

ICANN

Moderator: Benedetta Rossi
October 2, 2014
8:00 am CT

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you very much, (Victoria). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the NCPH Intercessional Planning call taking place on the 1st of October, 2014.

On the call today we have Jimson Olufuye, Steve Metalitz, Rudi Vansnick, Rafik Dammak, Kristina Rosette. And from staff we have Rob Hoggarth, Carlos Reyes and myself, Benedetta Rossi.

I would like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes.

And we have apologies for today's call from Elisa Cooper and Bill Drake.

Thank you very much and over to you, Rob. Hello? Is anyone...

((Crosstalk))

Benedetta Rossi: Rob, I think that you're on - you're not speaking right now. We can't hear you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. How's that? Is that better?

Benedetta Rossi: That's perfect.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Thank you very much. Yeah, I'm wondering, Rudi, whether I need to try to connect through the Adobe Connect room as well. Thank you. All right I'll talk very close to my microphone here.

The two major goals for today was to bring you all up to speed in terms of our logistical planning, give you a sense as to sort of follow up and flush out my recent email to you about space and dates and things like that. And then what I'd really hoped that we could achieve today is move forward in terms of some of your ideas, expectations, plans for topics and a general scope of the agenda for the meeting.

We're still many months out and I'm sure there are going to be some flexibility in terms of new items, new issues coming up that would be really great for us to begin to gel around at least a program or an agenda structure so that you all could begin your planning and some of the discussions that some of you may be having in Los Angeles in just a week or so.

So first in terms of the logistics and where we are with respect to that, as I indicated in my email we have had several discussions now with CSIS, a think tank here in the Washington DC area.

And thanks to the outreach of Christopher Mondini and working with Jim Lewis at CSIS we have secured an assurance from them of space in their conference facilities. They had the available dates that we were looking for which were January 12 and 13, 2015. So we are proceeding in plans with that group.

The original layout for the rooms they had, for those of you not in Washington toward those in Washington not familiar with the CSIS facilities, they have a ground floor large conference room and then a conference center one floor below ground level with three main meeting rooms.

They've assured us that they'll be able to provide us with three main meeting rooms we just don't know which specific ones they are at the moment. I'm hopeful we'll be able to nail that down by the end of this week. But they have a nice array of rooms and two of which could accommodate the entire group of 48 to 50 around the central conference structure, either an open table or a filled table.

They've got great audiovisual facilities that our IT team is going to be checking out with them next week. And so I'm hopeful that that looks like our solid spot so we are very good to go with that respect. We've got the space for two full days; that Monday and Tuesday of that week in January. So if we're solid with respect to that.

The other logistical matter I think that we resolved via email, prompted by Elisa and Bill's questions was the number of participants. As I explained during that - during my recent email there, the budget and approval for this meeting was based on the structure and framework that we used last time.

And we just happen to be, I think, it's fortunate that the physical facilities that we've been able to find in Washington pretty closely match what we had in Los Angeles at the ICANN headquarters, you know, a central room where everybody can gather in a central facility altogether and then the opportunity for breakout rooms as the agenda and program permits. So I think we're pretty set from, you know, a logistical standpoint in that respect.

Any comments, questions, observations that anyone would like to make about that? Hearing none I'll just indicate my thanks to Carlos Reyes, who's also on the phone. Carlos has done the trips over to CSIS with me, helped me look through the space, come up with a couple of really good brainstorms in terms of getting our IT support to be able to leverage the CSIS IT support. So thanks Carlos, for your help in that regard.

All right well that's essentially the update with respect to logistics and where we are. We've got a solid date, solid location. What I'd like to do is turn the conversation over to program but I understand that, Benedetta, we're still having some audio issues. Can you describe or explain just real quickly because I want to make sure that everybody can participate in the program discussion.

Benedetta Rossi: Yes. Either know what the issue is but, I mean, I tested it myself, unmuting my speakers, and the audio on the AC room just keeps jumping. You know, we can't really hear very well. I'll follow up with tech support afterwards, find out what the issue is. But I've asked Rudi and Marilyn if they needed dial-out. They're the only two people who aren't currently on the audio. And the operator is trying to dial out to Marilyn right now and Rudi said that he'll dial in in a few minutes.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay. Great, thank you very much. Well let me tee up the discussion and the program in this way. I shared with you all the wiki link to our space for the original intercessional meeting. That was something that Laurie had requested because of, you know, just the interest in becoming familiar with sort of what had happened before.

