filled with specific recommendations, but you had these broader principles, these general thoughts. And my perspective, being still relatively new to ICANN, is that there was an expectation that the constituencies and

stakeholder groups would move toward filling in these blanks consisted with the overall approach and (unintelligible) of ICANN.

Now what was very clear in the board governance committee report was a sense that the stakeholder group concept not creating an extra level of bureaucracy. So the really challenge here is how to provide a framework, create some level of process and understanding within each of the stakeholder groups that's not overly bureaucratic but yet gives guidance and strength there.

I think built into what the board has approved is that there's an expectation that the stakeholder groups will go back and share with the board what the plan is and receive that approval. So doing that you're almost forced to be true to those overall principles, be true to these checklists so that the board can very comfortably say, "Oh okay yes. Check, check, check. You've done all this," as opposed to, in your one very stark example, I think if you came forward with, "Yes French (IP) lawyers -- that would not pass the smell test."

So it's really an exercise of getting as close as possible and I think being as true to the spirit of what's being intended here.

(Chuck):   And...

(Milton):   (Can I get in) the queue here?

(Chuck):   Yes sure. Just one second. I want to ask (Susan) a question. (Milton) I've got you in the queue. (Susan), I've been kind of assuming personally that the plans or the proposals for seating representatives on the council under the bicameral structure from the different

stakeholder groups would not have to be the same. They're - they could vary depending on the needs of the stakeholder group. Is that a fair assumption on my part do you think?

(Susan): Yes that's true. That - and I think (Rob)'s right. What's been set forth here is an aspiration that the groups would organize themselves and would do so based on their own principles. As long as - I mean the overarching thing here recommended back in 2006 is that it's easier for people to understand from the outside what's going on...

(Milton): Yes.

(Susan): ...and where they might feel most effective. So that's the important thing. But as far as how people get on the council or, you know, the method by which different groups are created and what their power is, that's all up to the individual constituencies.

(Chuck): Thank you (Susan).

(Denise): This is Denise. The - I would agree with all of that, and that the (unintelligible) does indicate (unintelligible) submitted for approval. So we are looking at a, you know, a lightweight process whereby the proposal structure (unintelligible) council members would be submitted to the board for their (unintelligible)....

(Susan): (Denise), we can barely hear you. You're breaking up a lot.

(Denise): Oh sorry. I'm sorry. Can you hear me now?

(Susan): Yes.

(Chuck):   Better.

(Denise):   (Plan for) creating the - and running the initial stakeholder groups and seating the initial council members would be submitted to the board for their review and approval.

(Susan):   But it's unlikely that the board will want to delve into those details I have to say.

(Denise):   Right. Yes - and I would agree with - what - with what (Susan) had said about, you know, I also get the strong impression that board members want to provide overall guidance and - but then empower the GNSO community to create the structures that work best for them.

(Chuck):   Thank you (Denise). Okay (Milton)?

(Milton):   Yes I just had been reading these principles, and there's a serious problem with number five and six. The problem is not what you might think I'm going to say it is with respect to six. The odd thing about number six is all of those groups that you list are currently members of the non-commercial constituencies. There's not a single category there that isn't currently represented.

                So I'm wondering why you say go far beyond, because - but the problem here is not that, because that just shows that many people in the board or the staff are not that aware of what's going on with us, which we know all too well.

What's interesting here is that you're talking about individuals. And we have made - already we have actually three individual members now. We have created a template -- and by the way they're provisional and non-voting until we revised our charter in line with this process.

But we think that there are commercial and non-commercial individuals. That is, there are people who are maybe individual domainers or consultants or people who basically are interested in the business aspects of domain name policy, and there are people who are either sort of family or non-profit oriented or people who are mostly just interested in sort of the public interest policy aspects of domain name policy.

And we have been assuming that individuals would be welcome in both the non-contracting party stakeholder groups -- that we would get individuals that consider themselves more interested in the personal or policy aspects and that the commercial stakeholders would get individuals interested in the business and commercial aspects.

Now if you don't have an individual category in the commercial side, that means that every individual who wants to join is going to come to us. And I don't want to go on too long, but let me tell you a story here that just happened in the last few days.

