GNSO Improvements Planning Teamteleconference
19 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 19 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-20080919.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#sep

Participants present:

Chuck Gomes - Registry c. - Team leader Avri Doria - NomCom appointee, Mike Rodenbaugh-CBUC, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – ISPCPC, Milton Mueller – NCUC, Jon Nevett - Registrar c., Kristina Rosette – IPC, Susan Crawford - ICANN Board Liaison

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

Absent apologies:
Ute Decker - IPC
Olga Cavalli - NomCom appointee
Philip Sheppard - CBUC

Coordinator: This is a recording you can go ahead

(Chuck):   Thank you very much.

Coordinator: Thank you.

(Chuck): Okay welcome everyone. Let me just go through who is on the call. Avri is on. I am on. (Olga) will not be able to make it today because she is traveling. Mike Rodenbaugh is filling in for (Philip). (Milton) is on. (Kristina Rosette) is filling in for Ute. (John Nevett) is on.

Is - do we know whether (Susan) is going to make it today?

Glen DeSaintgery: She is - her reply that she could make it but I have not heard anything back from her nor about for the call next week (Chuck).

(Chuck): Okay. And (Denise) is on. (Liz) is on. (Rob) is on. Glen is on. And we have a new person on today. And (Rob) would you like to introduce (Ken) to us?

(Denise): This is (Denise). I would be happy to.

(Chuck): Oh (Denise), okay, fine.

(Denise): I have asked him to join. (Ken Bour) is a consulting with ICANN. He is helping us manage the overall GNSO Improvements Project. He has a long history in the industry of a variety of jobs including extensive project and program management. And you all will be meeting him in Cairo and he is based on the east coast of the U.S.

(Chuck): Okay, where at on the east coast (Ken)?

(Ken Bower): I am in Northern Virginia.

(Chuck): Okay, well...

(Ken Bour):   Loudoun County.

(Chuck):   ...I am going to be out there next week. In fact I will be in Loudoun County next week.

(Ken Bour):   Hey wonderful.

(Chuck):   So, okay. Welcome to (Ken). All right. Let us go ahead and get started. The hopefully everybody has (John)'s red line version of his edits up because that is what we are primarily go through this morning.

The - our agenda really is to try and finalize the plan so that we can submit it to the Council in advance of the Council meeting next week.

Keep in mind that the idea is not that the Council would act on the plan this coming Thursday, but I will plan on giving a brief overview of the plan and maybe have a little bit of discussion, although we will not have too much discussion on it because we want everybody to have plenty of time to distribute it to your constituencies and get feedback from then.

And then the goal would be to act on the plan in the 12 October Council meeting. So if you do not have that up, please pull that up. Mike did you receive it?

Mike Rodenbaugh: I have got it (Chuck). Thank you.

(Chuck):   And (Ken) have you received that?

(Ken Bour):   Yes I have it.

(Chuck):   Good, okay, excellent. That will make it a lot easier if everybody has that in front of them.

Okay, if the plan if no one objects, my plan if no one objects is to simply go through that, not necessarily word by word. I am sorry, another phone is ringing.

Woman: Just to let you know, I am in transit again so I do not have anything in front of me. So if I am ignorant, my apologies.

(Chuck):   Okay, and I will try and where possible read that for you. My apologies, the wife is not able to get the other line so it is going to ring (unintelligible).

And if I mute it you could not (unintelligible) me, so. All right. Starting off with that plan, and as I explained earlier, the reason I want to use the red line is because basically what I would like to focus on are the edits that are in front of us here so that we can - well we will not go through all the other things because most of those have been approved already.

Okay, so let us start off with the...

Mike Rodenbaugh: (Chuck), can I ask you a question here before we get going?

(Chuck):   Sure.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Just because I am obviously a little new to this process sitting in for (Philip) today.

So everything else other than the edit suggested by (John) have been accepted by the group by consensus?

(Chuck):   Yes. We have gone - we made additional edits to the plan a couple weeks ago Mike that mostly were non-substantial edits in terms of content. They were bringing it - keep in mind that the plan dates back to spring. And so we had to bring it up to date in a variety of things, and a few more of those were caught in this iteration, but that is it.

Now, that Mike it does not mean that if you see something else that we should discuss that we should not discuss it, okay?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Hmm.

(Chuck):   And keep in mind that ultimately there will be feedback from all the constituencies on the plan before the Council actually acts on it. But we should, you know, do as good a job as possible of getting it in shape that we think will be acceptable.

(Rob):   And (Chuck) excuse me, this is (Rob). Just to confirm too, since the last call, you guys had asked me to insert draft language about the life of the - the initial life of the group so it has not been fully discussed by anybody on the phone.

(Chuck):   And is that in, you know, I meant to check for that last night and I did not. IS that in (Jon)'s draft?

(Rob): Yes it is.

(Chuck): Okay good. So when we get to that, make sure you comment on that so that we have that. So now, one logistical thing, (Liz) are you going to have the pen on this...

(Liz): I can, (Rob).

(Chuck): ...or is (Rob) going to have it?

(Liz): Sorry to negotiate this on the call (Rob). What would you prefer?

(Rob): I am happy to give it a shot. Thanks.

(Chuck): Okay and if you want to work from the clean version, that is okay. I do not know what works best for you (Rob), but whatever is best for you, okay?

(Rob): Okay, great.

(Chuck): And...

(Liz): And (Rob) just let me know, if when you need backup on here.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Rob): Okay.

(Chuck): All right? So, starting off below the Table of Contents, we will not - the Table of Contents can be updated later.

But we have the section call GNSO Improvements Process Documentation. Note that (John) deleted the first - I am going to say (John). I some of these cases there was probably some edits from me too.

(John) deleted the first paragraph and then he - are there any problems with that deletion?

Jon Nevett: Yes, let me just explain. The first paragraph is an exact duplication of the first paragraph in the summary section in the front. So that is why I got rid of it. There is a lot of redundancies in there that I tried to take out.

(Chuck): Yes. Yes, and probably - a lot of the things were fairly - I thought they were fairly straightforward edits, just cleaning things up. So, I will not - you do not necessarily have to explain every one (John) unless somebody has a question, I think so.

(Susan): Hey (Chuck) it is (Susan). I am sorry to be late.

(Chuck): Oh hi (Susan), welcome. (Susan) do you have the (John)'s red line document of the implementation plan?

(Susan): I do, I am just pulling it up.

(Chuck): Good, excellent. That is what we are going through and we just started.

(Susan): Okay.

(Chuck): So we have no problems with that. The rest of that section with the exception of the yellow highlighted item I think are fairly straightforward edits. If anybody disagrees with that, please let me know.

Let us look at the highlighted section there in what is now the second paragraph where it says the goal is to initiate the actual work of the committees described in the proposal in the Cairo meetings in November 2008.

Any problems with that? Can we remove the yellow and...

(Kristina Rosette): This is (Kristina). I have a question, and I think this may be obviously because I am standing in. But the sequence of events as we anticipate with this document is that it would be made available to the Council after this call or after any edits discussed and approved during this call are made, at which point Council members are responsible for getting out to their constituencies for comment. And then what happens?

(Chuck): Well then on this next Thursday in the Council meeting, the only thing that will happen is is I am going to do a very brief meeting - maybe as brief as five minutes overview of the plan...

(Kristina Rosette): Um-hmm.

(Chuck): ...just to kind of make sure people are familiar, see if they have any high level questions...

(Kristina Rosette): Um-hmm.

(Chuck): ...and then just make sure that everybody is actively soliciting constituency input...

(Kristina Rosette): Um-hmm.

(Chuck): ...before our October 12 meeting at which time we would hope to approve the plan.

(Kristina Rosette): Okay.

(Chuck): (Unintelligible).

(Kristina Rosette): That clarifies something for me. And our meeting is October 12? Isn't that a Sunday?

(Chuck): Oh did I get the wrong date?

((Crosstalk))

(Kristina Rosette): No that is okay. That is just in the side. Okay.

(Chuck): (Unintelligible).

(Kristina Rosette): So that what I was concerned about was the possibility that perhaps we would start work on - we would start the work here before the constituency had an opportunity but it...

(Chuck): (Unintelligible) being on...

(Kristina Rosette):   ...sounds like that is taken care of, so never mind.

(Chuck):   Is the meeting on October 12, a 16 I mean?

(Kristina Rosette):   Sixteenth, okay, all right, good. Okay. Okay.

(Chuck):   Glen can you help me out there? I do not have the...

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes it is (Chuck) (unintelligible)

(Chuck):   (Unintelligible)...

(Kristina Rosette):   Okay.

(Chuck):   ...16th...

(Kristina Rosette):   Okay.

(Chuck):   ...sorry about that, I.

(Kristina Rosette):   No, you have answered my question, thank you.

(Chuck):   Okay thanks (Kristina). And make sure - do not - please feel free to ask any questions. For those of you that have not been on all of our calls, do not worry about asking things. Let us make sure that everybody is clear on everything that we are doing. So, please feel comfortable in that regard.

Okay, so we are okay then with the changes made in the GNSO Improvements Process documentation section. All right?

Then let us go down to the background section. I do not think, other than my comment, which was - it looks like there are some other Board motions that have happened here (Rob) so we do not need to do this on the call.

But could you take on the task of providing some links to other more recent Board motions that have happened because obviously this base plan was last spring and several things have happened since then.

Can you just take that as an action item?

(Rob): Yes sir, will do.

(Chuck): And then you can have...

Man: So you would just add more bullets with other links. You are not going to...

(Chuck): Yes.

Man: ...cut...

(Chuck): That is all.

Man: ...and paste the whole...

(Chuck): That is all.

Man: ...resolutions right?

(Chuck):   That is correct. Yes, any problems with that?

Man: No.

(Chuck):   And the (unintelligible) delete my comment, so. Then going on to
                planning team members, now is it okay to add - (Denise) should we
                add name to the policy staff. On our - on this?

Avri: This is Avri. I think you should.

(Chuck):   Yes I - that is fine with me. I...

Avri: Yes, I am sorry, I was speaking on mute. Yes, that would be great,
                thank you.

(Chuck):   Okay, and then what I would also suggest is that we do a slash next to
                (Uta) and put (Kristina) and also with (Philip) and Mike the same way
                for the business constituencies. Is that okay?

                Got it (Rob)?

(Rob):   Got it. I thought you were asking okay of the group.

(Chuck):   No I was. I was, but I was separately asking you to make sure before I
                move on that you are up with it.

(Rob):   Done.

(Chuck):   Okay. Going on to the planning process, and in particular the session there, the paragraph, the planning team, what we will talk about that - let us talk about that section. In particular that item 2 is where there is some changes. For Avri's benefit, let me read that one. And sorry I did not read things earlier Avri.

But number 2 says to mon- with (John)'s edit, it reads as follows. To monitor and report on the progress of the transition including monthly updates to the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board. And that is highlighted in yellow there.

This group will not be assessing policy related deliverables or outcomes. Those deliverables will be forwarded directly to the Council for consideration.

