

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
December 12, 2014
8:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you for standing by. At this time this call is being recorded. If you have any objections, please disconnect at this time. You may begin your conference.

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, (unintelligible). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the NCPH Intersessional Planning call taking place on Friday, December 12, 2014 at 2 pm UTC.

On the call today we have Bill Drake, Rafik Dammak, Steve Metalitz, Marilyn Cade. From staff we have Rob Hoggarth and myself, Benedetta Rossi. We have apologies from Elisa Cooper and Tony Holmes.

I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Benedetta. Welcome, everybody. Benedetta, if you scroll through the agenda for us, I'll do a quick review. It's very similar to our agenda from last week. We'll do a quick update pretty well and we'll just stick (unintelligible). We'll review the updated draft meeting agenda.

And what I'd like to do, although we don't have everybody on today's call, is have some designated folks here for some of the various sessions so that some of you can begin your preparations or just do some handshakes in terms of how you want to potentially conduct some of the sessions. And then we'll have an any other business session there for us to capture anything that we have missed.

Is there any other specific agenda item that you all want to make sure that we got covered today? Hearing none, we'll go ahead with that agenda and I'll turn to item number two, staff updates. The good news that you have all been able to provide Benedetta and I with a list of your names.

As I noted in the draft document that I circulated last night, Benedetta and I are still working with a couple of the community leaders because there are, you know, one or two slots that still may be open for their community. In the case of the NCUC, we've got some elections that still need to be concluded. But we've got the large majority of the attendees identified and have communicated all that information to the travel team.

My understanding is that some of those communications have been going out or at least will have 100% of the folks who have been identified as delegates for the meeting have been (unintelligible) no later than the beginning of next week. So I think that we're in good shape in terms of having the travel team nailed down and engaged.

The one challenge that we have had that I still don't have final confirmation on yet is the hotel situation. We have been advised that there is a major convention taking place that week, and the challenge the meeting's team has had is that there's no one hotel that can accommodate the number of rooms

that we're looking for. So (Stacy) is individual negotiations with a number of places.

I identified two of the hotels on the latest draft version of the agenda, the Marriott Courtyard and the Holiday Inn at Scott Circle that she knows has rooms and with whom she's working with directly. Unlike a typical ICANN meeting, given the demand here in D.C., there's not an option to just set aside a block of rooms. So literally (Stacy)'s going through and she'll be going person by person in terms of confirming, you know, what their travel dates are and what days/nights they'll be staying in the rooms.

What we're going to have to do is just make those commitments and bookings, and unfortunately the cancellations will have some resources that we're going to have to eat there. But she is continuing to work with the different groups. I'm expecting a report from her later today. As soon as I get any more substance I'll let you all know as a group. And of course (Joseph) and (Stacy) will work with individual travelers as that information becomes available.

The only other two major things, and this bleeds a little into the meeting agenda that I have under my notes as logistics, is I've been working with (Christopher Mondini) and Jaime Hedlund on Fadi's schedule. And you'll see there are a couple of issues that we have that I think are perfectly manageable but that impact the timing of perhaps the plenary session. And we're moving up the sessions with the individual stakeholder groups on Tuesday morning by about half an hour, but otherwise that's all very manageable.

The conversations with Larry's office are still in flux in terms of finding a perfect time for him. What Jaime's centered on right now is lunch with Larry on Monday to talk about accountability. So obviously as those get solidified, that will drive a decision or two that we have in terms of some of the

constituency or stakeholder group breakout sessions. But again, I think we've got some flexibility there.

At least, you know, over the next week or so we should be able to solidify that so that you'll have at least two weeks' notice for the folks you want to attend as to when the specific meetings will take place. So particularly if you have people local for some of the SG meetings, you can nail that down for those folks.

That's all I had on my meeting logistics. I don't know, Benedetta, if there's anything else you want to flesh out on the delegate front in terms of something that would be useful to talk about on a broad scale. Otherwise we've just been having individual e-mail exchanges or conversations with some of you about just nailing down folks. Anything else you want to add Benedetta?

Benedetta Rossi: No thank you, Rob. I don't have anything to add for the moment.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay, thank you. Comments or reactions from anybody on just the logistics update?

Marilyn Cade: Rob, it's Marilyn. I just sent a suggestion for a small - it's a boutique hotel. But my question really is we've got, what, 22, we've got, I don't know 20, 22 people that need hotels, something like that?

Rob Hoggarth: It's more like 35.