We got an application from .CYM for the non-commercial. It's a non-profit group that wants to run a new top level domain registry in the Welsh script. The Welsh script -- try saying that quickly. All right, we told them, "Well this is really strange. I mean you are non-profit, you have lots of cultural groups that are your members, but as soon as you become a registry, you belong in the registry constituency, and we

certainly don't want the non-commercial users to be sort of dominated by people who want to get domain names and be suppliers. So we're going to say no. But why don't you ask some of your constituents who are these Welsh cultural organizations to join us as a pure (NGO)?"

What that tells you - and then why did they protest and why were they worried about this decision? Well they feel there's no place for them. And they're right. If there's no place for them, they will come to us because we look like, you know, the grab bag that might accept them.

And that was - that is what was happened with individuals too. We would get every individual who couldn't join the commercial stakeholders group and might have purely commercial interest and motives would suddenly be applying for us because it would be the only avenue or channel for them to participate.

So that's a concern. Nothing else in here looks rally bad, but I think - and again on the whole it's great guidance for us and I'm really happy we had this document. And I just want you to be aware of that possibility, because it's a problem that we've been dealing with for a long time. People come to us when here's no other place for them to go.

(Chuck): Well (Milton) you raise a good point on the commercial individual versus the non-communicate. I'm curious (Phillip) as to whether or not you have any members in the business constituency that are essentially individuals, you know, sole proprietorship or something like that in the...

(Phillip): Well I think we do. And you may be familiar with some of them. (Northern Cade) (unintelligible).

(Chuck): (That's correct).

(Phillip): (Unintelligible) (and back), (unintelligible). They're all members of the (BC_ and they're all basically one man band.

(Chuck): Don't you have some domainers that are member too that are...

(Phillip): We've got (unintelligible) mostly (unintelligible) (Association). We've got a few companies domainers that have joined recently. We've become...

(Chuck): Oh okay.

(Phillip): ...a favorite group, the domainers. (Unintelligible) planning (unintelligible) (coup) in the next election. We look forward to that.

(Milton): Great. So then you should just add individual sole proprietorships or something to that list I would think.

(Phillip): Yes. And on perspective (unintelligible) we've also had the pleasure of (unintelligible) in the (parks) and (unintelligible) currently. So, you know, this - (unintelligible) maybe depending on now the (unintelligible) looks at itself.

Ultimately they're going to be a not for profit or a for-profit, perhaps is the (unintelligible) word I think that can have an in road. But raises the

old question, (unintelligible) it's (unintelligible) (home) (unintelligible) (GNFO) for perspective registries...

Man: Right, right.

(Phillip):   ...and maybe that's something we need to consider.

(Chuck):   Right.

(Susan):   (Chuck) if I could just add a note.

(Chuck):   I was just going to call on you.

(Susan):   This precise subject was discussed within the board. The asymmetry between having individual registrants specifically called out for the non-commercial part of the non-contracted house and not mentioned for the contracted - for the commercial part was the subject of board discussion. And there was a feeling that they should be equally open to individuals who felt themselves to be aligned one side or the other of that divide.

I agree with everybody that there's a gap here for perspective registries and registrars, and I'm hoping that with the formation of these more easy to understand stakeholder groups that there will be room for them in - on one side or the other in the non-contracted house.

(Phillip):   (Unintelligible) in the proposal that we made earlier, we recently said we would welcome individuals. So there's no...

(Susan):   Oh good. Okay I didn't know that.

(Phillip):   There's no resistance to that. It's something that the (BC) might not have picked up, but that was in our proposal.

(Susan):   Thank you. I didn't know that. I appreciate that.

(Chuck):   Thanks (Susan) and thanks (Phillip). That's helpful. Good points. (Milton)? Anybody else want to talk about that principles that (Rob) sent around? Okay, then...

(Milton):   This is (Milton). I'm going to have to get off the phone. So...

(Avri):   This is (Avri). I'm sorry (Milton).

(Chuck):   Yes.

(Milton):   No, I'm just saying I have to get off. I have another conference call at seven, so I'm sorry to depart.