Now the reason I highlighted the part about the providing monthly updates to the Board - to the Council and the Board, I thought we should decide, do we still want this Planning Committee to do that? I am okay with that, but I thought that was something we probably should at least discuss.

That was something that was considered a long time ago. Is everybody okay with that?

Man: Yes.

(Chuck):   Okay, no problems here. Okay, so that yellow can be removed.

Avri: The only thing I would change on that is periodic to monthly. I mean because they do not necessarily...

(Chuck):   Good, good change, yes. Okay (Rob)?

(Rob):   I am sorry, I could not hear Avri's final comment. She was in the background.

(Chuck):   She said instead of monthly updates, put periodic updates.

(Rob):   Okay, thanks.

(Chuck):   Okay?

(Rob):   Yes.

(Chuck):   All right. So no - any other comments on that particular paragraph? Okay, going on to Steering Committees. And we go down to the second paragraph. There are quite a few changes in that.

The, let me again for Avri's benefit, quickly read through that. The Planning Team is - recommends the use of two focus Steering Committees. It is essential that the Steering Committees are focused on GNSO or GNSO Council processes and practices and not on GTLD policies which will be the province of Working Groups.

The two Steering Committees proposed by the Planning Committee are, and the first bullet there is the Policy Process Steering Committee overseas overall efforts to (unintelligible) policy development process, PDP, including serving as the coordinating body for separate teams passed with developing proposals for a new working group model, and an new PDP procedures.

This committee will be responsible for making recommendations concerning processes and methods involved in the transition to a working group - to a working group model, and revisions to the GNSO PDP, which is closely tied to the transition to a working group model.

This committee should operate in an inclusive and transparent manner. Membership in the committee and in the work team should be drawn from both existing and emerging constituencies as possible. Any comments on that?

Okay. Going on then to the opera - the next bullet which is the Operations Steering Committee oversee, I guess that should be oversees instead of oversee (Rob) - oversees efforts to enhance the GNSO structure, constituencies and communications. This committee should task various work teams to develop proposals, implement recommendations related to these areas, and should operate in an inclusive and transparent manner.

Membership in the SC and in the work teams should be drawn from both existing and emerging constituencies as possible. Any comments?

Okay? Going on then to adopting, modifying or terminating a Steering Committee. Most of the edits there are really editorial. But there are a couple things in here that we probably should discuss so that I highlighted in yellow.

The first one says, and it is talking about the work plans. All such work plans and membership decisions, including termination of Steering

Committees will be done by a motion within the Council that is duly seconded and which receives a super majority vote in compliance with the current GNSO Council Voting Guidelines or at least a 60% vote of both houses in the recently approved GNSO Council voting scheme.

And let me stop there and see if everybody is okay with that.

(Kristina Rosette):   (Chuck), it is (Kristina). I have a question.

(Chuck):   Sure.

(Kristina Rosette):   The reference to membership decisions, is that intended to mean membership decisions at the macro level or the micro level. In other words, are we talking about...

(Chuck):   Yes.

(Kristina Rosette):   ...kind of one person from constituency or are we talking about identifying the actual people?

(Chuck):   Good question.

Jon Nevett: Well in this document we talk about membership as one person from each constituency. We do not talk about specific people.

(Kristina Rosette):   Okay.

Jon Nevett: So it is...

(Chuck): So, and I think that is what it is intended here. Do you think maybe we should clean the language up, make it a little more specific?

(Kristina Rosette): Maybe what we could do is just put a footnote that references to membership decisions are intended to refer to allocation of members among constituencies, you know, sent through general categories of membership as opposed to individual members, just to make sure, because I imagine that the same issue comes up again in other places.

(Chuck): In fact, to keep it - I think we need to be even more direct than a footnote. Maybe (Rob) if we could just do something like and membership decisions regarding allocation of Steering Committee (unintelligible) or something like that. Can you (Unintelligible).

(Liz): Not the selection of specific members or...

(Kristina Rosette): Yes.

(Liz): ...you know...

(Kristina Rosette): Yes.

(Liz): ...something clear.

(Chuck): (Unintelligible) right in the text, it is pretty simple. It is a good point.

Man: (Chuck) I fell off for about two seconds. Could you tell me what line you are on, that is all.

(Chuck):   We are in the middle of that paragraph where it says all such work plans and membership...

Man: Right.

(Chuck):   ...decisions and so membership decisions we need to qualify, be a little bit more specific on. And (Liz) do you want to say what you said again?

(Liz):   I was just saying that they would do something for this for the allocation, not the specific selection.

(Chuck):   Yes, that could be a parenthetical after membership.

(Liz):   Right.

Wolf: (Chuck) it is Wolf. So I have the (correction) to that.

(Chuck):   Sure Wolf go ahead.

Wolf: Well if they compare your version, the former version and the new version of these, your headlines (unintelligible) now in disrespect. Your version seem to be more general on that subject. It was not so specific on the voting threshold in this respect. So what is your reason here to be so decision? Isn't that covered by the voting thresholds given to the GNSO Council? To the (unintelligible).

(Chuck):   The GNSO Council Voting Thresholds did not cover this particular issue.

Jon Nevett: Well I can address that Wolf. Essentially it says in the prior version of the document, it referred to a super majority vote of the Council.

Wolf: Yes.

Jon Nevett: So that does not exist in the new voting scheme or voting system that we are getting ready to implement. So I put in some specific language of what that would mean in the new voting system as oppose - we cannot just use super majority vote anymore.

Wolf: Um-hmm.

(Chuck): Yes, because we have the two houses and the voting structure is different. And keep in mind that what is going to happen here is that when these Steering Committees start, the Council will be under the old structure, the existing structure. And that may happen through the first quarter of next year.

But at some point, we are going to transition to the new voting structure. So we needed to cover both. Now the voting thresholds under the (bicameral) approach that have been - or that hopefully will be approved, that part is still one of the outstanding issues, says for all other issues.

There is another category that I think it just requires a simple majority of both houses if I recall correctly.

So what this does is it makes it a little bit tighter, a little bit stronger requirements for any changes to the Steering Committees.

Avri: Hi (Chuck). Can I get something in before my bus makes noise again?

(Chuck):   Go ahead.

Avri: And that is that I am not sure that we wanted to just make it - for example I think it did relate to people, not just to constituencies where you have things like possibly the (unintelligible) influence or just the combination of people.

               So I am not sure that we thought of it all the way through as just voting on constituency makeup, going silent again.

(Chuck):   Okay. Did everybody get that? Anybody not get that? Okay.

               The interesting point that Avriraises, so what happens if there is a disruption? Do we need to go back to the Council on that regard or could that be hand - normally we give, and Avril will ask you to jump in again after I make this comment, but normally don't we give the chair the authority to deal with those kinds of problems?

               Avrican you jump in?

Avri: Yes, now putting back on. And the bus will stop again in a second so it will get quiet. Sorry.

               Yes the normally the Chair is but you can have a situation (unintelligible) put on there by constituencies. One is that the cons (unintelligible) whole group does get approved. We have done that before. And two, if there is a problem, the Chair cannot necessarily tell us (unintelligible) something take a person off.

So there has to be some recourse to going to the whole group to say hey there is a problem, we need to do something. So I am not sure it was just, because I am not sure what it means to (unintelligible) constituency. The constituency (unintelligible) constituency it is on. There is nothing (unintelligible) there, so.

(Chuck): So there is - it seems to me there is a couple ways we can approach this. Avridoes raise an important point. Hopefully one that will not even be needed, but you still have to cover it.

And one way of doing it is reverting back to not being so specific on membership decisions. Another way to do it would be to add - really add a footnote here because I think it would require much more detail. And to add some of the language in the footnote with regard to management of committees and working groups that we have used in other documents where we talk about a progressive process where the Chair can kind of try to deal with it.

And then if that does not work it can be challenged and ultimately raised to the Council. What are the people's thinking on this?

(Kristina Rosette): This is (Kristina). I have two thoughts. First if the situation be kind of the problem member situation - if we anticipate that is likely to arrive exclusively in the context of removing somebody, then I think it is a much easier matter to be dealt with.

If as anticipate that we may, kind of at the outset say, okay this person has a history of disruption, they just cannot participate. That is an

entirely different matter and then I think does require for more detailed, you know, drafting.

I guess, when I am trying to avoid a situation is where for example it is whoever is the member of the Steering Committee is sick, you know, as it is written now, arguably for example, I could not be, if this is actually Steering Committee, I would not be able to participate on this call unless the whole Council had agreed I could. I mean, that is some kind of (unintelligible)...

Man: That is not accurate (Kristina) based on what is written now, because it is not written with the specific - it is not written with a specific individual. So if someone is appointed and then there is a substitute, then that does not violate this document at all.

(Chuck): Well okay. Let us - let me make a suggestion here. I think we need to make - I think it is helpful to make clear that we do not intend it to be that specific. I think it is okay to do that.

At the same time, we need to deal with the situation that Avri brought up.

Man: And the intent of this was, sorry (Chuck), the intent of this was talking about maybe not membership, maybe it is composition of the group. It was not - the intent certainly was not about when a certain member, you know, how many, who the IPC appoints or does not appoint or anything, or, you know, substitution or anything like that.

I assume that, you know, that was not - the membership...

(Chuck):   No I think you are right, yes.

Man: So if we change the word to composition, does that satisfy everyone?

(Kristina Rosette):   That works.

(Chuck):   Is that okay?

Woman: Yes.

(Chuck):   Now we still have the issue to deal with Avri's concern because composition - we do get into composition in cases where there might be a problem in someone's behavior on the group.

Again, I would like to think that would not happen in this particular situation, but we probably ought to address it now.

Would it be possible to add just a footnote that basically says, and I do not know that we need to draft that right now, but if maybe if (Rob) or (Liz) could maybe take that task on to just add a little footnote that the...

Avri: They could put something, you know, I just thought, you could put something like any issues relating to individual members of the group can be brought up to the Council, you know, for resolution and leave it at that for the moment.

(Chuck):   Okay. Anybody opposed to that? Okay, (Rob) or (Liz) one of you want to volunteer to just draft something simple there, probably a lot like Avrijust suggested?

(Rob):   Yes, since I have the pen, when I process the edits I will add that
                footnote to reflect Avri's language.

(Chuck):   Okay, very good.

(Rob):   Now otherwise to confirm, the only other edit at this point will be all
                such work plans and membership composition decision, is that what
                you wanted to do or did you want to replace membership with
                composition (John)?

Jon Nevett: You could say committee composition.

(Rob):   Okay.

(Chuck):   Okay? Okay now at the end of the paragraph, I had highlighted in
                yellow at least a 60% vote of both houses in the recently approved
                GNSO Council voting system, I guess I should read the whole
                sentence there so that makes sense.

                Either Steering Committee is intended to be a permanent entity. Their
                respective charters will expire on 30 June 2009 unless specifically
                reviewed by the GNSO Council - renewed, excuse me, by the GNSO
                Council by at least a 60% vote of both houses in the recently approved
                GNSO Council voting system.