Marilyn Cade: Thirty-five, thirty-five, I see. Okay. Because to the extent they can be, yes, okay.

Rob Hoggarth: What I've told (Stacy) is ultimately, you know, if there are hotels up in Silver Spring and folks want to commute with me on Monday or Tuesday, I'm more than happy to be a transportation service. But I'm comfortable that we'll find, you know, we'll find things. It's just that the downtown core is where we're having some real challenges.

Marilyn Cade: For people who aren't familiar, if they're familiar with ICANN - sorry with the (unintelligible), then, you know, suggesting they take the subway works, but it gets more complicated if we're sending people - north Virginia, northern Virginia usually has hotels right across the river. But it does get more complicated for people if they are not familiar.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes. And I mean, our goal was to have these, you know, the accommodations within walking distance. The second goal is particularly since everyone's not going to be in the same facility is to cluster as many folks together as we can as well, so.

Marilyn Cade: Great, great. Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: If it were anyone else other than (Stacy), with whom I've worked for six years now, I would be worried, but I'm very confident in her abilities.

Great. Well then let's turn our attention to the agenda. Again my apologies if any of you didn't get the agenda earlier in the week. We had some e-mail challenges according to our IT team. Some messages went out - well all messages went out, it's just where they ended up arriving in people's inboxes or spam filters. But what I wanted to do was get out to you the latest version of the agenda last night because I wanted to reflect the feedback from (Christopher) and Jaime in terms of Larry and Fadi's schedule.

And so when you look at the agenda, where it has potential impacts for us starting right off is on Monday, with Larry more likely at the lunchtime period that puts some potential shifting of topics for the morning plenary sessions in play.

Right now over the course of those two sessions we've got accountability, GNSO review, in-house coordination, community resources and budget, which was your suggestion, Marilyn, and then the possible pre-ICANN 53 meeting conference that you suggested, Bill. I threw that in here too. We could slide other things there, but, you know, with the accountability moving out, that was probably going to be a substantial discussion. If that then ends up being in that hour, hour and twenty minute block with (Larry) at lunch, we'll just want to backfill some of the other topics there.

Any thoughts or comments about that? Yes, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Yes, Rob, sorry.

Steve Metalitz: We're not using the chat room for the queue?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes. And I see Steve and Bill with their hands raised.

Marilyn Cade: Why don't you take them first? I'm still trying to figure out if I can raise my hands on my iPhone.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. We'll go Steve, Bill, then Marilyn. Go ahead, Steve. Thanks.

Steve Metalitz: Yes thank you. Well I think with this change with Fadi cut back to two hours and I guess only on that first afternoon, I think we need for slot B or C to be switched with slot F. Because if we're going to make the best use of our time

with Larry and with Fadi, particularly, I think the SGs at a minimum to need caucus among themselves and figure out which issues they wish to raise and, you know, just to prepare for it. So the old schedule we had that, this one we don't. So I would suggest switching either slot B or slot C with slot F.

Rob Hoggarth: We may be able to do that. I like the idea of getting everybody together right off the bat. So, you know...

Steve Metalitz: Yes, cut down introduction and welcome. Or I mean either B or C. It could work either way.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes correct. If we combine the introductions and then went into an overall plenary session then you could all break for - well, you know, break into breakout rooms for that hour and a half, which would allow you to prepare for Larry and Fadi. You would normally have been able to prepare for Fadi for a lunch on the second day, but I think that's your point. You want to have that opportunity.

So you're all comfortable then with having slot C be the breakout, Steve?

Steve Metalitz: That would be fine with me.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. We'll accept that as a proposal for the moment. And I'll turn the mic over to you, Bill, for a comment or two.

Bill Drake: Okay. Hi, everybody. First of all, if we could get Larry for - I mean I was an advocate for letting people talk informally in lunch on the first day, but if we can Larry for lunch on the first day and do the accountability there, I think that'd actually be excellent. Because I tend to think personally that most of us

will probably already be fairly teed up for that conversation, and if we're not, we could certainly coordinate among colleagues electronically in advance.

So - but if we were to do that and take the accountability bit out and put it there, then yes that really does free up a lot of room. I agree with you, Rob, about everybody starting out together. I think that's important. I wouldn't want to be breaking out right away. I don't personally - again, maybe we're just in a different place and I don't care enough about this to argue the point that Steve feels strongly about having a breakout to prepare to meet the gentlemen.

But for me I think we probably on our side would be able to prepare for those meetings online and come in ready to talk anyway. So we wouldn't feel as much of a need for that.