(Chuck):   (Milton) please watch the action items, the minutes that come out of the meeting for what happens afterwards so that we have a connection there. Thank you for all your contributions.

(Milton):   All right.

(Avri):   And this - yes this is (Avri). I have to say pretty much the same thing. I have a dinner meeting I'm coming up, so I've got to go also and get to where I'm going.

I appreciate what (Rob) put together, so - and yes I'll pay attention to what's going on too, and I'll catch up with you later. Thanks. Bye.

(Chuck): Thanks (Avri). Thanks (Milton). Okay so as far as kicking off the stakeholder group work, any suggestions, any ideas how we could - I mean is it enough for this group just to - the various constituency representatives in this group that are in a particular stakeholder group - - and we have - we did have one from every stakeholder group up until now -- to go back to their stakeholder groups and get this thing moving or should we be more specific? What are your thoughts on that?

(Phillip): (Phillip) here. I think right (unintelligible) are going to be the best (thing). The whole point about stakeholder groups is they're about stakeholders self-organizing. And therefore all we need to do I think is see that things are happening.

And it's a longer term plan, but as I said, it's (unintelligible) and the important thing is a point that (unintelligible) (immediately) is a point that (Wolfe) raised about the upcoming elections. Do we hold them, or do we have an extension. And I have to be (unintelligible) because it's a vital operation. And the point I made earlier about January, if that is a desire (that's got to be) (unintelligible).

And we need also the board decision on that. And then we can look at (unintelligible) thing that structure through the exciting (PDP), which will have some (tensions) as well, but that can be done with a little bit of ugly (unintelligible), and if the desire of our board is to have this all done by then.

(Chuck):   Would anybody in this call be opposed to recommending - now we
              don't have any decision making power on this team, but
              recommending that the terms of existing counselors be extended and
              that the board authorize that to accommodate the transition that's in
              front of us?

Jon: This is Jon. We would object to that in that we have an election
              scheduled for a new counselor due to our term limit policy in our
              bylaws, so that would violate our own bylaws by doing that.

(Chuck):   Okay. Well would you...

Jon: But again for us it doesn't matter, because...

(Chuck):   Right.

Jon: ...we're going from three to three. So, you know...

(Chuck):   So would you object if other constituencies - it worked better for them
              to extend their...

Jon: If you give the choice to the constituency then I would not object.

(Chuck):   Okay. Is anybody opposed to that?

(Phillip):   No. (Chuck) (it was), so the - we shall (unintelligible) the constituency
              call tomorrow. So - and this is one point that is (unintelligible). So we
              could come later on with results (to that). But I would like to have it
              open - to leave it open for (unintelligible).

(Chuck): Okay. Thank you. (Susan) what do you - I mean is this - now the problem is we don't have a council meeting for two weeks, and so is this something that maybe the board could provide some direction on?

(Susan): Well here's the situation. The retreat is not actually a voting...

(Chuck): Right.

(Susan): ...board meeting. It will help us if this is just (unintelligible) written down in a paragraph and then we could discuss it. And I - then I can come back and sort of a liaison way and say, "This is what the board is thinking," but I can't actually give you a vote on anything.

(Chuck): Understand. So you could at least get - give us a sense of the board so that...

(Susan): Yes, yes.

(Chuck): ...we could communicate the sense and then we could go through the process. I suppose we'd probably have to have a motion at the - a council motion on the 25th...

(Susan): Right.

(Chuck): ...and - like that, but as long as there was a general sense of just the direction we're going, at least constituencies could plan reasonably well in terms of what the expectations would be.

So unless somebody else wants to do it, I'll write down something and send it to (Susan) in this regard and include the ideas that would be future council action and so forth.

(Susan): And also add to that note the voting thresholds need to be approved.

(Chuck): And the voting thresholds...

(Susan): ...which is another dependency.

(Chuck): Yes. Yes that's very good. Okay, good. So nobody's - everybody's okay with that. And feel free to communicate with your constituencies in that regard.

Now as far as getting this moving, we have two people from the commercial stakeholder group on the call -- (Phillip) and (Wolfe). Is it fair to assume that you guys will go back to your constituencies and communicate with (Ute) and the intellectual property constituency and start, you know, getting things going? You may already have things going with regard to your stakeholder group.