                Is everybody okay with that? I just thought I should call that to people's
                attention so that we - that was a decision we made I think in our last
                planning meeting that instead of having the Steering Committees
                automatically renewed and then reviewed and canceled if they need to

be, we went the other direction and they end unless specifically renewed, so, and then the 60% vote of both houses to renew them. Any problems with that? Okay.

Moving on, thanks.

Avri: Quick question. How long - when is the first (sunset)?

(Chuck): June 30, 2009.

Avri: That seems soon, but, you know...

(Chuck): That seems what? Soon?

Avri: That seems soon since we are just starting on all these things now. I would suggest putting it on the same period as the yearly meetings or something like that. But June is just, you know, that is just a thought that it seems a little soon when we are just getting started to already have to deal with that in...

(Chuck): Okay, let us talk about that. Did anybody not hear Avri's thought there?

Okay.

Avri: I am off the bus so I am a little less noisy.

(Chuck): It is still pretty noisy.

Avri: Okay, I will turn myself off.

(Chuck):   Okay. Comments on Avri's thought there that June 30 may be a little
                 soon. And she suggested one idea of it being like at the annual
                 meeting.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes, one year. One year seems (unintelligible).

(Chuck):   Was that you Mike?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

(Chuck):   And you, so you are supportive of Avri's suggestion there?

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes. I think I interpreted it as one year from Cairo basically.

(Chuck):   Yes, basically. Well we would approve this a little bit before Cairo, but
                 we could just say the annual meeting.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Yes.

(Chuck):   Anybody opposed to that?

                 Okay. Good catch Avri. (Rob) you have that I assume?

(Rob):   That will be at the ICANN annual meeting in 2009.

(Chuck):   Right. All right.

                 The next couple paragraphs have what I think are very minor edits.
                 The - let us look at the paragraph entitled Who Can Be in a Steering

Committee? Now these edits are not terribly significant either, but we probably should look at them.

And for Avri's sake, I will start with the second sentence there. It has been recent Council practice, however permit other constituency members to substitute for Council members and task forces and in committees of the whole.

In the transition period, membership in the Steering Committees will permit such substitutions from the existing and emerging constituencies or the liaisons SO or AC. Any concern about that?

Okay. Going on to I think the next paragraph is editorial type changes. The - let us look at the paragraph Transparency for Steering Committee and Their Teams. The only reason I am suggesting that is I had highlighted wikis and the second sentence reads, this purpose publicly viewable wikis or other group collaboration tools mailing lists with public archives and meeting minutes should be available.

I think mind concern has been taken care of by adding or other group collaboration tools. I did not want us to restrict ourselves to wikis if there is a better tool. So I think that is okay. Any concern there?

Okay. Now the start date for Steering Committees. That reads now, the initial Steering Committee should be formed no later than 7 November 2008. To me that is a little bit late. That is at the end of the meetings in Cairo. It seems to me that it would be really nice if the Steering Committees could meet in Cairo.

((Crosstalk))

(Kristina Rosette):   I am sorry. This is (Kristina). My only comment on that is for a number of the constituencies at least on the non-contracting party side, I think we may all have two members up for election at the end of the annual meeting.

So arguably you run into a situation if we use the 7 November date where, you know, just in the interest of kind of continuity, you have - you basically assume that whoever the person is that is not up for election is going to have to be the Steering Committee member.

(Chuck):   Well, let me respond to that (Kristina). First of all, that is okay because you do not have to have a Council member on the Steering Committee.

(Kristina Rosette):   Right, okay.

(Chuck):   So probably that would not have to be an issue.

(Kristina Rosette):   Okay.

(Chuck):   Now if it is an issue for the given constituency, that is another subject. Like (John) did you have something to say there? Did I hear you speak up?

Jon Nevett: No, it was not me.

(Chuck):   Okay. Did some - I thought I heard somebody else speak up.

Wolf: Well it is Wolf. My...

(Chuck):   Okay Wolf go ahead.

Wolf: Well, she also tells some or picks (unintelligible) time schedule. I would be welcome if you could form the SCs in advance to that. But, you know, we have here laid down okay the Council should approve the implementation plan on October 16. And the Board should endorse it.

So the first question is how should the Board endorse it unless he is going to meet before November the 7th, so this is my first question.

The other thing is then in practice how does his work, how the Steering Committees should be formed? Who is going to call for the first meeting and all these questions? So this is to be discussed I think so, (feel) open.

(Chuck):   Good point Wolf. Let me ask (Denise) a question here. Wolf is right that obviously the Board is going to have to approve this steering plan. Would that necessarily have to prevent us from getting these things kicked off with the understanding that it is pending Board approval?

(Denise):   That seems to be a practical approach to me.

(Chuck):   Because I know the Board Governance Committee and the Board itself really, I mean, keep in mind that what they originally wanted us to do was to start working on some of these things that were non-controversial, remember the wording...

(Denise):   Right.

(Chuck): ...in advance. So I think it is consistent with the Board intents. My concern is is that it would be really nice to take advantage of being in person - of the in person meeting in Cairo and not - and the next one we have, unless we schedule a special in-person meeting, would be in Mexico City in March.

So it would be really nice to take advantage of that and have some kickoff meetings and maybe at those meetings, you know, we could get going and even start forming some working teams and so forth, understanding that it would be pending Board approval of the plan.

Avri: And also, I mean, understanding that there is not all that much time left in the Cairo meeting. It has been getting very, very crowded, you know. So unless people were doing these things Friday afternoon, it would be very difficult to find lots of time for them to meet.

But I understand, but just keep in mind that the time to meet in Cairo is also getting precious.

(Chuck): Well Avrimy understanding was - is that we had tentatively slotted time on Saturday for GNSO improvements. So couldn't that time be used for that?

Jon Nevett: (Chuck) this is (John).

Avri: Possibly.

Jon Nevett: You know, we as constituencies still have to go through the appointment process and people have probably already booked their tickets for Cairo. So a lot of people are not - may be not available for

Saturday who might be taking this position on. That is why I put the end of the meeting. So that gives us the opportunity of the meeting to get the group situated essentially.

And if they do not have substantive meetings yet because of the, you know, due to the timing then so be it. But at least the group will be together. That was my thought process.

(Chuck):   Right, yes. And one of the registry constituency members expressed a similar concern with regard to Saturday and Sunday meetings. My response to that was as we have been pretty consistent for well over a year now of having working sessions on Saturday and Sunday, so and but I - let us talk about it as a group.

Do we want to try, even if it is unofficial meetings on Saturday before the official meeting start of kicking these things off, keeping in mind that if - I do not think anything would prevent a constituency if they needed a substitute to fill in in those.

And keep in mind also that the weekend meetings we have a history of making those open to anybody who wants to participate in those. So it is a pretty flexible arrangement.

We could change this to the initial Steering Committees should meet informally in Cairo with and should be officially approved no later than 7 November. Something like that.

Wolf: Well (Chuck) it is Wolf again.

(Chuck):   Go ahead.

Wolf: So well I am I was thinking in (unintelligible) it means what these SCs have to do at the beginning. So at first, we have, I think, let me start with that point.

On the 16th of October, the Council shall approve that plan. And that could be the starting point for somebody let me say to call for the appointment of the members of CSC. That is the first step.

So, it is not only the constituencies, it is also some (unintelligible) and staff. It is people from (GAC). It is people from, I do not know, wherever that should be appointed to that. So that is the first step.

And then, after the (unintelligible) appointed then, a invitation could be sent out from somebody, let me say, somebody, maybe the plan team or staff or so on, well to call for that informal meeting.

And at the first meeting, I would expect that the CSC is going to organize itself. It means it is going to appoint somebody as a Chair formally, as a Chair. This is really essential for that. And then the (world) could start, and with that. So and all this has to be prepared. So I am just looking for that - how we should meet that.

(Chuck): And couldn't that happen on the Saturday at the - just before the official meeting starts?

Wolf: Well it could happen so this meeting. But, you know, something has to be done in advance.

(Chuck): Absolutely. I totally agree. But I would also hope that - granted we are not going to have final approval of the plan until October 16 on the Council level at the soonest, but there is no reason why all of us could not go back to our constituencies, you know, right now, or as soon as we as a Planning Committee do this and start working on who we would like to represent us on the Steering Committee. Is there?

Man: Does it still have to go to the Board?

(Chuck): The Board is going to have to approve just about everything in this, yes.

Man: Okay. So it needs to go to Council. It needs to go to the Board. And then simultaneously we need to get reps appointed, and not knowing whether those reps were planning to be therefore the weekend meeting or not because they did not have anything formal planned beforehand, and meeting informally on Saturday, and I think what I heard Wolf say was, you know, the initial meeting needs to be formal because you need to elect a Chair, and you need to work out a workplan, so...

Woman: This is how, okay, sorry.

(Chuck): Go ahead.

Woman: No, no. I thought you were done. I will wait until you are done and then ask.

Man: No, I mean my point is it would be ashamed to drag people there for a meeting, an informal meeting on Saturday before they could do anything.

(Chuck): Well yes, I disagree with you that they could not do anything. It would have to be - it would not be ratified until official approvals happen, but they could do a lot actually. Go ahead Avri.

Avri: Can I - yes, I wanted to ask (unintelligible). I am getting confused by how many things that this Planning Committee does or whatever follows that actually need Board approval before they can happen.

And how many things is the Board actually putting itself as a gaiting factor?

Woman: AvriI am a little confused myself I have to say because I thought that we could approve things like voting structure and the eventual policy development process when that is done.

Avri: Right.

Woman: (Unintelligible) but every detail I did not know that we needed Board approval. I will defer, I mean I will be interested in what (Denise) has to say about that, but I did not think the Board had to get more into the details of this than that.

(Chuck): Well I thought that the - (Susan), doesn't the Board have to approve the implementation plan?

((Crosstalk))

(Susan): The implementation as a whole for moving - I had not thought so (Chuck) but you know me, I am a lower, well I guess I am being a little - sometimes the Board does get very involved in things. But I would think that the implementation of moving to the structure is really up to the careful.

(Denise): Yes, this is (Denise).

(Chuck): Go ahead (Denise).

(Denise): If I may, that is also my understanding (Susan). The Board resolution in June that approved the BGC GNSO Improvements Report also called for an implementation plan to be submitted to the Board.

And from my notes and the conversations, it seems clear to me that the intent of the Board was not to approve all the various details of the implementation plan, but to receive an overall plan to assure the Board that the GNSO community broadly was moving forward with - had a plan to move forward this implementation in a fair and transparent and inclusive manner and to have the intention of addressing all the various elements in the BGC report.

So I in no way interpret this as the Board's desire to approve every detail of the implementation.

Avri: This is Avriagain. I mean I would have jumped in. I kind of understood it, but we had to keep reporting and we had to keep letting them know what we were up to, but that, you know, and that, you know, that was overall, they need to be able to see this.