But however people want to do that, that's fine. But I think the important point is if we can score Larry on that day, then yes we have a lot more flexibility to open things up and have a fuller discussion on a couple of these other items, which I think would be really good because the - I just had a long conversation the other day with the people doing the GNSO review, and I really think there's a lot for us to talk about in house, as it were, and that that should be the leading priority for the substantive sessions. So anyway, I'm happy with all this. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks, Bill. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I think actually Steve pretty much captured most of the direction I was going in. The rest of it I think can wait.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay great. I mean, I really appreciate this brainstorming because, you know, it could fall through with Larry at lunch and then he moves to some other

section. But I think this works out very nicely in terms of us being able to be flexible and move things back and forth.

In terms of just clarifying the time with Fadi, we haven't really lost any time, it's just a matter of when we get the time with him. He'll probably be able to, at least at this point, want to, be able to and want to sit in and observe lunch discussions with Larry and then go into a plenary session that afternoon. And, you know, while hopeful and (Christopher) and Jaime have asked if he can block that, you know, in a way where he's got a solid couple of our period rather than jumping back and forth, obviously that facilitates some of their meetings that they're trying to schedule for him as well.

All right. Well that - with the exception of, let's see, with the exception of the remotely possible reception I have down here, we're pretty much done with Monday. I put in that word remotely possible reception simply because I won't know probably until toward the end of next week what things, what price in terms of resources, how many hotel room nights, at what hotels. There is some spread in terms of what the cost that (Stacy)'s been able negotiate with some of the facilities. She doesn't have a lot of flexibility unfortunately.

So once I have those figures back, we have some preliminaries, then I'll be able to determine whether we've got money in the budget for a reception. You'll note that I've put here in the notes from the last version that David, -- well I didn't indicate it here -- but we're investigating sponsorship options, and David has had some brainstorm, David Olive that we're trying to explore. If any of you have any brainstorm on that front, that might need less to go ahead and schedule a reception without having to worry about the timing and how much we're spending on airfares and hotel rooms.

So it's something I'd still like to be able to do (unintelligible). I don't know if anyone has any thoughts or brainstorms in terms of the reception but I see Steve and Bill your hands - those are up again?

Bill Drake: Yes, again.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Steve and then Bill.

Steve Metalitz: Okay thank you. I'm just not clear in terms of Larry Strickling. So we don't know whether he can - whether we can get him for lunch on Monday, but is - if that does not work is Tuesday lunch an option? I'm just not clear on what - where things stand with that. I understand the change with Fadi here, but I'm not clear on Strickling.

Rob Hoggarth: The feedback, the latest feedback, I got from Jaime was that it was looking like a Monday lunch would be the most workable. If that doesn't work and, you know, what I told him is we'll take any time, we'll make it fit. So yes, if he can't do it and he has to do it on Tuesday and we can still get him, then, you know, we ask, based on the current version of the agenda, then we flip toward (Marcus) and (Dan) back to day one.

You guys might even like the idea of the lunch with them as a future guest so we could try to come up with the informal approach that Bill had suggested or something else. So I think we can be flexible on that point, Steve. My - the impression I've gotten from all of you is that you'd really like Larry, you'll take Larry any way you can get him, so wherever we can fit him in we'll accommodate that as best we can.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. This is Steve again. I would agree that it - for Tuesday, assuming we, you know, if we have Larry at lunch on Monday, but on Tuesday I think

having that a discussion time amongst all the participants would be good. I don't know that we necessarily need to structure it as with (Dan) and (Marcus) particularly. They would be part of the dialogue obviously. I think it's good to have some time together. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. Thank you. Bill, you're next.

Bill Drake: I keep agreeing with Steve, which is starting to scare me all the time. But anyway, I was going to make the latter point on the second day lunch. I don't see the need for it to be structured and a dialogue with an NTIA appointee and a board member will be around, will be part of the conversation.

More generally, if it was going to the remotely possible reception, that hadn't even occurred to me in looking at this that there's no dinner or anything like that organized. And we are packing the agenda with like a lot of like meeting, meeting, meeting when part of what I think really needs to happen here is for people to just spend some time together. Because in my experience, having informal time really is quite a good bridge builder.