(Phillip): (Unintelligible) we've already started that dialogue.

(Chuck): Yes. And it - just for kind of - since there's no other oversight body -- not that we have any control -- it'd probably be helpful if nobody objects. Somebody objects, that - we won't do it. But if - in our next meeting in the planning theme we just had a quick update in terms of what's happening there, if for no other reason to be able to let the board know what's going on. The - anybody object to that? Okay. All right.

(Susan): (Chuck), it's (Susan). If you think that's going to be my task for now, I can drop off and go join the retreat. What - how...

(Chuck): I think problem that would be okay.

(Susan): Okay.

(Chuck): We can always hit you up later.

(Susan): Okay. And I'm - I'll be online and available for anything else.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Susan): All right. Thanks a lot guys.

(Chuck): Very good. And sounds like (Milton) is already working on the task from their side. So just want to write myself a note. Just one second. Okay then I think we've kind of covered the - that. Is there anything else anybody else wants to talk about with regard to the implementation of the bicameral voting structure?

So other than a report, you know, a brief report just kind of for information purposes next time, the planning committee won't be involved in that. The stakeholder groups will be doing that, and the council will need to act on a motion to provide the option of extending terms and get the board to act on that and so forth. Any other discussion on that topic agenda item number five?

(Phillip): No, none for me.

(Chuck): Okay. Then let's go back to the plan and spend our last 20 minutes or so talking about the plan to see if we can at least get a little bit of direction about next steps in that regard.

Unfortunately (Milton)'s not on, but let's try and talk about his topic of simplification of a structure a little bit. Do others have thoughts about the simplification of the structure? And in particular he talked about the standing committees lasting too long.

(Phillip): It's a concern (that) shows what I think we - it's a potential issue if you have standing committee (unintelligible) teams, et cetera under that, I mean there's (a very) - I think - discussed this previously on the same group. There's a balance between the division of labor and the coherence (there). And I think we just need to look at that balance and make sure we have it right.

(Chuck): Do you think (Phillip) that if a change was made to give the standing committees a specific end date -- and that couple be either a date or a once certain tasks are (completed) -- and then they only are continued if a decision is made rather than the way it's structured right now, whether they go on indefinitely until such time as they are ended. Does that...

(Phillip): I think that'd be better. I mean always - I think just having a refreshed cause, if you like, in the life of anybody is good.

(Chuck): Could you come back between now and our next meeting with a - maybe a suggested change in the plan to accomplish that?

(Phillip):   (Unintelligible) that's very straightforward. I mean that's...

(Chuck):   It is. I'm just asking you to...

(Phillip):   I think it's probably - I think - I mean I would probably suggest
                 something like, you know, the middle of next year, you know, June 30,
                 2009, after which the group should be, you know, a vote of council is
                 required to continue with them.

(Chuck):   (Rob) can you take the lead on that then...

(Rob):   Sure.

(Chuck):   ...in proposing a change? Maybe we can do a red line of the plan as it
                 stands now without all the other edits I've done, just to show people
                 what it is that we're talking about there. And then we can talk to
                 (Milton) maybe on lists to see if that deals with a concern he had. Any
                 other thoughts on the simplification of the structure?

(Phillip):   Okay. I was just going to ask a question I asked at the very beginning
                 of the call. And you may have answered it, but I got cut off I think as
                 you were doing so, which is it would be useful to know -- maybe (Rob)
                 could just, you know, go through it and give us an idea -- as to the
                 resourcing requirements per constituency that would likely be required
                 in the standing committees and the teams, assuming no duplication (as
                 well).

(Rob):   Sure, I'll do that.

(Chuck):   Okay?

(Rob):   Now when you say resource...

(Phillip):   People. People.

(Rob):   ...requirements, (Phillip) - yes people. Okay.

(Chuck):   Okay. The -okay good. Now John you had brought up - I think the
                issues that - oh you brought up the idea of separating and
                implementation phase and a long term phase. And is that kind of
                covered by the change that Phillip just suggested?