But you did not have to actually go to them and say okay now we have figured out how to do Steering Committees. Is that okay? Okay. Now we have figured out how to do Working Groups. Is that okay?

Now when we get to PDPs, yes that was a big chuck because that is policy and that is policy that goes to them. So that was one of those milestone markers that that would indeed require their review and approval before it became bylaw that anything that had to go into bylaw certainly had to get their (imprimatur).

But that, you know, we needed to, on a (unintelligible) just like we ask, you know, for what is happening in the Board and what is happening with this working group and that working group in the meetings, I would assume they would want to keep hearing, they would want to keep knowing what we were doing.

But it is my assumption that if we come up with these Steering Committee plans, they get told at the next meeting, but we just proceed and, I am hoping that is reality.

Woman: Yes, yes, that is my reality too Avri. I would concur with everything you said. Again, the Board and (Susan) I think should also of course speak to this, but my understanding is the Board wants to see progress and would like to be kept apprised but had no intention or desire of approving every detail of how this was implemented.

Wolf: Oh, get to work so. If - is it possible just to from the summary of this plan at the beginning, so we had said, the last sentence was and

endorsed by the ICANN Board. If you could leave that away, so is that possible? Then it would help us really.

(Susan):   I would think that is a good idea Wolf. It is (Susan). I would like to have as much of this possible moving forward without needing to check in with Board other than for these progress reports.

(Chuck):   So how do we make that happen?

(Susan):   Well I can just delete the language as Wolf suggests.

(Chuck):   In other words, the Board approval language, is that what we are talking about?

Wolf: It is not approval, it is endorsed.

Woman: It is endorsed, yes. It is like we are recognizing it or waving at it as it goes by. And I am not sure that that is needed.

(Chuck):   Okay. So, state your suggestion specifically again Wolf please.

Wolf: That that is (unintelligible). So in the summary the first page of this implementation plan, the summary has been - it may at the end approved by the GNSO Council and then endorsed by the ICANN Board. Just delete and endorsed by the ICANN Board.

(Chuck):   So totally and delete that. Anybody opposed to that?

Woman: We could put and report it to the Board. So if we want to have some still acknowledgement that, you know, we still have to tell them what

we are up to, we can certainly and report it to them and, you know, I am sure that the Board will be quick enough to hear what we are saying and say whoa guys, if that is what they need to say.

(Chuck): Anybody opposed to that approach?

Woman: No.

(Chuck): Okay. The...

(Rob): From a - I am sorry, from a drafting perspective, you want me to replace endorsed with reported to? In other words replace the Board (unintelligible)...

Woman: That is my suggestion.

(Rob): Okay.

(Chuck): Yes, and whatever word that so it fits appropriately, but that is the idea.

(Rob): Okay.

(Chuck): Approved by the Council with regular reporting to the Board, something like that.

Avri: By the way, you do not have to read for me anymore. I am at a place with a computer in front of me.

(Chuck): Oh, thanks Avri

((Crosstalk))

Avri: Thank you very much for doing it before.

(Chuck):   And it is nice and quiet now so that is (unintelligible). So okay. Now, so you are okay now (Rob)?

(Rob):   I believe so.

(Chuck):   Now (Susan) and (Denise) you can comment on this too, my push to be a little bit more aggressive in getting things started, I have thought was consistent with what the Board wanted.

               In other words, if we could start meeting on the Saturday - start the Steering Committees on the Saturday before the official meetings start, I thought that was what the Board wanted, to get it moving as soon as possible. Am I correct on that or am I being too aggressive?

(Susan):   No, no. I think that is right (Chuck). I am very glad you are setting up those days. And we do not have that much time in Cairo so I think it is good to start beforehand as the GNSO is traditionally done, and use it in particular for this Steering Committee work.

(Chuck):   So (Denise) did you want to add anything there?

(Denise):   Yes, I agree. Thanks.

(Chuck):   Okay. Now, still this Planning Committee needs to make a decision then on that start date for the Steering Committees. Is anybody

drastically opposed to the initial Steering Committees starting in Cairo and maybe just leaving it at that.

We do not - if we do not need Board approval, we really do not need the November 7 date necessarily. There are some logistical problems like (John) pointed out, but I think we can work around those and still get some things done.

Keep in mind that the charter, that - besides something like electing a Chair, they are some details of the Steering Group Charters that have - that we - the plan allows for the Steering Group to do further work on.

So that is where they would start. And then there is also beginning to decide what working teams they want to establish. So there is plenty that could be worked on there and then the representatives from each constituency and group that are in the work, in the meetings if it is on Saturday, could then report back and get feedback from their constituencies on constituency day with - and then follow up on the Council meeting on Wednesday I presume.

Is anybody opposed to that?

(Kristina Rosette): (Chuck) it is (Kristina). I am not going to, you know, oppose it. I just want to note that I think - I am fairly certain that the person that the IPC expected will participate in this is not expecting to be in Cairo on the Saturday. So we will need to make absolutely certain that we really do have...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: What (unintelligible).

(Kristina Rosette): ...viable remote participation facility.

Woman: Oh boy.

Woman: Well what if we put it on the Sunday. I mean we need to have viable remote participation facilities anyway all the time, so hopefully we will have that.

Man: I think if you (unintelligible)...

Woman: But what if we put that on a Sunday.

Man: I think it would be better because you have people who were not planning to be there that may now have to be there.

Woman: Right.

Man: And some people may be - like I get in Saturday night for example.

Woman: Right yes.

Woman: So, I mean I still have flexibility in terms of putting together the weekend schedule. So I mean putting it together Saturday or Sunday. Or at the worst, and I do not know how early people are leaving, but there is trying to find sometime on the (unintelligible).

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Yes. No, I mean I think Sunday, you know, I do not know the specific person's schedule to the tee, but I think Sunday is again likely to work much better.

(Chuck):   That is good input for Avriand Glen in terms of developing the schedule. So that is good information.

Wolf: It is Wolf again. So I still have some well (unproportalla). It seems to me this one sentence, the initial Steering Committee should be formed no later than, so it is too general. So we should put in some more details, action let me say. Who is taking action on that?

             So my proposed for example could be that after the Council approval, action (unintelligible) information of his, he is going to be taken by I would say staff for example, or...

Woman: Well actually, can I recommend, I mean, what we have normally done in our Working Group, even when we are going to elect a Chair, the Council has either asked the Council Chair, the Council Vice-Chair or someone else to be the acting person until such time as the election happens, so you always have the Chair or the Vice-Chair available to do that initial kickoff (bootstrap) work.

             And then you have your elections at the first meeting and then that person steps aside for whoever has been elected. So I would just actually suggest going with that sort of model that, you know, it the Chair or Vice-Chair, whichever one is, you know, on this particular Steering Group or whatever that has the lead until the election.

Wolf: It is good. Sounds good.

(Chuck): So (Rob) have you got all that?

(Rob): Oh yes. I have taken notes on that. So if you want me to flush that out and indicate that the Council will - I will create some text to follow that process.

(Chuck): And am I (unintelligible).

(Rob): But if that is not (unintelligible).

Woman: Yes. I mean that is what the Chair and Vice-Chair get paid the big bucks for, you know, to do all this bootstrapping.

(Chuck): And am I correct that the members of the Steering Committees, to the extent possible, should be identified before the Cairo meeting? Are we assuming that? I mean, that will give at least two weeks and plus any time in advance of actual Council approval that (unintelligible) could be working on.

Woman: But to tell you the truth, my tendency is to want to find a time for Thursday where these groups meet. And it is easier than scheduling a lot of things I have been trying to schedule lately because it does not involve another SO, an AC or something. It is just these people. Now that is difficult enough to try and, you know, get a time slot on Thursday so that if the group - I think you are right.

It is good to say if at all possible they should be ready, but I think they should be able to finish up (unintelligible) constituency day if they need to, and we have the Wednesday meeting there for, you know, doing

any sort of Council action that may or may not be required and move on from there.

(Chuck): I do not know if (Denise) has any or Glen has any information on the proposed schedule for Thursday, but we do not even know that is going to be scheduled on Thursday this year. So we do not know what available times there are.

Woman: Nor do we unfortunately.

(Chuck): Yes.

Woman: But normally there is a room that we can get into and, you know, it is - we do not need scribes. You know, we do not need a lot. We may need remote but hopefully we could, even if it is, you know, finding a table at a restaurant that they sit around.

Glen DeSaintgery: Well I am thinking - I am really sorry to disturb you. I am putting in a note to (Diane Rock) at the moment to get that room.

Woman: Okay great, because often we have had our GNSO room on the Thursday and we use it for various things.

(Chuck): And are - is it reasonable to expect that most people will be staying through Thursday?

Woman: I suppose.

Woman: I will.

Woman: I would hope.

(Chuck):   Well I am, but I - that is another issue, so. Okay. So (Rob) are you okay with - you are going to draft something on this one right?

(Rob):   Yes. Let me introduce one other item though for you all. The heading there says Start Date for Steering Committee. And then line 31 says the initial Steering Committee should be formed. There is potentially some disconnect there. I mean, what you guys are talking about, you can form the Steering Committee through emails and pulling everybody together. Is that what you view as the start date or do you believe the start date is when they actually meet? And does that have any impact on this drafting?

(Chuck):   Comments? I think you can clean the language up to - so that it makes sense.

(Rob):   Okay.

(Chuck):   So, I understand your point. Feel - I say go ahead and take the freedom to word it appropriately including the title if the title needs adjustment.

(Rob):   Will do, thanks.

(Chuck):   Okay, the next item was to move the org chart - the draft org chart. And keep in mind that the lower part of that org chart where you have working teams is just a proposal for the Steering Committees to use as a possible way that they can organize their work and form work team.

Going on then to Steering Committee Charters, the GNSO policy process Steering Committee is first. I think now that Avrihas the text in front of her, I am not going to read unless somebody requests it.

But there are quite a few. Let us just take it a paragraph at a time. The first paragraph after description of the PPSC has quite a few edits in it. Any comments on any of those? Most of them look editorial.

How about the next paragraph? Quite a few deletions, some new language. Any comments there?

Okay, going on to working method and back me up if I go too fast. I do not - I want to keep it moving but at the same time, I do not want to miss things.

Working method for the PPCS, there are quite a few. Let us just look at that section as a whole. There are three paragraphs. Any comments there?

(Kristina Rosette): (John) this is (Kristina). I have a question. I am just curious as to I guess in both of those sections, it looks, and I am looking at the red line, basically the revisions kind of take this section from a, you know, here is one way to doing it, here is one possible task or, you know, here is one rationale for doing it this way to we will do it this way.

And I did not know if that had been a decision that the group had made previously and it just hadn't been reflected in the language?

(Chuck): That is a suggestion that (John) made. (John) you want to comment on that?