And so I would really regard that as a priority, if there's some way to get sponsorship or find budget from somewhere or something to at least be able to have a reception together so that people can mingle. Because otherwise I would be really concerned if the natural tendency towards people breaking down into their respective tribes were to set in, you know, I hardly need to spend more time chatting with Rafik, who I talk to everyday, but I'd be happy to have more time talking to people from IPC and so on. So I would just - anything we can do to try to create spaces for that kind of interaction I really think is a priority here.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks, Bill. We'll continue to do that. And your initial comments, you know, I think reflects that. You're agreeing more with Steve because you guys are spending more time together on the phone. Yes so more time together.

What we tried to do is basically shut things down at six, so, you know, at least one of the evenings you can all do separate dinners or break off into smaller groups and do things like that. We'll definitely continue to pursue the reception options where there's at least a structured mingling if we can pull that off. I think that worked well in the Los Angeles setting, and we'd certainly like to do that here as well.

I will get back to you as that shapes up so that we can, you know, chat a little bit perhaps next week about, number one, if it looks like we can do it, how we want to do it. In other words, do we want to use it an opportunity to invite others from D.C., so we think that is mingling opportunity. So that's something that we've got to take a look at.

Bill Drake: Yes and further to that, Rob, since there's no organized dinner thing budgeted, is it may be possible at least for staff to try to line up a place where we could go on our own time together? Because I think, you know, if the meeting ends and you've got 40 people and they have to go eat somewhere, it's a little hard to make a booking. You know, so it might be good to tee something up in advance, even if people are paying for themselves so that we could - unless people wanted to split into little groups again.

But I mean, I would have thought some opportunity for us, at least some of us who want to, to go off together and spend a little bit more time would be a good thing. So if we had some help in making a booking somewhere nearby, that would be great.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks, Bill. Yes this is Rob. I think that's an excellent idea, in addition to the brilliant recommendations that Steve or Marilyn can potentially share. (Carlos Reyes), who's working with me here locally on the logistics and planning, I know would probably be delighted to organize something like that and recommend a place or two. So we'll definitely factor that in. Thanks for the suggestion.

I think Marilyn had first indicated that she couldn't raise her hand on her iPhone, so she'll be first. And then, Rafik, your hand was up. So we'll go Marilyn then Rafik next. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. So I'm getting a little dizzy with all of our changes and I just need to verify a couple of things here. I do think that the informal discussion part around certain topics needs to have ample time for focus.

The other thing I wanted to support, I see (Dan) as a participant, not as a speaker, and I'm - but I don't know where things stand on whether he's confirmed. I think (Marcus) is waiting for confirming information. That was my understanding when I saw him at the IGF, as I indicated last week. Are we expecting any other board members such as (Ray) or Steve Crocker, who are local, to come join us any particular time?

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob. No, Marilyn, not at the moment. If you all think - and nor have I extended a formal invitation. I would be delighted to do so if you all would like to do that. My initial thought was that if we had a reception or some other event, we'd extend an invitation to, you know, our local certainly ICANN board members and potentially others, but I hadn't factored them into their sitting in on the meetings specifically. Because if we're only talking about Steve and, you know, (Ray), we probably have meeting room space, you know, for a chair for them to sit in.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to make a quick response then. I think it's up to a group discussion, but what I would say is I would certainly welcome having the local board members come to join us. I don't consider a reception a formal consultation, and that's what this, you know, formal discussion. I think on behalf of the BC members that are coming, if they were able to come and perhaps get a better understanding from the in house perspective, that that might be valuable.

Rob Hoggarth: I like your suggestions. This is Rob. Perhaps what at least the initial approach I can take is sending a communication out to say hey we're organizing this meeting, we want you to be aware of it and the opportunity to show up. Share with them a copy of the agenda, ask if there are particular areas that they would be interested in sitting in on, when they might be able to come in. I can also go more formal route and extend the invitation formally from the house if you would like to do it that way. I can see either being an effective way to let them in. Any thoughts on that, Marilyn, in terms of the preference?

Marilyn Cade: I think that I would just ask others to comment on it.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. Well Rafik, you're next in line so I'll let you either comment on that or probably on the previous thing that we were discussing that prompted you to raise your hand. You have the floor, sir. You may want to get off mute first.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Rob. In fact I lowered my hand but if I can speak, I am for I mean kind of a reception. The whole goal of this meeting is that we get an opportunity for the non-contracted party to meet and have a good discussion and within some common ground. And I think a reception is more to discuss. I mean in other ICANN meetings it's too - it's not that easy, so this is more an opportunity to more - to focus on how this possibility to discuss.