Jon: I'm not sure. I guess I find -- and maybe it's an issue of nomenclature -
                - but I find the question of how long should a standing committee last
                to be an oxymoron. I mean a standing committee is standing. It's there
                permanently.

(Chuck):   Yes.

Jon: So I think if we are looking at this in a way where we need an initial
                committee to help implement or, you know, the (BCG) changes -
                (BGC) changes, then maybe we set up an initial committee on either
                process or organization or something. And then if we take one of those
                recommendations would be to have a standing committee of the
                GNSO council to do X Y and Z, that's one of the recommendations
                those implementation committees could agree on.

(Chuck):   So do you have a specific recommendation for modifying the plan in
                that regard...

Jon: No.

(Chuck):   ...or could you come up with one between now and our next meeting?

(Phillip):   (Unintelligible) isn't it? I think - I mean you're right Jonon semantics. I mean if you want to call a standing committee the GNSO improvements committee, which has - is likely to be renewed ever six months, we've done it haven't we?

(Chuck):   Or we - yes. Or call them steering committees or, you know...

(Phillip):   Yes.

(Chuck):   .The reason...

Jon: And then pull out any long term proposals based, you know, that we might have in here already. And I need - honestly need to look at it a lot more closely. But if there's any...

(Phillip):   I agree. Yes. But (we're saying) (unintelligible) why we should (unintelligible) we do need to look through this -- this plan on another call and (unintelligible). But (unintelligible) there's global changes would I think help to shape that to (review).

(Chuck):   Yes. And feel free to go through the document and highlight those areas. Any other general thoughts? The last thing I'd like to do is go through the edits that I think are non-material and the areas I flagged in the document that we do need some decisions on. I don't think any of them are terribly material to the plan itself, but just to clean it up. Anything else before we do that?

Okay. Then let's see where I have that document. Is - I'm having trouble finding that. I thought I had it up here. It's down here. Bear with me while I scroll down (unintelligible) (wicki) to get to that.

(Rob): Well in your edits (Chuck) we're largely, you know, minor.

(Chuck): Yes, they - well if people have looked through them, maybe we don't even need to go through them. Or are people okay with those edits or should we go through those edits?

(Wolfe): Well I have some - it's (Wolfe) so I have some comments to your comments. It's not only edits but...

(Chuck): Go ahead please (Wolfe).

(Wolfe): There was a question - let me say - find it. Yes, concerning the membership in the standing committee.

(Chuck): Yes. Yes.

(Wolfe): You commented it may be reasonable to reflect (that) with regards to the new structure -- the (working) structure.

(Chuck): Right.

(Wolfe): So - and (unintelligible) the new stakeholder structure. So I'm of a different opinion in that respect, so I think here in those committees and teams let me say, there should be a kind of working structure.

More - be - a kind of working structure than a kind of let me say, political structure also in that.

So that means the constituencies themselves, they should be members of those teams of those standing committees, not only the stakeholder groups. It might be different. If you look from the level of the shareholder groups, it might happen that not all constituency members - constituencies are participating - could participate in that standing committee. That's my concern in that respect.

(Chuck): So what would be your recommendation for change of the membership part of the plan?

(Wolfe): No, I wouldn't change that.

(Chuck): Oh you would - you're okay with the way the membership is outlined in the plan...

(Wolfe): Yes.

(Chuck): ...for the standing committees, steering committees, whatever we call them.

(Wolfe): Yes.

(Chuck): Oh okay. Then back - I'm sorry, I - so is there - so you're okay with that?

(Wolfe): I'm okay with the existing one. But you raised the comment (unintelligible) to discuss whether the existing one should be...

(Chuck):   Right. Comment number - well on the process standing committee it
               was comment number three -- should this be reconsidered to fit the
               stakeholder model now or in the future.

(Wolfe):   I would leave it as it is.

(Chuck):   Okay. Other thoughts on that.

Jon: Sure. It's Jon. If we did this delineation between you know, initial
               implementation, then I have no problem with keeping it the way it is.
               But if we're looking at a future committee, we might want to think about
               changing it based on the new house structure, talking about
               constituencies when there might be additional constituencies out there.