And I know not all of you have been involved in some of the planning and other discussions for the meeting a year and a half ago. The approach there is the approach that I'd like to take here which is essentially to acknowledge and recognize that it's your meeting in terms of program and agenda and the priorities and topics should reflect, you know, what you all want to talk about as a group.

We've had some preliminary discussions about that for the purposes of the 2015 meeting. The focus of the 2013 meeting, as many of you saw, being located in Los Angeles, be in early in Fadi Chehadé's term of office was to really spend some quality time with the senior staff at ICANN, get briefings and updates from staff on a variety of issues including, you know, plans for the new gTLDs and how that was working.

Now we're in a different place, two years later. Some of your initial discussions have focused on more effectively operating as a house, talking about issues that you all agree provide opportunities for some commonality and also use it as an opportunity to, you know, continue to build bridges and potentially do some side meetings on your own.

That's been the overall sort of, I think, focus beyond just some general brainstorming. What I'd like to do is throw open the microphone and open the queue, if you will, to anybody who'd like to make any specific comments or share some ideas about agenda and how we may go about reaching some consensus on that.

So let me stop talking and turn over the microphone to whoever would like to raise their hand or just speak out on the phone.

Marilyn Cade: Rob, it's Marilyn.

Rob Hoggarth: Marilyn, you're first in the queue.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, I need to make two points. First of all technical challenges and o there issues have cost us considerable time. I'm not going to complain about it but I am going to say we really need for - to understand that has been a - that that's a problem.

Secondly...

Rob Hoggarth: On this specific call, Marilyn, that's what you're referring to, right?

Marilyn Cade: Sorry?

Rob Hoggarth: I'm sorry, you're referring to this specific call?

Marilyn Cade: Yes. And so...

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: ...my apologies for that.

Marilyn Cade: I got that part. The point is we're running out of time. I'm just trying to rush us through to a couple of items rather than focusing on that but it is a problem so as soon as the transcript is available it's going to be very important because the other issue I just wanted to raise a couple of our key - the people we need to be consulting with closely aren't able to be on the call. So if we could just

have an, you know, an expedited transcript that was the point I wanted to make. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Certainly. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Rob, let me go on to another point real quickly. I think that the BC is still discussing trying to do a day - a side event of our own. We haven't reached any conclusions; we haven't - there's the possibility we could work with the rest of the CSG. We haven't been able to take that forward. We would try to do that with some urgency in the next - in the next few maybe even by Monday to see if that's even a consideration that we would try to do a day after.

Rob Hoggarth: (Unintelligible) perhaps doing something that Wednesday.

Marilyn Cade: Rob, yeah, apparently nobody but me wants to meet on Sunday.

Rob Hoggarth: Touché, good point. Thank you. And that's helpful to hear because there may be some issues that specifically the CSG as the opportunity presents itself will be able to do as an individual group that day so I understand that. That could impact the program event.

Rafik Dammak: Rob? This is Rafik.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, Rafik, please.

Rafik Dammak: So if I understand correctly Marilyn was suggesting that to have additional one-day for CSG kind of, I mean, by stakeholder group?

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah, I think that's what the CSG is looking into. And this is a good opportunity for me to share with you my discussions with the constituency travel team. I've thrown this little note into a couple of my communications now. I hope you have all read it. My concern was that folks may have not read it and were, you know, not absorbing it.

Because we're in a new location in Washington DC which is substantially more expensive than the Los Angeles location, and recognizing that many of us are here in the DC area what we're trying to do is, for those folks relatively close in, is only provide the hotel accommodations for folks who are traveling from outside the DC area.

And what we were looking at doing and discussions this with constituency travel is provide Sunday, Monday, Tuesday night accommodations for out of towners. So that makes Wednesday, you know, a getaway day and if folks can arrange flights later in the day then we essentially have, you know, most of Wednesday already provided for within the, you know, general plan for the meeting.

So yeah, Rafik that would give folks an opportunity to have, you know, a 1/2 day, 2/3, full day of meetings among their individual groups. So that would be something that you might consider as well from the NCSG side - Non Commercial side.