I mean, I would be happy to talk with other members of - from CAG, so. Yes, so this just - I mean I am supporting what other said. I'm not sure how it's feasible but I would urge that we try to organize it, so.

Rob Hogarth: Great thank you. Based on this discussion I will remove the remotely from the agenda and we'll continue to pursue both the brainstorm in terms of sponsorship, and I'll continue to be monitoring very closely where we are in terms of travel arrangements and the rest to see what flexibility we have budget wise.

Again, I think, you know, two areas that were brought up with Marilyn and Rafik chatting, one of course is the reception that I think went very well in Los Angeles in the pilot to this. And so we want to be able to continue that if we can. The one thing that we're not able to take advantage of was that this very unique opportunity at the Los Angeles two years ago where the board just happened to be meeting in the same space, you know, the day after we had concluded our meetings.

So that just gave us a really neat opportunity to sit down in, you know, quote, unquote, formal dialogue session with the board that we don't have this time. So I really liked your idea there, Marilyn, about trying to take advantage of who may be here locally. And if that is - if we end up with Steve and (Marcus) and (Ray), we've got, you know, a few good members who can engage in dialogue with your leadership.

Great. Thanks for the comments. And appreciate the comments that you put in the chat as well, and Bill you and others can continue to contribute restaurant recommendations in the chat, if you'd like.

In looking at the agenda then, I mean there's really not much to change on the second day, on Tuesday. That pretty much stays the same, with the exception that (Christopher) had advised me that Fadi's national press club event that day requires him to leave at noon. And so in order to preserve the 90-minute blocks for each group, if we get started at eight with folks gathering for breakfast at CSIS, then we won't be pressured from a time perspective there.

So that's the only major change. You all have given me your comments about, you know, the lunch. And I will tone down the dialogue perspective. But I think you might want to think of, in the course of the next couple of weeks, if there are some particular things that are of value to tease out for (Marcus) and (Dan) or if there are aspects of their goals and how they interact with or provide support to the non-contracted parties house or your various stakeholder groups, where there's some balance in that.

Maybe it comes out informally over the two days, but if you want there's the opportunity for something, quote, unquote, a little bit more formal or structured. It doesn't have to be - and I take all your comments in that regard seriously. So thank you.

Any other comments? I see your comment, Marilyn, about those of locally having to get up extra early for that. Yes and I'm sorry about that one. Any other comments about day two? Steve, your hand went up. So please, sir, you have the floor.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. And just as I said in the chat, I mean I don't think it's critical that we have 90 minutes with Fadi. If we have 75 minutes, but start at a slightly more reasonable hour. Remember if we're going to have a great group dinner on Monday, we don't want to start too early on Tuesday. That's counterproductive.

Bill Drake: I agree.

Steve Metalitz: I don't think it's (unintelligible) that we have 90 rather than 75.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. Well I'll slide - I'll give you all that half hour back for your morning preparations. So we'll slide that back. Great. I mean, any other comments on the agenda in terms of the changed versions or any additional brainstorms any of you may have come up with over the course of the last week?

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. Can I just - Steve, I don't know if you're able to see that Rafik can't hear you very well.

Steve Metalitz: Yes I'll try to speak up.

Bill Drake: This is Bill. As far as the finalizing the program goes, Rob, I mean I think, you know, we really can't make decisions about what's in the substantive plenary sessions until we know what happens with Larry and the accountability piece. So I mean I think that that's just going to have to be sorted out, you know, on the fly a little bit closer to the event.

But as long as we know that we have a session that is talking about in house stuff and we know that we're having a session talking about GNSO and stakeholder group and constituencies, et cetera, and we know that there's a substantive one that'll be split and, you know, CFG's going to do, gTLDs I'm not sure what our side would want to suggest yet, but we basically the topography. We'll work this out. It's not going to be problematic. We just need to get an answer from Larry and then we calibrate everything accordingly. So I'm fine with where we are on everything.

I wanted to ask if anybody had any thoughts about my suggestion about trying to organize a conference unless - and maybe this is an AOB, why don't I wait and see if there's some other things that people want to talk about first and then I'll come back to this.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks, Bill. Yes we have the time so I think it would be great to chat about that for a moment or two. Steve, I don't know if that's a new hand but I see your hand up, so I'll give you the floor.