Jon Nevett: Yes. I do not know if I characterized it that much. But yes, I made the language clearer. It was, in my opinion, a little wishy washy. So here is what these committees will do and here is the initial plan for organization. But the committees themselves have plenty of leeway to, you know, form new teams and so there is definitely a lot of wiggle room for these committees, but at least it gives them a little more direction and a little more framework of where to start.

(Kristina Rosette):   (Hap) thanks.

(Chuck):   Are you comfortable with that (Kristina)?

(Kristina Rosette):   I am. I just was trying to, you know, to me it read it like a pretty dramatic change and I just wanted to make sure I got it.

(Chuck):   And the idea was to not be too prescriptive for the Steering Committees...

(Kristina Rosette):   Okay.

(Chuck):   ...in terms of what they could do. So they have some freedom to work together to design things the way they think best, and then - but at the same time, the Planning Committee provides quite a bit of thought, even in terms of Working Teams, that they can use as they so choose.

Any other comments on that section?

Then let us go to Membership in the PPCS. Is anybody not comfortable with the way that is laid out?

Wolf: Yes. So...

(Chuck):   Go ahead Wolf.

Wolf: Well yes. I have a problem with the voting members here. What does it mean in that respect? You know, we are talking about voting on Council level. Is that a kind of different voting here meant or what does he mean because I would not like - because voting is a little bit sensitive on Council level.

                 Here voting - well what is he - is he are doing regarding voting? What if we are voting about their work or what, but they do not have any thresholds for voting.

(Chuck):   Well they are going to have to approve, you know, work plans including what work teams they would establish and so forth. That might require a vote. (John) do you have any comments in that regard?

Jon Nevett: Yes, I mean, that was my thought process (Chuck). But I do not feel strongly if Wolf and others object to the word voting. It does not...

Woman: But if we do not have voting, then we do have to go with full consensus of the group, which I am fine. But full consensus takes longer and means, you know, more wishy washy.

(Kristina Rosette):   All right. This is (Kristina). I am fine with voting, but I think one thing I am concerned about is that at least, unless there is some kind of explanatory language, this delineation here would allow for the

possibility that a certain constituency or non-com could have double votes.

If for example the Council Chair is a member of, you know, the IPC, which will never happen but theoretically, you know, in that case the way this is structured, you could have...

Man: Look alive.

(Kristina Rosette):   ...kind of the GNSO Council Chair voting on behalf of the IPC and the IPC rep. So I think, you know, if the intention is that there is really one person from constituency regardless whether that person may also be the GNSO Council Chair or Vice-Chair, then I think we need to clarify that.

Woman: I think non-voting Chairs are a good thing.

(Kristina Rosette):   Okay, that is fine. We can do it that way too.

Woman: Does anyone else feel that way?

Man: Yes.

(Chuck):   Now...

Woman: And that would be easy to take care of.

(Chuck):   Now let...

Woman: But the problem is if you elect the IPC person to Chair, does that means that the IPC lost his vote?

(Kristina Rosette): True.

(Chuck): Let us keep in mind that you could actually have a Chair or Vice-Chair on this that was in a dual role of representing their constituency so that it would not necessarily have to be another constituency rep on there.

Woman: I think that is better.

(Kristina Rosette): Then maybe that is what we need to say is that if, you know, that if either the Council Chair or the Vice-Chair is constituency representative then they will also act as representative of their constituency for voting purposes.

(Chuck): Yes, that might be fine. What if we were just to delete voting members and just say initially the PPC will be comprised of the following, and let the Steering Committee work out their procedures for reaching consensus.

Man: Um-hmm.

Woman: That is fine.

(Chuck): Does that work?

Woman: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: And they can work by rough consensus. It just means that then the
                Chair has to call it.

(Chuck):   Right.

Wolf: Um-hmm. But this means that the other participants are non-voting
                members?

(Chuck):   Well we would not even address the voting issue in this document.

Wolf: Okay, so...

(Chuck):   So we are leaving...

Avri: Yes, I mean...

(Chuck):   Go ahead Avri.

Avri: I would not suggest leaving it empty. If we want to say that the Steering
                Committee works on rough consensus, then we should say that even if
                we do not define, you know, there is more than enough body of work
                on what that means, then I think that is fine.

                I do not think we want to say it works on full consensus, because then
                we are deadlocked by one member. Rough consensus, on the other
                hand, as we get better and better at it, is a workable system.

                And it means that if the Steering Committee calls a rough - a Steering
                Committee Chair, whoever gets elected Chair, I do not know how we

elect Chair, we agree to Chair, but if that person calls consensus when there isn't none, then that will get (unintelligible) by the Council.

(Milton): But I...

Avri: But yes, I think we have to say that this...

(Milton: ...am not sure I understand the - this is (Milton).

Avri: Yes.

(Milton): Yes, these Steering Committees are supposed to be small groups and they are not going to be fully representative of the entire range of constituencies. Therefore, I do not see any reason why they should not operate on full consensus.

Woman: Okay.

(Chuck): Uh-huh.

(Milton): I mean what kind of things would they be doing? It is mostly this amazon (unintelligible).

Woman: (Proof).

Woman: (Unintelligible) working group charters.

(Milton): Was that..

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Milton):   What?

(Chuck):   Working group charters.

Woman: Creating working group charters and things like that mostly.

(Milton):   Oh working group charters, oh.

((Crosstalk))

(Chuck):   If by...

(Milton):   I thought we were talking about the...

(Chuck):   ...working group she means working teams as defined in this plan.

Woman: Yes.

(Chuck):   Not policy working group.

(Milton):   I thought...

Woman: Not...

(Milton):   I thought this was...

Woman: ...policy working group, right. Not policy working groups, fourteen teams, sorry.

(Milton): Okay, so that, yes, that was my understanding. If anything that (unintelligible)...

Woman: Right, it is all process junk.

(Milton): Yes, process junk indeed. So, yes, why not full consensus?

Woman: Okay with me.

(Chuck): But if by full consensus you mean unanimous?

(Milton): Yes, you are talking about four, three people, right?

(Chuck): You are talking about a maximum of 12 people.

(Milton): A maximum of 12 people.

(Chuck): Right.

(Milton): You mean the entire Council can be on this sub-committee?

(Chuck): No.

Woman: No. One member from each constituency can be on.

(Milton): Can be or will be.

Man: Will be.

(Chuck): Well I suppose a constituency could decide not to be represented. I do not think...

Woman: And that will not happen.

Woman: Right. It is like this Planning Group. This Planning Group was every constituency who wanted to provide a member was able to provide a member.

Man: Or that knew about it.

Man: Yes.

Woman: Or, yes, I will - I am not going to get into that one. I am sure there were Council members from all constituencies who knew about it.

(Milton): Well as Avriknows, this idea of rough consensus to me means basically we ignore you if we do not like what you are saying. And what does it mean? One person can be ignored or two people?

Avri: No that is not what rough consensus means. Rough consensus means that if most people feel a certain way and you have made sure that you have understood and discussed fully the point of the one person, so it is not an ignoring. You have to deal with the issues, and then you still have, most people have gone the other way. So yes, one or two people.

(Denise): Can I just say that as somebody who, and I think (Chuck) did it as well, but I think it was much easier in his contacts, but, you know, as somebody who chaired a very contentious working group, dealing with

rough consensus was a tremendous headache. And I would frankly much prefer that we either say unanimity or we vote. And I know that I said the opposite about ten minutes ago and I apologize.

(Milton): Well I agree with (Denise).

Woman: It is (Christine).

(Chuck): (Kristina).

Woman: (Kristina).

(Chuck): Yes, the - well, I mean is it out of the question to just leave it up to the Steering Committees to work this issue?

Woman: To figure out how they work? We have done that a lot with groups.

Woman: Or any alternative we say would to be constituency is that when you comment on this, we are specifically interested in your comments on this particular point.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Chuck): So I am back to my suggestion to just deleting voting members and just saying the PPSC will be comprised of the following. The topic of this section is membership.

Wolf: I would agree.

(Rob): And there is the - this is (Rob). As the person with the pen who want to memorialize it by (see) taking out I am eliminating voting from the membership part. So it will read initially the PPSC will be comprised of the following members. Then could I suggest as you look at the following bullets, there would be an additional bullet that is identified as decision making by the PPSC.

And based on the discussion so far, it seems to me that where you, something that will get you closer to say, unless otherwise driven by the PPSC, decisions will be made using a full consensus process, or something along those lines.

Does that capture what everybody is trying to get to in this?

Woman: It looks like it would work.

(Chuck): Anybody opposed to that?

Woman: I can work with that.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Rob): I mean that way you have got some of the (calls) for them...

Woman: Yes.

(Rob): ...but I choose, I have a group to be something else they cannot.

Avri: Right. And (unintelligible) by consensus they can decide their institute voting or something else.

(Rob):   Well and Avrijust for the edification of this group, how would you
                describe the process that you all are going through right now? Is this
                rough consensus or is this full consensus?

Avri: No this is pretty much full consensus.

(Rob):   Maybe because you are all talking at such a high level, it seems to be
                fairly non-contentious, but I can understand when folks start getting
                into charters and any of the work teams, it may become a little bit more
                stressful.

(Chuck):   Although I think that the primary role of the Steering Committee is a
                coordinating role...

Avri: Um-hmm.

(Chuck):   ...and they are kind of playing a role between the Council and all of the
                working teams that are really going to be doing the work. I think that is
                where more contention is going to be at the working team level on
                some of the subjects.

                So I am okay with that. Anybody opposed then to (Rob)'s suggestion?

                Okay. Go ahead (Rob), then you can - you have the direction you
                need. Is that correct?

(Rob):   Yes sir, thank you.

(Chuck):   And the goals and milestones for the PPSC are basically left up to the
             Steering Committee to develop and they can get those approved by
             the Council, or do we just need to be - do we want that to be approved
             by the Council?

Woman: I think so.

(Chuck):   Okay?

Man: Yes.

(Chuck):   All right. Then the next section is the initial PPSC teams and there are
             two critical teams there I think. But they should be able to form other
             teams if they need to. Any comments on that section?

             Okay. And then there is just some background references. Now, we
             then go on to the GNSO Operation Steering Committee, the OSC, and
             I do like your abbreviations (John). They make them a little shorter.

             Pretty much, I think the change that this section parallels the previous
             section except for the detail on the suggested working teams. So
             unless somebody wants to go through this, you know, paragraph by
             paragraph or section by section, I do not know that that is necessary
             unless (Rob) needs that.

             I did highlight a few areas that we will look at, but does anybody think it
             is necessary to go through this section by section?

Avri: I have one question when we get to membership that is different.

(Chuck): Okay good. We will definitely go to membership then. Okay?

I did highlight, if you go down to the first bullet, I guess that is what in the second paragraph there and the sub-bullet that is highlighted there where I had a comment, prepare suggested changes to bylaws regarding Council's term limit.

I do not think we need to do that anymore. I think that is something that is already under way. Am I correct on that?

Woman: Yes you are.

(Chuck): Okay.

Woman: In fact it will be posted very shortly for...

(Chuck): Okay.