Rafik Dammak: Just so a little bit lost here. So you mean we have the two days which are Monday Tuesday but you are saying that we can get like, for example, Wednesday?

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah, I mean, we have the facility at CSIS for this two-day meeting on Monday and Tuesday. Taking advantage of the fact that you'll have folks in

town you may choose independently as your stakeholder group or constituency to use the fact that, hey, a bunch of us are here in the same city, let's meet on Wednesday.

We won't have the CSIS facilities, we do have the ICANN office which has one conference room that can accommodate probably about 20 people. And then of course, you know, within the CSG or others I'm sure there are options with members to connect with folks for some meeting space.

But, yeah, to clarify - and thanks for asking the question - we don't have and are not, you know, have not worked with any of the sites where we have the Wednesday available. It's really tight that period, I think we're very fortunate to find what we've got right now with CSIS.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Rob. So anyway we can explore this later if we really need. And we see - it depends the availability of people and so on maybe we can have this option but, yeah. We can explore it later anyways.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah. Correct. One last point and I see Steve has his hand up. The other piece of this, as Bill has expressed, and I think there may be some concerns there that you guys have had from the BC side, it's not clear to me what the schedule is for some of your elections and things like that.

And so I've gotten the warning from a couple of you at least that we won't necessarily for everyone be able to move to November 1 timeframe for providing participants. I'd like to have as many as we can by that time so that constituency travel can do the necessary arrangements, bookings, things like that to make this efficient and as effective as possible from a budget perspective.

By the same token, there will be some people who we don't know about until the last minute but the earlier we can, you know, confirm dates and times you guys have your programs and agendas together the better.

So, you know, as Marilyn suggested, with planning for a third day for some of you who want to do that you probably want to do that sooner rather than later and get that on the calendar just for folks' travel plans.

Steve, your hand was up.

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, thank you. Just a couple of points to clarify. First, it's clear that we're limited to seven different participants from each constituency within the CSG, is that a definite now?

Rob Hoggarth: We have the...

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: Well, what I outlined for you all was what the breakdown was last time. It would seem logical that you all might reach the same conclusion, okay, we've got 21 slots, we're going to divide them up evenly. But, yeah, the number is seven - or the number was seven last time; if you all choose to divide that otherwise you could.

Steve Metalitz: All right, then I should have said 21 slots for CSG. So, you know, given that it's Monday and Tuesday I do think it would make sense, as I think I suggested the last time, that we have some chunk of time, perhaps quarter of a the time that's available for meetings either at the stakeholder group or constituency level, some chunk of time.

And I guess I would suggest about half the time for meetings of the house with minimal, if any, staff participation, in other words, for us to work on some of our internal issues and discussions and then roughly 1/4 of the time where we might want to have some staff either briefing or dialogue or something on particular topics.

That's at least how I'm conceiving this but of course we haven't had any discussion of this within our stakeholder group and we're not going to make much progress today because we have so few on the call. That's kind of my conception.

My question is if it breaks down that way is it possible - because we're so restricted in the (unintelligible) is it possible if we have meetings of stakeholder groups or constituencies to invite other people from the stakeholder group or constituency to sit in on those?

And, again, I'm just thinking of whether we could pack this into like the Monday morning rather than - or maybe in addition to trying to add on a third day. So that's my first question is within space limitations is there any objection to non - people outside the magic 21 coming into the room for meetings of the constituency or stakeholder group level. That's my first question.

My second question, just to get it on the table, is for the last quarter as I'm conceiving it, where we would have ICANN staff available, is Fadi available to attend and be interested in doing a public event or simply private discussion?

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, Steve. This is Rob. I'll take the second question. I assume that your first question was directed more to your fellow leaders so I'll let them think about the question you asked me about potential observers.

On the second one, from the staff side, and thanks for asking the question because I wanted to clarify that with you. We're happy to be in the room at any time to provide the support to your discussions in a pure support role. If there are issues where you want to have some confidential discussions we're happy to leave the room or turn off the microphone or whatever, although we will have remote participation capabilities and we are planning on recording and transcribing the meeting for the benefit of all of you.

We have blocked Fadi's calendar for those days in Washington DC so he is planning to be in Washington DC at that time to be available to you all. One of the interests of course in being able to nail down a program is, as you note, you're not going to want him for the full time so if he's here they want to take advantage of being in Washington and do other things.