               We don't know about the growth, we're talking about keeping the size
               of the - of these committees at a certain level. We might want to
               consider using the contracted parties and non-contracted parties
               house as part of representation in the committee.

(Chuck):   Yes. So it probably would have to be re-looked at down the road, but
               what I'm hearing from at least the two of you is leave it this way for the
               initial formation of the standing committees. We might have to build in
               here some sort of an option for review once the new structure's in
               place. So good point. Other thoughts on that?

(Phillip):   (Phillip). I'm comfortable with that. I think (unintelligible) pragmatic.

(Chuck):   So (Rob) you can help me kind of stay on top of that -- that we do that.
               Now in the chart, one of the things we need to do in the chart is

change the board implementation consulting group box. It's on Page 10 of the report. The - apparently there's - we had thought originally that there might be a small group of the board governance committee r something that would be a consulting group.

Apparently - it sounds like that's not going to happen, and I did confirm this with - I think (Susan) confirmed this with (Rob), that we'll replace that with the board liaison. I think it can go on that box instead of a consulting group. So - and (Susan) is willing to be that liaison now.

I believe (Susan)'s term's expiring, so I haven't talked about that, but there will be a board liaison I'm sure. And maybe she'll continue to do that even after she's off the board, but I don't know if that even works. But that's another change that would have to be made.

Can we - is it fair to assume then that the - with the exception of the yellow highlighted areas, that nobody's opposed to just accepting the edits that I made in the - in this report ? Again, I don't - they're just edits to bring us up to date in terms of where we're at time wise and events that have occurred an so forth. So if - anybody object to that?

(Phillip):   (Chuck) I want to leave the question about start date for a standing committee. It's still June 27 and your (text) said - okay which one you prefer?

(Chuck):   Oh so I didn't fix that one, huh? We better catch that one.

(Wolfe):   Shouldn't there be the next council meeting after the council (unintelligible) take a vote on that -- on the...

(Chuck):   Yes, I think it - well see what we're going to do, we're going to submit this plan to the council. And that would be - we're hoping to do it. If we can wrap it up in one more meeting, which I think is realistic, based on what I've heard today, if w can wrap it up our next meeting then we can give it to the council for their action and we could leave that blank if we wanted to.

             But the start date, or something. But good point. And that's one I missed. Any other thoughts on that? Now what about this idea of, you know, we already had a comment period.

             It's my opinion -- and I may be way off base here -- but it's my opinion that, you know, what we're talking about today in terms of some modifications of this plan really doesn't significantly change it to the point where we need to go out to the public and get another comment period. Does anybody disagree with me on that?

(Phillip):   I think (unintelligible) that we need to have an edit that is clean, and sufficient time for it to go to constituencies to read and comment back Before we need to vote on it and (unintelligible).

(Chuck):   Right. Totally agree. And my thinking would be is, is that if we can in one more meeting kind of wrap this thing up, send it to the council and ask continue represents to get it to their - an advisory liaison to get it to their people right away so that we can talk about it on the council meeting on the 25th and hopefully act on it, I would think that would suffice.

             And we can - (Rob) maybe you can help us do a quick summary of the changes - the main changes that were made that are material, which

are even - those aren't terribly major I don't think, but that would at least help people see what we did that was different.

(Rob): Sure, (Chuck). The one thing that I just ask you to be mindful of is the timing. And I don't know how strongly you and (Avri) and the council would treat the seven days prior to the 25th, given the difficult setting this group together next week, (at least early in the week)...

(Chuck): Yes, we're going to have a problem there. We'll have to, I think deal with that as we go, because the last thing we're going to do today is try to figure out a time for our next meeting. And...

Jon: 79:20 - (Chuck), this is Jon. Let me ask a question. If we just divorced the January 1 deadline, what's our deadline for this group and, you know, is there any more flexibility in time such that we don't have to rush to the next council meeting?

(Chuck): Well it's my opinion only Jon. What would really be nice if we can get the - start forming the steering committees and - right away and actually - and maybe even some of the working teams before Cairo so that we could take advantage of a lot of us being together in Cairo.

One of the things that we've allotted for on the weekend is some time to talk about GNSO improvements, and maybe break up into some steering committee meetings or working teams to start working on this.