Woman: ...public comment so it can be approved by the Board.

(Chuck): Notice that there is an additional sub-bullet there, prepare clear rules for the establishment of stakeholder groups. That is a new one that was added. Any concern there?

Okay. Going on then, down, let me just see what else is highlighted. The next thing I highlighted was the membership category that Avriwanted to talk about anyway. And my comment there was that it was suggested in the Planning Committee meeting on 11 September that the initial membership be as proposed, but that the membership be reviewed once the bicameral structure is in place.

Is that a comment we want to leave in there?

Is that okay? Anybody opposed to that?

Okay? Now Avriwhat did you have under membership?

Avri: My issue has to do with the deletion of the one representative from any
          constituencies formally involved in the process of formation. We went
          through a lot of discussion on that. We tightened up the language so
          that it required us to have defined what it meant to be (formally) in the
          process of defining a new constituency.

          But it seems that once a constituency, you know, has met a certain
          threshold of activities, they should be allowed to participate. I do not
          have them as the decision making (unintelligible), you know, decision
          making members who are part of the consensus, but that they should
          be allowed to participate in a Steering Committee involved with life
          within a constituency.

          So, that one being crossed out, I guess I question the crossing out of it.
          I think it is an important way to start including those who are seriously
          involved in a formal process of becoming constituency to start being
          involved.

(Chuck):   And the Council could be involved in deciding whether it is seriously
          involved. So that might be a good place for Council involvement.
          (John) do you want to comment on that?

Jon Nevett: Sure. In the - on page 5 we put in, or at least I suggested language that said that they committees should be drawn from existing and emerging constituencies if possible.

So I guess the point was that it would have to go to the Council anyway, so I did not see a need to put it in here again. But if that gives you more comfort that is fine. You know, this is more of a snapshot. At this time, there are no emerging constituencies.

Woman: Exactly. But I am expecting some. I mean, I am expecting that to happen over the next couple months.

Jon Nevett: Right, and so then that would go to Council as part of changes in the composition of the committee and it will be changed that way.

(Chuck): Does anybody strongly object to leaving that bullet in there? That one representative from any constituency formally involved etcetera.

(Denise): No, but this is (Denise) though. I have another question about the OSC work activities.

(Chuck): Okay.

(Denise): (Unintelligible). So is your intention to give this group responsibility for statement if interest and declaration of interest forms? And could you, I am sorry, could you clarify what that is for?

(Chuck): What, I am not following you (Denise).

(Denise): Line 19 there under the OSC work activities it says develop statement of interest and declaration of interest forms. So those are for the Council members?

(Chuck): Hold on.

Woman: Those are actually for Council members and working group participants that was called for in the...

(Denise): Okay.

Woman: ...recommendations that those be revised.

(Denise): Okay.

(Chuck): I am lost at where you are at.

(Denise): I am sorry.

(Chuck): Could you give a page?

Woman: Yes, I sort of am too, but I just knew the - what that referenced.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Oh you are on page...

(Denise): So I am looking on page 12, I am sorry I am on page 12. I was looking back at the OSC work activities. Just, and another area that I wanted to explore was the distribution of responsibilities when it comes to

creating new (unintelligible) - creating and approving new constituencies and stakeholder group.

And that is something that I would like to clarify. The - and so of course my question is what is your - what sort of responsibilities are you giving the standing committee for - that relate to the creation of new constituencies and stakeholder groups? So what is your intention in that area?

(Chuck): As that again please?

(Denise): What do you see, so what is your intention for the role of the Standing Committee in the related to creating new constituencies and stakeholder groups?

Avri: Okay, can I start. Obviously the end of the road on that. Those things do have to get formal blessings from the Board. But we have had a situation and that basically any group of people have been able to apply to become a new constituency since this version of the bylaws were written, and then have now. I think I and a couple other people speculated that that was partly because there was no suggested procedure that you do this then you do that then you do the other thing.

You have created a list. You have created this. And then, you know, you submit this document to the, you know, to the GNSO or you submit this document to the Board or you submit this document to committee Y and etcetera.

So what I was thinking when I - when we were talking about this originally, is that this group would be involved in trying to come up with a process by which a new constituency could form.

In other what would be a formal procedure for reaching that point where they then go before the Board and say we are ready, please listen.

(Milton): I have a comment on this if I could get in the queue.

(Chuck): Go ahead (Milton) if you are done Avri.

Avri: Yes, done.

(Milton): I thought (Denise) - was (Denise) finished?

(Denise): Yes, I will get in the queue after you (Milton).

(Milton): Okay. I was under the impression, based on our last meeting actually, that the - we were supposed to submit plans for the stakeholder groups and that we were developing our own basically constitutions or whatever that the Board would approve, and that the formation of new constituencies and the nature of those constituencies within those groups would be up to the stakeholder group.

(Chuck): And we did make a decision - this Planning Committee did decide last meeting to let that be handled outside of this particular implementation plan. So you are correct. In fact, I have - in that regard (Milton) I have identified a couple other edits that need to happen in that bullet list that we are looking at right now.

But let me let (Denise) go ahead.

(Denise):   Yes, so I had a similar question with regards to constituency. The situation we are in now, the bylaws require any one entity that is interested in creating new constituencies to petition the Board.

The Board would then take any input that the Council and the public may have on the creation of this new constituency, but the bylaws clearly state that that will rest with the Board.

It is also clear, as Avriindicated that simply having a line in the bylaws is not really enough guidance or assistance to group that want to start new constituencies. And so I have already gotten actually inquiries about how one would go about creating a new constituency so they can quickly so they can participate in the formation of the stakeholder group.

So I think we have both a issue with responsibility for constituency approval and creation and also a timing issue. So I do not know that it is feasible to or appropriate to delegate to this Standing Committee the responsibility of defining that or creating new constituencies.

I do not know that that is the role of the Council. And the timing is such that even if it were to be assigned the responsibility, you would be - not have, you know, we would not have this group formed or have them do the work on the plans for creating new constituencies, you know, months and months from now. And there would be a disconnect between the creation of new constituencies and creation of stakeholder groups in this process.

(Chuck):   So.

Woman: (Denise) can I ask a question?

(Chuck):   Yes, me too.

(Milton):   Yes, I want to get in the queue too.

(Chuck):   Yes, so. (Denise) let me - help me understand what changes you think
                need to be made in these lists of sub-bullets here or in that regard.
                What is that - which particular items are of concern to you?

(Denise):   I think, so and perhaps I am reading that bullet incorrectly.

(Chuck):   You mean the one that says...

(Denise):   Determine what steps are needed to implement a new Council and
                constituency construction including identifying (native) changes.

                I just want to be clear about...

(Chuck):   Okay.

(Denise):   ...what do you see...

(Chuck):   I got you.

(Denise):   ...that - whether that part of the responsibility. I think the...

(Chuck):   Okay. Now I understand you. Let me let Avriand (Milton) jump in here and we will take...

Man: Well what - I am sorry, what time is this call supposed to go to?

(Chuck):   Well I had hoped to get it done in an hour and a half. We did not succeed obviously. So, the, I think we are getting fairly close. That is why I was pushing ahead. Is that a serious problem for anybody?

Jon Nevett: I have got to - this is (John) I have got to leave. I apologize.

(Chuck):   Okay (John) please watch the list, okay?

Jon Nevett: Yes.

(Chuck):   Sorry about that.

Jon Nevett: Thanks everyone.

(Chuck):   Okay Avri?

Avri: Yes. Okay. I will go quickly. What I was thinking of is that the Council was just going to get involved in an ongoing process of how these things, what kind of processes they went through. And this would be - and A, you are right. Over the transitions, that would be difficult. In a long term thing, that might be useful.

                The question I have for you (Denise) is do I understand therefore that what you are suggesting is basically the staff will come up with a process by which all these people who are coming to you and say I

want to be a constituency in the following stakeholder group, that the staff will define an open process whereby these people would be able to know what they were doing, and is that what you are actually suggesting?

(Denise):   Yes, I think just the reality of the situation we have right now with a bylaw sentence with little guidance leaves a vacuum and a number of questions that make it challenging for people to start new constituencies. So, I mean, given the timing, I think what I would propose is that the staff develop a very light weight processes that help people who are interested to take (unintelligible).

(Milton):   I think this is potentially a train wreck waiting to happen. First of all, if somebody wants to start a constituency, the first person or group that they should inform is not the staff or even the Board, but the - and particularly they want to participate in the rules - in the formation of rules for the establishment of the new stakeholder groups, they should inform the people who are currently in the existing constituencies who are in the process of developing those new stakeholder groups.

So if there is a group of let us say individual business owners who want to become a constituency within the commercial stakeholder group, they should be informing the current constituencies of their intention. And they should then be involved in the process of developing the rules for the new stakeholder group.

Likewise, for all of the other constituencies and stakeholder groups, it is very clear who is going to be in the stakeholder groups. You know, we are going to be in the non-commercial stakeholder group and for all

practical purposes at the moment, we are the non-commercial stakeholder group.

(Denise):   Um-hmm.

(Milton):   And the same with the business, you know, BCISTs and trademark are the commercial stakeholders group. And I do not know what rules they are formulating, but we are very interested in getting support and getting participation in the process. But we have not heard a thing from anybody.

So, I do not - and frankly, we have a very definite conception of how constituencies should be structured in a way that will avoid power struggles and gaming of the system. So, and we are going to go ahead with that.

And, you know, it would be quite a disaster for the staff or the Board to say okay now you are a constituency and we have developed a completely separate set of rules.

Just to give you an example, one idea that has been proposed in our context is maybe we should just have regional constituencies. That would make it very clear to people where they belong, and it would map well to (alack) structures and to the way many people think about the world. And there are people who like that idea, other people who do not.

But if we adopted a regional structure, it would be these five mutually exclusive categories, and there would be no room for any other constituencies. Everybody would fit into a regional constituency.

(Denise):   Sure, if I may get a queue (Chuck).

(Chuck):   Go ahead, go ahead.

(Denise):   So providing guidance on the process of creating new constituencies
                 as noted in the bylaws is in no way inconsistent with your intentions
                 that people interested in starting new constituencies should be talking
                 to the current constituencies than to genus of community members.
                 That makes a lot of sense to me.

                 But the Board has been very clear that the current constituencies on
                 the non-contracted party side are not the stakeholder group. So I
                 would not agree with this section to part of your statement.

                 So the Board has the clear authority to approve petitions for new
                 constituencies. Oh, we are just - I think the issues here is how to help
                 those who are interested in doing that. And I think, you know, one of
                 the reasons the Board has the responsibility for not only approving
                 these constituencies, but also renewing the charters of existing
                 constituencies is that (unintelligible) that is where appropriately the
                 authority rests under the current...

(Milton):   Well I understand that, but...

(Denise):   ...and right, and one of the problems, if I can finish, under...

(Milton):   Okay.

(Denise): ...the current system is there is an inherent (disconsentive) for current constituencies to support the creation of new constituencies when it means, you know, additional Board seats may dilute their voting power on the...