Christopher Mondini reached out to me and I think a couple of you independently to talk about, gee, you know, how - would you envision an opportunity for members of your community to participate in a more public event with Fadi? And he's exploring those opportunities just because Fadi will be here.

But in terms of your specific program, yes, he will be available, you know, we can work that in the schedule and the earlier you all choose the more guarantee we'll have to have him for the spot you particularly want him. And, yeah, whatever the topic is, whatever the issue is that would be great.

We have not planned for others to be in Washington, at least at this point. David Olive has noted that he'll probably be back for the Holidays and, you know, if he can arrange his travel just to stay here, he's got a home here in the DC area to, you know, be able to sit in on parts of the sessions where you'd like him so that's something if you'd like David involved where we can work to make that happen.

But definitely we've got Fadi on the books and on the calendar for those two days. And I think Christopher suggested that maybe for another day or two that week so for example, if somebody just had independent things you were working on where you wanted to potentially connect with him that would be a possibility.

But is that helpful, Steve, in answering question number two?

Steve Metalitz: It is, thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay good.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Question number one, I guess you have no objection so that's something we would need to discuss - and I'll ask obviously you may not be able to answer but I'll ask the NCPH if - the NCSG if they have any objection to that.

Rob Hoggarth: Yeah, and the only quick intercession I would make is you did add the qualifier, space permitting. The CSIS space - and I don't know if you're familiar with it, Steve, or if others are, there's a total of four decent conference rooms that are available.

So ones in the conference center that we were originally booked for provided a breakdown of, I think, as I indicated to you all, about, you know, we can get about 50-55 if you squeeze folks in and maybe add some chairs around the side you could get up to 60.

So, I mean, we're not talking capability size wise to have much more than that. One thing if you all, you know, say, yeah we could have, you know, some observers, you know, there is a central space there, sort of a reception area between all of them, a big foyer, but I don't know that they would be capable of giving us that space, you know, just to sit because it's open to the whole atrium. But I would think that would work.

So, I mean, you're really looking at a limited in the biggest room of probably around 60 if people sit on each other's laps, 65. So with that, you know, just physical constraints. I'll let you all talk about it.

Marilyn Cade: But, Rob. Rob, sorry, it's Marilyn. But that doesn't help us - so in the individual rooms how many people are we talking about?

Rob Hoggarth: You're talking about 65 in the biggest room, probably around - because that's what we, you know, again looking at the framework of the past meeting we had one big room...

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: ...participants and...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: I know but we're trying to understand how many in the breakout rooms?

Rob Hoggarth: Breakout rooms - oh, breakout rooms probably about 15-20; probably in terms of putting chairs around the outside 25. I mean, because CSIS also has individual conference rooms on each of their floors. There's some logistical issues about getting people up the elevators but we think we've got that handled.

And those rooms are good conference room size. You could probably get 20, and again if you really squeeze people in, 25 people in one of those rooms.

Steve Metalitz: Okay, Rob...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...Rob, this is not, I mean, every number you've given here is different than the numbers that you gave in your email last week. So if you could give us a better - an - I've been to that space but it was quite a few years ago and they may have changed it so if you could give us...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: It's new space, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: Okay then I don't know how it's laid out. So if you can give us some numbers that would be very helpful. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Certainly.

Marilyn Cade: And, Steve...

Rob Hoggarth: And again I am - and I'm just doing my own guestimates at this point, Steve...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Rob Hoggarth: ...about how many you could cram in.

Marilyn Cade: Steve...

Rob Hoggarth: In terms of sitting around the table the numbers I gave you are, you know, difference between being comfortable with your elbows and I think being squeezed in.

Steve Metalitz: Okay thanks.

Marilyn Cade: Rob? Yeah, Rob, let me make an offer. I will go over to CSIS with you next week and we can scope it out and come back and we can even take pictures of the rooms and send it to the team.

Rob Hoggarth: If you all would like I can show you pictures that Carlos and I did take. So, yeah, I'll circulate that to all of you so you can see it.

Marilyn Cade: Good because we...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: But, yeah, but, guys, we've got a problem we need to resolve right now in my view. Steve, because we've got to talk about the program so two quick things. If the rooms only accommodate 15 people for us to have a CSG meeting or for the NCSG to meet, you know, we're going to have to struggle to even have the space for our 21.