We don't have another meeting for, you know, several months after that, so it would be really nice if we could take advantage of that. Now we may not be able to, so that's kind of why I'm pushing a little bit to see if we can pull it off. If we can't, we'll have to deal with it.

(Phillip): Yes, (unintelligible) (sympathy) with Jon's approach, because I think (unintelligible) we just talked earlier and (unintelligible) to basically look at, you know, the interim approach to making (things work with) extensions of terms of office, and interim appointees, et cetera.

If that's all in place, then indeed the rest of the work can have a slightly more relaxed and considered timeframe. So, you know, and Cairo will also be useful. We'll also be talking bout these things. But I wouldn't regard it as (unintelligible) (the point where we) don't actually have a committee in place by then. We still don't have the people (unintelligible) that committee in place by then.

(Chuck): Right. Other thoughts on that? So is - the feeling then is that we don't, you know, if would be nice if before the September 25 meeting we at least have presented a plan, but we may - but it looks like we may not be able to get it enough in advance to really make a decision. So we could at least have an opportunity to talk about the plan with the rest of the council with action on the next council meeting, which will be in October, correct?

(Phillip): Yes. I - I mean I think that that's (unintelligible) better because, you know, the - there's a whole bunch of people in all of our constituencies who haven't probably paid attention to, you know, the last time we sent this around. But now we're (unintelligible) bicameral discussions and everything else are up there, they may want to start paying attention now that we offer it.

So I don't think that we can just assume that part circulation is going to be useful at this point where we're looking at things that - the different perspective. I think that extra time is needed.

(Chuck):   Okay. I'm fine with that. And what I will do some time within the next couple hours is send out a clean plan where only changes being accepting the changes that were just minor edits and leaving the yellow highlighting to make sure that we deal with those issues and also the one that (Wolfe) brought up, so that (then) people can work from that if they want to suggest additional edits before our next meeting.

Now let's last of all talk about dates for our next meeting. It looks like Monday through Thursday next week is pretty much out. (Olga) are you still on?

(Olga):   Yes I'm here.

(Chuck):   And you're traveling - you're unavailable all day Friday right?

(Olga):   Right. And I will be going back home to (unintelligible), so I be the whole day in a plane.

(Chuck):   Okay. And then the next week is the week of the council meeting, so Glen...

(Olga):   (Unintelligible).

(Chuck):   Go ahead.

(Olga): Thursday afternoon - Thursday late in the afternoon could be fine.

(Chuck): So Thursday late in the afternoon could be fine for you. It might not work for (Milton). Sounds like (Avri) could also do it like between - she said what -- six and eight or something...

(Olga): Yes, yes.

(Chuck): ...Central European time. Glen, would you send out a doodle for those - for some times? There aren't very - actually it's probably just times between 6 pm Central European and 8. So see if those'll work for the next meeting. If not, then I think we're going to have to go to the next meek - week on Monday or Tuesday.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay, (Chuck). I'll do that (unintelligible).

(Chuck): Okay. Our hour and a half that I predicted is pretty close to being up. Is there anything else that we've missed that we should talk about before I adjourn?

(Rob): Just a quick question (Chuck). The yellow highlights -- that represents issues that you think we need to discuss?

(Chuck): Well, some of them may need some discussion. It's mainly issues that - let me find where my document is. I lost it. I guess I scrolled back past it. Yes, those were things that I didn't actually make an edit. But depending on what we decided today, we actually may have covered some of those.

We'll look at those in our next meeting so that we make sure we've accommodated - I was just trying to flag some things where we needed to update, but it wasn't a matter of just a simple edit that I could do unilaterally.

(Rob): Okay, thank you.

(Chuck): Okay? Anybody else?

(Phillip): Not for me.

(Chuck): Okay. We made great progress. Thanks a lot, and watch for the doodle and we'll see if we can't get a meeting maybe later in the day Thursday.

Woman: Great. Thank you.

(Phillip): Okay. (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible) (Chuck). Bye.

(Chuck): Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Man: (Thanks everyone).

(Chuck): Bye.

Woman: Bye.

END