Steve Metalitz: That is a new hand. Thank you. And it's really just to, again, maybe agree with Bill. You know, I think we're in reasonably good shape. My question is on Slide J, if we're firm on that, that we'll have two topics, one will be new gTLDs, the other will be designated by NCSG, and so just some sense of when that is likely to happen. Again, we're trying to get our delegates prepared on all these topics, so the earlier that that decision is made the better. Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Steve. This is Rob. I think, you know, things could change, as Bill notes, and I appreciate everybody being so Zen about this and being flexible. I think that's ultimately what we want to achieve. This is your guy's meeting, so if you want to shift any of this around we don't have to be super structured other than the general framework.

I think you can be pretty comfortable, Steve, that the Tuesday afternoon is solid. Now granted it's with the shared topics and then the AOB session, so, you know, there are ways to play with that and that gives us some flexibility. But I think you can be pretty confident in that timeframe.

I would note, and, you know, as we have reached out to individuals, a number of folks will say, "Gee I don't know anything about the agenda yet, I don't

know where things stand." I don't know at what point in time you feel comfortable with us reaching out to all the delegates sort of collectively. But Benedetta is putting together basically a mailing list for all the delegates. You know, you've all provided us with names and e-mail addresses.

I was inclined instinctively to wait until we got, Bill, your final folks and we filled in a couple of other gaps with a couple of the groups. And then we would go out with, you know, hello here's the preliminary agenda agreed to by the community leaders. It's subject to change. Here's other information about Washington, D.C., a timetable, what the background of the meeting is. And that we would probably send out 22nd, 23rd of this month, my goal being that this group only needs to really have maybe one or two more calls.

We do a touch base next Friday and then, you know, then maybe the week before in early January have a time set aside for a conversation on the, you know, 6th or 7th just to make sure that everything is in line and you guys are all comfortable with stuff, but that we be communicating with the delegates in that meantime.

Bill Drake: Makes sense to me. Can I respond to Steve's question real quick? This is Bill.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes please do. Then I'll address Marilyn's comment in the chat.

Bill Drake: Oh okay. So, Steve, Rafik did send the last version of the evolving agenda to the NCSG Policy Committee, which is as you're aware it's our councilors plus, et cetera, and asked about the topics. And I had the impression from a lot people that because they haven't heard from constituency travel and - that this meeting's just really an abstraction. It's something that Rafik and I as chairs keep telling them there's a thing but they don't feel - they're heads are not into it yet.

So I'm hoping that, you know, once we start to actually get people getting booked and they know they're going to Washington, D.C. then we'll be able to get minds focused and get back to you with the topic. And probably in terms of helping both sides prepared, it'd be useful if each were to maybe share, once Rob sets up this list, maybe share like three bullet points of, you know, possible discussion points, what they're looking, what they're particularly interested in getting at, so that the other side is able to come prepared to engage. So once we have that infrastructure in place, we can sort that.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks very much, Bill. That's helpful.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks, Bill.

Rob Hoggarth: You know, I had on my - I had as the next agenda item here to start on co-chairs for sessions. It doesn't sound like we're exactly there yet, but Marilyn's comment in the chat sort of goes to that, reaching out to see if anybody would like to collaborate with her on -- or other members of the BC -- on the budget track plan discussion.

I don't know if - (unintelligible) that you may know, if we recognize that we have four plenary sessions with a general flavor, you know, opening topics, in-house topics, you know, open plenary topics broadly with the GNSO review, accountability, the budget - the community resources and budget issues, potentially the pre-ICANN 52 meeting conference. You've got those sorts of topics, you've got the real sort of in house, inside baseball topics, very important in terms of how you all collaborate, potentially discussions about selection of representatives, board members, NCA vice chairs, that sort of thing.

We've got the dual -- I won't call them dueling -- the dual topics where you've got a CSG and an NCSG topic, and then you have the any other business. As we discussed on the last call, I really like the concept of having co-chairs for each of those interactions, if you will, so that those discussions are conducted/moderated by, you know, one of you or two of you, you know, a CSG and NCSG leader, sort of taking the role and ownership of those sessions. Because otherwise it's, you know, me or David Olive or somebody else doing it, and I don't think that's the flavor or the sense that you want for this meeting.

And so if we can do over the course of the next week, Benedetta and I will remind you all and because not everyone's on this call we can sort of have a level playing field, but give you all an opportunity just to say, "Hey, Rob, Benedetta, I'd like to chair - I'd like to be the co-chair for the CSG or the discussion. I'd like to be the one for the NCSG for that session." That I think would be really helpful.

And to your point, Bill, that would, I think, sort of solidify so that you would all know, okay I've got to get ready for this session, what do we want to do. Does that make sense or do you want to do some volunteering on the call? What's your thoughts there, anybody?