So we need to be realistic about whether we're going to bring in outside observers. Or if not, are we able to have remote participation for observers for each of the breakout sessions?

The second question I would just raise, Steve, is for at least the BC most of our people who want to come are remote participants outside Washington DC. And I - that's why I raised the question about for the BC whether we may need to do a third day, which I don't want to go into more here.

But I don't see the practicality of having Washington-based people equally distributed across all of the groups to be able to come into the space. If we have remote participation maybe we could park that and ask Rob to come back and verify that whether we could have just open remote observation in our CSG meeting and - or our constituency level meetings.

Steve Metalitz: So I guess - this is Steve. I guess the question, Rob, is remote participation available in all the rooms?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, that's our expectation. We will have it set up for that.

Steve Metalitz: Okay. That's helpful. And I hear you, Marilyn, if the rooms only accommodate 20 then it's...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Steve Metalitz: ...it may well just be the...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: The second thing I wanted to go on is I - from the Business Constituency perspective, although I have not verified it with our members I'm going to take a fairly strong position that we want Fadi to meet with us. During the public event where Fadi gives a speech, I'm watching him give speeches here in Mexico, is one thing. And it's a treasure.

However, we want a meeting where Fadi is interacting with the leadership in a engaged and direct and sort of equalized manner, not just giving a speech.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve, I would agree with that.

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: And this is Rob. That's how I interpreted your request from the very first day. I mean, we're talking about the potential for opportunities for some public events but, you know, those two days, again, his purpose for coming is to interact and work with you all so thank you for reaffirming that, Marilyn and Steve.

Rafik Dammak: This is Rafik. So if I understand this correctly we are asking Fadi to listen more than talking and doing speeches so more interaction and more real frank discussion since we don't have really such opportunity often so.

Rob Hoggarth: Correct, yes sir. This is Rob.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, Rob, I had one other question I want to raise to all my colleagues, that is, in the past we did have the opportunity because some of the Board was at the location in LA. If there's going to be a social event would there be an

opportunity to invite the Board members who are local? And would there be interest from my colleagues?

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob. I'll take the first half. Yeah, we haven't talked in detail as a group yet about the possibility of a reception. I've held that sort of back a bit just to see where we're going to be in terms of numbers and budgets and things like that. But I think that would be a fantastic thing if we can swing that.

And I would think that if we do have that type of event like we did in Los Angeles we'd want to open it up to others within the DC area to participate. So, yeah, I think it'd be great to invite local Board members.

Rafik Dammak: Rob?

Rob Hoggarth: Yes, sir.

((Crosstalk))

Rafik Dammak: Yes, also I think she was asking everybody here on the call. So I guess for the Board members probably at least we need to get the new elected Board member, Markus Kummer to attend since he was - I mean, elected by the NCPH to the Board so it makes sense that he at least come. I hope that there is no disagreement here.

In addition to...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: I was just cheering Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: What we did in the past was we had the NCA rep and that's a good idea to also have Markus invited to participate. And I presume that a number of you will, in addition to the staff invitation, reach out to him and see if he's available and interested in participating.

((Crosstalk))

Rob Hoggarth: And, I mean, that could extend to not just - you had asked the question about the reception, Marilyn...

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Rob Hoggarth: ...but I think Rafik's point was more to, hey, let's have, you know, we can have him participate in the discussion.

Marilyn Cade: Right. Right and just to clarify before we go back to program, please, so Dan will, of course be invited since he is the Nominating Committee to the house. Markus Kummer and then our 21. And then since that's the space problem we're going to move on to talk about program, is that right?

Rob Hoggarth: Correct. I've acknowledged the space issues. And I realize the confusion I just created on this call because I mixed up the breakout rooms. When I said that there were three rooms available and the numbers that I gave you the conference room - the conference facility at CSIS, and this is a brand new building, Steve, it's only been there like a year, is underneath ground level.

And there are three rooms there. There's one that accommodates, you know, the (unintelligible), you know, 50 people around a big hollow square; there's a second one that is a similar layout that probably accommodates around 30-40 and then there's a smaller room that's probably about 20 people or so.

So earlier when I was talking about the - the main room, you know, we could probably squeeze in 50, 65. That's what I was referring to in terms of observers or a general assembly.