(Milton): Well that depends on that you...

(Denise): ...well there are other...

(Milton): Yes.

(Denise): ...other issues like that. So, you know,

(Milton): Let me just say that there is an inconsistency here between what we were told I think by you in the last meeting which is start developing a plan for the non - for the new stakeholder group.

Now there is nobody that can do that except for us. Right?

(Chuck): Okay, let me try and get us on track here.

Woman: Well but (Chuck), I mean, I think (Milton) makes an incredibly important point.

(Chuck): No, no, I am not disagreeing.

Woman: And do agree with (Denise) on that, but...

(Chuck): Okay. I am not - I did not say I was agreeing with anybody. What I want to do is get us on track here because first of all we need to

understand that the Steering Committee's role - we are not really telling the Steering Committee and this plan exactly what they do. We are making some suggestions.

Now I think we need some word fixes in some of the changes that (John) made. Let me go - let me go through some possible edits and you can take consider them as tentative (Rob) as you are going through this.

Take a look at the working method for the OSC section please. The way (John) changed it is it says the OSC will be comprised of a minimum of. Our intent really was, and I did not catch this before, was to make some suggestions for the Steering Committee in terms of how they organize the work teams and so forth.

So I really think that should say the OSC could be comprised of three separate teams to take on and follow that theme.

And then going down below to the very next paragraph, the OSC work activities should be allocated as follows. I think that should say could be allocated as follows, because our intent was not to tell the Steering Committee how they should organize it, but rather to give some suggestions in that regard.

I think that his word changes are not so problematic in the other Steering Committee as they are this one.

Then if we go down to the first sub-bullet under the GNSO Operations Team, I think we should delete the first sub-bullet that says determine what steps are needed to implement a new Council and constituency

structure including identifying any needed changes to bylaws and/or non-policy procedures.

The reason being is is we as a Planning Committee decided as (Milton) shared, to handle that implementation of the new structure outside of the implementation committee. So this Steering Committee would not need to be involved in that and I personally do not think they need to be involved in that. It is between the stakeholder groups and the Board.

And then the next edit is I think just a minor one in the third sub-bullet there (Rob) where it says on the first line and second line, other Steering Committees. That really should say Standing Committees there because that is what the Board called them in their report.

(Milton):   And just to be technical that is...

(Chuck):   Now does that make sense (Milton) in terms of your concern and then we still need to come back with to (Denise)'s concern.

(Milton):   Well I am not sure it does. Again, I do not think it answers my concern. Is (Susan) still on the call?

I guess not. (Susan) you there? I cannot hear.

So the concern is just I do not, you know, we have to have clear guidelines as to where the decisions are going to be made. I cannot - I am not going to lead people into an elaborate stakeholder group formation process which demands a lot of time and energy in a short period of time just be told well, you know, the Board has created two

new constituencies that are suddenly part of your, you know, your stakeholder group.

And, you know, oh by the way, you know, the whole presumption of this constituency structure is completely contrary to what you have worked out and you do not know any of these people and you do not know, you know, whether they meet your established criteria for eligibility in, you know, a non-commercial stakeholder's group, but, you know, just live with it.

You just wasted a couple of weeks and now you are, you know, you are basically disenfranchised and you have wasted a lot of time and live with it. You know, I am just - I am not going to go through that.

Either, you know, the responsibility, because we are talking about a two month period. We are talking about between now and Cairo right? It is less than two months. So you want to have a constitution of a stakeholder group in about a month. I cannot start people working on that unless I know that, you know, unless I know who I am working with.

(Chuck):   I do not understand that that is a task in the next couple months anyway (Milton). And my concern is is that in approving...

(Milton):   My understanding was it was a task.

(Chuck):   ...in approving this plan, in approving this plan for implementation and establishing the steering groups, a lot of what I think you are talking about really is going to be dealt with by working teams that are

established by the Steering Committee and the plan itself that we are looking at right now, we do not have to get into those details.

We are making some suggestions as terms - in terms of what they should consider based on what the recommendations are from the Board, but the detail you are getting into is really not needed for approving this plan.

(Milton): But again, what you said just again implied that these working teams within this plan will be doing something that we just said they were not doing or that you wanted us to do independently at this point.

(Chuck): No, the steering groups, well there is two things. With regard to implementation to the bicameral voting procedure, and in particular seating representatives on the Council...

(Milton): Uh-huh.

(Chuck): ...that is totally separate from this implementation plan. Okay?

Secondly, to the extent that the Steering Committee decides in working with, you know, with - in representing constituencies including your own and so forth, and developing work plans, it may or may not include work that you and (Denise) are talking about, but we do not have to make that decision right now.

(Milton): Well I have to make it now because...

(Chuck): Well what decision do you have to make right now?

(Milton): I have to make a decision as to whether I drag everybody into a process of developing a plan for a stakeholder's group. I have to do that in the next two months.

If you want to have adequate feedback, you have got to bring a plan into the Cairo meeting. And if you are going to implement it by January 2009 you are going to have - I mean this is just chaos. How am I supposed to know what to do?

Woman: Yes, (Milton) I appreciate this. And this situation is somewhat fluid and the transition is certainly offering a lot of challenges. As I indicated in the, I think in my last email to the Council is staff will be recommending that the Board extend the transition period and not have the new Council implemented for at least six months.

And we are getting more input from various constituencies on what they feel is appropriate for the implementation period. So the Board - we will be asking the Board if, you know, at their September 30 meeting to address this as one of the issues.

I think the obvious sequential steps here are to make sure we give some time for any new constituencies that want to be part of the process for creating a new stakeholder group to provide more guidance on what the process is and elements for creating a new stakeholder group and submitting a plan to the Board for approval.

And of course these steps need to occur before the stakeholder groups then elect the new Council structure.

(Milton): Hmm.

(Chuck):   Okay. I, you know...

Man: Can I ask a question?

(Chuck):   ...I do not think we are going to be able to wrap this up today. Glen are
                   you still on?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes I am (Chuck).

(Chuck):   How did we do with your doodle on meeting for Monday or Tuesday of
                   next week?

Glen DeSaintgery: Sorry, I will get that back for you.

(Chuck):   I meant to check that myself and I forgot, so.

Glen DeSaintgery: No, no, no.

Man: (Chuck) can I ask you a question also please?

(Chuck):   Sure, go ahead.

Man: Thanks. I am just wondering, you know, kind of what the reality is here.
                   Or is staff or anybody else on this call aware of another constituency
                   group that is wanting or intending to apply?

Woman: I received three informal inquiries about the process or method for
                   starting new constituencies. So, that may or may not result in, you
                   know...

Woman: Now...

Woman: ...petition for new constituencies.

Woman: I mean, you know, (Milton)'s point is an excellent, I mean, you know, what I am concerned about, and I realize this is not what we are talking about, but this is I think the first that a lot of us have heard about this is that, you know, you are putting the existing constituency and frankly - and on the - and particularly on the non-contracting party side between a rock and a hard place because we either move forward on developing a charter with the possibility that at some point perhaps just short of ratification, this new constituency kind of parachutes down and says okay now I get a vote and I do not agree with any of this, in which case we do not meet the deadline.

Or we go ahead and basically get everything done, and then a new constituency kind of parachutes in, without any notice to us, and I am not talking about, you know, whether we get a vote as to whether they exist or not, I am just talking about the notice.

And then, you know, we are criticized because we have already gone ahead and we have not included them. And I just am very concerned that one or both of those alternatives could happen on either side in the non-contracting party (health).

And I think frankly it is in the interest of everyone involved in this process to make sure that it really does not go out of the gate with a disaster.

Woman: Right. And so obviously, you know, the challenge that we are facing is how to best implement the Board stated objectives, you know, in a way that works for existing interests and for potential new interests.

Clearly the Board's intention is to support an expansion and diversification of constituency interest groups within the GNSO Council. And so we are obviously struggling with how to do that with existing, you know, with existing constituencies, with potential constituencies and moving this in a (cordially) fashion towards the stakeholder group creation, that, you know, that timeframe that is adjusted by the Board.

Woman: Sure, no absolutely. And I guess I would not have asked that perhaps there might be a way to identify kind of a notice provision. That if the potential constituency applicant has not previously notified the other constituencies in whatever stakeholder group it is in that it is seeking formal approval, that they either be required to do so or, you know, staff do it at a certain point in the process simply so that we can take them into account, or at least the possibility of them into account in our planning and our drafting.

Woman: Yes, absolutely. And in fact, you know, staff has just completed a - we have a template for a notice of intent to form a new constituency and I will send it to this group. It will be useful to get your quick feedback on it.

It has been, you know, we are suggesting and, you know, on an informal level that we have a short template to help people think through and provide public notice to their exploration of creating a new constituency.

So I think, yes, that seemed obvious to me as well that we need a lightweight process where people publish some type of notice, and then - before they go into the process of creating a formal petition and charter for the Board.

Woman: Appreciate it, thank you.

(Chuck): Okay. Glen I...

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

(Chuck): ...have the doodle. I have the doodle up now.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes, I have got it, yes.

(Chuck): I have it up now and we are going to need one more meeting. I think we will be able to wrap it up then, but there is not a perfect time, but it looks like Wednesday 6:00 pm UTC might be the best, but I have a question for Mike on this regard.

(Philip) is the only one that could not make that time that responded to the doodle, 6:00 pm UTC. So Mike for you and I that is, let us see, what is that 11:00 am in the morning on Wednesday?

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Chuck): So actually I will be on the east coast then, so. The - can - could you fill in for (Philip) if indeed he cannot make that meeting on that time?

Mike Rodenbaugh: That 11:00 am the 24th?

(Chuck): Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

Mike Rodenbaugh: I am currently scheduled to be in a seminar that day.

(Chuck): Well I guess yes, and then the other alternative is 2:00 pm UTC on Wednesday and (Milton) cannot make that one. So (Milton) could you get somebody to cover for you on that one or?

(Milton): The next Council meeting?

(Chuck): No, the Council meeting is on Thursday the 25th. We need to get this - get a meeting in before the Council meeting is the point. That is why. And I am totally out of the loop for traveling on Tuesday unfortunately, so.

So the other alternative, any other alternatives involve at least two people not making it. So now we could...

Woman: Yes, and I am definitely out. I did not even answer. But Wednesday I am lost in mountains that do not have telephones, so.

(Chuck): Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Milton) I think is the one we must ask (Chuck).

(Chuck):   Excuse me?

Glen DeSaintgery: (Milton) is the one we must ask.

(Chuck):   Okay (Milton) are you still on?

                    Well, all right, I guess we will just have to...

Glen DeSaintgery: (Milton) is disconnected (Chuck).

(Chuck):   All right. Then so Mike cannot fill in. (Philip) cannot do it on
                    Wednesday. It would be ashamed to have to bring in a totally new
                    person. (Robin) has been an alternate for (Milton). Have no idea
                    whether she can make it on Wednesday the 24th at 2:00 pm UTC. Let
                    us make sure my calendar has not (unintelligible).