Bill Drake: This is Bill. Personally, I mean I just hope we don't start to construct - we're so good at ICANN in constructing process about process that if we turn the selection of chairs for sessions into an issue that has to be debated at length, then I think that would be really pretty sad. We've got - I don't know if the AOB necessarily has to have co-chairs or not, but whatever.

As far as the other ones, I mean you've got three constituency chairs in CSG and you've got three chairs from the NCSG side. That'd be a pretty simple way

of dividing it up and we can just decide amongst ourselves which ones we're most interested in. I mean unless people wanted to nominate somebody else - I mean somebody else to replace (Lisa) I guess for BC. But anyway, however you want to do it, I don't care.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay yes I mean -- this Rob -- I was thinking of being informal. You know, so you can say Bill, "I want to, you know, I want to do the breakout for the session we have." And Rafik says, "I want to do the accountability." I don't know, however you want to do it. It doesn't have to be that way, but as we move through the agenda and we say okay it's now plenary session number two, I think it works more smoothly if (unintelligible) says, "Yes I'm in charge of this one. Here we go, folks."

Bill Drake: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: ...organically, Rob. I don't think we have to worry about it too much. But we'll decide this prior to the event.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. What I will do is I'll just create sort of a very - what I'll do is I'll add a column to the agenda and I'll just put co-chairs, and what I will do to start the horse trading, if you all choose to do that, is I'll just draw, you know, based upon your suggestion, Bill, I'll have my pieces of paper of the six chairs of the various groups and then just put names in. You guys can horse trade, say I don't want to do that, I'll do that, just to get the ball rolling there. And we can...

Bill Drake: I would be happy to co-chair with somebody in the session about the GNSO review type issues.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Bill Drake: And the whole stakeholder constituency type configuration.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: So it's Marilyn. Can I get into the queue?

Bill Drake: Jump in.

Rob Hoggarth: Marilyn, you're next.

Marilyn Cade: Yes. Why don't you (unintelligible) if you and Benni could just send to this planning group a little Word chart that has the sessions to be co-chaired a place for people can volunteer. Where's there's duplication, I'm sure we'll be able to work it out collegially. We've got three of our officers and one of our councilors who are there, so people have different interests and different expertise. But if we had a little grid like that, something like that, then we could - yes.

Bill Drake: No, no, (unintelligible) Marilyn - it sounded like he wanted a name. I withdraw my name. Put the column. But the point is we can't decide until we know what's happening with the accountability session. That's all.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Rob Hoggarth: I like that suggestion. Thanks very much for you both for your thoughts there. We'll put together the grid. That way because I recognize that everybody's not on this call, some of the people who will be coming may want to play roles, so

that will give you all opportunities to chat about that within your own groups as well. All right, great. Thank you very much. That was helpful.

We're now moving to any other business. So, Bill, we'd love to have you - to tee up the conversation about the pre-ICANN meeting conference contest. If I may, prior to you doing that, provide you all with just a very brief background.

Over time, and this was probably over the last three, four years now, different communities had come forward and said we'd like to do something prior to the ICANN meeting. And I think Bill mentioned he was one of the, at least during my tenure, one of the pioneers of this in San Francisco, to say hey we're going to do this, we've got some sponsorship. And then over time there's been more ICANN support or involvement in various sessions.

My take on your proposal to do something similar to that makes it more broadly in any CPH type affair, and that's something that you guys would talk about. Now you identified the fact that staff set aside some allocation in the SO/AC special request budget for this fiscal year, and we did do that. Basically what we looked at with the meeting team is what are the basic expenses that the meetings team incurs to arrange for additional space provide the logistics for a room and everything else. And the magic number came out to for a session like that about \$11,000.

And so what we did was we said okay, we want to allocate the capability because these things come out of the woodwork, people have brainstorm and then want to roll with them, we want to indicate those so that the meetings team doesn't panic like they had had to do in the past and say, "Oh my goodness, how do we support this, there's no money, we can't do it, it's not possible."

So we set aside these funds, 11,000 per meeting, now 33,000 for one, because what happens is as the meeting takes place and it obvious the money wasn't spent, you say, "Oh okay that can be repurposed for something else." So we will have and have in the budget the capability to handle just the basic logistics so that you all can be comfortable that yes, the meetings team capability exists to do something the Friday before the ICANN public meeting in Buenos Aires if you want to organize something.