The idea of getting the three rooms was then the capability to, you know, break out into multiple separate discussions whether that would be via - by each SG or by constituency.

You know, we have both the 50 and 40 rooms then, yeah, you guys can comfortably break out into stakeholder groups and there would be accommodations, for quote, unquote, observers for your SG meetings.

My concern is that I don't know that we could accommodate many observers in the plenary meeting, if you will, the general assembly just because our largest room wouldn't accommodate that. But once you break out into your separate ones, you know, we still have the 50 and the 40 then, yeah, you've got some more flexibility for someone to take a cab or walk over to the meeting and sit in for your half day programming or whatever that's just SG related. So I hope that helps clarify that a little bit.

In addition, when I was talking about breakout rooms, CSIS does have smaller conference rooms that are arrayed throughout the building but, you know, in the same spot on each floor. And that's the number of about 20 or so. So I hope that helps clarify a little bit. I realized as you all kept talking that I had mixed and matched the conference center with the individual breakout rooms.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Steve, your hand is up. I don't know if that's an old hand or a new hand.

Steve Metalitz: It's an old hand but let me just ask - so will there be - are we planning to have a reception, a social event? And if so where will that be and will others be able to attend that or just what's planned for that?

Rob Hoggarth: If you all would - this is Rob, let me answer the overall question. If you would like to have one we will work to plan one and look for opportunities. And then I think, you know, as we get - as we define a space, you know, I'll talk to CSIS where we can just use the central foyer there because that would be a good spot and everybody's already in the same location.

Or just at one of the nearby hotels, you know, we can examine, you know, whichever hotel would get the biggest room block for and see if they can swing us a deal for a reception space.

Yeah, then it's up to you guys in terms - I'll be able to give you the numbers about what the spaces can accommodate. But I think it would be a really neat thing for you to be able to do that. You know, the idea in Los Angeles was a good one but there weren't many extra community members available that could drop by whereas, you know, having it in Washington DC you all might find opportunities to, you know, do some outreach and bring in some - a good number of guests.

Steve Metalitz: Okay well speaking personally I'd encourage you to look into that and let us know what's possible.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay, will do.

Marilyn Cade: So if we can go to programs because I've got to go to a meeting with Fadi as a matter of face. The one thing that I'm - Chris Mondini is here and I just want to ask a question of my colleagues here.

We have work to do among ourselves then we want to have a frank and open dialogue with Fadi. We will, I think, want to be able to accommodate remote participation from some others from the ICANN staff depending perhaps on topics that we may decide to explore.

I'm just going to park that because now I think we really need to focus on the allocation of time, when Fadi's going to be there, when he's not in terms of his availability but how we move ourselves around.

So, Steve, Rafik, others, are we thinking that we would open with our own, you know, kind of a - we kick off either separately and have some working time as stakeholder groups, then we come together and figure out what we are working out in common, then we have any meetings with Fadi and the staff and then we come back together for a common planning session or is there some other organizational allocations?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. That's certainly one possibility. Another might be to, I mean, if you figure, again, for simplicity in four blocks, a half day each...

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Steve Metalitz: ...could be together...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...agenda. And then B could be well we've heard what everybody said, now let's talk in our stakeholder groups about, you know...

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...we want to decide. C could be Fadi, etcetera.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Steve Metalitz: And D could be we'll all come together and make our final conclusions. I mean, I don't feel strongly one way or the other but I think something like that would...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: Let me revise - let me join you with that idea and see what others think. So we launch together, we go then into stakeholder groups. The half-day, Day 2 we start the morning with Fadi and staff and then we have an afternoon together working session. I like that.

Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yeah, okay so first about the stakeholder groups meetings, I thought first you actually said - I'm not sure you or Steve that maybe you want additional day. So I was thinking if really we can spend as much time as possible as a house and discuss because I think we have several topic pending that we want to find a kind of finalize and find the solution.

And also working on how to improve, I mean, the coordination and so on within the house and starting from the intercessional and hopefully - I hope before.

But I kind of envision - I thought that we have - try to, if we have stakeholder groups meetings or even constituencies that maybe could be done before or after or even in the two days but to limit it in the way so we can spend as much time as groups to work and then we have the meeting with Fadi and staff. But we can follow what was suggested by Steve anyway.