Glen DeSaintgery: (Chuck)?

(Chuck):   Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: Sorry. (Milton) did indicate to me in an email when I asked about
                    this that he could at the stretch make it.

(Chuck):   Oh okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

(Chuck):   So, we are talking 2:00 pm UTC on the 24th.

Man: That is 7:00 am?

(Chuck):   Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: (Unintelligible).

Man: That works.

(Chuck):   So that is - I can make part of that. I have got a meeting that I will have
                to - yes, that is going to be difficult for me at that one. That would be
                10:00 am Eastern right? I can spend about a half hour so I may have
                to have somebody pick up for me on that in terms of chairing this.

                We can try quickly to get some work done in the first 30 minutes, but I
                will probably have to turn it over to somebody else to wrap it up.

Man: Unless we go to nine, 6:30, 7:30 Eastern.

(Chuck):   No wait a minute.

Avri: We do not have that many topics left, do we?

(Chuck):   No, the problem of is we have run into a stumbling block. I do not think
                it is a very big stumbling block Avri. You want to try and push ahead? I
                mean, we have already lost some people.

                Do people understand what I am getting at? The details of what we are
                talking about I think are really details that still need to be worked out by
                the Steering Committees and working of course in conjunction with the

Board recommendations to make sure we are consistent, but we do not have to answer these questions right now for this plan. Do we? Am I missing something?

Woman: I do not think so. I do not think so. And I think that the issues that (Milton) and others are talking to (Denise) about in terms of the formation of new constituencies is out the parameters of what we need to deal with at this point. That needs to be dealt with by the constituencies, the steering group, maybe Council, maybe not, and staff. But if staff is basically saying listen, we are taking responsibility for coming up for a process, we will work with your steering groups current constituencies to make it work, then that is not it.

Now maybe our committee later will want to say well that was all very good for transition, but we, the constituents, would like to see a different process occur in the future and will develop one and recommend it, but that is beside the point. We do not need to worry about that now.

(Chuck): Okay. So let us, let me try and push this forward to at least get some decision on the remaining edits. I just went through some. I am going to go through those very quickly on working method for the OSC.

Is anybody opposed to changing that first sentence to say the OSC could be comprised of three separate teams instead of the definitive will be comprised of a minimum of three separate teams.

Woman: No I think that is a good suggestion (Chuck). It gives everybody - it gives them more flexibility.

(Chuck):   Anybody opposed to that? Okay. Then going down to the next paragraph, I suggested the change the OSC work activities could be allocated as follows, and then we list the three teams, changing should to could.

And then the first sub-bullet under the GNSO Operations Team, I suggest we delete that first sub-bullet that says determine what steps are needed to implement a new Council and constituency structure including identifying any needed changes to bylaws and/or non-policy procedures.

I think that has been moved out of this implementation plan and it going to be handled with stakeholder groups making proposals to the Board and so forth, and then working with the Board to finalize those. Any disagreement with deleting that?

And then that next edit, (Rob) did you get the one changing Steering to Standing in that third sub-bullet.

(Rob):   Yes sir.

(Chuck):   Yes, okay. So, and we already agreed on that we are going to remove that about the term limits in the bullet that was highlighted.

I think the rest of the changes here, and without talking about them individually, would follow the same changes we made as applicable in the other Steering Committee. Any disagreement with that?

I did have a comment on constituency operations under the description of the OSC that the probably should be expanded to stakeholder group

and constituency operations instead of just constituency operations. Is that okay?

And you can just see my comment if nobody is objectional to that. The rest of the edits, anybody have any other comments on (John)'s edits, please speak up.

Under working method for the OSC, we already covered that. So let us see, scrolling down I think the rest of the changes are pretty much editorial. The same things we did for membership we would do in this, correct?

And the comment I added, I added a similar comment to this Steering Committee that membership be reviewed once the bicameral structure is in place. So that is the same. So we just leave that comment in there consistent with what we did above.

And I would just like to point to everybody that there are links to the team documents in this document, so you should look at those. I think they have been updated with non-material changes that needed to be maded - that need to be made, excuse me.

And the, but take a look at that. And those are just suggestions for the Steering Committees. We are not trying to be overly prescriptive in that regard in this plan.

That said, let me see if, and then one last thing, (John) deleted the - in the glossary, the drafting team definition, I am probably okay with that. I think it will have to come up - it probably should come up in the PDP process and working group model. But...

Woman: Why was it deleted?

Woman: Just out of curiosity.

(Chuck):   Let us see. What did he say to me on that? I think just because it was not used in this document.

Wolf: Yes, it was used on page number.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Yes.

(Chuck):   Where was it used?

Wolf: Page 9.

(Chuck):   Page 9?

Wolf: Yes.

(Chuck):   By the way, I am okay with leaving drafting team in there and I do not think (John) would have big objections to that and he will get a chance to look at that.

              Is that the preference to leave drafting team in?

Woman: Yes. I would say that.

(Chuck):   Okay. I am good. I think the drafting team has been a really good
             concept so I am okay with leaving it in. Does anybody have anything
             else on this plan, on the edits so that (Rob) can hear those now.

Woman: I actually do. And maybe I am very confused, which I think is the case,
             but my take away from the whole conversation we had about, you
             know, approvals, constituencies, and notification of shareholder groups
             was that in light of that that the third bullet, that the currently under
             constituencies team...

(Chuck):   Um-hmm.

Woman: ...should come out. And maybe I misunderstood it, but I kind of took it
             that methods were introducing...

(Chuck):   Oh...

Woman: ...(unintelligible) constituencies was not going to be within the scope
             of...

(Chuck):   Thank you. I meant to come back to that because that was I think
             related to your concern (Denise) is that correct?

(Denise):   Yes.

(Chuck):   Is that your opinion as well that that number 3 should come out?

Man: Um-hmm.

(Denise):   Or be clarified.

Avri: Right. I guess what I was trying to say, and this is why I was in favor in
          leaving it in, but I do not really care, not being a constituency person
          but just looking at it as a form and leaving things open for the future is
          that certainly recognizing that in this immediate transition period, the
          staff is going to do something.

          However, there is no, you know, so perhaps it should be, you know,
          review methods for introducing new constituencies or something. Now
          if the staff is going to do something now, and I think that everyone
          except for that for expediency purposes that is the way it should be
          because otherwise it will not happen.

          And then the question becomes for the future, does this Standing
          Committee or Steering Committee have the ability to - the
          constituencies that are members of it, it is not so much as the
          constituencies that are members of it, do they have a vehicle whereby
          as a community, they can review change, suggest changes, alter those
          methods.

          And so that is why I think it is reasonable that it remain there. Perhaps
          it is so, review and recommend changes in methods for introducing
          new constituencies or something. But that is - I see the placeholder for
          something like that in the future.

(Chuck): Two comments in that regard Avri. Number 1, I would like to call
          everybody's attention to the fact that the lead in sentence for those
          three items is recommendations considered from the BGC working
          group might include.

So we are not saying that these things have to be in there. But the more I think about it, the more I think that anything to do with introducing new constituencies should be in GNSO operations, not constituency operations, if we leave it there at all. You follow me?

Woman: Yes.

(Chuck): This is...

Woman: No I agree.

(Chuck): Yes. So now the question is should it be in GNSO operations. Again, whether we put it in this or not, it could be or may not be included in what the Steering Committee comes up with.

Woman: Right.

Woman: So would people feel comfortable if (unintelligible) but it was altered to say, you know, moved as he said to another (caretory) but, you know, review and, you know.

(Chuck): What do people think? It does not bother me. We would move it up to the GNSO Operations Team and reviewing methods (unintelligible)...

Woman: Reviewing as appropriate or reviewing and amending as appropriate, or reviewing and recommending methods as appropriate for introducing new constituencies.

Woman: I am fine with that.

Woman: Just so there is a placeholder.

Woman: Yes, I am fine with that.

(Chuck): Okay?

Woman: Are you okay with that (Denise)?

(Chuck): Yes, she just said she was.

Woman: Oh okay, I thought that was (Kristina). Sorry.

(Chuck): I think it was (Denise).

Woman: No it was me. It was (unintelligible).

Woman: It was (Kristina) but (Denise) is also fine with it. Thank you.

(Chuck): Oh okay. I am sorry.

Woman: It is a good suggestion.

(Chuck): The two of you do sound a little bit alike.

Woman: (Kristina) stop imitating me please.

Woman: Okay.

(Chuck): All right. We now know a new role for (Kristina) when we need it. So, okay. The - so (Rob) you got that?

(Rob):   Got it.

(Chuck):   Okay (Rob) would you please, you know, prepare a - and you might it is probably a good idea to keep the red lines and just with all the changes that were made so everybody can see them readily. You can do a clean version for those who want it too.

And then Glen...

Glen DeSaintgery: Yes.

(Chuck):   ...my suggestion is is that you try - go ahead and schedule a meeting for Wednesday. Can we do it at - instead of 2:00 pm doing it at like a half hour earlier than that? See if it works. We may not need it people. We just need to have something in place in case we do need it.

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay, 13:30 UTC...

(Chuck):   Yes.

Glen DeSaintgery: ...for Wednesday. I will do that (Chuck).

(Chuck):   Right. If you could do that that would be much appreciated. And then we may not need it. If everyone, when (Rob) sends out the draft, would do any - if we can cover it on the list, okay, basically what we need to do is confirm that all of us are okay with the plan as it is. Okay?

And if we can do that on the list, we will cancel the meeting. Okay?

(Rob):   And (Chuck) this is (Rob). What I am going to do so that for the benefit of folks who were not here or who had stand-ins today, I am going to go back to (John)'s red line. I will accept the changes that you have all have accepted. I will reject the changes that you all wanted to put things back in, version I will (take) the edit. Does that sound right?

(Chuck):   That is fine.

(Rob):   Okay.

(Chuck):   Yes.

(Rob):   With just one, two other quick things. I do not want to keep everyone on the call, but under the bullets after the OSC, there were two areas, one I was going to add in the bullet about decision making, tracking the PPSC addition and I also recall that under membership in the OSC, Avrihad asked, and I think even (John) agreed that we would reenter that bullet about emerging constituencies. So that will be going back in. That is not an accepted revision from (John).

(Chuck):   Now (Rob) in the case where you accept material changes that we made today, or even change things that were deleted, if you could highlight those in yellow or something just so...

(Rob):   Okay.

(Chuck):   ...people can quickly look, because we are going to have a short time on this to make it as easy as possible for people to see the significant changes that we agreed to today so that they can quickly confirm without having to go through and detail the whole document again.

(Rob):   Will do.

(Chuck):   Okay? My apologies for the lengthy time, but I think we did make some pretty good progress. So again let us try to wrap this up on the list. If we cannot, we will have a meeting on Wednesday.

                Thanks everybody.

Woman: Good, thank you (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Man: Okay.

Man: Thank you (Chuck).

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye.

                            END