Then the question becomes, and here's your role, Bill, to sort of, you know, support or discuss what your concept is, how it might work and then we can have folks react to it.

Bill Drake: Okay. Yes no I wasn't assuming that 33,000 was available for one event, although that would be quite a nice event if we did. You know, rock shrimp and caviar for all. Although some of that money if it's not spent could be repurposed for our reception in Washington, Rob.

But anyway, well my no, I mean I said what I said on the list. I think it's pretty self-explanatory. You know, we could propose all these things again. We know how do them. But I think it would be a nice bridge-building cooperative thing for us to work together doing something that raises the profile of the concerns of people who are not part of the, quote, DNS industry within ICANN about a number of different issues.

And I would think that, as I said, there's two ways we could do the program. One is if you want to do the minimal collaboration, you just kind of say okay NCSG programs half of it and NCSG programs half of it, and then they go off and do their separate things. Or you could try to actually collaborate across the program and have balanced engagement from both side on designing each

session, et cetera, et cetera. And I'm totally open to whatever people want to do.

I just thought it would be a useful activity in a number of different respects, both in terms of our internal dynamic and in terms of our position within the larger ecosystem to do it. And if we agreed early enough in advance and put this on people's agenda before they started to make travel plans, et cetera, you wouldn't have all the usual carping about well, you know, this is too late and, you know, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

So if we had some time in Washington -- if CSG supports doing this -- if we had some time in Washington, we could do an initial kind of scoping of what possible issues might be covered. And one could even imagine trying to do some things that are not just the usual panel after panel of talking heads, which after a while can get a little bit overwhelming, but maybe something with mixed formats where we're still open to discussion, things that were maybe structured in a particular way around a set of issues or whatever.

So I'll stop there. But just the main point was whether CSG people are interested in doing this. I heard positive responses from the ISP folks and I think kind of Marilyn expressed interest in it, and I understood that the IPC was going to talk about it, but then I didn't hear anything else and I haven't heard anything from NPOC.

Rob Hogarth: Thanks, Bill. Steve, you've raised your hand. And Marilyn put in a comment in the chat indicating a potential SSO topic. I don't know if that was for that conference issue or something for the intercessional. But that's something to consider. Steve, I'll turn over the floor to you.

Steve Metalitz: Yes this is Steve. We had a very brief conversation about it in the IPC. The reaction was generally favorable. We haven't had any discussion at the CSG level about it. My concern is that if this is going to be a successful program, as Bill says, it shouldn't just be half CSG and half for NCSG, it really needs some interaction.

It takes a lot of preparation, and we need to find a person or persons within IPC who would be interested in that preparatory work and really kind of taking charge of this. We don't have such a person now. But I think we'll be talking about that over the next several weeks to see if we can get somebody who can devote the bandwidth to it. I think the reaction was generally favorable.

Rob Hogarth: Thank you, Steve. Yes from a staff perspective, I can only say that, number one, certainly from (unintelligible), Benedetta and myself, David Olive and others would be delighted to help you guys organize something like that. Secondly just the fact that we're talking about this and it's not the next public meeting but it's the one after the next one, is fantastic because it allows us to, you know, talk with the meetings team, get them to be thinking about something like this now, you know, six months in advance rather than two months in advance. And that can make a world of difference.

So thank you for raising it at this point, Bill. And I guess the way we can leave this is it's still a potential topic for you all to talk about, probably more in the any other business section it sounds like right now for when you're talking here in Washington next month, but certainly something has the interest and you should pursue. Thanks for raising it, Bill, and I'm glad we had a couple moments to talk here.

Is there any other business that anyone would like to raise? I will give you all back two minutes with one last note to say that we will try to do this call again one more time before the holiday break next Friday, either this time or maybe an hour or two later. I recognize that this is a tough time for those farther west of Washington, D.C. and would like to encourage maximum participation. So we'll try to slide this forward by an hour or so. I noted your comment earlier, Bill, that you thought the call actually was later. Yes we'll do it, Rafik, for times on that Friday.

So thank you all very much. I think this was a productive call. I will process the changes and produce a version 5 for you all. There's not tremendous changes at the moment. I probably will do that early next week to allow me to get further feedback from the meetings team, the travel team, so that I can add that to the document.

Thank you all very, very much for contributing to these efforts. It's very helpful.

Bill Drake: Thanks, Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: All right. Bye-bye.

Bill Drake: Bye-bye.

Rob Hoggarth: Benedetta, we can stop the recording I believe.

END