Just I'm wondering about the time to spend as a stakeholder group within those two days and how we optimize the meeting and coordination within the house.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, Rafik it's Marilyn. Let me just clarify. If the BC has a meeting on the follow-on day it will have nothing to do with coordination; it will be a business recruitment and outreach focused on reaching others from business to talk to them about, you know, it will have nothing to do with the intercessional; it would just be taking advantage of the fact our officers are there.

Rafik Dammak: Oh okay. Understood. Okay so should we then follow what Steve suggested in term of time (unintelligible), I think he said has for house - I forget house or the house something and (unintelligible) for the meeting with Fadi and the staff.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, this is Steve. And let me just clarify. First of all, I mean, I'm kind of roughly dividing this into four blocks of roughly half a day each. But

obviously they don't have to be exactly that, it could be a little bit less for example for the stakeholder groups (unintelligible).

My proposal was that the first block, Monday morning, would be plenary of the NCPH; the second block would be stakeholder group and/or constituency (unintelligible) for that. Third block, Tuesday morning, would be Fadi's session plus any other staff interactions that we want to arrange, you know, that's to be decided. And then the fourth block, Tuesday afternoon, would be back in the plenary.

So that's my rough outline at least to work with - obviously again as I said, those blocks don't have to be exactly equal and we could adjust it a little bit. I think you make a good point, Rafik, this is a good opportunity for the whole house to be together and so we should try to maximize that. But I think it actually would be more - it could be more fruitful if there's also some time set aside for the stakeholder group to caucus separately.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, no disagreement here. So okay we can have this maybe this first, I mean, suggestion and then we share each with our groups and see, I mean, if we can get additional feedback or comments so we can work from - I think we can start from this template. I am okay with it.

Steve Metalitz: Great, I appreciate that. And I should say this is not a CSG approved position, either, this is just my suggestion. So we'll discuss it among our - within our group and communicate with you guys about.

Rafik Dammak: Understood. Steve, I was - I mean, kind of I think here we'll try to move - to move on and to move more quickly it's just we start with this draft and then we can work open it and maybe getting comment and feedback so, yeah.

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob. I mean, I hesitate to declare victory but I think, you know, thanks to the productive suggestions that may be where you all want to leave it at this moment looking at that sort of general framework of the meeting. I'll capture the critical items that Marilyn outlined at the beginning of that.

Then it sounds like the next approach would be for you all to go back, socialize some of this general concept and then maybe for our next call come back with some specific topics, particular session items that you want to go over for each of these major blocks.

I recognize that we could, you know, shift and move depending upon schedules and you guys have that flexibility but to take this, you know, quarterly block approach, look at this as a 16-hour meeting, if you will, broken in four hour chunks and then we can sort of, in our next discussion, start talking about actual topic detail.

Unless anyone wants to throw anything like that out right now I'd like to like to declare victory and note that we've been productive and move the ball forward here, go back and do some of the homework you've asked me to do in terms of some specifics, confirming specific rooms, sizes and things like that and you can start planning and thinking about what the SG alone time might look like too.

Agreement? Disagreement? Other - any other business that anyone would like to raise?

Steve Metalitz: That sounds good to me. This is Steve.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Thanks, Steve. I note that in the chat Rudi said we're going to lose him. Marilyn said she was going to have to drop off a little bit before the top of the

hour too. Kristina, wanted to give you an opportunity to interject any final thoughts as well.

Kristina Rosette: No, not at all. I think Steve has raised all of the issues that IPC had wanted to raise.

Rob Hoggarth: Okay great. Well thank you, Rudi, for your chat comments. Thank you, Rafik, Marilyn, Steve, for that productive conversation. Since we didn't have Elisa and Bill on here we will get quickly out a summary of this and Marilyn requested to actually work on getting out the transcript and the recording quickly.

My apologies, again, for some of our initial technical difficulties. Benedetta will get out a Doodle poll for our next call and I hope we won't take three Doodle polls next time to find the time to get some of us together.

Thank you all very very much. I appreciate this. I'm glad we are doing this in a spirit where we aren't rushed, we have months but it's good to get this all nailed down. Thank you all very much for your time today.

We'll be in touch.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you.

Kristina Rosette: Thanks, Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: All right. Bye-bye.

Rafik Dammak: Bye-bye.

Rob Hoggarth: And thank you, Benedetta.

END